A Textual Commentary

on the

Greek Gospels

Vol. 2
Mark

BY
WIELAND WILLKER

Bremen, online published
12th edition 2015
© all rights reserved

Textual variants
in the
Gospel of Mark

Results from the variant evaluation:

The best manuscripts of Mk:

1. Primary (=best) witnesses for Mk are: 01, B, L, Ψ, 083, 0274, bo
   Ψ is extant from 9:5

2. Secondary (= good) witnesses for Mk are: (P45, P88), C, Δ, 892, 1342, sa
   Δ and 1342 get much better from ch. 5 on.

3. Tertiary (all weak): (33, 579, vg)

"Caesarean": [Θ, 565], f1, f13, 28, 700, 2542
"mixed": *P45*, W, Sy-S
"Western": D, it
Byzantine: A, (f13), 157, 1071, 1241, 1424, (vg), $Sy^{P,H}$

other: 0131 is not a very good manuscript (70% Byz), but has many special readings.

manuscripts with Lacuna: (also noted in the text)

P45 extant:

N.B.! The lacunae of P45 are not mentioned explicitly in this commentary.

4:36-40	6:36-50	8:34-9:9	12:13-19
5:15-26	7:3-15	9:18-31	12:24-28
5:38-6:3	7:25-8:1	11:27-12:1	
6:16-25	8:10-26	12:5-8	

C lacuna:

1:1-17	6:32-8:5	12:30-13:19

L lacuna:

10:16-30	15:2-20

W lacuna:

15:13-38

Ψ lacuna:

N.B.! The lacuna of Ψ is not mentioned explicitly in this commentary.

1:1-9:5

083 extant:

13:12-14	21-24	14:29-45	+ shorter ending
16-19	26-28	15:27-16:8	

0274 extant:

6:56-7:4	7:19-23	8:3-4	9:26-41
7:6-9	7:28-29	8:8-11	9:43-10:1
7:13-17	7:34-35	9:20-22	10:17-22

33 lacuna:

9:31-11:11	13:11-14:60

579 lacuna:

3:28-4:8

Sy-S lacuna:

1:1-12	1:44-2:21	4:18-41	5:26-6:5

Sy-C is extant only from 16:18-20.

That Sy-C is missing in Mk is not mentioned explicitly at every variant. It should be kept in the back of one's mind.

Additional noteworthy manuscripts from T&T:

	"2"	"Sonder"	Comparable to:		
372	9%	6%			
2737	10%	6%	1241	11%	9%
2786	16%	9%	1071	12%	11%
			1424	14%	14%
517	15%	11%			
954	9%	10%			
1675	15%	12%			
2766	13%	11%			

372, 2737 and 2786 are also noteworthy in Mt! As in Mt 372 agrees with 2737 191/196 (97%).
517, 954, 1424, 1675: 517 agrees 185/196 (94%) with 1675, 166/188 (88%) with 954 and 168/188 (86%) with 1424.

f1:
It should be noted also that 131 belongs to f1 in Mk 1-5 according to Lake ("f1"), being Byzantine in the remaining part. 131 is also f1 in Lk.
1582: This manuscript has been corrected by a later hand to the Byzantine text. I have decided to normally not record these corrections, but only in exceptional cases.

108 of the 288 variants (38%) are difficult to evaluate (Rating either "-" or "1?").
Mk has 673 verses. This means that we have
- one significant variant every 2nd – 3rd verse, and
- one difficult variant every 6th verse.
About 31 variants (11%) should be reconsidered in NA.

Of the variants noted only 25 (9%, Mt: 13%) have an umlaut in B (plus 4 insecure cases). There are 56 umlauts overall in Mk. This means that 31 of the 56 umlauts indicate rather minor (or unknown!) stuff.

TVU 1

1. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:1 Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ **[υἱοῦ θεοῦ].**

BYZ Mark 1:1 Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ **υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ**

T&T #1

omit:	01*, Θ, 28^{C}, pc^{9}, L2211, sa^{ms}, arm, geo^{1}, Sy-Pal
	Or, Serapion, WH, **NA^{25}**, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, SBL
	pc = 28$^{62\%}$, 530, 582*, 820*, 1021, 1436, 1555*$^{89\%}$, 1692, 2430, 2533
	(% = Byz readings. Those without have more than 90% Byz, from T&T)
υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ	A, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj
υἱοῦ θεοῦ	01^{C1}, B, D, L, W, 732, 1602, WH^{mg}, Weiss
one of the longer endings:	Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, arm^{mss}, geo^{2}, goth, Ir, Ambrose, Jerome, Aug, Cyr
τοῦ θεοῦ	055, pc^{4}
υἱοῦ τοῦ κυρίου	1241

εὐαγγελίου **τοῦ Κύριου** Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Sy-Pal^{mss}

28* omits Χριστοῦ.

Lacuna: C, Sy-S, Sy-C(up to 16:17)

B: no umlaut

Church fathers evidence:

A. Globe has carefully studied the evidence and he concludes that the following witnesses to the shorter variant should be removed from the apparatuses: Irenaeus, Jerome, Basil, Epiphanius.

Irenaeus actually cites the longer form twice: Adv. haer. 3.10.5 (Latin) and 3.16.3 (Latin and Armenian). Irenaeus' exposition repeats the phrase 'Son of God' several times.

The longer form is also cited by Ambrose (4th CE, Expos. Luc. 10.118; = PL 15. 1926), Jerome (Tract. Marc. 1, Comm. Matt. 1, Comm. Hiezec. 1.1.6/8 and in his Vulgate), Augustine (De cons. evan. 2.6; = PL34. 1084-85) and Cyril of Alexandria (5th CE, Contra Julian. 10.330; = PG 76. 1007-8).

It should me noted that Jerome cites the short form twice, too: Epistle to Pammachius 57.9 and Commentary on Malachi 3.1.

Unequivocal support for the short form is limited to two fathers:

Origen (early 3rd CE):

Origen seems to knew the short form only. He is citing it three times:

- Comm. Jo. 1.13 and 6.24: The first four books were written in Alexandria ca. 226-29, and the sixth in Caesarea ca. 232 (cp. Lake "The Caesarean text of Mark", p. 259).
  1.13.79 Πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ τοῦτο περὶ εὐαγγελίου ἰστέον, ὅτι πρώτως τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ὅλου τῶν σῳζομένων σώματος, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐστὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὥς φησιν ὁ Μάρκος· Αρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ· Ἤδη δὲ καὶ τῶ ν ἀποστόλων τυγχάνει· 1.13.81 Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς Μάρκος· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου. Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.
- Contra Celsum 2.4: written ca. 246-48 in Caesarea.
  2.4. Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἷς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, ὁ Μάρκος φησίν· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου, δεικνὺς ὅτι ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀρχὴ τῶν ἰουδαϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἤρτηταὶ.

Origen cites the short form once more, in Comm. Eph. (on Eph 1:13, cp. JAF Gregg, HTR 3, 1902, p. 233-44, esp. 242), but here he is citing only verse 1, so this is not clear: ἀλλὰ ποῦ τὸ μὲν εὐαγγέλιον ὀνομάζεται παρατηρητέον, παρατηρητέον δὲ καὶ τὰς προστιθεμένας αὐτῷ λέξεις, οἷον κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, ἢ ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον αἰωνιον, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν Εφεσίων· ἢ ἁπλῶς εὐαγγέλιον, ὥσπερ ὅταν λέγῃ περὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ ὁ Παῦλος οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

Serapion (4th CE):

The often cited Titus of Bostra is actually Serapion of Thmuis (cp. Globe, ref. below). The words in Titus are (PG 18, c. 1216-17): Εἰ δὲ Μάρκος λέγει· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ. ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος· Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ … The words in Serapion are (PG 40 c. 921 "Against the Manichees"): Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε ἐπιστήμην τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἔχουσι, τὴν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων ἀρχὴν μὴ παραλαβόντες· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ. Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν μαθημάτων ἐκβεβληκάσι, τῇ ἀρχῇ * τῶν μαθημάτων ἐμαχέσαντο, τὰ

τελευταῖα ἐζήτησαν, εὑρεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὴν ἀκολουθίαν μὴ παραδεξάμενοι. (* the end taken from Casey, p. 102)
That Serapion's Gospel text agrees quite closely to that of Origen has been shown in a careful study by A. Globe.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	01, L, 157, pc, b, r^1
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος	W, f13, pc, Sy-P, sa^{mss} (from Mt 16:16)

A lot has already been written about this variant, but still it is not clear.
The support for the omission is not very strong, but diverse (or incoherent). The omission possibly occurred due to confusion of scribes over the many nomina sacra:

ΙΥΧΥΥΙΟΥΘΥ or ΙΥΧΥΥΥΘΥ

That some kind of oversight might be involved is supported by the fact that 4 witnesses for the omission have been corrected at this point. This should be checked at the originals. Also, it is not clear why 9 normal Byzantine minuscules support the omission.
The NET Bible notes:
"Even though 01 is in general one of the best NT manuscripts, its testimony is not quite as preeminent in this situation. There are several instances in which it breaks up chains of genitives ending in ου like this one (cf., e.g., Acts 28:31; Col 2:2; Heb 12:2; Rev 12:14; 15:7; 22:1), showing that there is a significantly higher possibility of accidental scribal omission in a case like this."

On the other hand scribes often expand book titles. Also it has been argued that an error such as this is rather unlikely at the very beginning of a new book.

WH: "neither reading can be safely rejected."

Both readings have been in competition from a very early date. The two church fathers noted for the support of the shorter reading have complete quotations, including parts of verse 2, and not only short references.

On the other hand it could be argued that citations from the fathers in this case are not very reliable, even if verses 1-2 are cited. This could still be from memory, smoothing the rather clumsy long form. Note that several fathers, who know the long form, sometimes quote the short form (cp. Globe). Thus the weight of the fathers isn't very strong in this case.

The parallel Mk 8:29 shows that such an addition is only natural, perhaps a harmonization to Mt 16:16. Interestingly 01 is supporting the longer reading there.

It has been suggested that Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is the book title. It could have been added (or expanded) later. But Croy notes: "it is odd for a title to speak of a beginning." He goes on: "The awkwardness of vs. 1 increases when we consider Manson's second observation: vs. 2 is a subordinate clause that lacks a main clause. Construing vs. 1 as a title makes vs. 2 the beginning of a sentence, indeed, the beginning of the entire Gospel. But this is unlikely." No exact analogies exist to verse 1.
Also Καθὼς γέγραπται of vs. 2 is in the NT "never the introductory clause, but rather always follows a report of something seen as the fulfillment of a prophetic word" (so already F. Spitta). Similarly Kilpatrick notes: "Where καθὼς introduces a following quotation in the NT it invariably follows its main clause." But this cannot be verse 1. Thus it has been argued by several scholars that actually the beginning of Mark's Gospel is lost (so again already F. Spitta). Croy gives more arguments in his article (e.g. the usage of the term εὐαγγέλιον, or the unique Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Croy argues that verse 1 is non-Markan, for Elliott the verses 1-3 are non-Markan.

Lachmann argues the other way round, that verse 1 is original, but that verses 2-3 have to be omitted. He has the verses in brackets in his GNT. E. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 53-55) agrees with this: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ was John the Baptizer, who, in the desert, was proclaiming a baptism of repentance ..."

Note also:
NA28 Philippians 4:15 οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππήσιοι,
ὅτι <u>ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου</u>, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, ...

Here ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου has the meaning of "in the early days of my proclamation of the gospel".

Compare:

- F. Spitta "Beiträge zur Erklärung der Synoptiker" ZNW 5, 1904, 305-8
- W.A. Craigie "The Beginning of St. Mark's Gospel" Expositor 8th series, 24 (1922) 303-5 [argues that the beginning has been lost]
- C. H. Turner "A Textual Commentary on Mark 1," JTS 28 (1927) 145-58
- A. Wikgren "ΑΡΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ" JBL 61 (1942) 11-20
- J. Slomp "Are the words 'Son of God' in Mk 1:1 original?" BibTrans 28 (1977) 143-50
- G. Arnold "Mk 1:1 und Eröffnungswendungen in griechischen und lateinischen Schriften" ZNW 68 (1977) 123-7
- R. Way-Rider "The Lost Beginning of St. Mark's Gospel" in Studia Evangelica Vol. VII, Akademie Verlag, Berlin 1982, p. 553-6 [argues also that the beginning has been lost]
- Alexander Globe "The Caesarean Omission of the Phrase 'Son of God' in Mark 1.1," HTR 75 (1982) 209-18
- Alexander Globe "Serapion of Thmuis as Witness to the Gospel Text Used by Origen in Caesarea" NovT 26 (1984) 97-127, cp. also Robert Pierce Casey "The Text of the Anti-Manichaean Writings of Titus of Bostra and Serapion of Thmuis" HTR 21 (1928) 97-111
- D. Dormeyer "Die Kompositionsmetaphor "Evangelium Jesu Christi, des Sohn Gottes Mk 1:1 …" NTS 33 (1987) 452-68
- Peter M. Head "A textcritical study of Mark 1:1" NTS 37 (1991) 621-9 [argues for the short form]
- J.K. Elliott "Mark 1:1-3 – A later addition to the Gospel?" NTS 46 (2000) 584-8 [argues for a lost beginning, verses 1-3 non-Markan]
- N. Clayton Croy "Where the Gospel text begins: A non-theological interpretation of Mk 1:1." NovT 43 (2001) 106-127 [also argues that the beginning has been lost, verse 1 is non-Markan]
- Tommy Wasserman "The 'Son of God' was in the Beginning (Mark 1:1)" JTS 62 (2011) 20-50

Rating: - (indecisive)

brackets: Rating: 1? (= slight tendency to omit brackets)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original) = omit brackets

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 2

2. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 1:2 Καθὼς γέγραπται **ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ·**
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου·
NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Mark 1:2 Ὡς γέγραπται **ἐν τοῖς προφήταις,** …

T&T #2

Byz A, P, W, f13, 28, 579, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj, vg^{ms}, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, Ir$^{Lat2/3}$

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, f1, 22, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, al^{30},
Lat, Sy-Pal, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, goth,
Ir^{Gr}, Ir$^{Lat1/3}$, Or^{5times}, Basil, Epiph, Eus, Jerome, Titus

omit 1.τῷ D, Θ, f1, 372, 700, 1071, 2737, pc^{21}, L844, L2211,
Or^{pt}, Ir, Epiph, Tit

+ et in Malachi propheta Sy-H^{mg-mss}, Catenae

Legg notes the following catena (Cat^{oxon}, item scholia cdd. 253, 255, 256, al.):
τουτο δε το προφητικον μαλαχιου εστιν, ουχ Ησαια. σφαλμα (=error) δε εστι γραφεως. ως φησιν Ευσεβιος ο καισαρειας εν τω προς μαρινον περι της δοκουσης εν τοις ευαγγελιοις περι της αναστασεως διαφωνιας.

Origen (3rd CE): οτι ο Μαρκος δυο προφητειας εν διαφοροις ειρημενας τοποις υπο δυο προφητων εις εν συναγων πεποιηκε. κατως γεγραπται εν τω Ησαια τω προφητη.

Porphyry, a 3rd CE neoplatonic philosopher, jeers at the Christians, because of this error ("Against the Christians", Harnack Frag. 5.9).

Jerome (com. Mt): "nomen Jesaiae putamus additum scriptorium vitio … aut certe de diversis testimoniis scripturarum suum corpus effectum."

Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: umlaut! p. 1277 C 3 R γέγραπται **ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐᾳ τῷ**

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:3 οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 3:4 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Matthew 11:10 οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

NA28 Luke 7:27 οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Compare LXX:
LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου
LXX Exodus 23:20 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ὅπως εἰσαγάγῃ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἡτοίμασά σοι

LXX Isaiah 40:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

Isho'dad of Merv (9th CE) writes in his commentary on the Gospels that in the Diatessaron book which was composed in Alexandria (possibly the Ammonius synopsis?), Mark says "in the prophets" and not "in Isaiah". (Compare Hjelt, Diatessaron 1901, p. 34-35 and M. Gibson Isho'dad p. 126)

The quote given by Mk consists of two parts. The source of the first part of the LXX quote, verse 2, is not completely clear. The words ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου cannot be found anywhere in the LXX.
The sources that come nearest to it are Mal 3:1, or Exo 23:20. Verse 2 is paralleled in Mt 11:10 and Lk 7:27 and they both do not mention a prophets name there, but write:

οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται·

The second part of the Markan quote is clear, verse 3 is from Isaiah 40:3. This part of the quote is also given in Mt 3:3 and Lk 3:4.

Note that both Codex W and Old Latin c add Isa 40:4-8 after verse 3.

It has been suggested that such quotations came from so called Testimonia, or Florilegia, collections of LXX quotes, which Christians regarded as testimonies to their faith (compare: R. Harris "Testimonies Part I + II", Cambridge 1916/20). Jewish sources, too, combine Mal 3 with Isa 40 (Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch I, p. 597).

If Isaiah was originally in Mk, it might have been changed to "in the prophets" because the first part is from Malachi and only the second part is from Isaiah. This is the traditional explanation of the NA reading. Perhaps it was a reaction to Porphyry's assault?
Note that Malachi is never mentioned in the NT by name.

On the other hand if "in the prophets" was originally in Mk, it might have been changed to Isaiah to be more specific. This happened also at other places e.g. at Mt 13:35 where "through the prophet" has been changed to "through the prophet Isaiah" even though the word is NOT from Isaiah:

Mt 1:22	διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου	D, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, Ir^{Lat}
Mt 2:6	Ἠσαΐου	01^{mg}
Mt 13:35	διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου	01*, Θ, f1, f13, 33, pc

Isaiah was certainly the best known and most important prophet for the NT writers.

The change to "Isaiah" could also simply be a harmonization to Mt/Lk.

A third alternative, not backed up by manuscript evidence though, is that the beginning of Mk is (as the ending) somewhat corrupt. This has been argued by several authors (see verse 1 for references). Some argue that verses 2-3 are an early gloss. Compare E. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 53-55): "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ was John the Baptizer, who, in the desert, was proclaiming a baptism of repentance ...".
If verses 2-3 are a harmonization to Mt/Lk, it is a rather sophisticated one, because verses 2 and 3 come from different places.
Lachmann suggested that the two verses are the result of a conflation. Originally someone added verse 2 from Mt 11:10/Lk 7:27 with the intro ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, someone else added verse 3 from Mt 3:3/Lk 3:4 with the intro ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ. Finally someone combined the two verses.

Güting suggests that the verses have been added from Q. At least verse 3 is in Q.

Both Mt and Lk have Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου safe. (This is not surprising, because there was no need for a change. They do not have the Malachi quote.) Changing Mk to the Byzantine reading would create a significant Minor Agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk.
That both Mt and Mk don't have the Malachi part of the LXX quotation at this place is a Minor Agreement, too. Both cite it later at Mt 11:10/Lk 7:27, but not here. Did they both omit it, because it is not from Isaiah? Did they read it at all in their copy of Mark? Did they have a different source? Q?
But this isn't a textcritical question.

Compare:

- Maurice Robinson "Two passages in Mk" Faith & Mission 13 (1996) 66-111 [very detailed study]
- E. Güting "The relevance of literary criticism for the text of the NT. A study of Mark's traditions on John the Baptist" in: D.G.K. Taylor (Ed.) "Studies in the early texts of the Gospels and Acts" (1st Birmingham Colloq.) 1999

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 3

NA28 Mark 1:2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ·
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου·

BYZ Mark 1:2 Ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις,
ἰδοὺ <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου <u>ἔμπροσθέν σου</u>,

T&T #3

Byz A, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 1342, 892, Maj,
Sy-H, f, ff^{2}, l, vg^{Cl}, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}, goth, Or, Eus

txt 01, B, D, K, Π, L, P, W, Θ, Φ, 700*, 2766, al^{40}, L2211,
Lat, Sy-P, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}, Ir^{Lat}

700: The words have been added by a later hand in the margin.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἰδοὺ <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου <u>ἔμπροσθέν σου.</u>
NA28 Luke 7:27 ἰδοὺ _____ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου <u>ἔμπροσθέν σου.</u>
Byz: ἰδοὺ <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἀποστέλλω
D, it: omit ἔμπροσθέν σου

LXX parallel:
LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου
01*, B omit ἐγὼ

Compare also:
LXX Genesis 24:7 αὐτὸς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ <u>ἔμπροσθέν σου</u>
LXX Genesis 24:40 <u>αὐτὸς ἀποστελεῖ</u> τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ μετὰ σοῦ καὶ εὐοδώσει τὴν ὁδόν σου
LXX Exodus 23:20 καὶ ἰδοὺ <u>ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω</u> τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

It is possible that ἔμπροσθέν σου fell out due to h.t. (σου - σου). Also ἔμπροσθέν σου does not appear in the original LXX quote. The omission could thus be a conformation to the LXX. But the LXX wording is quite different and a harmonization is improbable.

It is probable that it is derived from Mt/Lk and therefore not original (so Weiss). The addition of ἐγὼ also comes from Mt. But note that both Mt and Lk do not have this Malachi quotation at the opening of their John the Baptist accounts (Mt. 3:3 and Lk 3:4).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 4

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης **[ὁ]** βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ **καὶ** κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

omit: B, 33, 892, pc, bo-mss, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Bois, Trg[mg], Bal, SBL

txt 01, A, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, goth, [Trg], Tis

add ὁ: 01, B, L, Δ, 33, 1342

ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ___ κηρύσσων	B, 33
βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ___ κηρύσσων	73, 892
βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων	A, W, f1, f13, Maj
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ βαπτίζων καὶ κηρύσσων	D, Θ, 28, 700, L2211
ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων	01, L, Δ, 1342

Lacuna: C

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 3:1 Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας

NA28 Luke 3:3 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν [τὴν] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,

Compare:

NA28 Mark 6:14

καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν

NA28 Mark 6:24 καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς· τί αἰτήσωμαι; ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντος.

It is possible that the addition/omission of καὶ is connected with the addition/omission of ὁ, but the evidence is inconsistent.

Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων can be taken as a title. Note that Mk has it as a title also in Mk 6:14, 24.

The clearly secondary D, Θ reading resorts the words to avoid a reading as a title. The same understanding is obtained by omitting the article (A, W et al.). In these cases καὶ connects the two participles: βαπτίζων … καὶ κηρύσσων. On the other hand the B reading without καὶ makes sense only by interpreting ὁ βαπτίζων as a title. E.g. the NRS version has: "John the baptizer appeared in

the wilderness, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins." And it makes better sense than the txt reading, which is slightly awkward: "John came, baptizing in the wilderness, and proclaiming a baptism of repentance".
Matthew takes it as a title. Luke does not have it (he has "John son of Zechariah" in verse 3:2), but he does not mention baptizing together with κηρύσσων.

It is probable that the txt reading is original. It has the difficulty of an unclear ὁ βαπτίζων, of which it is not immediately clear if it is a title or not. So some witnesses omitted the article to make clear that it is not a title and some omitted the καὶ to make clear that it is a title (so also Metzger). Of course in the txt reading ὁ βαπτίζων is also not a title, but this is apparent only after reading the καὶ.
Swete (Comm. Mk), to the contrary, thinks that also in the txt reading ὁ βαπτίζων is a title and writes: "If with all the uncials except B and with the versions we read καὶ κηρύσσων, the descriptive clause will run on to the end of the verse (*John the Baptizer ... and preacher*)".

Weiss (Comm. Mk) argues for the B reading. He thinks that ὁ βαπτίζων as a title was not understood anymore and that the article has been omitted therefore. Then one had to connect βαπτίζων with κηρύσσων adding καὶ. He notes that the 01, L makes no tolerable sense [if one takes ὁ βαπτίζων as a title], but fails to explain its origin.
So also C.H. Turner ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) writes: "ὁ βαπτίζων. A participal by-form of the noun βαπτιστὴς, probably a demotic form in Hellenistic times."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 5

3. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:6 καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

δέρριν D, a ("pellem"), geo^{2A}, Bois
not d ("pilos")!

omit: D, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, r^{1}, t), vg^{ms}, Bois
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg) have the words

Lacuna: C, Sy-S

B: no umlaut

δέρρις "leather clothing"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 3:4 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, ἡ δὲ τροφὴ ἦν αὐτοῦ ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

Compare:

LXX Zechariah 13:4 καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καταισχυνθήσονται οἱ προφῆται ἕκαστος ἐκ τῆς ὁράσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ προφητεύειν αὐτόν καὶ ἐνδύσονται δέρριν τριχίνην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐψεύσαντο
"And they put not on a hairy robe to deceive."

Possibly txt is a harmonization to Mt. So C.H. Turner ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158):

> "It is so difficult to account for δέρρις - a rare word, meaning 'skin' of an animal - that the agreement of D (not d) with a claims for it more than a place in the margin. Assimilation to Mt ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου would account for supersession of a rare, probably vulgar, word by the more familiar word of the more familiar Gospel. Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. δέρρις assert that in the 'Western text' here δέρρις has been transferred from Zech. 13:4 ἐνδύσονται δέρριν τριχίνην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐψεύσαντο - which is surely very improbable - and quote Hesychius δέρρεις· τὸ παχὺ ὕφασμα, ᾧ εἰς παραπέτασμα [= hanging] ἐχρῶντο. It is a not unlikely word for Mark, and I suspect that it is genuine.

Add. καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ the rest, with Tisch, WH. I have treated the shorter reading as a 'Western non-interpolation', because it is not unlikely in itself that Mt (3:4) should have supplemented Mark's description by drawing from the description of Elijah, the Baptist's prototype, in 4 Reg 1:8 the words καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην [περιεζωσμένος] τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, and that scribes should have assimilated Mark's text to Mt. Mark depends less on O.T. language than the other Synoptists. In Mt. ζώνην has a proper construction (εἶχεν), and so too in Apoc. 1:13 (περιεζωσμένον)."

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the change was made because one cannot wear just camel hairs, but only camel skin.
The omission of καὶ ... αὐτοῦ could be due to h.t. (..ου - ..ου or καὶ - καὶ), so von Soden.
Swete (Comm. Mk) suggests that δέρριν comes from Zec.
Compare also Mt 7:15, *"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing.*

Compare:
H.J. Vogels BZ 13 (1915) 322-33

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 6
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:8 ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι,
αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

T&T #7:

add ἐν before ὕδατι: A, (D), L, P, W, f1, f13, 579, 892^{mg}, Maj, [Trg]
txt 01, B, H, Δ, 33, 892*, 1342, al^{60}, L2211, pc

T&T #8

omit ἐν before πνεύματι: B, L, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Bois, Bal
txt 01, A, (D), W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Or, [Trg], Tis

καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ D (=Mt/Lk)
αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ f13, 28, 565
αὐτὸς δὲ ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ Θ
αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίω καὶ πυρί P

Taken together:
ὕδατι, πνεύματι: B
ἐν ὕδατι, πνεύματι : L
ὕδατι, ἐν πνεύματι: 01, Δ, 33, 892, 1342, pc (txt, = Lk)
ἐν ὕδατι, ἐν πνεύματι: A, D, W, f1, f13, 579, Maj (= Mt)

Note also (:: Mt):
ἐγὼ **μεν** ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς (ἐν) ὕδατι
A, P, W, Δ, (Θ), f1, f13, 28, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj

ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς **μεν** ὕδατι Θ
To count Θ as supporting ἐν before ὕδατι (in brackets) is misleading in NA.

NA28 has 892* for the omission of ἐν before πνεύματι. This is wrong. NA27 had this correctly. 892 omits ἐν before ὕδατι. The word is added in the margin (umlaut sign).
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:11 Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·
NA28 Luke 3:16 ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·
NA28 John 1:33 κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν· ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

NA28 Acts 1:5 ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ
NA28 Acts 11:16 Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

Several readings are clearly harmonizations to the parallels.

The readings with ἐν in the parallels are safe. In Lk several witnesses add ἐν before ὕδατι (D, f1, f13, 700), probably as a harmonization to Mt. The addition of ἐν appears also in Mk before ὕδατι.

There are several possibilities:

1. At both places Mk originally read ἐν. Many witnesses omitted it in the first place as superfluous, but only few continued the omission in the second place. This is a typical phenomenon in manuscripts. It is nevertheless improbable, because all ἐν readings in the parallels are safe.
2. Only the 2nd place originally read ἐν. This would agree with Lk. Then some witnesses omitted it to conform the words to the first part of the verse. Some other witnesses added ἐν in the first place to harmonize it to Mt (so Greeven, TC Mark, 2005, p. 60).
3. At both places there was originally no preposition. Then some added it before ὕδατι (harmonization to Mt) and even more before πνεύματι (harmonization to Mt and Lk).

C.H. Turner writes (JTS 28, 1926/27, p. 151): "A variation where the other Synoptic texts are bound to have influence on the scribes of Mark, ..., a reading like ὕδατι ... πνεύματι, unsupported elsewhere in the NT, has strong claims."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 7
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

T&T #9

ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν	01*, D, S, L84, pc[4], d, ff[2], t, Tis, Bal (01* corrected by 01[C2]) pc = 807, 900, 1128, 1263
ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἠκούσθη	Θ, 28, 565, geo[1]
ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγένετο λέγουσα	1342
ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα	pc[6]

[T&T has 1 for this reading, but this is not correct. Checked at the film.]

NA[25], WH have ἐγένετο in brackets.

add ἰδοὺ before φωνὴ: 565, pc
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:17 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα·
NA28 Luke 3:22 καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι·

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ·
NA28 Mark 1:4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης
NA28 Mark 1:9 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα·
NA28 Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα·

NA28 Mark 9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς,
καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης·

NA28 John 12:28 ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·

NA28 Acts 10:15 καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν·

The omission of ἐγένετο could be a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). On the other hand it is possible that the short reading is the original and the longer forms attempts to correct it stylistically and/or grammatically. Note that φωνὴ has no verb in verse 3, too.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 64): "If one considers the inner connection of the individual readings, it becomes apparent that they all arose from *one* original problem: the missing verb. Thus they all support the reading without ἐγένετο."

It is not clear though that it really was a problem. It could have been a well known idiom. Compare Act 10:15.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 8

NA28 Mark 1:13 καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ, καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 1:13 καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ

Byz W, Δ, Π^{C2}, 22, 28^{C2}, 118, 157, 1071, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt 01, A, B, D, L, Θ, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Lat, Co, Or, Eus, goth

only ἐκεῖ K, Π*, f1, 69, 124, 788, 28*, 565, 700, 1424, 2542, al, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, arm

add καὶ τεσσεράκοντα νύκτας (Mt 4:2): L, M, f13, 33, 579, 892, pc, Lat
From here Sy-S is extant again.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut
(But there is an umlaut on the next line for τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας indicating probably the word-order variant of these two words.)

Parallels:
LXX Exodus 24:18 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Μωυσῆς εἰς τὸ μέσον τῆς νεφέλης καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας
LXX Exodus 34:28 καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ Μωυσῆς ἐναντίον κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας ἄρτον οὐκ ἔφαγεν καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἔπιεν καὶ ἔγραψεν τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῶν πλακῶν τῆς διαθήκης τοὺς δέκα λόγους

Possibly ἐκεῖ has been added as a conformation to Exo 24:18.

Note that already in the previous verse 12 the place εἰς τὴν ἔρημον was mentioned. It is possible that scribes replaced therefore ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ in verse 13 by ἐκεῖ and subsequently conflated both readings.

Kilpatrick argues that such duplicate expressions are typical for Mark, especially when the more general expression (here ἐκεῖ) is followed by a more precise one (here ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ).

Weiß (Comm.) argues that ἐκεῖ was originally meant as a replacement for the clumsy ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ and that the Byzantine reading is a conflation.

Compare:
G.D. Kilpatrick " Some thoughts on modern textual criticism and the Synoptic Gospels" NovT 19 (1977) 275-92

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 9

4. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ

T&T 10

Καί μετὰ	B, D, 771, a, ff^2, Sy-S, bo-mss, WH, NA^{25}, Weiss, Trg, SBL
txt	01, A, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, sa-mss, bo^{pt}, Or
Μετὰ καὶ	38
Μετὰ	pc^4 (971, 1291, 1302, 1534)

B (p. 1278 A 19) reads: ΚΑΙΜΕΤΟ ΤΑ

B* omitted ΤΑ. Tischendorf assigns the addition of the ΤΑ to B^{C3} (= enhancer).

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:12 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Context:

1:12 Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.
1:13 καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας
πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ,
καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων,
καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.
1:14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην
or: Καί μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην

Καί μετὰ appears four more times in Mk (Mk 8:31, 9:2, 10:34, 14:70 always safe), μετὰ δὲ appears only once in 16:8.

In the previous context (the Temptation story) a lot of καὶ appear. In verse 14 a new pericope begins and it would be only natural to change yet another καὶ into something else to indicate the break.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 1:6 καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου
BYZ Mark 1:6 ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου
txt 01, B, L, 33, 565^{c}, 892, pc, L2211, Lat, bo^{mss}
Byz A, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 565*, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, it, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}

NA28 Mark 1:8 αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.
καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει D

NA28 Mark 1:9 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς
Ἐγένετο δὲ W

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 55-56, 67) notes two arguments. On the one hand the numerous καὶ as typical Markan style have been changed often. On the other hand it is possible that scribes got used to this style and imitated it. The latter is supported by the fact that the Byzantine minuscule 771 (94% Byzantine in Mk, T&T) also reads καί μετὰ.
Note that D changes δὲ into καὶ in verse 9, too.

The correction in B might be interesting:
ΜΕΤΑΔΕΤΟ
ΚΑΙΜΕΤΟ
ΔΔ could be misread as Μ. But this of course explains not everything.
Perhaps it is just an accidental error.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 10

NA28 Mark 1:14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ

BYZ Mark 1:14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ

T&T #11

Byz A, D, K, Π, W, Δ, f13^{a}, 28^{mg}, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, 1475^{c}, 2766^{c}, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, bo^{pt}, goth

txt 01, B, L, Θ, f1, f13^{b,c}, 28*, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1342, 2766*, pc^{15}, b, c, ff^{2}, t, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, Or
pc = 156, 301, 373, 508, 717, 1090, 1127, 1320, 1416, 1464, 1475*, 1566, 2126

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας but omitting τοῦ θεοῦ: pc^{35}, vg^{mss}, aur

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"good news of God" appears only here in the Gospels.
NA28 Matthew 4:17 Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν· μετανοεῖτε· ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.
NA28 Matthew 4:23 Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
add τοῦ θεοῦ 157
NA28 Matthew 9:35 καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
add τοῦ θεοῦ 157
NA28 Matthew 24:14 καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ

There is no reason for an omission. The addition is inspired either by Mt 4:23 or by immediate context, verse 15:
NA28 Mark 1:15 ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ·

Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας is unique to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 11

NA28 Mark 1:16 Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος
ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς.

BYZ Mark 1:16 Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα Καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σίμωνος
βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς

T&T #13

βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον	E^c, $Π^c$, 579, 892, 1241, Maj
ἀμφίβληστρον βάλλοντας	700, 872, 1342, 2193, pc^{45}
ἀμφίβληστρα βάλλοντας	f1, pc^{14}
ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον	A, W, Δ, (all Byz Majuscules[15]), 0133, 22, 565*, 2766, pc^{150}
ἀμφιβάλλοντας τα δικτυα	D, Θ, f13, 28, 565^c
one of the above:	Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-C, Co, arm, goth
txt ἀμφιβάλλοντας	01, B, L, 33

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:18 Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς.

Compare next verses 18-19:

NA28 Mark 1:18 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. 19 Καὶ προβὰς ὀλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα,

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. The τὰ δίκτυα in D et al. comes from context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 12

NA28 Mark 1:19 Καὶ προβὰς <u>ὀλίγον</u> εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον
BYZ Mark 1:19 Καὶ προβὰς <u>ἐκεῖθεν ὀλίγον</u> εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον

Not in NA but in SQE and Tis!

<u>ἐκεῖθεν ὀλίγον</u>	A, C, Δ, f13^{a,c}, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy-H, arm, goth
<u>ὀλίγον ἐκεῖθεν</u>	01^{C2}, 33
<u>ἐκεῖθεν</u>	01*
<u>ὀλίγον</u>	B, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 124, 788(=f13^{b}), 28, 565, 579, 892, 1424, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, r^{1}, t), Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 4:21 καὶ προβὰς <u>ἐκεῖθεν</u> εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς,

The Byzantine reading is a conflation of Mk and Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 13

5. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν **εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.**

T&T #14

ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν (= omit **εἰσελθὼν**)

01, C, L, Δ, f13, 28, 565, 892, 2766*, pc[3], c, (Sy-S), sa[mss], Or, WH[mg], Gre, SBL

pc = 837, 1138

in particular:

ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν	01, L, 69, 346, 788(=f13), 28, 565, (Sy-S), Sy-Pal, sa[mss], Or
ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν	892
εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν ἐδίδασκεν	Δ, geo[1]
ἐδίδασκεν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν	C

txt A, B, D, W, Θ, f1, (33), 157, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, bo[mss]

εἰσελθὼν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν	33
ἐδίδασκεν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν	124

D, Θ, 700, Lat, Sy-H, bo[mss] add αὐτοὺς a the end.

Tregelles has εἰσελθὼν in brackets.

Sy-S omits εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ εὐθὺς. It reads the verse (acc. to EJ Wilson, Old Sy Gospels): "And he was teaching on the Sabbath in the Synagogue."

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 4:31 Καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν· ... 33 καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ...

It is possible that the word has been omitted due to homoioarcton (EIS - EIS, so Weiss). But this does not take into account that the resulting reading εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν is not known at all. Those witnesses that omit εἰσελθὼν have the word order ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν. This makes an accidental change unlikely.

Metzger on the other hand notes that possibly "the word was <u>inserted</u> in order to ameliorate what was felt to be an awkward construction in Greek."

Greeven similarly argues (TC Mark, 2005, p. 78f.) that the original reading was ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν and the problem was the local εἰς c. acc. for ἐν c. dat. This then has been corrected by adding εἰσελθὼν and moving ἐδίδασκεν to the end.
This is quite possible. The resultant reading (= txt) is smooth and straightforward.
If one thinks that the txt reading is original, it is difficult to explain why εἰσελθὼν fell out in the first place and why it has then been changed into ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν.
The shorter reading also has excellent external support.

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) further explains that Mark uses εἰς and ἐν interchangeably:

> "the scholar who produced the B text, whenever he found εἰς without any idea of motion expressed, systematically put matters right from a grammatical point of view by the insertion of the verb ἔρχομαι (εἰσέρχομαι). Still in view of the Latin evidence, and of the Greek support for the same reading, the decision is perhaps less easy than in any other instance of reading on our list. Neither of the other Synoptists has a parallel text here."

Note that the word is also omitted by Lk.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 14

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:25 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

T&T #16

ὁ Ἰησοῦς	01*, A*?, pc[4], Tis
	corrected by 01[C1] and A[C2]
	pc = 59, 136, 949, 1325
λέγων	D, pc, vg[ms], Bois, Gre[2005]
καὶ εἶπεν	W, b
ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν	(c), e

A, folio 30 (right column, line 33):

NA ("vid") and Tischendorf note A* for the omission of λέγων. The words after ΑΥΤΩΟΙC appear to have been deleted and added again, with ΛΕΓΩΝ included. To fit everything into the line the letters get smaller to the margin and protrude slightly into it by about 2 letters. However, if the scribe really omitted λέγων, or wrote something else originally, cannot be discerned from the facsimile.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

NA[25], WH have λέγων in brackets.

The omission of ὁ Ἰησοῦς is not in NA, but in SQE.

B: no umlaut

φιμώθητι φιμόω "silence, pass. be silenced"

imperative aorist passive 2nd person singular

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 4:35 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 8:30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ

. add ὁ Ἰησοῦς: M

NA28 Mark 8:33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς ... ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει

NA28 Mark 9:25 ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ λέγων αὐτῷ·

NA28 Matthew 16:22 ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ λέγων·

It is basically possible that λέγων is a harmonization to Lk, where λέγων is safe.
The omission is strange and a reason is difficult to imagine. In direct speech ἐπιτιμάω is always connected with some form of λέγω; this was already noted by Weiss (Mk Com.). Compare: Mt 16:22, Mk 4:39, Mk 8:33, Mk 9:25, Lk 4:35, Lk 23:40.
The only explanation given is independent accidental omission. Curiously 4 Byzantine minuscules omit, too.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 35) thinks that the addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς is secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 15

6. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:27 καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

T&T 18

omit 01, B, pc^{2} (290*, 1532) , WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Tis, Bal
txt A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565*, 1342, Maj, Lat, WH^{mg}

πρὸς αὐτοὺς G, L, S, Φ, Ω, 2, 372, 892, al^{37}, L2211, al, TR
πρὸς αὐτὸν 565^{mg}
B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 4:36 καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες· τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἐξέρχονται;

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:11 Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ,
σὺν αὐτῷ D

NA28 Mark 9:10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες
safe!

NA28 Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς.
συζητοῦντας αὐτοῖς A, D, f13, 33, 565, Maj

NA28 Mark 9:16 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς· τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς;
πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς 01*, A, W, 33, 579, al

NA28 Mark 10:26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς·
πρὸς αὐτὸν 01, B, C, Δ, Ψ, 892, Co

NA28 Luke 22:23 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς
πρὸς αὐτοὺς W

Difficult to judge internally. The reading with πρὸς seems to be the normal usage. But the support for the omission is rather slim.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) thinks that πρὸς is a reminiscence to the Lukan parallel. So also C.H. Turner earlier (Marcan Usage JTS 28, 1926/27, p. 154).
Later (JTS 29, 1927/28, p. 280f.) he writes: "I do not doubt that Alexandrian scholars disliked the phrase πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς if it was used – as συζητεῖν shews it was here used – to mean 'with one another. ... πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς 'with one another' is thus a Marcan usage, which Luke generally modifies, Matthew absolutely rejects."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 16

NA28 Mark 1:27

τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 1:27

Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη; ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασιν τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ

διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν	01, B, L, 33
διδαχὴ καινὴ αὕτη, κατ' ἐξουσίαν	f1, 28*, 565, 579
καινὴ διδαχὴ ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν	700, (bo)
διδαχὴ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν	Θ
τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν	C, K, Π, Δ, 157, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
τίς ἡ καινὴ αὕτη διδαχὴ, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν	A
τίς ἡ καινὴ διδαχὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν	f13, 1424
τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἐκείνη ἡ καινὴ αὕτη; ἡ ἐξουσία ὅτι	D, it, Sy-S
τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη, ἡ ἐξουσιαστίκη αὐτοῦ	W

omit τί ἐστιν τοῦτο: D, W, it(b, c, d, e, q, r^1), Sy-S

Lat = aur, f, l, vg
it = b, c, d, ff^2, q, r^1
The Sahidic has a lacuna in Horner (1910).
The versional evidence is doubtful.
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 7:29 ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

NA28 Luke 4:32 καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 4:36 καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες· τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἐξέρχονται;

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 1:22 καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ <u>τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ·</u> ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς <u>ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων</u> καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

"What is this? A new teaching - with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits..."
"What is this? What new teaching is this? That with authority also the unclean spirits he commands..."

Roberson (Wordpictures) notes: "It is not certain whether the phrase is to be taken with 'new teaching,' 'It's new teaching with authority behind it,' or with the verb; 'with authority he commands even the unclean spirits'. The position is equivocal and may be due to the fact that 'Mark gives the incoherent and excited remarks of the crowd in this natural form' (Swete)."

A look at Mt and Lk is equivocal too. Mt has only a "teaching with authority", but Lk has both, "his word is with authority" (4:32) and "with authority and power he does command the unclean spirits" (4:36).

In Mk the Byzantine reading removes the ambiguity by adding ὅτι, thus taking κατ' ἐξουσίαν with the following.
The question τίς ἡ διδαχὴ accords with the Lukan τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος. Similarly the addition of αὕτη could be an adjustment to the Lukan οὗτος. There is no reasonable explanation for an omission of these words.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 17

7. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 1:28 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ **εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ** εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

BYZ Mark 1:28 ἐξῆλθεν δὲ ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ **εὐθὺς** _____ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας

εὐθὺς	A, D, Δ, Maj, Lat(aur, d, f, l, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ	01^{C2}, B, C, L, f13, 892, 1342, pc, sa^{mss}, bo^{pt}
πανταχοῦ	W, 579, pc, b, e, q, bo^{pt}
omit:	01*, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc, c, ff^2, r^1, Sy-S, bo^{ms}

Tregelles has both words in brackets, separately: [εὐθὺς] [πανταχοῦ]

B: no umlaut

πανταχοῦ = everywhere (Lat. ubique)

Compare:

NA28 Mark 16:20 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ,

The omission of εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ might be due to h.t. (so Weiss).

πανταχοῦ is a rare word. There is no reason for an omission. Possibly it has been added to intensify the situation.

Compare with the 1:38 variant: ἀλλαχοῦ = elsewhere.

It is also basically possible that the B et al. reading is a conflation.

Other examples of εὐθὺς variants: Mk 5:42 and 7:35.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 18

8. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:29 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς **ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον** εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

T&T #19

txt **ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον**	01, A, C, L, 33, 892, Maj, l, vg, (Sy-P), Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, geo^{1}, goth, WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg^{mg}, Tis
ἐξελθόντες εἰσῆλθον	F, Δ, al^{40}
ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν	B, f1, f13, 22, 565, 579, 700, 1342, al^{120}, f, vg^{mss}, geo^{2}, WH^{mg}, Weiss, Bal
ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς **ἦλθεν**	D, W, Θ, Σ, 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc^{8}, it, bo^{pt}, arm pc = 349, 1061, 1065, 1068, 1694, 2220, 2747

Tis has arm for the B reading, UBS^{4} for the D reading.
The Sahidic has a lacuna in Horner (1910).
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:14 Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου εἶδεν τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν·

NA28 Luke 4:38 Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος __.

__καὶ Ἀνδρέου__ D, it, vg^{mss}

Compare:

NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.

NA28 Mark 1:30 ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα, καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς.

The variation is caused by the undetermined subject. The immediate previous context gives no hint. Metzger suggests that the singular could be a conformation to the following αὐτῷ in the next verse.

It is possible that the singular is a harmonization to verse 21, where also the singular is used ("he went into...", so Weiss). It is also possible that it is a harmonization to Mt or Lk, both have the singular without variation.

The singular is awkward though: "he went into the house of Simon and Andrew with James and John". This would imply that he enters the house without Simon and Andrew. It is possible that it has been changed to the plural for that reason (so Weiss, Textkritik, p. 79).
To the contrary one could argue that also the plural is awkward, *they came ... with James and John*, "hardly tolerable" (Swete).
Note that the witnesses for the singular are divided into two different groups, perhaps independent variations.

It has also been suggested that the awkward structure is due to Mark retelling a Petrine story: "And immediately we went into our house (of Andreas and me), with James and John, and my mother-in-law was lying fevered ..." or something like that. Cp Zahn, Einleitung II, p. 251-2.

Note further that Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 35) thinks that the words καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου are a post-Markan gloss. So already Bultmann.

Compare similar cases at 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19
Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 19

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:32 Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους·

ἔδυσεν B, D, 28, 1424, pc, WH, NA[25], Weiss, Bois, Trg
txt 01, A, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj
B: no umlaut

ἔδυ, ἔδυσεν both: indicative aorist active 3rd person singular

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:16 Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν,

NA28 Luke 4:40 Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν·

The phrase ἔδυ (γὰρ) ὁ ἥλιος appears 9 times in the LXX.
ἔδυσεν does not appear in the Greek Bible. It's the modern Greek form, though.

Either ἔδυ is a conformation to LXX usage or ἔδυσεν is a change to the more contemporary form.
The support for ἔδυσεν is not coherent.

Mt does not have the phrase, Luke has the Genitivus absolutus: Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 20

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:34 καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν.

T&T #20

αὐτὸν Χριστόν εἶναι	B, L, W, Θ, Σ, 0211, f1, 22, 28, 33^{vid}(NA), 565, 1342, 2766*, Maj-part^{450}, l, Sy-H**, bo, WH with Χριστόν εἶναι in brackets
αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν	01^{C2}, G, M, f13, 33(T&T), 700, 1424, 2786, al^{135} C, 0233, 517, 892, 954, 1241, 1675, al^{45} al^{20}
txt αὐτὸν	01*, A, (D?), Δ, Φ, 055, 064, 0104, 0130, 372, 579, 1071, 2737, 2766^{C}, Maj-part^{960}, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, sa^{ms}, goth, Weiss

(D repeats accidentally verse 34a: καὶ ... ἐξέβαλεν after ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν, probably because the next verse also started with καὶ. Therefore D probably did NOT contain the phrase in question!)

33: has a lacuna. It reads αὐτόν [... ...] Καὶ πρωὶ ... The lacuna is large enough to fit one of the longer readings.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 1:24 λέγων· τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

The support for the short reading is not very good. But why should the words have been omitted? It is probably a harmonization to Lk (so Weiss).

Already in verse 24 Jesus has been identified as "the Holy One of God".

Perhaps we have here also some "orthodox corruption": "Given the serviceability of the harmonized text in attacking separationist Christologies, one must consider it at least plausible that the text was changed in light of this historical context." (Ehrman, 1993, p. 179, note 183).

Wayne C. Kannaday, Ehrman's student, argues in a similar way. He thinks that the short (original) reading may give the impression of Jesus being a magician and "an intimate association between residents of the spirit realm and Jesus."
The addition is qualifying this specific acquaintance. ("Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 124-7)

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 21

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:35 Καὶ πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς **ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν** εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κἀκεῖ προσηύχετο.

T&T #21

ἐξῆλθεν B, 28*, 565, pc[20], sa[mss], bo[pt], Bal
ἀπῆλθεν W, pc[3], it(aur, b, d, e, ff[2], q, r) Sy-P

txt 01, A, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, 0130, f1, f13, 28[c], 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(a, c, f, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-H, bo[pt]

W reads: Καὶ ἔννυχα ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον …
(Swanson has ἐξῆλθεν, but in error)

WH have καὶ ἀπῆλθεν in brackets.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·

BYZ John 4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·

Byz A, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, 33, Maj, aur, c, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H[mg], Vogels
txt P66, P75, 01, B, C, D, W[sup], 083, f13, 892, 1241, al, it, Sy-C, Co, Or

Probably omitted due to h.t. (so Weiss) or to improve style (remove redundancy).
W further corrects the rather awkward first part.
It is basically also possible that the txt version is a conflation of an original B reading and a revised W reading.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 22

9. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 1:38 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἄγωμεν **ἀλλαχοῦ** εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον.

BYZ Mark 1:38 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἄγωμεν _____ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξελήλυθα.

Not cited in NA, but SQE!

Byz A, C^{C3}, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth
txt 01, B, C*, L, 33, 579, pc, Co, arm, aeth

Tregelles reads txt but has ἀλλαχοῦ additionally in brackets in the margin.
B: no umlaut

ἀλλαχοῦ = elsewhere

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 4:43 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην.

A rare word. Only here in the Bible. Possibly omitted for this reason?
Compare with the 1:28 variant: πανταχοῦ = everywhere.
Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that it has been omitted as being superfluous.
Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 105) thinks that the word has been added as a harmonization to Lk 4:43, but this is very improbable, because the wording is completely different.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 23

NA28 Mark 1:39 Καὶ **ἦλθεν** κηρύσσων **εἰς** τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

BYZ Mark 1:39 καὶ **ἦν** κηρύσσων **ἐν** ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

T&T #22 (ἦλθεν only)

Byz A, C, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth
ἦν ... εἰς A, C, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1342, Maj-part, Trg^{mg}
ἦν ... ἐν M, U, Γ, 700, 1071, Maj-part

txt 01, B, L, Θ, 174, 892, 2786, Co

33: has a lacuna after κηρύσσων.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 4:23 Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων
NA28 Luke 4:44 Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.
BYZ Luke 4:44 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

From the grammar ἦλθεν ... εἰς and ἦν ... ἐν belong together. But in the Koine εἰς is also used locally (BDR §205, εἰς finally supersedes ἐν), so ἦν ... εἰς is acceptable, especially in Mk, who is using εἰς and ἐν interchangeably.

Mt	239 εἰς,	307 ἐν	56%
Mk	188 εἰς,	143 ἐν	43%
Lk	235 εἰς,	366 ἐν	61%
Jo	205 εἰς,	239 ἐν	54%

Mk is the only one who has more εἰς than ἐν.

C.H. Turner writes ("Marcan Usage"):

> "With regard to the prepositions, Matthew changes εἰς both times into ἐν, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν: Luke retains εἰς on the first occasion, but by combining the two phrases into εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Γαλιλαίας [Ἰουδαίας] avoids the second. With regard to the verb, Matthew changes to περιῆγεν ' went about', Luke has ἦν. It is much more likely that Luke repeated ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς from Mark than that he altered ἦλθεν εἰς into ἦν εἰς. It is further much more likely that scribes or editors of Mark should have

> substituted ἦλθεν εἰς for ἦν εἰς than vice versa. I cannot doubt that 01 B represent here an intentional correction of a non-literary usage of St Mark."

On the other hand it could be argued that ἦν εἰς is a harmonization to Lk.

Note the previous verse: ... εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον. The following ἦλθεν fits good here, but could be a conformation to context.

The support for txt is incoherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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, 69^{c}, 33, 372, 700, 1342, 1424, 2737, Maj, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, geo^{2}, goth, [Trg]
καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν	69*, Weiss
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ	01^{C2}, L, Θ, f1, 517, 565, 579, 892, 954, 1241, 1675, 2542, 2766, 2786, pc^{90}, Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo^{1}
καὶ γονυπετῶν	01*, **NA^{25}**, WH, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, WH^{mg}, Gre, SBL [WH have καὶ γονυπετῶν in brackets]
καὶ	D, G, W, Γ, 124(=f13^{b}), pc^{60}, it, vg^{ms}
omit:	B, sa^{mss}

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

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</u> λέγων·
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, ff^{1}, l, r^{1}, 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, ff^{2}, q, Cl

Rating: - (indecisive)

brackets ok, slight tendency to omit the brackets

TVU 25

11. 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.

Not in NA but in SQE!

Κύριε ὅτι B, Co?

ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς Κύριε Φ, 090, 124, 28, 565, 1071

Κύριε C, L, W, Θ, Σ, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Lat(c, e, ff^2, vg^{mss}), Co?, Sy-Pal

omit: D, pc, Lat(a, aur, b, d, f, l, r^1, vg), Sy-P

txt 01, A, K, Π, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1424, Maj, q, Sy-H, goth

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:2 καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων· κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι.

NA28 Luke 5:12 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων· κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι.

Without κύριε we have a Minor Agreement between Mt and Lk here.

Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 309): "But the combination of the three distinct traditions, Egyptian (B, C, L, sa), African (W, c, e) and Caesarean (Θ, 700), is a very strong one. Either then, B is right and there is no agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk; or we have, not only a clear case of B, L convicted of assimilation, but evidence of such an orgy of assimilation in these small details that no text can be relied on, and it is just as likely that the presence of κύριε in either Mt or Lk may be due to the same cause."

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = Κύριε reading probably correct)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 26

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, ff^{2}, r^{1*}, Diatess^{Ephrem}, Bois, SBL
καὶ	pc$^{4\ Byz}$, b, g^{1}
	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, ff^{2}, r^{1*}
Iesus autem misertus	aur, c, f, l, (q), (r^{1C}), 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 μετ' ὀργῆς,
safe!

NA28 Mark 10:14 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκτησεν καὶ __εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
ἀγανακτέω be indignant or angry
add ἐπιτιμήσας: W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 1342, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, 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 ἐπ' 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 ἐπ' αὐτούς,
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Mark 9:22 βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς __εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
μετ'/ἐν ὀργῇ D, X, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 22, 157, 1071, al^{21} :: 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 (A, 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 r^1, 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 <u>Minor Agreement</u>. 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)

TVU 27

13. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 1:42 **καὶ εὐθὺς** ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.

BYZ Mark 1:42 **καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ εὐθέως** ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη

T&T #25

Byz A, C, Δ, Θ, 0130, f1, 33, 700, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg), Sy-H, goth, Gre

txt 01, B, D, L, W, f13, 565, 892, al^{30}, L2211,
it(a, b, c, d, ff^{2}, r^{1}), Sy-S, Sy-P, Co
καὶ εὐθέως D, W, f13, 565, 892, pc

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:3 καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.
NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
ἀπῆλθεν ἡ λέπρα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. f13, 157
ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτου ἡ λέπρᾶ. 579

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας

"and he having spoken, immediately the leprosy went away from him"
"and immediately the leprosy went away from him"

There is no reason for an omission. The addition could be a natural intensification ("and as soon as he had spoken ...").
Mt and Luke do not have an equivalent. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 126) thinks that the words fell out as a harmonization to the parallels. A secondary addition without parallel he finds "hardly conceivable".

Rating: - (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 28

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, **καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.**

NA28 Mark 1:43 **καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν**

NA28 Mark 1:44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς,

omit: W, b, (aur, c, e omit only verse 43)

42 καὶ εὐθὺς **ἐκαθαρίσθη.**

43 **καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ·**

44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Sy-S

B: umlaut! p. 1279, line 22 A καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος

ἐμβριμάομαι "speak harshly to, criticize harshly"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:3 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. 4 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς,

NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 14 καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν,

παραγγέλλω command, order

For the B umlaut:

No variant is known here, but one can easily imagine something similar to that of verse 41: ὀργισθεὶς/σπλαγχνισθεὶς. Or does the umlaut indicate the omission by W?

W:

The omission by W is most probably a harmonization to Mt/Lk, who omit the same passage. An omission due to h.t. (KAI - KAI) is also possible.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit the sentence. A significant Minor Agreement (but there is maybe a reminiscence in Lk with the παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ). Compare the similar instance in Mk 1:41, where both Mt and Lk omit the word σπλαγχνισθεὶς/ὀργισθεὶς.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) suggests: "I presume therefore that καὶ ἐμβρ. ... ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν was at one time an alternative marginal reading to v. 25 καὶ

ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ. the rebuke being thus addressed not to the leper but to the unclean spirit."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 29

14. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι **προσενέγκαι** αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

BYZ Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι **προσεγγίσαι** αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσιν τὸν κράββατον ἐφ' ὧ ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο

Byz A, C, D, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, it? , Gre, Bois, Trg
προσῆλθειν W, it?
accedere it = a, b, c, d, e, ff^{2}, q, r^{1}, vg^{ms}

txt P88(4th CE), 01, B, L, Θ, (33), 892, pc,
Lat("offere" aur, f, l, vg), Sy-H, Co, Trg^{mg}
προσενέγκειν 33

P88 reads προ[οσεν]εγκαι
αὐτον instead of αὐτῷ: f13, 892, pc
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

προσενέγκαι προσφέρω infinitive aorist active
"bring"
προσεγγίσαι προσεγγίζω infinitive aorist active
"come or get near"

Parallel: NA28 Luke 5:19
καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,
εἰσφέρω

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 9:2 καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον.

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 2:3 καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.

ΠΡΟΣΕΝΕΓΚΑΙ
ΠΡΟΣΕΓΓΙΣΑΙ

The words look quite similar.

προσεγγίζω does not appear elsewhere in the NT.
προσφέρω appears 24 times in the Gospels.

The main problem is that there is no direct object:
"And when they could not <u>bring (HIM)</u> to Jesus because of the crowd..."
"And when they could not <u>get near</u> to Jesus because of the crowd..."
This is quite typical for Greek, but not in other languages. Some witnesses change αὐτῷ into αὐτὸν (f13, 892, pc) for that reason.
Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that προσενέγκαι has no object and that it has been changed into the intransitive προσεγγίσαι. The same would be true for the correction προσῆλθειν by W.
On the other hand it could be argued (so Kilpatrick) that προσφέρειν is a transitive verb and without an object it is an error.

It is possible that προσενέγκαι is a conformation to the pervious φέροντες (verse 3) or to Lk, who has εἰσενέγκωσιν.
The internal arguments slightly favor προσεγγίσαι, but the external weight for προσενέγκαι is stronger.

Rating: - (NA indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 30

15. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:9 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;

No txt in NA but in SQE!

	ἔγειρου	B, L, Θ, 28, 372, pc, Trg, WH
txt	ἔγειρε	01, A, C, D, W, 1, 69, 33, 700, 892^{c}, 1342, 1424, Maj-part[E, F, G, H, K, Π, M, S], NA^{25}, Weiss
	ἔγειραι	U, Δ, 118, 1582, f13, 157, 565, 579, 1071, TR, Maj-part, Robinson

372: Noted by Greeven (TC Mark, 2005) correctly, checked at the film.

892: Letters after ρ have been erased and an ε has been written above it by a different hand/ink. Unfortunately the original writing remains unclear.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

P88 has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

ἔγειρε	imperative present active	2nd person singular
ἐγείρου	imperative present middle	2nd person singular
ἔγειραι	imperative aorist middle	2nd person singular

Context:

NA28 Mark 2:11 σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. (not in NA and SQE!)

ἔγειραι	L, U, Δ, 118, 1582, 28, 157, 565, 700, al
ἔγειρε	01, A, B, C, D, W, Θ, 1, f13, 33, 1424, Maj

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:5 τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; safe!

NA28 Luke 5:23 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; safe!

Compare:

NA28 Mark 10:49 θάρσει, <u>ἔγειρε</u>, φωνεῖ σε.
<u>ἔγειρου</u> f1, f13, 28

NA28 Luke 6:8 <u>ἔγειρε</u> καὶ στῆθι εἰς τὸ μέσον· καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔστη.
<u>ἔγειρου</u> D

NA28 Luke 8:54 αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων· ἡ παῖς, <u>ἔγειρε.</u>
<u>ἔγειρου</u> A, W, f13, 28, 565, 700, Maj

ἔγειρου is rare. It appears only once in the LXX.
ἔγειρε appears 14 times in the NT. In almost all of these cases the Byzantine text changed it into ἔγειραι, some also change it into ἔγειρου.

It is interesting that the variation ἔγειρου does not appear in 2:11. Perhaps ἔγειρε in verse 9 is a conformation to verse 11?.
It is also possible that ἔγειρε is a harmonization to Mt/Lk.

See discussion in Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 137-39), without noteworthy arguments.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 31

16. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς - λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ·

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας (= Mt, Lk)	P88(4th CE), 01, C, D, L, Δ, 0130, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, L2211, pm, Lat, Sy-P, sa, bo, goth, Trg, SBL
ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτίας	A, K, Π, Γ, f1, f13, 28, 565, pm, Sy-H, Robinson, Gre2005
ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας	W, pc, b, q, Bois
ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	B, Θ, Φ, 157, pc, Trgmg

Lacuna: Sy-S

Φ: Noted correctly by Legg, checked at the image (CSNTM).

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:6 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας

ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτίας W

NA28 Luke 5:24 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας safe

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 2:7 τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;

Possibly the addition of ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is a harmonization to Mt, Lk (so Weiss). This is supported by the different insertion points. The support by W only is a problem though. Note that W changes the order in Mt, too. It is possible that the short form is a conformation to immediate context Mk 2:7.

Note that the word-order is basically safe in both Mt and Lk. It is possible that the txt order is a harmonization to Mt/Lk (so Greeven).

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 143) argues that it is improbable that the normal prose form ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας has been changed into the unusual rhetorical style of A et al.

Omission of ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς:
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
External Rating: - (indecisive, P88 reading most probable externally.)
(after weighting the witnesses)

Word order:
Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 32

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:14 Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν **Λευὶν** τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.

T&T #29

Ἰάκωβον D, Θ, f13[a,b], 565, pc[4], it(a, b, c, d, e, ff[2], r[1]), vg[ms], Diatess
pc = 59, 676, 1506, 2508

"Levi" Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg)

Ephrem: "He chose James, the tax collector …". McCarthy calls *James* "the Tatianic reading".

M. Robinson's new Byz text (2005) reads Λευι (against Λευιν in the old text).

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Origen (2nd CE, Fr. Matt. 194, s. GCS, Or 12.3:93)

ἔν τισι δὲ τοῦ κατὰ Μᾶρκον εὐαγγελίου εὑρίσκεται **Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου**, ἀντὶ τοῦ **Λευὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου**. κατ᾽ αὐτὸν τὸν Μᾶρκον μετὰ τὴν θεραπείαν τοῦ παραλυτικοῦ **παράγων εἶδε Λευὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον**. ἔοικεν οὖν διώνυμος εἶναι. ἐσημειώσατο δὲ ἐπιτηδείως τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματα, ἵνα μηδενὶ πεισθῶμεν ἑτέρῳ παρὰ τοὺς εἰρημένους.

But in some copies of the Gospel of Mark is found "James, son of Alphaeus" in place of "Levi, son of Alphaeus". According to Mark himself, after the healing of the paralytic, "passing by, he saw Levi, son of Alphaeus, sitting at the tax booth." Therefore it seems like there are two names. But the names of the apostles are carefully indicated, lest we be misled to any other by the things mentioned.

Origen (Contra Celsum, book 1:62)

Ἔστω δὲ καὶ ὁ **Λευὴς** τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ· ἀλλ᾽ οὔτι γε τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἦν εἰ μὴ κατά τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου.

The Leves also, who was a follower of Jesus, may have been a tax-gatherer; but he was not of the number of the apostles, except according to a statement in one of the copies of Mark's Gospel.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:9 Καὶ παράγων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, Μαθθαῖον λεγόμενον,
NA28 Luke 5:27 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευὶν καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:18 καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον

The problem with the call of Levi is that the name does not appear in the lists of the twelve apostles, where he is called James in all three Synoptics. One other attempt of correction in those lists is the change from Θαδδαῖος to Λεββαῖος, so that possibly Lebbaios could be an equivalent to Levi.
It is only Mark who has here τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου, which connects this Levi with the apostle lists, where it is always "James, son of Alphaeus". Thus the "best" correction would have been to omit τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου here, which interestingly did not happen.
Origen says that Levi was not one of the apostles, "except according to a statement in one of the copies of Mark's Gospel".

Matthew writes Μαθθαῖον λεγόμενον, where the λεγόμενον may indicate that he originally had another name (and perhaps Jesus called him Μαθθαῖον?

Regarding the Diatessaron Burkitt writes (JTS 28, 1927, p. 273-4):

> "The special object of this Note is to point out that both MSS of the Arabic Diatessaron actually read 'James', as is duly recorded in Ciasca's Arabic apparatus, though he regarded it as a scribe's blunder and put Levi in his text and in his Latin translation. From Ciasca it passed to the English editions of Hamlyn Hill and H. W. Hogg, and also to the recently published German translation by Preuschen and Pott (Heidelberg, 1926)!"

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 33
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 2:15-2:16
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. 16 **. καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ____ἰδόντες

T&T #30

καὶ P88(4th CE), 01, D, L, Δ, 047, 0130^{vid}, 33, 2786, pc, bo^{pt}, Trg
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Punctuation 1 with καὶ:
01, L, 33, 151, b, bo^{mss}:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοι· **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ **καὶ** γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων **. καὶ** ἰδόντες
Δ, 0130^{vid}, bo^{pt}:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοι· **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ_____ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων **. καὶ** ἰδόντες
P88(4th CE):
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοι· **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ **καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων **. καὶ** ἰδόντες
D, 047, 2786, r^{1}:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ· **οἱ καὶ** ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ **καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι **. καὶ** ἰδόντες

Punctuation 2 without καὶ:
txt: B, (W), 28, 124, L547, pc
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ **. καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ____ἰδόντες
A, C, K, Π, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, bo^{pt}:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ **. καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι_____ἰδόντες
Θ, 565:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ **οἱ** ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ **. καὶ οἱ** γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι_____ἰδόντες
Σ, 700:
ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ **καὶ** ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ **. οἱ δὲ** γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι_____ἰδόντες

W omits from ἰδόντες ... τελωνῶν probably due to h.t. ῶν - ῶν.
Summary:
Punctuation 1 with καὶ:

P88(4th CE), 01, D, L, Δ, 047, 0130vid, 33, 2786, b, r1, bopt

Punctuation 2 without καὶ:
A, B, C, (W), Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy, sa, bopt

Minority, punctuation 1, with καὶ:
" ... many tax collectors and sinners were also sitting with Jesus and his disciples -- for they were many **and also/even the scribes of the Pharisees followed him. And they saw ..."**

txt, punctuation 2, without καὶ:
" ... many tax collectors and sinners were also sitting with Jesus and his disciples -- for they were many **and they followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees saw ..."**

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:10-11 καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐλθόντες συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.
11 καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;

NA28 Luke 5:29-30 Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευὶς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι.
30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;

15 And it came to pass, in his reclining in his (Levi's) house, also many tax-gatherers and sinners were reclining with Jesus and his disciples.
For there were many, and they followed him. 16 And the scribes and the Pharisees, having seen him eating with the tax-gatherers and sinners, said to his disciples, ...

Some scribes were probably confused by the slightly equivocal sentence structure: many tax collectors ... for they were many and they followed him and the scribes ...
It is not clear to what the καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ belongs. This parenthetical sentence is rather clumsy. Both Mt and Lk omit it. It is not clear how to punctuate. If one reads on beyond the end of verse 15 "and followed him also the scribes ..." one gets an asyndeton with ἰδόντες.

It is normally assumed that the tax collectors followed him. But it is also possible that the Pharisees followed him and then saw what he was doing. To

make this explicit, some scribes added another καὶ. This happened with the txt version and also with the Byzantine version.

If one accepts the reading that also the scribes followed him, one gets a problem with the meaning of ἀκολουθέω. It is used in the Gospels for the disciples only. Following = being a disciple. Thus it would be very unusual here to say that the scribes followed him.
Note that both Mt and Lk changed the wording here.

Compare on the other hand A. Pallis (Notes, 1932): "The conjunction stands for a relative pronoun. Similarly 15:25 ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ (=ὅτε) ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. It is a paratactic popular form of speech. Pernot, La Langue des Evangiles p. 196:'καὶ n'a pas d'autre valeur que οἵ; meme construction en grec moderne' "

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 34

NA28 Mark 2:15-16 καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. 16 καὶ **<u>οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων</u>** ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν

BYZ Mark 2:15-16 καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. 16 καὶ **<u>οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι</u>** ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν

T&T #30

Byz A, C, D, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, sa, goth

txt P88(4th CE), 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0130, 124(=f13^{b}), 28, 33, 151, b, bo^{pt}

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:11 καὶ ἰδόντες <u>οἱ Φαρισαῖοι</u> ἔλεγον

NA28 Luke 5:30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον <u>οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν</u>
BYZ Luke 5:30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον <u>οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι</u>
118, 788, 1071: καὶ ἐγόγγυζον <u>οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς</u>
D: <u>οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς</u> ἐγόγγυζον

Compare for the term:

NA28 Acts 23:9 ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀναστάντες τινὲς <u>τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων</u> διεμάχοντο λέγοντες·

The term "the scribes of the Pharisees" is more unusual and has probably been changed to the common "the scribes and the Pharisees".
Note the similar changes in Mt and Lk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 35

NA28 Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· **ὅτι** μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;

BYZ Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· **τί ὅτι** μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει;

T&T #33

ὅτι	B, C^{vid}, L, 33, 1342, 1424, pc^{23}, bo^{pt}
τί ὅτι	A, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj, L2211
τί	Θ, pc^{2}
διὰ τὶ	01, D, W, pc^{5},
one of these:	Latt("quare"), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

τί ὅτι = "why"
διὰ τὶ = "why"
ὅτι = "that"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:11 καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;

NA28 Luke 5:30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:11 Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἠλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;

τί οὖν	W, Θ (:: Mt)
πῶς οὖν	f13

NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν· ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;

διὰ τὶ A, D, K, Π, 33, 1071, 1424^{c}, al (:: Mt)

NA28 Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με;

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 2:18 διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;
NA28 Mark 11:31 διὰ τί [οὖν] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

τί into ὅτι:
NA28 Mark 2:8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;

ὅτι τὰ 579
ὅτι ταῦτα P88

Meaning:
ὅτι as colon:
they said to his disciples, "He's eating with tax collectors and sinners!?"
ὅτι as "that":
they said to his disciples, that he's eating with tax collectors and sinners.
ὅτι as interrogative pronoun:
they said to his disciples, "Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?"

τί ὅτι:
they said to his disciples, "Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?"

διὰ τί in both parallels is safe.
τί ὅτι appears nowhere else in Mk. It appears once in Lk, safe.
διὰ τί appears two times in Mk, both safe.

It is pretty clear that διὰ τί can be ruled out as secondary, because it is very probably a harmonization to Mt/Lk. Also there would have been no reason for a change. Compare the διὰ τί in immediate context 2:18, which is safe.

Of the 102 occurrences of ὅτι only two other positions show a similar variation (9:11 and 9:28), both are clear harmonizations to the Matthean parallel. Also in both cases ὅτι is an interrogative pronoun, and therefore equivocal. It is possible that this is the case here, too. Both Mt and Lk took it this way.

According to Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 159) also most commentators accept the interrogative meaning. To make this meaning clear, probably the τί has been added.
There is no reason to change one of the other readings into ὅτι. But note one case where two witnesses replaced ὅτι for τί: Mk 2:8. Güting even thinks that it is "possibly original".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 36

NA28 Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν **ἐσθίει;**

BYZ Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· τι ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν **ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει;**

T&T #34

ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει;	P88(4th CE), A, f1, f13a,c, 28, 33, 157, 892, Maj, c, l, q, Sy, sams, goth, WHmg, Gre, Trg
ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;	G, Σ, 124(=f13), 517, 565, 700, 954, 1241, 1424, 1675, pc7 (Lk)
ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν	C, L, Δ, 69, 346, 788(=f13), 1071, pc70, f, vg, Co (Mt)
ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει	579

ἐσθίει;	B, D, W, pc7, it(a, aur, b, d, e, ff2, r1), WH, **NA25**
	pc = 213, 297, 499, 779, 1129, 1704*, 2159
ἐσθίεται;	Θ
ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;	01, 235, 271, 1342, vgms (Mt)

add καὶ πίνει after the first ἐσθίει: 579

Tregelles has additionally καὶ πίνει in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: umlaut! (p. 1279 C, line 41) ἁμαρ**τωλῶν ἐσθίει; 17 καὶ ἀ**κούσας

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:11 καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;

add καὶ πίνει: M, 346, 1689, 565, 1071, pc, vgms, Sy-S?, geo2

NA28 Luke 5:30

διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;

omit καὶ πίνετε: K

NA28 Luke 5:33 οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 11:19 ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων,
NA28 Luke 7:34 ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων,

Compare next verse:
NA28 Mark 2:16-17
ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν
ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει; 17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Some harmonized to Lk (person) and some to Mt (omission of καὶ πίνει and addition of ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν). It is not clear though if the omission of καὶ πίνει is part of the harmonization, or if the words were originally not present in these manuscripts and that scribes added only ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν.
Another harmonization to Mt/Lk occurs in διὰ τί for ὅτι.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 160) suggests that καὶ πίνει could have been dropped because in the first part of the verse also only ἐσθίει is mentioned. Compare:
καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες
ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν
ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·
ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;
The question is if this symmetry has been introduced secondarily or if it's original.
It is also possible that καὶ πίνει has been omitted due to h.t. (εικαι – εικαι). This is corroborated by the fact that 9 Byzantine minuscules support the shorter reading, too.

Greeven notes that the two verbs occur some 22 times together in the Gospels. Therefore a secondary addition is quite possible.

External analysis is hampered by the fact that heavy harmonizations took place in this verse (check Swanson for a complete overview). Many important witnesses drop out therefore.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 37

NA28 Mark 2:17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὅτι] οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ᾽ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.

BYZ Mark 2:17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς εἰς μετάνοιαν.

Not cited in NA, but SQE and Tis!

Byz C, Γ, f13, 2, 33, 1071, Maj, a, c, r^1, vg^{ms}, Sy-Pal

txt P88, 01, A, B, D, K, L, W, Y, Δ, Θ, Π, f1, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, al, Lat(b, d, e, f, ff^2, i, l, q, vg), Sy, Co, arm, goth

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 5:32
οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.

Clearly a harmonization to Lk. Bad support.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 38

NA28 Mark 2:18 Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου **καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι** νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου **καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων** νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

BYZ Mark 2:18 Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου **καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων** νηστεύοντες καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου **καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων** νηστεύουσιν οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

T&T #35 (a)

a)

Byz G, Σ, L, Δ, f1, 124, 346(=f13), 28, 33, 372, 579, 700, 892, 954, 2737, 2542, 2786, Maj, a, l, vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}, sa^{ms}, bo^{pt}, goth

txt P88(4th CE), 01, A, B, C, D, K, M, Θ, Π, f13, 517, 565, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc^{87}, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, bo^{pt}

καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων W, sa^{mss}

b)

Byz C^{c}, D, (W, Δ), f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

txt P88, 01, B, C*, L, 33, 565, 892, pc, e, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}

καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι Θ, 1424, pc (= Mt)

omit: A (= Lk)

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:14 Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου λέγοντες· διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν [πολλά], οἱ δὲ μαθηταί σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

NA28 Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.

In the first case a) the support is not good. I seems to be a harmonization to b). The change in b) seems to be a stylistic improvement.
On the other hand it could be argued that the term "disciples of the Pharisees" is rather unusual and therefore the τῶν has been omitted in the first place. When it occurred again though, only a few witnesses changed it again. This argumentation is equivocal though, because the omission of τῶν in b) by Θ and 1424 can also be a conformation to an original καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι in a).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 39

Minority variant:

NA28 Mark 2:19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν νηστεύειν; **ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν.**
2:20 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

T&T #36

omit: D, U, W, f1, 983, 33, 700, al[50], it, vg[mss], geo[2]

"No!" Sy-P[mss]

1582: another hand added the words in the margin. Same in 2193.
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) have the words.

Diatessaron: The Arabic Diatessaron seems to have taken the whole passage from Lk. In Ephrem we find (McCarthy, p. 105):
"For the bridal guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them."

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:15 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν ἐφ᾽ ὅσον μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ νυμφίος; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν.

NA28 Luke 5:34 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι;
35 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Byz: νηστεύειν;

D/05 Luke 5:34 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐφ᾽ ὅσον εχουσιν τον νυμφιον μεθ εαυτων νηστευειν.

The omission is most probably due to parablepsis:
νηστεύειν … νηστεύειν Lat: ieiunare.
Many Byzantine minuscules commit this error, too.

It is also possible that it has been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Lk, who both don't have it (so Wohlenberg). Or it has been omitted as redundant (so Weiß). Such somewhat clumsy doublings are typical for Mk.
Note how D is harmonizing in Lk!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 40

NA28 Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει **ὁ οἶνος** τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή ῥήσσει **ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος** τοὺς ἀσκούς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλοῦνται. ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς βλητέον.

Byz A, C^c, Δ, f1, 124, 346(=f13), 33, 1424, Maj, f, Sy-H

txt P88(4th CE), 01, B, C*, D, L, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, goth

1342 harmonizes to Mt: εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ …

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

Probably a harmonization to Lk. On the other hand it could have been omitted because of the similarity of the words: OOINOSONEOS.
It is also possible that the addition is a conformation to immediate context.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 41

NA28 Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλοῦνται. ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς βλητέον.

Byz 01, A, C, (W, Θ), Δ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy, sa, goth, Gre, Trg^{mg}
ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί L
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται 579

txt P88, B, (D), 892, (it), bo
καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί ἀπόλοῦνται D, it(a, b, d, e, ff^2, i, r^1, t)

(D, it): in NA cited as belonging to the Byzantine reading, but meaning is clearly txt.

B: no umlaut

ἐκχέω = "pour out"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται·
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυνται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ D, a, k

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται·

The support for the txt reading is very slim. Nevertheless it best explains the origin of the others. The καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί looks like an afterthought. The re-arrangement by (D, it) seems to be an early improvement of this awkward structure (adding a verb to καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί).

In general the many variant readings indicate that scribes felt uncomfortable with something. Most of them harmonized to Mt. 579 harmonized to Lk. Both Mt and Lk use a form of ἐκχέω, which constitutes one of the so called Minor Agreements.
Note that D omits ἐκχεῖται in Mt! Perhaps this is a harmonization to Mk (so Güting, TC Mark, 2005, p. 169)?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 42

17. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς·
εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται
καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί·
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς __.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς·
εἰ δὲ μή ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται,
καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλοῦνται.
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς βλητέον.

T&T #37

Byz P88, 01^{C1}, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, l, q, vg), Sy-H
βάλλουσιν W, e, f, Sy-S, Sy-P

txt 01*, B, pc^{3}
pc = 1041, 1282, 2528*

D, 976, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, i, r^{1}, t), bo^{ms}*, Tis, Bal omit the last sentence (see next variant).

B: no umlaut

βλητέος (verbal adj. from βάλλω) = "must be put or poured"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

βάλλουσιν 01*, D, it, Sy-P
βάλληται W

Difficult. Extremely slim support. The Byzantine reading is identical to Lk. βλητέον appears only here in the Greek Bible.
βάλλουσιν is a harmonization to Mt (W, it-part, Sy-S, Sy-P). In Lk likewise some harmonization to Mt occurred (01, D, W, it, Sy-C).
Both Mt and Lk have some form of βάλλω: βάλλουσιν/βλητέον.
Either the Byzantine reading is original or it is a harmonization to Lk. It seems more probable that txt is an accidental omission. Note that three otherwise Byzantine minuscules omit the word too!
Possibly the "source" of Mk had no middle part:

<u>καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς·</u>
εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί·
<u>ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.</u>

The words are slightly awkward without βλητέον:
καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς·
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.
"And no one puts new wine into old wineskins;
but new wine into fresh wineskins."
This just cries for some verb like "must be put".
The problem is that there is absolutely no reason why the word should have been omitted if original.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 43

18. Difficult variant:

Minority variant:

NA28 Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί· **ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.**

omit: D, 976, it(a, b, d, ff^2, i, r^1, t), bo^{ms}*, Tis, Bal

WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg all have the sentence in brackets.
Lat(aur, c, e, f, l, q, vg) have the phrase.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

This is probably related to the previous variant. It is also possible that the "source" of Mk omitted the last part:

καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς·
εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί·
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

Unfortunately the support is very slim. Possibly the omission was deliberate to correct the awkward structure.

Stephen C. Carlson Thu, 21 Nov 2002 on the TC-list:
"A bolder proposal here would have been to argue in favor of the omission as a Western non-interpolation, and it has more going for it than adding BLHTEON. The entire clause could be viewed as a harmonization to either Luke or Matthew, and it is the Western witnesses supporting the shorter text. (If the Western reading is accepted, though, it would generate a striking **"minor agreement"** against the Q hypothesis.)"

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 168) finds it difficult to believe that both Mt and Lk added the phrase without having read it in Mk. So also C.H. Turner: "but the arrangement of Mt and Lk in giving exactly these six words in common, while they provide different forms of βαλλω to complete the construction, is a strong argument for their genuineness in Mk."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 44

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας.

διαπορεύεσθαι B, C, D, 1342, Trg, WH, Bal

πορεύεσθαι W, f13

txt P88[4th CE], 01, A, L, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 700, 892, L2211, Maj, **NA[25]**, Weiss, WH[mg]
παραπορευόμενον 565

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:1 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων·

NA28 Luke 6:1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων, πορεύεσθαι C*, 1582[c]

The meaning of the words is the same, but παραπορεύομαι has the additional meaning of "pass by".

It is possible that παραπορεύεσθαι has been changed because it does not seem to fit to the following preposition διὰ. Interestingly διὰ is safe.

διαπορεύεσθαι could also be a harmonization to Lk (so Weiss).

There is no reason why διαπορεύεσθαι should have been changed here so universally into παραπορεύομαι.

διαπορεύομαι is rare in the NT (2x Lk, 1x Acts, 1x Romans), but occurs 36 times in the OT (cp Prov 9:12 διαπορεύεται δὲ δι' ἀνύδρου ἐρήμου).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 45

19. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:26 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

T&T #38

omit: B, D, pc, d, r^1, t, Weiss, Bal
WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg all have πῶς in brackets.

καὶ a ("et")

P88(4th CE) reads txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

NA28 Luke 6:4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ_
omit: P4(3rd CE), B, D, Sy-P

Strange coincidence of B and D. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 170) thinks that it is a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 46

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:26 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν;

T&T #39

ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως	01, B, G, K, Y, 118, 157, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg)
ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως	A, C, Θ, Π, Σ, Φ, 064, f1, f13, 22, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, al^{250}, Co, Trg^{mg}
ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ τοῦ ἱερέως	Δ

omit D, W, pc^{5}, it(a, b, d, e, ff^{2}, i, r^{1}, t), Sy-S
pc = 855, 1285, 1546*, 1668*, 2774

P88 reads: ἐπὶ Ἀβι[… here the papyrus breaks off.

B: umlaut! (p. 1280 B, line 16, blurred) Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον, ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;

NA28 Luke 6:4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;

Compare:

1 Samuel 21:1 David came to Nob to the priest Ahimelech (Αβιμελεχ). Ahimelech came trembling to meet David, and said to him, "Why are you alone, and no one with you?"

It was Ahimelech, not his son Abiathar, who was the high priest when David ate the bread. To get this right the easiest way would be an omission. Others changed it to "at the time of Abiathar, the high priest", because Abiathar was high priest later on. It is interesting that nobody inserted the correct name here.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit the phrase! A significant Minor Agreement.

Wenham suggests that ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως means "at the passage of scripture concerning Abiathar the High Priest". He notes that in Mk 12:26 a similar phrase occurs:
οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως <u>ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου</u>
"have you not read in the book of Moses, in the story about the bush"
Rogers rejects this idea based on an earlier note by Lagrange and writes: "ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως would only refer to a passage of scripture if it immediately followed ἀνέγνωτε."

Compare:
J.W. Wenham "Mark 2:26" JTS 1 (1950) 156
A.D. Rogers "Mark 2:26" JTS 2 (1951) 44

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
omission wrong

TVU 47

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 2:27 + NA28 Mark 2:28

NA28 Mark 2:27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον·
28 ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

T&T #40

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν· κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

Dico autem vobis, quoniam Dominus est filius hominis etiam sabbati.

D, a, c, d, e, ff^2, i

Lat (aur, b, f, l, q, vg) have the full words

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκτίσθη
28 ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

W ἐκτίσθη (κτίζω) "create, make"

καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκτίσθη
28 ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

And he was saying to them: "The Sabbath because of man was **created**, therefore the Lord of the Sabbath is the Son of man." (Burkitt)

Sy-S

Old Latin a (Vercellensis) adds after v. 28:

Et cum audissent, qui ab eo erant, exierunt detinere eum, dicebant enim, quia extitit mente. (compare Mk 3:21)

f1, 700, Sy-S, Sy-P, aeth read txt, but have also ἐκτίσθη (for ἐγένετο) as W.

Diatessaron:

Ephrem (McCarthy):

"Therefore, the Sabbath was not laid down for God, but for man."

Peshitta:

"The Sabbath was created because of the man, not man because of the Sabbath."

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew
12:6 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν …
12:8 κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

NA28 Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·
κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
BYZ Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου

Byz A, D, L, R, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
Latt, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, Marcion^{E}, WH^{mg}, Gre
txt P4^{vid}(200 CE), 01, B, W, 1241, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, WH, NA^{25}

For κτίζω compare:
NA28 Matthew 19:4 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς;
BYZ Matthew 19:4 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς

Byz 01, C, D, (L), W, Z, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy
txt B, Θ, f1, 124(f13), 22, 700, pc, e, Co, Or

NA28 Mark 10:6 ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς·

Verse 27, an often cited and admired word, is only found in the Gospel of Mark. Both Mt and Lk do not have it. Part of the Western witnesses omit it, too, which may be a harmonization to Mt and Lk, as it happens elsewhere in Mk.
λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν is un-Markan, it appears not in Mk, but 7 times in Mt and 5 times in Lk. Note that the parallel Mt 12:6 introduces Jesus' words with λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, which is also found in the Western text of Mk 2:28. The Western text harmonizes a lot in this passage, mostly to Lk. See below.

It has been suggested that someone added the words to more clearly refer back to verse 23 where the disciples are addressed and not Jesus. But this would be a very unusual recensional activity.
And, assuming someone found this catchy "floating word" somewhere, why adding it in Mk and not in Mt or Lk?

The wording of v. 27-28 is somewhat redundant, typical for Mk. The story has one conclusion too many. Either Jesus is superior to the Sabbath, or everyone is. This may have been a reason for the omission. The previous context with Abiathar and David fits good to verse 28. On the other hand verse 27 fits good

to verses 23-24, but perhaps these were already too remote and verse 27 was considered as interrupting the narrative.
That other scribes found the doubling problematic can be seen in W and Sy-S, which both omit the second part of verse 27.

Steven Ring suggested (tcg forum 2/2011), that perhaps the original meaning was:

"The Sabbath was created for man,
not man for the Sabbath,
therefore man is lord of the Sabbath."

This removes the difficulty of two different subjects. In the Greek txt reading verse 27 is referring to "man" in general, but verse 28 to the "son of man", Jesus. Note that in Syriac 'Bar nāshā' is equivocal, it literally translates as 'son of man', but depending on the context, it can be translated as 'man', 'humankind' etc. If the saying was originally transmitted in Aramaic, it is possible that it was translated inconsistently, destroying the symmetry. But is it probable that a translator is translating this word in two different ways here? Howsoever, the gist remains the same.

W: ἐκτίσθη appears nowhere else in the Gospels. Note that f1, 700, Sy-S, Sy-P, aeth read ἐκτίσθη for ἐγένετο, too. Are the Greek manuscripts influenced by the Syriac here? But phrases like ἔκτισεν ἄνθρωπον appear several times in the LXX also.

It remains interesting that both Mt and Lk omit the verse, which thus constitutes a <u>Minor Agreement</u> of Mt and Lk against Mk. Weiß thinks that Mt and Lk used another source here, the "apostolic source", something comparable to Q, which then explains the absence of v. 27.
Mt is going his own way in verses 12:5-7, which may account for the omission.
Luke may have omitted the words as not necessary and distracting from the main line of thought.

Harmonization of Bezae to Mt and Lk:

Bezae Mark 2:23	**Luke** 6:1	**Matthew** 12:1
και εγενετο παλιν		Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ
αυτον εν τοις σαββασιν διαπορευεσθε δια των σποριμων	Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων,	ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων·
και οι μαθηται ηρξαντο τιλλειν τους σταχυας	καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς στάχυας ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν.	οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείνασαν καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχυας καὶ ἐσθίειν.
24 οι δε φαρισαιοι ελεγον	2 τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπαν·	2 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπαν αὐτῷ·
ιδε τι ποιουσιν οι μαθηται σου τοις σαββασιν ο ουκ εξεστιν αυτοις	τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν;	ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταί σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.
25 και αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτοις	3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	3 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
ουδεποτε ανεγνωτε τι εποιησεν Δαυειδ οτε χρειαν εσχεν και επινασεν αυτος και οι μετ αυτου οντες	οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ [ὄντες],	οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,
26 εισηλθεν εις τον οικον του θεοῦ	4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ	4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ
και τους αρτους της προσθεσεως εφαγεν	καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν	καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον,
και εδωκεν τοις μετ αυτου ουσιν	καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ,	
ους ουκ εξεστιν φαγειν ει μη τοις ιερευσιν.	οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;	ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;
27 λεγω δε υμειν	5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·	5 ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν; 6 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὧδε. 7 εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἐστιν· ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους.
28 κύριός εστιν ο υιος του ανθρωπου και του σαββατου	κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. **[v. 5 in D post v. 10]**	8 κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

It can be concluded that the Western text is not very reliable here (as elsewhere). It is most probable that the omission is due to harmonization.

Since there is no compelling reason why the words could have been added secondarily, and the evidence in favor is overwhelming, the words must be retained.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 48

20. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:1 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς **τὴν** συναγωγήν. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

omit 01, B, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt A, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, 072, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj, [Trg]

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:9 Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν·

NA28 Luke 6:6 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.

There is no reason for an omission except accidental. The other occurrences are safe. If missing originally, a secondary addition would only be natural, possibly also as a harmonization to the parallels.

It is possible that the article has been omitted because it is not clear which synagogue is meant. It could possibly refer back to Mk 1:21.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 49

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

θεραπεύσει D, W, Latt("curaret"), goth

αὐτόν θεραπεύσει K, Π, 700, al

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 12:10 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν. καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι; ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 6:7 παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει, ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.

Possibly a harmonization to Mt/Lk.

The omission of αὐτόν is a Minor Agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 50

21. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι· ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον.

BYZ Mark 3:3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ἐγεῖραι εἰς τὸ μέσον

T&T #41

τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι	01, C*, Δ, Θ
τὴν ξηρὰν ἔχοντι χεῖρα	33[vid]
ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα	372, 435, 1342, 1675, 2737
τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηρὰν	B, (L), 072, 565, 892, 2786, a, NA[25], WH, Weiss, Trg, SBL
τὴν χεῖρα ἔχον ξηρὰν	L
ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ξηρὰν	W, Lat
ἔχοντι τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα	C[C3]
ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ἐξηραμμένην	D, pc[4]
τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἐξηραμμένην	28, 124, 2542, pc, L2211
ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα	A, Σ, Φ, 064, 0133, 0211, 0213, f1, f13, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2766, Maj, goth

33 has a partial lacuna:

καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν ἔχον[τι χεῖρα ἔγ]**ειρ**[ε ...

NA has 33 wrongly for Byz. INTF Image 2360, 4th line from the bottom.

B: no umlaut

Compare verse 3:1

NA28 Mark 3:1 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 12:10 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν. safe!

The readings with the adverb are probably harmonizations to immediate context, verse 1.

A evaluation of the other readings is difficult. Externally it can be boiled down to either the 01 or the B reading. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 180) suggests that the B reading might be influenced by Mt 12:10. Güting on the other hand thinks that τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα is "a natural word order" and secondary.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for the ἐξηραμμένην readings
Rating: - (indecisive) for the word order variants.

TVU 51

22. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:4 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν **ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι** ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.

BYZ Mark 3:4 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν **ἀγαθοποιῆσαι,** ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; Ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; Οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.

Byz A, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj, Gre, Trg, WH, SBL

txt 01, (D), W, NA[25], Weiss
τι ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι D, b, e

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:12 πόσῳ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου. ὥστε ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν. safe!

NA28 Luke 6:9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς εἰ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι; ἀγαθον ποιῆσαι 892, L1094

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 19:16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;
τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσας 01, L, 28, 33, 157, 892, L2211, pc

NA28 Mark 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας.
ὁδοποιεῖν B, G, H, f1, 565*, 892
ὁδοιποροῦντες f13, 565[c]

NA28 Luke 6:33 καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.
NA28 Luke 6:35 πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· both safe!

This orthographical variant could be at least in part accidental. In scriptio continua the only difference is the missing N.

The A, B reading could be a harmonization to Lk. It is also possible that it is a conformation to the following κακοποιῆσαι (so Weiss). Note that also in Mk 2:23 a number of witnesses (including B) contracted ὁδὸν ποιεῖν.
The txt reading (and especially the D reading) could be reminiscence to Mt 19:16.
The support is slim for the txt reading. D has a very bad text in Mark, W also is not very good.

Internally one has to favor the txt reading, externally the A, B reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 52

23. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἔκτεινον **τὴν χεῖρα.** καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:5 Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, Ἔκτεινον **τὴν χεῖρά σου.** Καὶ ἐξέτεινεν, καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Byz 01, A, C, D, L, P, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, L2211, Maj-part[G, H, K, Π*], Latt, Sy, bo, WH, Robinson, [Trg]
ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα f13-part(13, 69, 346, 828), 1342, 1424, pc

txt B, Maj-part[E, M, S, U, V, Γ, Π^{c}, Ω, 0135], **NA^{25}**, Weiss, WH^{mg}

Swanson has erroneously L, 565, 1424 for txt! I have checked 1424 on the image. It reads ἔκτεινον σου τὴν χεῖρα. Tischendorf has ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖ ρα σου for L. Belsheim has ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα σου for 565.

Lacuna: 33
B: umlaut! (1280 C 10 L) ἀπεκατεστάθη **ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. 6 καὶ ἐξελ**θόντες

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 12:13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.
σου τὴν χεῖρα 01*, B, L, N, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1424, al
τὴν χεῖρα σου 01^{c2}, C, D, W, 579, Maj
no omission!

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. safe!

The 01 reading could be a harmonization to Lk (so Weiss).
It is important to note that the support for the harmonization to Mt is very slim (f13-part). Normally a harmonization to Mt is more probable. It is thus possible that the omission of σου in B et al. is accidental.

The support is curiously divided. One the one hand B plus part of the Majority text, on the other hand 01, C, L, Δ, 892 plus part of the Majority text. Externally the support for τὴν χεῖρα σου is nevertheless better.
In the parallels no omission of σου is recorded.

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 53

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ᾽ ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ ὀργῆς συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα σου. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Variant not in NA, but in SQE.

Byz C^{C}, L, Θ^{Cmg}, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, a, b, c, Sy-S, (Sy-Pal)
omit ὑγιὴς 346, a, b, c, Sy-S

txt 01, A, B, C*, K, P, W, Δ, Θ*, Λ, Π, f1, 33, 565, 579, pc,
Lat(aur, e, f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

εὐθέως D, it("statim" d, ff^2, i, r^1)

B: umlaut! (p. 1280 C, line 10) ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. 6 καὶ ἐξελθόντες

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:13 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.
omit ὡς ἡ ἄλλη: 01, C^{C2}, 892*

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.
BYZ Luke 6:10 καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Byz A, D, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 892, 1071, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H
ὑγιὴς W, 579
txt P4(200 CE), $P75^{vid}$, 01, B, L, 33, pc, Lat(a, aur, e, ff^2, l, vg), Co

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 54

24. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας **[ἠκολούθησεν]**, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας
καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα πλῆθος πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 3:7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας **ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ,** καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας

T&T #44

ἠκολούθησεν	B, L, Θ, 565, pc
ἠκολούθησαν	01, C, 728
	(01, C: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἠκολούθησαν)
ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ,	A, P, Σ, f1, 579, 700, 892, Maj-part[705], Lat(aur, f, vg)
ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ,	(W), (Δ), All Byz Majuscules, 0133, f13[a,c], 22, 33, 1241,
(= Mt)	1342, 1424, Maj-part[836], l, Sy-H, sa, bo[pt], goth
	W, b, c have ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ in verse 8.
	Δ: ἠκολούθησαν αὐτὸν
omit:	D, 124, 788(=f13[b]), (28), 2542, 2786, pc, it, Sy-S, bo[pt]
	28, 2533 omit ἠκολούθησεν … Ἰουδαίας (h.t.?)

1342 has it after Ἰουδαίας.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ

NA28 Luke 6:17-18 καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας … 18 οἳ ἦλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ

Compare:
NA28 Mark 2:15 ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Mark 5:24 καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς
NA28 Matthew 9:27 καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ **ἠκολούθησαν** [αὐτῷ]

Verse 7b and verse 8 have been rearranged and changed in several ways to improve Mark's insertion of ἠκολούθησεν within the listing of places. Some omitted it altogether, some changed the position with minor other improvements and W put it at the end of the listing.
It is possible that the missing pronoun caused additional problems for the scribes.

The main question is if the αὐτῶ is original or not. In the Gospels ἀκολουθέω is invariably followed by αὐτῶ or some other personal pronoun. For the ratio ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῶ / ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ (with respect to multitudes) we have 7 : 1 in the Gospels, and 3 : 0 in Mk.
Note that in verse 8 we have: πλῆθος πολὺ <u>ἦλθον</u> (3rd person plural). Perhaps ἠκολούθησαν is conformation to ἦλθον (so Greeven, TC Mark, 2005, p. 188).

That the omission by D is original is very improbable. That scribes confronted with the long list of places inserted almost invariably ἠκολούθησεν/-σαν after the first item is improbable.

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the intentional separation of two groups caused problems.

Overall ἠκολούθησεν seems best to explain the origin of the other readings. Metzger: "the least unsatisfactory text".

Compare:
H.J. Cladder "Textkritisches zu Mk 3:7-8" BZ 10 (1912) 261-72 [he argues for the D, Sy-S reading]

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 55

25. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα πλῆθος πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὅσα **ἐποίει** ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

ποιεῖ B, L, 892, sa, bo^{pt}, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Trg

txt 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, L2211,
Lat, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

B: no umlaut

ἀκούοντες 01, B, W, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 700, 892, pc
ἀκούσαντες A, C, D, L, P, Θ, 157, 579, 1342, 1424, Maj

Compare:

NA28 Mark 5:20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

NA28 Mark 6:30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν.

NA28 Acts 9:39 … καὶ ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ ἱμάτια ὅσα ἐποίει μετ' αὐτῶν οὖσα ἡ Δορκάς.

The words do not appear in the parallels. It is possible that the Present ποιεῖ is a conformation to the preceeding Present ἀκούοντες.

On the other hand it is possible that ἐποίει and ἀκούσαντες are conformations to the following ἦλθον (so Weiss).

Both tenses, imperfect and present are rare with ὅσος. Of all 116 occurrences (ὅσος with ποιέω) in the Greek Bible 103 are Aorist. Imperfect 3 times and Present 2 times (Future 6 times, Perfect 2 times). It should be noted though that Mark is fond of the historical present.

Taking ποιεῖ as original, it would be remarkable that it has been changed into the imperfect and not into the aorist. On the other hand, if ἐποίει would have been the original, it has been changed into the present as a conformation to the preceding ἀκούοντες.

Note that ἀκούοντες is masculine plural, whereas πλῆθος is neuter singular. ἀκούοντες has been changed into ἀκούσαντες, too.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 56

26. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον **λέγοντες** ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:11 Καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπτεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζεν, **λέγοντα** ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

Byz **λέγοντα** A, B, C, L, P, Δ, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, L2211, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Gre, Trg, Bal, SBL

txt **λέγοντες** 01, D, K, W, 69, 28, 579, pc, L48, L260, WH[mg], Tis

omit ὅτι: D, W

καὶ πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα D, Θ, f13, 28, pc

B: no umlaut

λέγοντα present active nominative neuter plural
λέγοντες present active nominative masculine plural

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
safe!

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 8:29 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες·
NA28 Matthew 15:22 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελθοῦσα ἔκραζεν λέγουσα·
NA28 Matthew 20:30 καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες·
NA28 Matthew 21:9 καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον λέγοντες·
NA28 Matthew 27:23 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες·
NA28 John 18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν λέγοντες·
NA28 John 19:6 καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·
NA28 John 19:12 οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·
all safe!
But compare also:

NA28 Matthew 11:16 Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίοις καθημένοις ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἃ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἑτέροις
προσφωνοῦντα nominative neuter 01, B, D, Z, Θ, f1, f13, 892, 1424, pc
προσφωνοῦσιν dative masculine C, L, W, 22, 33, 579, Maj

NA28 Mark 5:13
καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους
ἐξελθῶν 579

NA28 Luke 11:26 ... ἕτερα πνεύματα ... καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ·
εἰσελθῶν G

λέγοντες could have been changed into λέγοντα to fit to the neuter τὰ πνεύματα. It could also be a harmonization to Lk. On the other hand λέγοντες is the much more common word and it could have been used accidentally. The support for λέγοντες is rather bad and incoherent.
Of the occurrences of λέγοντες above all are safe. But one observes that in some cases the neuter participle has been changed into the masculine one. The examples above are not exhaustive. They are only examples. This should be studied in more detail.

Note that D omits the articles at τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα.

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 57

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

Not in NA but in SQE.

ὁ θεὸς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	69
ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	C, M, P, Φ, 517, 1424, pc, Sy-H**, sa^{mss}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

NA28 Matthew 26:63 ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

NA28 Mark 14:61 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

NA28 Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Luke 22:67 λέγοντες· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός,

NA28 Luke 23:39 αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς.

NA28 John 1:49 ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ,

NA28 John 10:24 εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὲ ἡμῖν παρρησίᾳ.

NA28 John 11:27 λέγει αὐτῷ· ναὶ κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.

The reading of 69 is probably a confusion over the many nomina sacra.
The reading of C et al. is a conformation to the parallels.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 58

27. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν] ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν

BYZ Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα
ἵνα ὦσιν μετ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν

T&T #45

omit: A, C^{C2}, D, L, P, f1, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy, goth, **NA^{25}**, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt 01, B, C*, (W, Δ), Θ, f13, 28, pc^{20}, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, geo^{2A}, aeth, WH

C^{C2}: this corrector is from the 6th CE.

καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα μαθητὰς ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ
οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν W

καὶ ἐποίησεν ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ δώδεκα
οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν Δ

καὶ ἐποίησεν ἵνα ὦσιν δώδεκα μετ' αὐτοῦ D, Lat

B: no umlaut

Compare verse 16:

NA28 Mark 3:16 [καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα,] καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον,

omit: A, C^{C2}, D, L, (W), Θ, f1, (f13), 33, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy, bo, arm, geo, Gre, Bois
txt 01, B, C*, Δ, 565, 579, 1342, pc^{1}, sa^{ms}, WH, NA^{25}, Weiss

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 6:7 Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,

NA28 Mark 6:30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ <u>δώδεκα ἀποστόλων</u> τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα·

BYZ Luke 6:13 ... προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ αὐτῶν δώδεκα <u>οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν</u>

This is probably a harmonization to Lk (so Weiss). The support is quite good, but there is no reason why it should have been omitted by so large a range of witnesses. Also the different insertion point by W and Δ indicates a secondary cause.

Note the phrase ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς later in the verse. One the one hand this phrase could have lead to the addition. On the other hand οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν could be original and makes a good counterpart:
οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν - ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς.

It has been suggested (Skinner) that the words in 3:14 and 6:30 are meant as a narrative bracket. Compare:
3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα <u>οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν</u>
3:14 ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς</u> κηρύσσειν
6:7 … καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς <u>ἀποστέλλειν</u> δύο δύο
6:30 Καὶ συνάγονται <u>οἱ ἀπόστολοι</u> πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν

The words bracket the ministry of the twelve, the appointment (3:14) and the consummation (6:30). Later it is not mentioned anymore. Interestingly οἱ ἀπόστολοι is safe in 6:30!
Lührmann (Comm. Mt) thinks that the words are original, because in Mk 6:30 the name οἱ ἀπόστολοι is already assumed to be known.

Note the similar omission of καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα in verse 16!

The main problem is that there is no convincing explanation for the omission of the words by so large a range of witnesses. The double omission in verse 14 and 16 points to a deliberate cause.
Possibly the reason is stylistic. In 3:14 the words καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν is clumsy. Later in 3:16 the words are unnecessary, because the appointment has already been mentioned.
But is it likely that such an omission would then spread and permeate the vast bulk of witnesses (virtually all other manuscripts of all texttypes, as well as almost all the ancient versions)? Such an addition would be quite typical for the Byzantine texttype and if the external evidence would be the other way round

one would certainly omit the words. That the Byzantine text would deliberately omit the words is rather unlikely.

External evidence is divided: L, 892, 1342 support the shorter reading, Θ and f13 on the other hand support the longer reading.

W and Δ show different word orders, which may point to a secondary insertion.

Note that no witness omitted the words in Lk!

Compare:
Christopher W. Skinner "Whom He Also Named Apostles: A Textual Problem in Mark 3:14" Bibliotheca Sacra 161 (2004) 322-29

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 59

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν] ἵνα ὦσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν __
3:15 καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια·

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· 15 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

D, W, it, vg^{mss}, bo^{pt}, arm

praedicare evangelium.	Et dedit illis …	b, d, f, ff^{2}, i, r^{1}, t, vg^{mss}
praedicare.	Et dedit illis …	aur, c, l, vg
praedicare evangelium.	Et haberent …	e, q
praedicare.	Et haberent …	a (= txt)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.
NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.
NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν
NA28 Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι [τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς],

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 4:23 καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
NA28 Matthew 9:35 καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
NA28 Mark 1:14 κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ

A natural addition. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 60

28. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:15 καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν _____ ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια·

BYZ Mark 3:15 καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια·

No txt in NA.

Byz A, C^c, D, P, W, (Θ), f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj, Latt, Sy, arm, goth, Trg^{mg}
Θ has θεραπεύειν νόσους καὶ

txt 01, B, C*, L, Δ, 565, 892, pc, Co, geo, WH, NA^{25}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ ... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.
NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 4:23+9:35
καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ.

NA notes this reading as "p) ". But the wording is not exactly as in the parallels. On the other hand there is no reason for an omission. The clause is supported by a variety of different sources. If it is not original it must have been arisen independently at different places.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 61

29. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 3:16 [καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα,] καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον,

BYZ Mark 3:16 _____ καὶ ἐπέθηκεν τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον

T&T #46

Byz A, C^{C2}, D, L, P, (W), Θ, f1, (f13), 28, 33, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy, bo, arm, geo, goth, Gre, Bois, Trg

txt 01, B, C*, Δ, 565, 579, 1342, pc^{1}, sa^{ms}, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Tis, Bal

πρῶτον Σίμωνα f13, pc, sa^{mss}

καὶ περιάγοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον W, a, c, e, vg^{mss}
(this fits better at the end of verse 15!)

NA^{27}: It might be better to add the reading of W in the apparatus at the end of verse 15 and not as a replacement of this variant (done in NA^{28}). Hoskier notes (Codex B, i, p. 81) that there is a space between δαιμόνια of verse 15 and the addition of καὶ περιάγοντας … (folio 319). Possibly this caused NA to include it at verse 16?

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 14:
NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν]
txt 01, B, C*, (W, Δ), Θ, f13, 28, pc^{20}, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, geo^{2A}
omit: A, C^{C2}, D, L, P, f1, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj Latt, Sy

Compare for W:
NA28 Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
for f13:
NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς <u>δώδεκα</u> μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,

<u>omit:</u> f1, 22, pc, mae-2

It is difficult to decide. The words by 01, B et al. and of f13 could have been added to smooth the abrupt introduction of the names.
The supporting witnesses are almost the same as in the previous variant 3:15. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 185) thinks that the phrase has been omitted as superfluous.

Compare discussion at verse 14!

The words have in verse 14:	01, B, C*, (W, Δ), Θ, f13, 28,				Co
The words have in verse 16:	01, B, C*,	Δ,		565, 579, 1342	

Interestingly the support is not the same for both verses:
W, Θ, f13, 28, Co have the words in verse 14, but not in 16.
565, 579, 1342 have the words in verse 16, but not in 14.

It appears as if the additions are deliberate. Perhaps, so Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 197), to emphasize the appointment of the twelve, as the prototype of the church.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 62

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:17 καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόμα[τα] βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς·

κοινῶς δὲ αὐτοῦς ἐκάλεσεν βοαναν̄ηργέ, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς· ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι Σίμων καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης, ...

communiter autem vocavit eos Boanerges, quod est interpraetatum fili tonitrui ...

W, e, (b, c, q)

omit ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς Sy-S (he called them "Benai-Ragsh")

B: no umlaut

The reading of W is a deliberate change. The meaning is now that ALL disciples are called Boanerges and not only James and John.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 63

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:17 καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόμα[τα] βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς·

ὄνομα B, D, 788, 28, pc, Sy-P, bo^{ms}, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss^{text}

txt 01, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy-H, Co, WH^{mg}, Weiss^{Comm}

W reads curiously for verse 16-18:
3:16 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον,
3:17 κοινῶς δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσεν Βοανανηργέ, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς·
3:18 ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοί Σίμων καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης, …
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 3:16 [καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα,] καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον, ὀνόματα Θ, 33, 1071

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα· τὰ ὀνόμα 579

Regarding Boanerges:

Aramaic nickname given by Jesus to James and John, the sons of Zebedee; translated "sons of thunder" (hebr. vg<r, ynEB.).

Robertson (Wordpictures) writes: "the reason for it is not clear. It may refer to the fiery temperament revealed in Lk 9:34 when James and John wanted to call down fire on the Samaritan villages that were unfriendly to them. The word literally means 'sons of tumult, sons of thunder' in Syriac."

BDAG:

> "The difficulty pert. to the vowels of Boa is not yet solved; s. ThNöldeke, GGA 1884, 1022f. Nor is it certain that rges = vg<r,; Kautzsch points to zg:r> wrath, which would make the word mean the hot-tempered. Wlh.[2] ad loc. draws attention to the name Ragasbal. Schulthess (ZNW 21, 1922, 243-47) first cj. bene rehem=fratres uterini, full brothers, then bene

reges=partisans, adherents. JRook, JBL 100, '81, 94f attributes the problem to a transliteration technique involving an ayin/gamma change."

Possibly the plural ὀνόματα is a conformation to the following plurals Βοανηργές and Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς. On the other hand ὀνόμα appears the more natural usage. ὀνόμα could be also a conformation to the preceeding singular in verse 16.
Weiss in his commentary (9th ed. 1901) argues that the singular, indicating that each of the two sons is called the name of one son of thunder, is certainly wrong. Interestingly he nevertheless prints the singular in his text.

The support for ὄνομα is not coherent. Most probably the singular ὀνόμα is a conformation to the previous verse 16 or accidental (compare Mt 10:2).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 64

30. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 3:20 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον· καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν [ὁ] ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν.

BYZ Mark 3:20 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἴς οἶκον Καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν

Byz	01^{C2}, A, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H	
	εἰσέρχονται	D
	veniunt	Lat(aur, d, f, l, q, vg)
txt	01*, B, W, Γ, 1241, 1342, pc, b, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}	
	introivit	it(e, ff^2, i, r^1)
	venit	b

Old Latin Colbertinus c omits the whole first sentence.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 7:17 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου

NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον

Note that here the verse numbering is varying. Some count the first part of verse 20 to verse 19!

Difficult to evaluate, because no Synoptic parallels exist and the context does also not provide any clues.

The txt reading is not coherent (Γ, 1241). Perhaps the variation is in part accidental.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19

Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 65
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 3:21 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ
ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.

D: καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσαν περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ
ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἔξεσται αὐτούς.

T&T #50+51

περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ
de eo scribae et ceteri
D, W, it(a, b, c, d, e, f, ff^{2}, g^{1,2}, i, q, r^{1}), vg^{ms}

ἔξεσται αὐτούς ("he is amazing/bewitching them")
quoniam exsentiat eos
D, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1}) [c, e omit]

ἐξήρτηνται αὐτοῦ ("they are adherents of him", from ἐξαρτάω, cp. BDAG)
W

aur, g^{1,2}, l, vg, Sy-S read txt.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

The change is probably the result of the embarrassment to which the text lent itself, the perception that Jesus was mad. (If ἐξέστη really means "mad" here or something else is not clear. Compare the commentaries.)
The first variant is exchanging Jesus relatives (οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ, cp. Proverbs 31:21) for his enemies, the scribes. For Jesus own friends or relatives to perceive him as "mad" would either lend suspicion to Jesus or make his associates look bad.

The second variant smoothes down the assertion of madness to "he is bewitching them".
The W reading takes a different turn by letting the scribes accusing Jesus of making many disciples/followers: They (= the scribes) went out to restrain him, for they were saying: "They (= the crowd, vs. 20) are adherents of him". It's also possible that the meaning is "They have become dependent upon him".

Mt and Lk omit 3:20-21 altogether.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 66

31. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:25 καὶ ἐὰν οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ,
οὐ δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη **σταθῆναι.**

	στῆναι	B, K, Π, L, 579, 892, pc, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Gre, Trg
txt	**σταθῆναι**	01, A, C, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, a, Sy-H
	ἑστάναι	D
	σταθήσεται	1241 (and omit δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη σταθῆναι) = from Mt.

B: no umlaut

σταθῆναι	infinitive aorist passive
στῆναι	infinitive aorist active
ἑστάναι	infinitive perfect active
σταθήσεται	indicative future passive 3rd person singular

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:25 εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.

NA28 Luke 11:17 αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει.

Compare previous verse 24:

NA28 Mark 3:24 καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἡ βασιλεία ἐκείνη·

στῆναι 579, 892, pc

and next verse 26:

NA28 Mark 3:26 καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει.

στῆναι 01, B, C, L, Θ, 892, pc

σταθῆναι A, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, (579?), 700, 1071, 1424, Maj

579 omits due to h.t. (prob. στῆναι ... στῆναι).

The Byzantine text has in all three verses σταθῆναι.

3:24	<u>σταθῆναι</u>	almost safe (=txt)
	<u>στῆναι</u>	579, 892, pc
3:25	<u>σταθῆναι</u>	01, A, C, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1424, Maj (=txt)
	<u>στῆναι</u>	B, K, Π, L, 579, 892, pc
3:26	<u>σταθῆναι</u>	A, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1424, Maj
	<u>στῆναι</u>	01, B, C, L, Θ, 892, pc (=txt)

The first of the three verses reads (basically safe) σταθῆναι, and it is only natural that some scribes would use this form also in verse 25. The passive could also be a conformation to the passive of μερισθῇ. In verse 26 then, the urge to change στῆναι, decreases somewhat (so also Greeven). This fatigue is a known phenomenon in textual criticism. But the effect here is not strong. The other way round though, would contradict this rule. Every time the support for στῆναι gets stronger.

On the other hand one could ask, why would Mark use two different forms here at all? Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 205) asks if it would be possible that already in verse 24 στῆναι is original? But he answers in the negative that there was no exquisitely strong motive to change στῆναι there. To the contrary he suggests that στῆναι in verse 24 could be a conformation to the two following στῆναι in verse 25 and 26. This means that only (579?), 892 have the original text in all three verses.

The support for στῆναι reading is not coherent (K, Π).

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

TVU 67

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:29 ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

omit: D, W, Θ, 1, 1582*, 788(=f13), 22, 28, 565, 700, pc,
it(a, b, d, e, ff^{2}, q, r^{1}), vg^{ms}, Cyp

Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg) have the words.

omit ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος bo^{ms}, sa^{ms}

1582: the words have been added above the line by a different hand.
Sy-S is defective, but there is no space for the full sentence, and the reading may have been only "shall not be forgiven sins for ever" (Burkitt).
Lacuna: 579
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:32 ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.
NA28 Luke 12:10 τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

Possibly omitted to avoid redundancy on account of the following αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 68

NA28 Mark 3:29 ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

BYZ Mark 3:29 ὃς δ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀλλ' ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου κρίσεως,

T&T #52

Byz A, C^{C2}, f1, 124, 700, 892^{C}, 1342, (1424), Maj, f, r^{1}, vg^{ms}, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

txt 01, B, L, Δ, Θ, 28, 33, 372, 565, 892*, 2737
ἁμαρτήματος or ἁμαρτίας Lat, Sy-S, bo^{pt}, goth
ἁμαρτίας C*, D, W, f13

κρίσεως καὶ ἁμαρτίας 826, 828(=f13)
κρίματος 517, 954, 1424
κολάσεως pc^{17}

892: κρίσεως in the margin (triplet sign).
The Sahidic omits ἀλλὰ ... ἁμαρτήματος.
Lacuna: 579
B: umlaut! (p. 1281 B, line 37) αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος. 30 ὅτι ἔλεγον·

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 3:28 πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν·
NA28 Matthew 12:32 ... ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.
NA28 Luke 12:10 ... τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 5:21-22 ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.
ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·
ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ·
ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.
NA28 Matthew 26:66 ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν.
NA28 Mark 14:64 ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου.

τὰ ἁμαρτήματα is seldom used in the NT, it often appears in the LXX. But the whole expression is unusual. Therefore scribes replaced the expression with several substituents (κρίσεως, ἁμαρτίας, κολάσεως).
Note the addition of τὰ ἁμαρτήματα by Byz in Mk 4:12!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 69

32. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 3:31 Ἔρχονται οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω ἑστῶτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν, φωνοῦντες αὐτόν.

Καὶ ἔρχεται	01, D, G, W, Θ, f1, 565, 892, pc, it(a, b, d, e, f, ff^2, q, r^1), vg^{mss}
Καὶ ἔρχονται	B, C, L, Δ, f13, 28, 700, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, pc, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Trg, SBL
Ἔρχονται οὖν	A, 33, 157, Maj, Sy-H
Καὶ ἔρχονται οὖν	346
Ἔρχεται οὖν	115

Lacuna: 579

B: no umlaut

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19

Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:46 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἱστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι.

NA28 Luke 8:19 Παρεγένετο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ

Byz Luke 8:19 Παρεγένοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ,

Byz	01, A, L, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, Lat
txt	P75, B, D, 070, 579, pc

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 3:21 καὶ ἀκούσαντες <u>οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ</u> ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 3:20 Καὶ <u>ἔρχεται</u> εἰς οἶκον·
BYZ Mark 3:20 καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> εἰς οἶκον
<u>ἔρχονται</u> 01^{C2}, A, C, (D), L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
<u>ἔρχεται</u> 01*, B, W, Γ, 1241, pc

NA28 Mark 5:38 <u>καὶ ἔρχονται</u> εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου,
BYZ Mark 5:38 <u>καὶ ἔρχεται</u> εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
<u>ἔρχονται</u> 01, A, B, C, D, F, Δ, f1, 33, pc
<u>ἔρχεται</u> L, W, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj
(not in NA but in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 8:22 Καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.
BYZ Mark 8:22 Καὶ <u>ἔρχεταί</u> εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν
<u>ἔρχονται</u> 01^{C}, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 579, 1071
<u>ἔρχεται</u> 01*, A, f1, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj
(not in NA but in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 10:46 Καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> εἰς Ἰεριχώ.
<u>ἔρχεται</u> D, 2, 788, pc (not in NA and not in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 11:15 Καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.
<u>ἔρχεται</u> 700 (not in NA and SQE!)

NA28 Mark 11:27 Καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.
<u>ἔρχεται</u> D, 565, pc, it (not in NA but in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 14:32 Καὶ <u>ἔρχονται</u> εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανὶ
<u>ἔρχεται</u> Θ, 118^{C}, 205, 209, 565, pc (not in NA but in SQE!)

Difficult to judge. This case is not comparable to the other cases above, where no explicit subjects are given.

According to Weiss the plural was slightly awkward with the singular ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ following. Therefore the Byzantine text moved οἱ ἀδελφοὶ to the first position and used only one combining αὐτοῦ. This is clearly secondary. For the same reason 01, D et al. changed to the singular.
On the other hand it could be argued that the singular has been changed to the plural because there is more than one subject. Against this it could be noted that in all cases where a minority variant is present, the change it to the singular (twice D, it).

Interestingly in the Lukan parallel a similar situation is present, and also the singular has been selected by UBS/NA. Probably they considered the singular the more difficult reading.
One must also consider that perhaps one Synoptic account influenced the other. The question is how probable it is that the number of the verb in Lk has influenced the number in Mk, or vice versa.
If one argues as above that the singular is secondary in Mk, then it must be secondary in Lk, too. But it is possible that already Lk, assuming that he used Mk, changed to the singular himself.

οὖν has probably been added to connect the following more clearly with verse 21. Weiss argues that also the plural is meant to connect back to οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ from verse 21.

The support for txt is not very good and it is incoherent. There is a curious division of the witnesses here. Probably the change to the singular occurred more than once.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) notes that Mk sometimes has the prefixed verb in the singular with several subjects. Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ <u>ἐξεπορεύετο</u> πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῖται πάντες,
<u>ἐξεπορεύοντο</u> L, Maj-part

NA28 Mark 1:36 καὶ <u>κατεδίωξεν</u> αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,
<u>κατεδίωξαν</u> A, C, D, L, W, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1424, Maj-part
txt 01, B, Θ, 28, 565, 700, Maj-part

The support for the examples above is also mixed. Sometimes the Byzantine text has the plural and sometimes it has the singular.

Very difficult to decide.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 70

33. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν **καλοῦντες** αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 3:31 ἔρχονται οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω ἑστῶτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν **φωνοῦντες** αὐτόν

T&T #54
Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz D, G, Σ, Φ, 064, 33, 1424, Maj, Gre
txt 01, B, C, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1342, pc

ζητοῦντες A (from Mt)

omit καλοῦντες αὐτόν Δ, 0211, 2542, pc[16] (h.t.?)

Greeven and Legg have λαλοῦντες for 565.
579 omits 3:28 καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι up to 4:8 τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 12:46 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἱστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι.

Compare:
NA28 John 10:3 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά.
φωνεῖ P66, P75, 01, A, B, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 579, 1071, 1241, al
καλεῖ Θ, 0250, f13, 28, 700, 1424, Maj

καλέω 75/73/4 times, φωνέω 37/25/10 times in the Gospels/Synoptics/Mk. The meaning is basically the same. Almost all occurrences are safe. The only other major variation occurs at Jo 10:3.
Nestle thinks that φωνέω has been replaced by the more common καλέω.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 215) notes correctly that there is no reason for a change of καλέω to φωνέω.
One has to note that in Mk φωνέω appears more often than καλέω (10/4).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 71

34. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:32 ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου
[καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου] ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε.

BYZ Mark 3:32 Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου
καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε

T&T #55

omit: 01, B, C, K, Π, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 2, 28, 33, 157, 372, 517, 565, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2766, 2786, [G, Y] Maj-part^{450}, Lat(aur, e, f^{c}, l, r^{1}, vg), Sy, Co, arm, geo, WH, Trg, Bal, SBL

txt A, D, 124, 700, 954, [E, F, H, M, S, U, Γ, Ω] Maj-part^{1150}, it(a, b, c, d, f*, ff^{2}, q), vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}, goth, NA^{25}, Trg^{mg}, Tis

Lacuna: 579

B: probably umlaut (p. 1281 C, line 6L!) καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω

This umlaut is on the left side, which is unusual for column C and it is just in the middle between column B and C.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:47 [εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι.]

NA28 Matthew 12:50 ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

NA28 Luke 8:20 ἀπηγγέλη δὲ αὐτῷ· ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἑστήκασιν ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε.

NA28 Luke 8:21 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦ ντες.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ

NA28 Mark 3:33 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει· τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου];

NA28 Mark 3:34 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει· ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

NA28 Mark 3:35 ὃς [γὰρ] ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

NA28 Matthew 13:56 καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσιν;
NA28 Mark 6:3 καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 18:29 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς __ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,
__ἢ ἀδελφὰς__ D, X, Δ, Ψ, (579, 1071, 1241), pc, d, sa^{mss}

The term could have been omitted by oversight:
καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου
καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου.
This has certainly happened at least in part.

Both Mt and Lk don't have the words in their parallel (both safe), but Mt retained καὶ ἀδελφὴ in verse 12:50, as did Mk in 3:35. It is possible that the word has been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Lk. It is also possible that the words have been omitted as conformation to verse 31, where no sisters are mentioned.

On the other hand the words could have been added as a natural expansion, possibly stimulated by καὶ ἀδελφὴ in verse 35. But note that nobody added the words in verses 31, 33 and 34.
The support for the shorter reading is very good.
Metzger argues in a minority vote that the shorter reading should be adopted, because historically it would be unlikely that Jesus sisters would seek to check him publicly. But this could also be an argument for its later deletion.

If one takes the words as original, both Mt and Lk would agree against Mk (Minor Agreement).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 72

35. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:33 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει· τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου];

omit first μου W

omit second μου B, D, NA[25], WH, Weiss

d has the word.

Lacuna: 579

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:50 ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

NA28 Luke 8:21 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 20:21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· τί θέλεις; λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

omit first σου: 01, B, NA[25], WH, Weiss

omit second σου: D, E, Θ, f1, 22, 33, 565, pc, Lat, mae-1, arm

Possibly omitted to improve style? Or added as a harmonization to Lk?

The phrase "... AB μου καὶ XY μου ..." appears 29 times in the LXX, but only once in Lk in the Gospels.

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that it has been added for parallelism.

It is curious that no other manuscript agrees with B, D.

Note the omission of σου in Mt.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 73

NA28 Mark 3:33 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει·
τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου **καὶ** οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου];

BYZ Mark 3:33 Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων,
τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου **ἢ** οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

Byz A, D, 2, 28, 33, 157, 700,
Maj-part(E, F, H, K, Π, it, Sy-S, Sy-H, TR, Robinson, Gre, SBL
D has: ἢ ἀδελφοί;
700 has ἢ ἀδελφή μου;

txt 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542,
Maj-part(G, S, Y, U, Γ, Ω), Lat, Co

Lacuna: 579
B: no umlaut

Byz And he replied, "Who are my mother **or** my brothers?"
txt And he replied, "Who are my mother **and** my brothers?"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 12:48 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ· τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου **καὶ** τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;
ἢ D, W, Θ, pc, it, Sy-S, mae-1, bo

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 3:32 καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου **καὶ** οἱ ἀδελφοί σου [καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου] ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε.
NA28 Mark 3:34 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει· ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου **καὶ** οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

On the one hand it is possible that καὶ is a conformation to the context. In both, previous and next verses καὶ is used and both are safe.

On the other hand it is possible that ἢ is a grammatical correction to account for the singular τίς ἐστιν. Note that also Mt changed this (under the assumption of Markan priority) into τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; Even here some witnesses changed καὶ into ἢ.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 74

36. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:35 ὃς **[γὰρ]** ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

T&T #56

omit B, pc[3] (590, 1188, 1310), b, e, bo, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Bois, Tis, Bal

txt 01, A, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, bo-mss, WH[mg], [Trg]

καὶ ὃς ποιῇ W

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:50 ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

ὅστις γὰρ D

ὃς γὰρ ἂν L

NA28 Luke 8:21 μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:41 Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

καὶ ὃς ἂν Θ, 565, 700 (harmonization to Mt)

Ὃς γὰρ Ψ

ὃς ἂν is the normal form, ὃς γὰρ ἂν is comparatively rare.

The γὰρ fits good here and could be a harmonization to Mt. The support for the short form is very limited (and incoherent).

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 233) pleads for the short reading as a "typical Markan asyndeton".

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 75

37. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:5 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·

καὶ ὅπου B, 1071, [Trg], [WH]
καὶ ὅτι D, W

txt 01, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:5 ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·
NA28 Luke 8:6 καὶ ἕτερον κατέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, καὶ φυὲν ἐξηράνθη διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα.

Compare previous verse 4:
NA28 Mark 4:4 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.
NA28 Mark 4:7 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.

Taking καὶ as "and" there is a difference in meaning here:
txt "Other seed fell on rocky ground, where it did not have much soil, …"
B "Other seed fell on rocky ground and where it did not have much soil, …"

The B reading separates two different grounds: the "rocky ground" and the one "where it did not have much soil".
Note that D, W also support καὶ. Probably the ὅτι is a misreading of ὅπου.
Others have suggested to take καὶ as epexegetic καὶ "namely":
"the rocky ground, namely/that is where it had not much earth".

The omission of καὶ could be a harmonization to Mt or it could be a smoothing of the slightly awkward construction.

On the other hand it is possible that the addition of καὶ is stimulated by the immediate context. In the previous verse also a καὶ follows the place where the seed has fallen.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 76

38. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:8 καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα καὶ ἔφερεν ἓν τριάκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν.

εἰς B, L, (1071) , WH, NA^{25}, Weiss
1071 omits 2nd ἓν
B^{C2} accents: εἰς … ἐν … ἐν NA^{25}, WH, Weiss
L accents: εἰς … ἓν … ἓν WH^{mg}

txt A, C^{C2}, D, Θ, (W), f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, Sy-P, Trg^{mg}
3 times τὸ ἓν W

εἰς … εἰς … εἰς 01, C*^{vid}, Δ, 28, 700, pc, WH^{mg}, Trg, Tis, Bal
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:8 ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπόν, ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

NA28 Matthew 13:23 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς, ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.

NA28 Luke 8:8 καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἓν τριάκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν.

basically safe, no εις.

The accents are not certain, it could be either the number "one" (so NA) or the preposition "in" (so B, L).

BDAG notes: —ἓν τριάκοντα Mk 4:8, 20 is prob. to be considered an Aramaism thirtyfold (B-D-F §248, 3; EKautzsch, Gramm. d. bibl. Aram. 1884 §66, 2; JHudson, ET 53, '41/42, 266f).

This is also what Metzger thinks: "In favor of ἓν is the probability that underlying the variants was the Aramaic sign of multiplication ('-times' or '-fold'), dx, which also is the numeral one."

It is possible that the B reading is original and that the other readings are attempts to avoid different prepositions or genders (so already Weiss).
A secondary origin of the B reading is difficult to explain. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 230) suggests that the scribe of B corrected the first ἓν into εἰς, but left the following ones untouched.

Possibly some idiomatic expression.

C.H. Turner writes (Marcan Usage):

> "By a curious freak of the Greek language εις εν can mean, according as breathing and accent differ, either the two correlated prepositions εἰς ἐν, or the masculine and neuter of the cardinal number one, εἷς ἕν. And since breathings and accents were not part of the usage of MSS at the time when our Gospels were written, we are thrown back on internal evidence to decide between possible interpretations. Matthew on each occasion substitutes ὃ μὲν ... ὃ δὲ ... ὃ δὲ: he would therefore seem to have read ἕν, and certainly to have understood Mark to mean 'one … another … another'. Luke, with the dislike of an educated Greek for the Jewish use of symbolic numbers, omits the details on both occasions.
> εἷς in verse 8 would be ungrammatical after ἄλλα, and if we translate with Matthew 'one … another … another' we must read the neuter ἕν throughout, against the testimony of 01 B C* L Δ. The Latins followed Matthew's interpretation, and rendered unum: and so among moderns Blass (§ 46.2 p. 142). But in view of the Semitic idiom, which uses the preposition 'in' to mean 'at the rate of', I suspect that Mark had in his mind here the preposition and not the numeral. Further, if the mass of evidence adduced in these notes convinces us that the evangelist used the two prepositions ἐν and εἰς almost interchangeably, it becomes simple enough to suppose that he had the same idiom in his mind whether he expressed it by ἐν, as certainly in verse 20, or by εἰς, as perhaps in verse 8. Nay, it becomes even possible that cod. B is right in interchanging the two in a single verse: in verse 8 if B's εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν is the true text, we can the better understand why 01 should have εἰς … εἰς … εἰς and A D ἐν … ἐν … ἐν."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 77
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω __.

__καὶ ὁ συνίων συνίετω__ D, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}i, r^1), vg^{ms}, Sy-H^{mg}, Bois
et intellegens intellegat

Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg) do not have the addition.
B: no umlaut

συνίημι understand, comprehend, perceive, have insight into

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 4:12 ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 7:14 ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε.
NA28 Mark 8:17 οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε;
NA28 Mark 8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὔπω συνίετε;

NA28 Matthew 13:14 ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε,
NA28 Matthew 13:23 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς,

NA28 Luke 8:10 ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

Some form of ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω appears five times elsewhere in the Gospels, but never with this addition (Mt 11:15; 13:9, 43; Mk 4:23, (7:16); Lk 8:8; 14:35).
For the use of συνίημι as a participle the only other occurrence is Mt 13:23.
Probably a natural addition from context verse 12. There is no reason for an omission, except possibly h.t. ετω - ετω (Bois).
συνιείς and συνίων are both participle present active nominative masculine singular!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 78

NA28 Mark 4:11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·
ὑμῖν <u>τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται</u> τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·

BYZ Mark 4:11 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,
ὑμῖν <u>δέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον</u> τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·

Not in NA, but in SQE.

<u>τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται</u>	01, B, C*, L, 892, pc, bo^{mss}
<u>δέδοται τὸ μυστήριον</u>	A, K, Π, W, pc, Sy-S, sa
<u>τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται γνῶναι</u>	1342
<u>δέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον</u>	C^{C2}, D, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, geo, bo^{mss}
<u>δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια</u>	G, Σ, Φ, f1, 1424, pc, Sy-H, arm

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:11 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
ὅτι ὑμῖν <u>δέδοται γνῶναι</u> τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν,
NA28 Luke 8:10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·
ὑμῖν <u>δέδοται γνῶναι</u> τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,

γνῶναι is safe in Mt and Lk. This wording appears therefore to be unproblematic for the scribes.
γνῶναι in Mk is probably a harmonization to Mt/Lk. The word order δέδοται τὸ μυστήριον by A et al. is probably also a (more mild) harmonization to Mt/Lk. Some witnesses to the Byzantine reading additionally change the singular to the plural τὰ μυστήρια.
On the other hand it is also possible that the A et al. reading is simply an error by omitting γνῶναι due to h.t. (αι – αι) from the Byz reading.
It is nevertheless interesting that both Mt and Lk read γνῶναι and use the plural τὰ μυστήρια. This is a significant <u>Minor Agreement</u>.

Streeter (Four Gospels, p. 313) writes: "The phrase [in Mk] 'the mystery is given to you' is obscure; the verb γνῶναι (to understand) is the most natural one for two independent interpreters to supply. But note the singular μυστήριον is read in Matthew by k, c, a, ff^2, Sy-S, Sy-C, Cl, Ir."

γνῶναι appears only here in Mt and Lk, but Luke uses it 6 times in Acts. Also μυστήριον appears only here in the Gospels.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 79

NA28 Mark 4:12 ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 4:12 ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.

Byz A, D, K, Π, Δ, Θ, f13, 28^{c}, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892^{c}, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Trg^{mg}
τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν Δ

txt 01, B, C, L, W, f1, 28*, 892*, 2542, pc, b, Co

892: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
LXX Isaiah 6:9-10 καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε 10 ... καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς
Verse exactly cited in: Acts 28:26-27

NA28 Matthew 13:13-14 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν, 14 καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἠσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα· then follows the exact Isa quote as above

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:28 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα

The words given by Mk are not an exact quote, but only an allusion to Isaiah. Mt took this up and cited explicitly the verses. The addition of τὰ ἁμαρτήματα does not appear in Isaiah.
It is a natural addition inspired probably from immediate context 3:28

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 80

NA28 Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν· ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον **εἰς αὐτούς.**

BYZ Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν· ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν εὐθὲως ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον **ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.**

Byz	ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν	D, Θ, 124, 346(=f13), 33, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, arm, goth, Trg^{mg}
	ἀπό τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν	A, I (= Lk)
txt	εἰς αὐτούς	B, W, f1, f13, 28, 2542, pc, Trg
	ἐν αὐτοῖς	01, C, L, Δ, 579, 892, pc
	one of these:	c, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:19 παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἁρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς.

NA28 Luke 8:12 οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

In the Koine εἰς could be used locally (BDR §205). See also variant 1:39 above. Therefore the εἰς and ἐν readings are probably identical in meaning.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 98) notes that the (secondary) ἐν seems to fit better to the Part. Perfect ἐσπαρμένον, denoting a state/condition.

The Byzantine variants are harmonizations to Mt/Lk. There is no reason for a change. Note that both Mt and Lk agree against Mk here (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 81

39. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 4:16 καὶ οὗτοί **εἰσιν** οι ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι, οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν,

BYZ Mark 4:16 καὶ οὗτοί **εἰσιν ὁμοίως** οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὲως μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν

T&T #58

εἰσιν ὁμοίως	A, B, K, Π, 124, 346(=f13), 157, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, f, l, vg), Sy-H, goth, **NA[25]**, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, SBL
ὁμοίως εἰσιν	01, C, L, Δ, 33, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 2766, 2786, pc[16], bo?, Trg[mg], Tis, Bal pc = 7, 267, 695, 1084, 1138, 1396, 1454, 1495, 1557, 1645, 1651, 1654, 1685, 2555
txt	D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 2542, pc[13], it(b, c, d, ff[2], i, q, r[1]), Sy-S, Sy-P, sa, Or pc = 435, 663, 676, 793, 1261, 1273, 1387, 1561, 1901, 2694, 2697, 2750, 2779

Tregelles has additionally ὁμοίως in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:20 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν,

NA28 Luke 8:13 οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν,

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·

and:

NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες,

In the immediate context of Mk no other ὁμοίως occurs. Also both Mt and Lk don't have the word (Minor Agreement).

Possibly the word has been omitted to harmonize the verse with the other verses.

The different insertion points may indicate a secondary cause. But note that in the other verses no ὁμοίως has been inserted.
Metzger: "there is no question that ὁμοίως makes the text smoother." Why?

Weiss notes (Textkritik, p. 211), that the order εἰσιν ὁμοίως could be interpreted as if those "sown on rocky ground" are equivalent to those "on the path" from verse 15. Therefore the order has been changed.

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)
ὁμοίως εἰσιν οἱ very probably right

TVU 82

NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

BYZ Mark 4:18 καὶ οὗτοί εἰσὶν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· _____ οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούοντες

Caes reading: καὶ _____ οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

Byz A, C^c, 33, 1342, Maj, f, q, Sy-H, goth

txt 01, B, C*, D, L, Δ, pc, Lat, sa^{ms}, bo

Caes (W), Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1424, 2542, pc, Sy-P, sa^{mss}
W has οἱ δὲ εἰς τὰς ...

Sy-S is missing from here to 4:41.

B: no umlaut

Next verse:

NA28 Mark 4:19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

Compare immediate context:

NA28 Mark 4:5 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες
NA28 Mark 4:7 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας,
NA28 Mark 4:8 καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν

NA28 Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν· ὅπου ...
NA28 Mark 4:16 καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν ... οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον
NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν ... οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες
NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν οἱ ... οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:19 ... οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς.
NA28 Matthew 13:20 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν,
NA28 Matthew 13:22 ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων,
NA28 Matthew 13:23 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων

NA28 Luke 8:12 οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
NA28 Luke 8:13 οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν
NA28 Luke 8:14 τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
NA28 Luke 8:15 τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες

The ἄλλοι could be a harmonization to the previous context (καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν). Or, more probably, the οὗτοί looks like a harmonization to the immediate context of verses 15, 16, and 20.
Possibly the redundant, double ἄλλοι/οὗτοί εἰσιν is slightly awkward. Both, the Byzantine and the "Caesarean" reading correct this by omitting one of the terms.
Note that Mt has the verses very symmetric:

13:19 ...		οὗτός ἐστιν
13:20	ὁ δὲ	οὗτός ἐστιν
13:22	ὁ δὲ	οὗτός ἐστιν
13:23	ὁ δὲ	οὗτός ἐστιν

Lk has:

8:12	οἱ δὲ	εἰσιν
8:13	οἱ δὲ	οἳ
8:14	τὸ δὲ	οὗτοί εἰσιν
8:15	τὸ δὲ	οὗτοί εἰσιν

Note that both Mt and Lk never have ἄλλοι.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 83
NA28 Mark 4:19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι <u>τοῦ αἰῶνος</u>

BYZ Mark 4:19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι <u>τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου,</u>

τούτου not cited in NA and SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, f13, 22, 33, 157, 579, 892^{C}, 1071, 1342, Maj,
f, Sy, Co, arm, geo, goth

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, f1, 28, 892*, pc, aur, l, vg

<u>τοῦ βίου</u> D, W, Θ, 517, 565, 700, 1424, pc
<u>vitae / victus</u> it(b, c, d, e, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1})

892: τούτου has been added above the line.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:22 καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος
BYZ Matthew 13:22 καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος <u>τούτου</u>
Byz 01^{C1}, C, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa^{mss}, mae-1+2, bo, Or
txt 01*, B, D, it, sa^{ms}

NA28 Luke 8:14 καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν <u>τοῦ βίου</u>

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 13:40 οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος·
BYZ Matthew 13:40 οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος <u>τούτου.</u>
Byz C, L, W, Θ, 0106, 0233, 0242, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj,
f, h, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, bo,
txt 01, B, D, Γ, 1582, 22, 892, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, mae-1, Ir^{Lat}, Cyr

NA28 Luke 16:8 ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος <u>τούτου</u> φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν.
<u>omit:</u> pc

NA28 Luke 20:34 οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος <u>τούτου</u> γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται,

The term τοῦ αἰῶνος was probably difficult or equivocal. Therefore the change to τοῦ βίου or the addition of τούτου. Note the similar variations at Mt 13:22 and 13:40. Possibly idiomatic, τοῦ αἰῶνος = τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.
τοῦ βίου is probably a harmonization to Lk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 84

40. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ **ἐκεῖνοί** εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες,

BYZ Mark 4:20 καὶ **οὗτοί** εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες

Not cited in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, D, (W), f1, f13, 22, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj,
Latt, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, goth, Trg^{mg}
οὗτοί δὲ W, e, ff^{2}, sa

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, 892, pc, Sy-P, bo^{pt}

omit: Θ, 28, 565

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:23 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρείς,
NA28 Luke 8:15 τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ,

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν· ὅπου ...
NA28 Mark 4:16 καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν ... οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον
NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν ... οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες
BYZ καὶ οὗτοί εἰσὶν ...

Compare variant 4:18 above.
Either οὗτοί is a harmonization to verses 15, 16 and 18(Byz), or ἐκεῖνοί is a change to break the monotonous style, in the same way as the ἄλλοι in verse 18.
Note that both Mt and Lk don't have ἐκεῖνοί or οὗτοί (Minor Agreement).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 85

41. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

T&T #59

ὅτι μήτι B, L, 892, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Bal

μή ὅτι 1074, 1487
ὅτι μή 1317

ἴδετε μήτι f13, 28

txt 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.
NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.
NA28 Luke 11:33 Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἅψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν [οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον] ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

Normally Mk uses καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς without ὅτι. The words appear 59 times in Mk, but only 5 times with ὅτι. In 4 cases ὅτι is omitted by some witnesses. In only one of the 59 cases some witnesses added a ὅτι (Mk 2:27, W, 28). This seems to indicate that a secondary addition of ὅτι is rather improbable.
This argumentation is in strong contrast to Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 242) who writes: "ὅτι as introduction of direct speech is especially in Mk and Jo particularly common."

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

TVU 86

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

ὑπὸ 01, B*, Y, f13, 33, 1071, pc, WH^{mg}

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut, but corrected (p. 1282 B 37/38): The corrector (B2 acc. to Tis) canceled the U and the O and wrote an E and an I over the letters. This has been done before the enhancement. The old U and O and the diagonal slashes are not enhanced. The new letters are enhanced.

Evidently an error due to mechanical repetition. ὑπὸ makes no sense.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 87

42. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 4:24 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν **καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.**

BYZ Mark 4:24 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν **καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.**

T&T #60

Byz A, Θ, 0107, 0167, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj,
(f), q, Sy, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, goth, Gre
f13 omits ἐν ᾧ ... ὑμῖν

τοῖς ἀκούουσιν G, 205, pc^{100} (h.t.?)

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, 700, 892, pc^{2}, Lat(aur, c, f, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1}, vg), bo^{pt}
pc = 122*, 161*

omit: D, W, 565, 579, pc^{6}, b, d, e, l, vg^{mss}, sa^{ms} (h.t.?)
pc = 873, 1534, 2206, 2207, 2474, 2808

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 7:2 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,
καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

NA28 Luke 6:38 ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.
both safe!

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 6:33 ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

NA28 Luke 12:31 πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

NA28 Luke 6:27 Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,

NA28 Luke 8:18 Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε__· ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν f13, 66^{c}

It is interesting to note the many occurrences of h.t. at this variation unit. It is possible that the words τοῖς ἀκούουσιν fell out due to h.t., too: ..ιν - ..ιν.
The omission by D et al. is either due to h.t. or it is a harmonization to Mt. If it is h.t., which is probable, then the witnesses are indirect support for the txt reading.

Possibly the words have been added to make a connection with the βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. This is supported by the addition of the words by f13 at Lk 8:18 directly after ἀκούετε.

Nevertheless the construction sounds a bit awkward and seems rather unmotivated. It is also possible that the words have been omitted as confusing. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 247): "the phrase appears difficult to understand and disturbing". He thinks that the promise of such an extreme reward was considered problematic.

Compare:

- Hyeon Woo Shin "Coherence and Textual Criticismin Mk 4:24" JTS 65 (2014) 425 - 32

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 88

43. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:28 αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ,
πρῶτον χόρτον **εἶτα** στάχυν **εἶτα** πλήρη[ς] σῖτον ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.

εἶτεν 01*, B*, L, Δ, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Bal
txt 01^{C1}, A, B^{C2}, C, D, W, Θ, 0107, 0167, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj

01* omits εἶτεν στάχυν due to parablepsis. A corrector (01^{C2}) adds εἶτα στάχυν in the top margin and some scribble above the τ of εἶτεν, which NA interprets as a separator: εἶτ' ἐν πλήρη σῖτον.

B, p. 1282 C 20/21: The ΕΝ is left unenhanced and an Λ is written above the line.

B: no umlaut

εἶτα/εἶτεν adv. "then, and then; moreover"
According to BDAG εἶτεν is the " Ionic-Hellenistic form".

No parallels.
Compare context:
NA28 Mark 4:17 καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται. safe!

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, safe!
NA28 Luke 8:12 εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος safe!
NA28 John 13:5 εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα safe!
NA28 John 19:27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ· safe!
NA28 John 20:27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾷ· safe!

All other occurences of the word are safe. εἶτεν appears nowhere else in the Greek Bible.
Note that εἶτα in Mk 4:17 is safe. Possibly the word has been changed to create a better sounding word flow?
πρῶ**τον** χόρ**τον** εἶ**τεν** στά**χυν** εἶ**τεν** πλήρη σῖ**τον**

On the other hand it is possible that εἶτεν is original and had been changed because it was considered unusual? Perhaps εἶτεν came from Mark's source of the parable of the growing seed, which he alone preserves.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 89

44. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:28 αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον εἶτα στάχυν εἶτα **πλήρη[ς] σῖτον** ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.

BYZ Mark 4:28 αὐτομάτη γὰρ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ πρῶτον χόρτον εἶτα στάχυν εἶτα **πλήρη σῖτον** ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ

"... then the full grain in the head."

πλήρη σῖτον	01, A, C^c, L, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, Maj, WH, Gre, Bois, Bal
πλήρη τὸν σῖτον	Θ, 565, 700, 1424
πλήροι τὸν σῖτον	892
πλήροι σῖτον	983(=f13^c), pc
πλήρης σῖτον	Σ, 13*, 28, 2542^c, pc, some Lect = txt !
πλήρες σῖτον	C^{*vid}
πλήρης ὁ σῖτος	D, W
πλήρης σῖτος	pc, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Tis, Trg
πλήρες σῖτος	B

B: no umlaut

Swanson has Ω and 1 (not in Lake!) for πλήρης σῖτον, too. K. Witte from Muenster confirms that NA is right for f1. He couldn't check Ω.
WH have the term in brackets, with † ... † in the margin. This means that they suspected a primitive error here.

Forms of πλήρης in the Greek Bible/NT: (underlined appear in NT)

πλῆρες	nominative/accusative neuter singular 8
πλήρει	dative feminine singular 7
πλήρη	accusative masculine/feminine singular 18/1
πλήρης	accusative masculine singular 2/1
πλήρης	nominative feminine singular 24/1
πλήρης	nominative masculine singular 32/6
πλήρους	genitive masculine singular 2
πλήρεις	nominative/accusative masculine/feminine plural 28/5
πλήρη	nominative neuter plural 16

σῖτον accusative masculine singular

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:19 πόσους κοφίνους κλασμάτων πλήρεις ἤρατε;
πλήρης A, F, G, M, al

NA28 Luke 4:1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου
no variation

NA28 Luke 5:12 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας·
no variation

NA28 John 1:14 πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.
πλήρη χάριτος D

NA28 Acts 6:5 ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως
ἄνδρα πλήρη πίστεως B, C^c, 1739, pc

Acts 6:8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; 13:10
no variation

πλῆρες = neuter, from B seems to be an error, because σῖτος is masculine.

Early scribes must have found some unusual term here, that caused all the various readings. What this reading was is difficult to say. Since πλήρη σῖτον is the most normal term, it was probably not the original.
Most probably the original was πλήρης σῖτον. To get rid of the problematic πλήρης, some changed it to πλήρη and some changed σῖτον to σῖτος.
Some other occurrences of πλήρης (see above) where less problematic and no variation is extant.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 28) sees πλήρης σῖτος as an emphatic exclamation ("Full grain in the head!"), which was not understood and has been changed therefore into a complete sentence (πλήρης ὁ σῖτος...) or into the accusative.

πλήρης is sometimes used as an indeclinable adjective. A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) writes: "As WH remark, the variant πλήρης σῖτον, relegated by vSoden to the supplementary apparatus, is probably right. It exists in a minuscule ... The indeclinable form πλήρης is abundantly illustrated by Moulton and Milligan from papyri. It is again encountered in Mk 8:19 and strongly attested, but this time not mentioned by either WH or vSoden."

Compare also BDAG:

"In some of the passages already mentioned πλήρης is indeclinable, though never without v.l., and almost only when it is used with a genitive, corresponding to an Engl. expression such as 'a work full of errors': τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ … πλήρης (referring to αὐτοῦ) χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας J 1:14 (cp. CTurner, JTS 1, 1900, 120ff; 561f). ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως Ac 6:5 (v.l. πλήρη). It is found as an itacistic v.l. in Mk 8:19; Ac 6:3, 5; 19:28, and without a genitive 2J 8 v.l. (s. N.[25] app.). Examples of this use of πλήρης with the genitive are found from the second century BC, and from the first century AD on it is frequently found in colloquial Hellenistic Greek."

Carl Conrad writes on B-Greek (Aug 20, 2008):
"apparently the originally nominative form πλήρης of this adjective has come to be - or is on the way in Koine to becoming indeclinable. What we're dealing with here is not, I think, an "intentional solecism" but rather an intrusion of a Demotic usage into writing that the author really intends to keep more formal and conformant to "school" usage."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 90
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:29 ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ **καρπός**, εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

καιρός cj. (Friedrich Blass, 1843-1907)

NA[28] dropped conjectures.

B: no umlaut

txt "when the crop permits" or "when the crop is ripe"
Blass "when the time permits" or "when the time is ripe"

Interesting conjecture. Noted just for curiosity. Blass must think of a very early scribal confusion of the similar looking words.

Another idea comes from A. Pallis (Notes, 1932):
"It is not surprising that the ancient interpreters (see Bloomfield) were puzzled as to the meaning of this clause, for in its present form it means nothing. Modern students have interpreted it by *when the fruit has offered itself* or *when the fruit allows*. But evidently the context demands *when the fruit is ripe*, as given by the RV; and why could not the Evangelist have said this in a direct fashion, as is his wont, instead of in the round-about way which the modern interpretations suggest? But it seems to me that he did say it in his own simple style; only the word which he really employed, namely ἐπιδῷ, was corrupted. Cf. Philo, Opif M. 12 (opificio mundi) συναυξεται [ο καρπος] εις ογκον επιδιδους τελειοτατον. Acts Andr. 12 σπερματων α ουκ επιδωσει ανισχοντα. See further Liddell and Scott s.v. ἐπιδίδωμι."

BDAG: 4. to make it possible for someth. to happen, allow, permit (Hdt. 5, 67; 7, 18 [subj. ὁ θεός]; X., An. 6, 6, 34 [οἱ θεοί]; Isocr. 5, 118 [οἱ καιροί]; Polyb. 22, 24, 9 τῆς ὥρας παραδιδούσης) ὅταν παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός when the (condition of the) crop permits Mk 4:29.—On the whole word: WPopkes, Christus Traditus, ’67.—M-M. EDNT. TW. Spicq. Sv.

Probably just idiom.

TVU 91

45. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν;

BYZ Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἔλεγεν τίνι ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν ποῖα παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν

"In what parable shall we set it forth?"

1. πῶς/τίνι (not in NA but in SQE!)

τίνι	Byz	A, D, Θ, f1, 157, 565, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Or, Trg^{mg}
πῶς	txt	01, B, C, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 33, 579, 892, pc, b

2. θῶμεν/παραβάλωμεν

Byz	A, C^{c}, D, Θ, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Trg^{mg}
txt	01, B, C*, L, (W), Δ, 788(=f13), 28, 579, 892, 1342, pc, b, Co, Or
	W: ἐν τίνι τὴν παραβολὴν δῶμεν

ἐν τίνι ὁμοιώματι; παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν f1

ὁμοιώματι ὁμοίωμα noun dative neuter singular common

ἐν τίνι παραβολῇ αὐτὴν θῶμεν; παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν f13

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

θῶμεν τίθημι subjunctive aorist active 1st person plural

παραβάλωμεν subjunctive aorist active 1st person plural

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:31 Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Luke 13:18 Ἔλεγεν οὖν· τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;

Regarding the pronouns τίνι and ποὶα it should be noted that the beginning of the question is similarly divided. We have basically:
τίνι/ ποὶα D, Byz
πῶς/ τίνι 01, B ...
ἐν ποίᾳ appears only in the phrase ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ in the Gospels.

It is possible that the τίνι is a harmonization to Lk (so Weiss).

Regarding the verbs παραβάλωμεν and θῶμεν:
παραβάλλω = "to put someth. beside someth. for the sake of comparison, compare" - This word appears only here in the Gospels.
It is possible that παραβάλλω has been replaced by θῶμεν because the double παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν sounds a bit strange: "with what parable may we 'parablerize' it" or "with what illustration may we illustrate it".
It is also possible that the variation originated in an accidental oversight:

ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗΘΩΜΕΝ --> ΠΑΡΑΒΑΛΩΜΕΝ

Thus the first change was: ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβάλωμεν. Then the object παραβολῇ or ὁμοιώματι(f1) has been added and the place of αὐτὴν changed.

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the difficult θῶμεν has been changed into the explanatory παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν.

Bartsch notes that especially the f1 reading looks like a reference to Isa 40:18.
LXX Isaiah 40:18
τίνι ὡμοιώσατε κύριον καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώματι ὡμοιώσατε αὐτόν

Compare:
Hans-Werner Bartsch "Eine bisher übersehene Zitierung der LXX in Mk 4:30" TZ 15 (1959) 126-28

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 92

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:33 Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς **πολλαῖς** ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν·

Not in NA but in SQE!

omit: C*, L, W, Δ, f1, 788, 983(=f13), 28, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj-part, b, c, e, Sy-P, bo

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally πολλαῖς in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Context verse 2:

NA28 Mark 4:2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ

W, 28, b, c, e: παραβολαῖς

D: παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς

(not in NA)

Verse 13:

NA28 Mark 4:13 καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 13:3 Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγων·

It is possible that πολλαῖς has been added here from context. It is on the other hand quite probable that it has been omitted due to h.t. (λαῖς - λαῖς). Note the similar omission at Mk 4:2.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 93

NA28 Mark 4:34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς **ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς** ἐπέλυεν πάντα.

BYZ Mark 4:34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς κατ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς **μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ** ἐπέλυεν πάντα

Not cited in NA, but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1424, Maj, Sy-H, Trg
txt	01, B, C, L, Δ, 892, 1342, Trg^{mg}

ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ	1071
μαθηταῖς	22, 700, pc, i, l, geo^{2}

Latt, Sy, Co, goth not clear.

B: no umlaut

The term ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς is unique in the NT. It is probable that it has been changed to the common term. μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ appears 32 times in Mk alone.
It is possibly used here to emphasize the ἴδιος:
κατ' **ἰδίαν** δὲ
τοῖς **ἰδίοις** μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 94

46. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:36 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

πλοῖα πολλὰ ἦσαν	D, it(b, d, ff^2, i, q, r^1) Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg) has txt
πλοῖα πολλὰ ἦν	33
πολλοὶ ἦσαν	W

τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ὄντα πλοῖα	Θ, 565
τὰ ἄλλα δὲ τὰ ὄντα πλοῖα	700
τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ὄντα μετ' αὐτοῦ πλοῖα	f1, 28

Byz	δὲ πλοιάρια ἦν	L, U, 124, 2, Maj-part, TR
	δὲ πλοῖα ἦν	A, C^{c2}, f13, 1241, 1424, 2542, Maj-part, L2211

txt	πλοῖα ἦν	B, C*, 788, 157, 579, 892, pc, vg
	πλοῖα ἦσαν	01, Δ

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

ὄντα εἰμί participle present active accusative masculine singular

These changes are slightly unusual, because they are not inspired from context or parallels.

The change to πολλὰ might be a natural intensification.

The replacement of ὄντα for ἦν is possibly stimulated by the other participle ἀφέντες in the sentence.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) conjectures that the rather unimportant observation that other boats were with him (which do not come into play in any way) makes more sense, if it would be negative:

καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα οὐκ ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 95
NA28 Mark 4:40 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
τί δειλοί ἐστε; οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν;

BYZ Mark 4:40 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
τί δειλοί ἐστε οὕτως; πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν

T&T #61

ἐστε οὕτως πῶς οὐκ	A, C, 33, Maj, f, (Sy-P), Sy-H, goth, NA[25], Weiss, Tis
ἐστε οὕτως	W, e, q
ἐστε; οὔπω	01, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, 565, 700, 892*, 1342, 2737, pc[4], Lat, Co pc = 722, 858, 1416, 2808
οὕτως δειλοί ἐστε; οὔπω	P45[vid], 0167, f1, f13, 28, 2542, pc
ἐστε οὕτως; οὔπω	892[C], Gre (he separated the two var. units)

(:: Mt)

ἐστε ὀλιγόπιστοι οὕτως πῶς οὐκ	508, 1424
ἔσται ὀλιγόπιστοι οὔπω	579
ἐστε ὀλιγόπιστοι	766, 1315, 2590

579 is wrongly listed for txt in T&T. Compare "variae lectiones minores" in NA or Swanson.
892: οὕτως has been added in the margin (umlaut as insertion sign).
P45 is not completely certain. It reads only: α]ὐτοῖς· τί οὕ[τως, with the next line missing.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:26 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι;
NA28 Luke 8:25 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 2:7 τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ;
omit οὕτως: 346, 565

NA28 Luke 12:56 τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

οὐ D

Parallel Mt 15:17 / Mk 7:18:

NA28 Matthew 15:17 οὐ νοεῖτε B, D, Z, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, pc, Or
οὔπω νοεῖτε 01, C, L, W, 0281, f1, 892, Maj

NA28 Mark 7:18 οὐ νοεῖτε A, B, D, W, Θ, 28, 33, 565, 579, 1424, Maj
οὔπω νοεῖτε 01, L, Δ, U, f1, 700, 892, 1342, pc

Parallel Mt 16:9-11 / Mk 8:17-21:

NA28 Matthew 16:9 οὔπω νοεῖτε
οὐ νοεῖτε f13

NA28 Matthew 16:11 πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε
οὐ νοεῖτε Θ, 1424
πῶς οὔπω νοεῖτε 565

NA28 Mark 8:17 οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; safe!

NA28 Mark 8:21 οὔπω συνίετε 01, C, K, Π, L, Δ, 1, 892, 1241, 1424, al
πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε B, 2
πῶς οὐ συνίετε 28, 157, 579, 700, 2542, Maj-part, Robinson
πῶς οὔπω συνίετε A, D*, W, Θ, 1582, (f13), 33, 565, Maj-part
πῶς οὔπω νοεῖτε D^c

txt "Why are you afraid? Have you still no faith?"
Byz "Why are you so afraid? How have you not faith?"

There are two problems:

a) the addition/omission and position of οὕτως:
On the one hand the addition of "so" is only natural as an intensification. But it is interesting that the words in Mt without οὕτως are safe. It is therefore also possible that οὕτως has been omitted here as a harmonization to Mt. In Mk 2:7 two witnesses omit οὕτως (see above), but there we have a different situation with οὗτος οὕτως suggesting a misunderstanding.
The position of οὕτως is not certain. This often indicates a secondary addition (so Güting, TC Mark, 2005, p. 259). Greeven (p. 258) thinks that the order of P45 et al. τί οὕτως δειλοί is a clear stylistic smoothing of the A et al. reading.

It has been suggested that οὕτως is an error of οὔπω. ⲟⲩⲡⲱ has been accidentally written as ⲟⲩⲧⲱ, which then has been taken with the antecedent. Compare W! To complete the following, πῶς οὐκ has been added.

b) οὔπω or πῶς οὐκ:
It is possible that this variation is also at least in part accidental (so Weiss):
ⲟⲩⲧⲱⲥⲡⲱⲥⲟⲩⲕ ---> ⲟⲩⲡⲱⲥⲟⲩⲕ ---> ⲟⲩⲡⲱ
This appears rather improbable, though. The variation ουπω ---> ουτω is more probable.
πῶς οὐκ appears elsewhere only in Mt 16:11 and in Lk 12:56 in the NT. 565 adds οὔπω in Mt 16:11, probably as a conformation to verse 9.
An οὔπω/οὐ variation occurs several times (see the examples above). An addition of πῶς does not appear though, except for Mk 8:21, where we have the same variation. There it is quite obvious that the πῶς οὐ readings are harmonizations to Mt.

πῶς here has the meaning: "how is it possible?"

Unraveling of what exactly happened here at this variation unit is difficult, but overall it appears (also in light of the very good external support) most probable that the txt reading is original and that the origin of the variants was initially some confusion over οὔπω.

Compare:
John MacDonald Ross "Further unnoticed points in the text of the NT" NovT 45 (2003) 210-11

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 96

47. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἦλθεν 01$^{C1\text{-}vid}$, C, E, G, M, L, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, 2542, al, q, Sy, bo, geo, Epiph, Gre, Bois

txt 01*, A, B, D, K, Π, W, f1, 33, 157, 565, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, sa, goth

01: NA notes this correction, which is not in Tischendorf. The ο is partly erased and has been changed into an ε. From the normal image one could suspect something shining through from the recto, but this has been checked, there is no ο or any other round letter at this position. The raking light image shows clearly the erasure, there is an impression in the parchment at this position.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:28 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν
ἐλθόντων 01* (corr. by 01^{C2})

NA28 Luke 8:26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν,
κατέπλευσεν L, R, W, Θ, 118, 209, pc καταπλέω "sail"

NA28 Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν

Compare previous verse 4:41:

NA28 Mark 4:41 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;

Note next verse 2:

NA28 Mark 5:2 καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς
ἐξελθόντων D, W, it

Possibly ἦλθον is a harmonization to Lk. It is also possible that it is a conformation to the immediately preceding context, where plurals occur.

On the other hand ἦλθεν can be a harmonization to Mt, or it is a conformation to the next verse, where ἐξελθόντος is in the singular (so B. Weiss and C.H. Turner). Note that some witnesses changed the plural into the singular in the Lukan parallel, too. As Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 264) notes, it appears more probable that the preceding context influences the wording.

The complete pericope 5:1-20 does not require the presence of the disciples. External support is divided.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19
Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 97

48. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.

BYZ Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν.

T&T #64

Γερασηνῶν	01*, B, D, 1282, Latt, sa, WH, **NA**^{25}, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
Γαδαρηνῶν	A, C, f13, 157, 1342, 2786, Maj, L2211, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
Γεργεσηνῶν	01^{C2}, L, U, (W), Δ, Θ, f1, 22, 28, 33, 372, 517, 565, 700, 892, 954, 1071, 1241, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2766, pc^{50}, Sy-S, bo, arm, geo, aeth, Epiph, Bois, Trg^{mg} W: Γεργυστηνων

Δ: the Greek has Γεργεσηνῶν, the Latin has Gerasenorum.

B: no umlaut

This difficult case is discussed at Mt 8:28.

In Mk (and Lk) it is a tie between Γερασηνῶν and Γεργεσηνῶν. Externally the support is stronger for Γερασηνῶν, whereas internally one should favor Γεργεσηνῶν.

Gerasa is geographically impossible.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 98

49. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:6 καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν **αὐτῷ**

αὐτόν A, B, C, L, Δ, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, pc,
WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Trg^{mg}, SBL

txt 01, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj
προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ F, 1424, pc

ἰδὼν δὲ for καὶ ἰδὼν: A, D, W, 33, 157, 565, 1071, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 8:28 ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν· τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 2:2 προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.	αὐτόν	Γ, Δ, 157
NA28 Matthew 2:8 προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ.	safe!	
NA28 Matthew 2:11 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ	safe!	
NA28 Matthew 4:9 προσκυνήσῃς μοι.	με	157, 565
NA28 Matthew 8:2 προσεκύνει αὐτῷ	αὐτόν	33
NA28 Matthew 9:18 προσεκύνει αὐτῷ	αὐτόν	1424
NA28 Matthew 14:33 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ	safe!	
NA28 Matthew 15:25 προσεκύνει αὐτῷ	αὐτόν	Δ
NA28 Matthew 18:26 προσεκύνει αὐτῷ	safe!	
NA28 Matthew 28:9 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.	safe!	
NA28 Mark 15:19 προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ.	safe!	
NA28 Luke 24:52 προσκυνήσαντες **αὐτὸν**	safe!	(700 omits αὐτὸν)
NA28 John 4:21 προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί.	safe!	
NA28 John 4:23a προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ	safe!	
NA28 John 4:23b προσκυνοῦντας **αὐτόν.**	αὐτῷ	P66*, 01*, pc
NA28 John 4:24 προσκυνοῦντας **αὐτὸν**	safe!	(01, D* omit αὐτὸν)
NA28 John 9:38 προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ.	αὐτόν	D, 157, pc

LXX quote:

NA28 Matthew 4:10 <u>τὸν θεόν σου</u> προσκυνήσεις safe!
NA28 Luke 4:8 <u>κύριον τὸν θεόν σου</u> προσκυνήσεις safe!

NA28 Matthew 28:17 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν

προσεκύνησαν	01, B, D, 33, L844, L2211, Lat
προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ	A, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj
προσεκύνησαν αὐτόν	Γ, 346, 28, 157, 700*, 1241, al

Compare also Josephus:
Ant 6:154 ὁ Σαοῦλος ἀσεβῆσαι μὲν ἔλεγεν ἀγένητα δὲ ποιῆσαι τὰ πεπραγμένα μὴ δύνασθαι τιμῆσαί γε μὴν αὐτὸν παρεκάλει τοῦ πλήθους ὁρῶντος σὺν αὐτῷ παραγενόμενον <u>τὸν θεὸν προσκυνῆσαι</u> δίδωσι δὲ τοῦτο Σαμουῆλος αὐτῷ καὶ συνελθὼν <u>προσκυνεῖ τῷ θεῷ</u>

The normal case following προσκυνέω is the dative (BDAG: "the Koine uses the dat.", so also already Weiss), but also the accusative appears (Lk 24:52, Jo 9:38). Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 269/70) notes that in Mt the dative is safe (basically).

It is possible that the dative is a harmonization to Lk. That harmonization is involved can be seen from the clear cases ἰδὼν δὲ and προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ.

The support for αὐτόν is very strong.

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)

TVU 99

NA28 Mark 5:12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες·
πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.

BYZ Mark 5:12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ δαίμονες λέγοντες
πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν

πάντες	οἱ δαίμονες λέγοντες	A, 33, Maj, Sy-H, goth
	οἱ δαίμονες λέγοντες	K, M, Π*, 579, al, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P
πάντα	τὰ δαιμόνια εἰπόντα	Θ, 565, a
	τὰ δαιμόνια εἰπόντα	D
πάντα	τὰ δαιμόνια λέγοντα ὅτι	700

λέγοντες	01, B, C, L, Δ, f1, 22, 892, 1342, Co, geo[1]
εἶπαν	W
εἶπον	f13, 28, 2542

B: no umlaut But there is one on the previous line! (p. 1283 C, line 4)

2 11 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει
3 ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη
4 **βοσκομένη· 12 καὶ παρε**
5 κάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγον
6 τες· πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς

δαίμονες δαίμων	noun nominative masculine plural
δαιμόνια δαιμόνιον	noun accusative neuter plural

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:31 οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων.

NA28 Luke 8:32 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς.

Θ: καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:29 … ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.
BYZ Luke 8:29 … ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους

Most certainly οἱ δαίμονες is an addition of an explicit subject, which is missing since verse 7. There is no reason for an omission.

The masculine ὁ δαίμων is rare (only once in the NT), the neuter τὸ δαιμόνιον is much more common (52 times in the Gospels). Interestingly Byz replaces δαιμόνιον with δαίμων in Lk 8:29.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 100

50. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς _____.

BYZ Mark 5:13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Byz A, f13, 33, 892^{C}, Maj, Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg), Sy-H, goth

txt 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, (579), 892*, 1342, 2542, pc, b, e, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	579__
ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθέως	E_____
_____ἔπεμψεν αὐτοὺς	Θ
ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψεν αὐτοὺς	565, 700
ἔπεμψεν αὐτοὺς εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς	H, U, al

εὐθέως κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους

Statim Dominus Iesus misit eos in porcos

D, pc, it(c, d, ff^{2}, i, r^{1})

892: words added in the margin by a later hand (triplet insertion sign).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 8:32 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς.

NA28 Matthew 8:32 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑπάγετε.

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 5:12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.

εὐθὲως is a typical Markan word. It is not clear why it should have been added or omitted here.

Compare: 5:42 and 7:35 for similar addition/omission of εὐθὺς.

The form εὐθὲως itself appears to be late, it is very probable that Mk originally wrote εὐθὺς always.

ἔπεμψεν is probably simply a misreading or it comes form the previous verse 12.

The addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς can be understood as supplying a direct subject that is missing since verse 7.

The support is very good for the txt reading.

Swete (Comm. Mk) on the D reading:

> The reading of D (εὐθέως κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους) loses sight of an important distinction. The permission shewed how completely the spirits were subject to His will: Clem. Hom. xix. 14, ὡς μηδὲ τοῦ εἰς χοίρους εἰσελθεῖν ἄνευ τῆς αὐτοῦ συγχωρήσεως ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντες. Cf. Tertull. fug. 2: nec in porcorum gregem diaboli legio habuit potestatem nisi eam de Deo impetrasset, and Thpht. ad loc."

Rating: - (indecisive) regarding εὐθὲως.

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 101

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

BYZ Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν

T&T #65

omit: P45^{vid}, D, Θ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc^{30},
it(b, c, d, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1}), Sy-S, geo, arm, Bois

Western non-interpolation?

txt 01, A, C, K, Π, L, Δ, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, l, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, sa^{mss}, goth

ἐν πλοίῳ	B, pc^{10}
	pc = 299, 447, 830, 996, 1593, 1661, 2446, 2623
εἰς Γεννησαρέτ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ	1342 (Mt 14:34 + Mk 6:53)
ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ	W, sa^{mss}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.

NA28 Luke 8:40 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 4:36 παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ,

NA28 Mark 4:37 καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,

NA28 Mark 5:2 καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου

NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ᾽ ἰδίαν.

NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

NA28 Mark 6:54 καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου

NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

NA28 Mark 8:14

καὶ εἰ μὴ ἕνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν <u>ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.</u>

NA28 Mark 6:53 Καὶ <u>διαπεράσαντες</u> ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον <u>εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ</u>

NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς <u>εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν</u>

NA28 Matthew 14:34
Καὶ <u>διαπεράσαντες</u> ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν <u>εἰς Γεννησαρέτ</u>.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

<u>add εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον:</u>	P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, Maj, it(a, b, c, d, f, i, l, q, r^1, vg^{mss}), (Sy-S), sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, [Trg]
txt = omit:	01, B, C, L, Δ, 2144, bo^{pt}, Lat(aur, ff^2, vg)

(Here we have come to the conclusion, that the omission is probably wrong, see below.)

The three adverbial phrases ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν make the sentence clumsy. Perhaps the words have therefore been omitted, because it is obvious that he uses a boat to cross over? Note that Θ omits πάλιν and P45 εἰς τὸ πέραν, too (see next variant).

It has been suggested that the omission might be a harmonization to Lk, but this is very unlikely, because the wording is completely different.

On the other hand the words could have been added to connect the verse with verse 18: "18 As he was getting into the boat ... 21 When Jesus had crossed <u>again</u> in the boat to the other side" (immediate context).

Note the other divided case in Mk 8:13.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
Omission probably wrong.

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 102

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν	01*, D, 565, 700, it, Sy-P
εἰς τὸ πέραν	Θ, pc, Sy-S, bo^{mss}, sa
πάλιν	P45, c, f, ff^{2}

01: the correction is not noted in Tischendorf. The word-order is noted with slashes /, //, /// above the words.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 8:18 ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν. safe!

NA28 Matthew 8:28 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν safe!

NA28 Matthew 14:22 Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, safe!

NA28 Matthew 16:5 Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν safe!

NA28 Mark 4:35 διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. safe!

NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης safe!

NA28 Mark 6:45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν,

omit εἰς τὸ πέραν: P45^{vid}, W, f1, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 8:13 και πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. safe!

NA28 Luke 8:22 διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης safe!

Metzger notes that Lk 8:40 presupposes the Markan πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν:

NA28 Luke 8:40

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος·

ὑποστρέφω "return, turn back"

The connection of πάλιν with συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς refers back to 4:1

NA28 Mark 4:1 καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν.

The only reasons for these changes in verse 21 are probably stylistic. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 214) notes that often the preposition is set before the adverb, because it is considered the more important qualification.

Note that P45 omits εἰς τὸ πέραν in Mk 6:45, too!
Of 9 occurrences of εἰς τὸ πέραν 7 are safe (see above). Only Mk 5:21 and 6:45 are variant. In both cases the witnesses are of a "Caesarean" kind.
Perhaps εἰς τὸ πέραν has been omitted here as redundant following διαπεράσαντος? In 6:45 it has possibly been omitted to avoid difficult geographical problems.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 103

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων, ὀνόματι Ἰάϊρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

omit: D, it(a, d, e, ff^2, i, r^1)

Lat(aur, b, c, f, l, q, vg) have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἷς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.

NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάϊρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,

In Lk the words are safe.

It is possible that the omission is a harmonization to Mt. On the other hand the addition could be a harmonization to Lk.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 36) considers the addition of the name secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 104

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.

καὶ θέλω ἵνα ἐλθὼν	157
ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν	225 (Legg, from Lk)
ἵνα	1342

ἐλθὲ ἅψαι αὐτῆς ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.

Veni, tange eam de manibus tuis

D, it(b, d, e, ff^2, i, q, r^1), Sy-S, Sy-P

Lat(a, aur, c, f, l, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἷς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.

NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάϊρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,

157 is purely Byzantine in Mk. This addition here is striking, as Hoskier noted already in his collation (JTS 14, 1913, 78ff.).

Hoskier: "There can be but two explanations of this addition… One is that the addition is a literary one, intended to complete the otherwise somewhat faulty Greek sentence, carrying ἵνα ἐλθὼν … without introduction of any kind.

The other explanation would be that this is perchance a genuine lost reading, excluded in a very early age from the Greek text on account of the impression that an order to or a demand upon our Lord, couched in such imperious language, was out of place."

The second explanation is the more improbable one. A change for stylistic reasons is more probable, because the D reading is a similar attempt to improve style.

Robertson in his "Wordpictures":

"*I pray thee*, not in the Greek. This ellipsis before ἵνα not uncommon, a sort of imperative use of ἵνα and the subjunctive in the Koine (Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 943)."

On the Syriac P. Williams comments:

> "Where *txt* has λέγων ... ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, NA27 cites *(SP)* in support of D's reading ἐλθὲ ἅψαι αὐτῆς ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου. *S* reads 'come put upon her your hand' and *P* with the same meaning. *SP* contrast with *txt* and D in having 'hand' in the singular, but as we have seen this is quite normal in Syriac for the imposition of hands. *SP* agree formally with D over against *txt* in having a possessive, but according to principles established above this would be expected irrespective of the presence of a possessive in their *Vorlagen*. *SP* appear to agree with D in having an imperative, but as *txt's* ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς is an imperatival construction its most natural translation in Syriac would be by two imperatives. ἐλθὼν is an imperatival participle and cannot therefore be rendered by a Syriac participle. Thus the Syriac use of singular, a possessive and the imperatives do not allow us to decide which Greek *Vorlage SP* had. Ironically, however, the vocabulary choice of *SP* ... is somewhat closer to the vocabulary of *txt* than it is to that of D, as a concordance search on ἅπτομαι and ἐπιτίθημι and their Syriac equivalents will quickly establish. The Syriac texts thus may give support to the opposite reading to that for which they are cited, though it is probably wisest to drop reference to them altogether from the apparatus."
>
> P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 79-80 and 152.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 105

51. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:27 ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὄπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·

T&T 68

τὰ περὶ 01*, B, C*, Δ, pc[6] (811, 1006, 1214, 1540, 1546, 1630), L33
WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Gre, [Trg[mg]], Tis, Bal

txt 01[C2], A, C[C2], D, L, W, Θ, 0132[vid], f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy, Co

B: no umlaut

The words do not appear in the parallels.

Compare previous verse 26:

NA28 Mark 5:26 καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα,

Compare:

NA28 Mark 7:25 ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ,
ἀκούσασα γυνή τις περὶ αὐτοῦ, 700

NA28 Luke 7:3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν safe!
NA28 Acts 13:29 ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα,
NA28 Acts 18:25 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 2:2
καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν

NA28 Matthew 24:17
ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,
τι D, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 1424, TR

Weiss (Comm. Mk) thinks that it has been omitted as superfluous.
Metzger: "the reading with τὰ appears to be an Alexandrian refinement."

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 284) has changed his mind. In his Synopsis (1981) he had the reading with τὰ, but in his commentary he concludes that the internal arguments are indecisive and that external support has to decide. Here he considers the τὰ reading secondary, because it is limited to Alexandrian support.

The omission could be a reminiscence to Lk 7:3, whereas the addition could be inspired by Acts 13:29 or 18:25. But all this is not very likely.

It should be noted that a similar construction appears in the previous verse:
26 δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς
27 ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

It is possible that the construction in verse 26 inspired the addition of τὰ in verse 27.

The support for τὰ is good, but incoherent (8 Byzantine minuscules).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 106

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:27 ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὄπισθεν ἥψατο___τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·

Not in NA, but in SQE.

τοῦ κρασπέδου M, f1, 33, 579, 1071, pc, aeth

Sy-S is missing from here to 6:5.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:20 ... προσελθοῦσα ὄπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· omit: 1689, it(a, b, c, g^1, k), vg^{ms}

NA28 Luke 8:44 προσελθοῦσα ὄπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

omit: D, it(a, d, ff^2, l, r^1), Marcion

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:36 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἅψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Mark 6:56 ... καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται·

The words τοῦ κρασπέδου constitute one of the so called Minor Agreements between Mt and Lk against Mk.

It is quite clear that the words here in Mk are a secondary addition from the parallels.

Equally secondary are the omissions in Mt and Lk, possibly omitted as redundant, or accidentally (TOU … TOU). Streeter (FG, p. 313) thinks that in Lk the (Western) omission is original.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 107

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:33 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα_____, εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ, ἦλθεν καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

T&T #69

διὸ πεποίηκεν λάθρᾳ	D, Θ, 28, 124, 565, 2680, pc[15], it(a, d, ff[2], i, r[1]) pc = 20, 50, 176, 184, 207, 215, 348, 495, 537, 709[c], 718, 773, 829, 1510*
διὸ πεποίηκεν	700, 1071

quod fecerat occulto ff[2], i
quod fecerit occulto r[1]
quod fecerat occultum d
quod fecerat absconse a
Lat(aur, b, c, e, f, l, q, vg) read txt.

πεποιήκει (Pluperfect): D, (28 -η), 124, 565, 700
Swanson notes for 124: δι' ὃ πεποιήκει λάθρᾳ
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

λάθρᾳ adv. "secretly, quietly"

Parallels:

NA28 Luke 8:47 ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα ἦλθεν καὶ προσπεσοῦσα αὐτῷ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα.

Compare LXX:

LXX Leviticus 15:27 πᾶς ὁ ἁπτόμενος αὐτῆς ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ λούσεται τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἕως ἑσπέρας

"Whoever touches these things shall be unclean, and shall wash his clothes, and bathe in water, and be unclean until the evening."

No exact parallel.

There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added to supply the reason for her fear, inspired possibly from Lk.

Scrivener: "a poor comment" (Bezae). Weiss: "old gloss".

Wayne C. Kannaday ("Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 228-230) argues that the words have been inserted to soften the actions of the woman, "with the inclusion of this potent phrase he [the scribe] tempered her assertiveness and rendered her humble."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 108

NA28 Mark 5:36 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ· μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.

BYZ Mark 5:36 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εὐθέως ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ Μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πίστευε

εὐθέως ἀκούσας	A, C, (N, 828, 983), 0132, f13, 33, 579, L2211, Maj, a, Sy-H, goth
ἀκούσας	01^{c}, D, Θ, 0126, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 892^{c}, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, al, Lat, Co, Trg^{mg}
παρακούσας	01*^{,c}, B, L, W, Δ, 892*, pc

01: Tischendorf writes: "παρα punctis notatum (a C^{a}?) rursus deletis, α vero erasum et iam prima ut videtur manu notatum."
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

892: παρ has been erased.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

παρακούω "refuse to listen; pay no attention to or overhear"

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 8:50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ·

Of course παρακούσας is the harder reading, because it is more difficult to understand. There is no reason, why παρακούσας could have been invented.

εὐθέως generally is a later word, Mk uses εὐθὺς. εὐθέως fits only to ἀκούσας and therefore the two are connected.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 109

52. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:38 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά,

BYZ Mark 5:38 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον, κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά.

Not in NA, but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz L, W, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, 2542, Maj, a, c, f, ff^{2}, Sy-H, bo^{mss}, arm

txt 01, A, B, C, D, F, Δ, f1, 33, 579, 1342, pc, Lat, Sy-P, Co

Swanson has 579 wrongly for Byz, but he notes the correct form ἔρχοντε in his orthographical apparatus at the bottom. Checked at the film.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:23 Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν …
NA28 Luke 8:51 ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν …

Context:
NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.

Possibly the plural has been changed to the singular, because of the following singular θεωρεῖ.

On the other hand it could be argued that the singular has been changed to the plural to make better sense with the previous verse, where we are told that Jesus went with Peter, James and John.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19
Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 110

53. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.

BYZ Mark 5:40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ ὁ δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον **ἀνακείμενον·**

ἀνακείμενον	A, C, 124, 33, 157, 579, 1342, L2211, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy, Gre
κατακείμενον	W, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc
κατακεκλιμένον	f13 (not in NA and SQE)

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, 0153, 983, 1689(=f13^{c}), 892, pc, it(a, b, d, e, ff^{2}, i, r^{1}), Co

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

ἀνάκειμαι be seated at table; be a dinner guest
κατάκειμαι lie (in bed), be sick; sit (lit. recline) at table, dine

κατακλείω shut up, put in (prison)

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:30 ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα,
NA28 Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.
BYZ John 5:6 τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει λέγει αὐτῷ Θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι

ἀνάκειμαι is used in the Gospels only in the context of lying around tables for dinner. It has thus been suggested that the other readings including the omission are attempts to avoid this unusual word here.
On the other hand one could argue that due to this unusual usage, which is without parallel in the NT, the reading must be secondary (so Güting, TC Mark, 2005, p. 292).
It is also possible that the short form inspired the additions.

The word could have been omitted due to h.t. ON - ON.

ΔΙΟΝ - ΝΟΝ

In Mk 2:4 ὅπου ἦν is safe. Note that later in the verse ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο appears.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 111

NA28 Mark 5:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἐξέστησαν **[εὐθὺς]** ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ.

BYZ Mark 5:42 καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ ἐξέστησαν _____ ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ

T&T #71

omit: P45, A, W, Θ, 0133, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(a, aur, b, e, l, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{mss}, arm, goth, Gre

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, 33, 579, 892, sa^{pt}, bo, [Trg]

πάντες D, 2713, it("omnes" c, d, f, ff^{2}, i, q), vg^{ms}, sa^{pt}, bo^{ms}

οἱ γονεῖς al^{45}, vg^{ms} (Lk)

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

BYZ Luke 8:56 καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός

It is possible that εὐθὺς has been omitted to improve style. This is supported by D et al. which replace πάντες.

A secondary addition is rather improbable. It could be suggested that perhaps εὐθὺς has been added to separate the two similar words ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει.

Weiss (Mk Com.): "The second εὐθὺς, with the emphatical position in front of the dative, which should be emphasized, has been omitted due to its unusual position."

Other examples of εὐθὺς variants: Mk 1:28 and 7:35.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 112

54. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:2 καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες·

οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες	B, 28^{c}, 892, pc, sa^{ms}, bo^{mss}, **NA^{25}**, WH, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal, SBL
οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούσαντες	L, f13, 28*, pc, sa
πολλοὶ ἀκούσαντες	D, F, H, N, Δ, Π, Θ, 0126, 124, 565, 1342, al, bo^{pt}
πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες	01, A, C, W, f1, 33, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
multi audientes	Lat
omnes	e
omit:	b, c

Tregelles has in the margin: [οἱ] πολλ. and ἀκούσαντες

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 4:22 Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον

NA28 Luke 4:28 καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 24:12 καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν.

NA28 Mark 9:26 καὶ κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας ἐξῆλθεν· καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν.

omit τοὺς:	C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj
txt	01, A, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 0274, 33, 579, 892, 1071, pc

NA28 Mark 12:37 αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστιν υἱός; Καὶ [ὁ] πολὺς ὄχλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

omit ὁ:	01, D, W, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc
txt	A, B, L, Ψ, f1, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj

In all three cases in Mk of a form of οἱ πολλοὶ the article is omitted by a large number of witnesses. The article seems to imply a defined, known group. The omission would be only natural.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 297) has checked positions of πολλοὶ where an addition makes sense, but he did not found any added articles.

Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that οἱ πολλοὶ indicates the majority in contrast to a minority and that this has not been understood.
The support by f13, 28 is strange.
There is no reason for a secondary addition.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
add οἱ in brackets

TVU 113
Minority reading
NA28 Mark 6:2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες· πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ,
καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γινόμεναι;

ἵνα (καὶ) δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνωνται;
C*, D, K, Π, Y, Θ, 124, 346, 700, al[28], UBS[1,2]

ὅτι (καὶ) δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται;
U, pc, TR(!), Kilpatrick, Elliott(!)

One of the above: b(et ut), d, ff[2](ut et), f(quod), i, q, r[1] (ut), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, sa[ms]
Lat(a, aur, c, e, l, vg) read txt.
If (and which) minuscules support ὅτι is not clear. The info we currently have comes from UBS[4], Scrivener (Full and Exact Collation), von Soden and Greeven (synopsis and tc commentary). Legg is probably wrong. Anyway, all note a few unremarkable Byzantine minuscules and lectionaries for ὅτι only. Tischendorf marks it as "cum minusculis ut videtur vix multis".
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

γινόμεναι participle present middle nominative feminine plural
γίνωνται subjunctive present middle 3rd person plural
γίνονται indicative present middle 3rd person plural

txt: "What is this wisdom that has been given to him? What mighty works are being done by his hands?"

ἵνα: "What is this wisdom that has been given to him, in order that he might do such mighty works by his hands?"

ὅτι: "What is this wisdom that has been given to him, that (also) such mighty works are being done by his hands?"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 13:54
καὶ λέγειν· πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις;

The variant readings transform the two distinct questions into a single sentence with a purpose clause.

It is probable that the variants are just smoothings of the grammatically difficult txt reading. As is the norm ἵνα comes with the subjunctive, ὅτι with the indicative.

Wayne C. Kannaday proposes that the variant has to do with the accusations against Jesus as being a magician. Kannaday writes: "This implied separation of wisdom and wonder-working could have invited speculation on the part of the reader or hearer that Jesus effected cures and exorcisms by means of magic. […] It is striking, then, that the secondary reading serves to connect Jesus' miraculous power with his wisdom in such a way that Sophia is named as the specific and direct means by which Jesus is able to perform mighty works." ("Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 122-3)

Interesting in this regard is also the reading of the Old Latin c, which has

"… et virtutes quae <u>per labia</u> eius efficiuntur."

The ὅτι reading is probably an independent attempt of smoothing. How it got into the textus receptus is unclear. Probably a conjecture of an early editor.
Erasmus and the Complutensian Polyglot have the Byzantine reading καὶ δυνάμεις, but Stephanus introduces ὅτι καὶ δυνάμεις in his famous 1550 edition. Beza and the Elzeviers follow Stephanus. Beza's Latin text has "quod etiam virtutes …".
For references on Kilpatrick and Elliott compare Greeven, Güting "Textkritik des Markusevangeliums", Münster 2005, p. 300-1.
Elliott notes (NovT 15, 1973, p. 287): "Despite the special study of ὅτι undertaken for UBS (p. xxxvi f) it has apparently not been recognized that ὅτι in the sense of γάρ is characteristic of Markan style especially after double questions (e.g. 6:2)."

The UBS committee found it difficult to decide this variation unit. They assigned it a "C". What the reasons were to accept the ἵνα reading in UBS 1+2 is unknown. No other edition or commentary accepts the ἵνα reading. Edward C. Hobbs writes on this:
"The reading in UBS 1 and 2 was due primarily to Aland and Metzger. I wrote to one of my old professors on the Committee (Allen Wikgren) complaining about it; his reply was, 'I was outvoted!' Kilpatrick was never on the UBS Committee. And, tellingly, his own edition of the NT does NOT have the hINA reading!"

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 114

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:3 οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆτος καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος;

txt 01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 124, 788(=f13^{b}), 28, 157, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(d, f, ff^{2}, l, q, vg), Sy, Co, goth

P45^{vid}, f13, 33^{vid}, 565, 579, 700, 2542,
it(a, aur, b, c, e, i, r^{1}), vg^{mss}, bo^{mss}, Or:

τοῦ τέκτονος, ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τῆς	P45^{vid}, f13^{a}, 33^{vid}
τοῦ τέκτονος, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς	346(f13), vg^{mss}
τοῦ τέκτονος, υἱὸς καὶ	69(f13), 700
τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς, ἀδελφὸς	579
τοῦ τέκτονος, υἱὸς	Σ*^{vid}, 565, 2542
υἱὸς τῆς	Sy-Pal

P45 clearly reads τέκτονος. It is uncertain whether it reads τῆς or καὶ τῆς.
Swanson has: ... τεκτον]ος ὁ υ[ιος ...
NA notes it as "vid for ... τεκτον]ος ὁ υ[ιος και ...
Comfort and Barrett also agree with this, but note additionally that υἱὸς is abbreviated as a nomen sacrum as $\overline{\text{Υ[C}}$. This is correct. Actually the C is quite visible, too. Also part of the N of τέκτονος.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

33 has a partial lacuna:

οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος [... Ἰακ]ώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆτος

579 omits Μαρίας.

Origen (Contra Celsus 6:36):

ου βλεπων οτι ουδαμου των εν ταις εκκλησιαις φερομενων ευαγγελιων τεκτων αυτος ο ις αναγεγραπται

"in none of the gospels current in the churches is Jesus himself ever described as being a carpenter."

Justin (dial. 88,8)

ιυ᾽ νομιζομενου ιωσηφ του τεκτονος υιου υπαρχειν᾽ και τεκτονος νομιζομενου· ταυτα γαρ τα τεκτονικα εργα ειργαζετο εν ανθρωποις ων, αροτρα και ζυγα

"He was considered to be the son of Joseph the carpenter; ... He was deemed a carpenter, for He was in the habit of working as a carpenter when among men, making ploughs and yokes;"

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Arabic Diatessaron:

"Is not this a carpenter, a son of a carpenter? And is not his mother called Mary?"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:55 οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός;

Sy-S ὁ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ υἱός;

it, vg^{mss}, Sy-C ὁ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός;

NA28 Luke 4:22 οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος;

Scribes felt objection against Jesus as a carpenter, so they changed it to "son of the carpenter" as a harmonization to Mt. Both Mt and Lk changed this too, but differently.

The Origen quote is curious, perhaps he has forgotten the reading, or he already read τοῦ τέκτονος in his copy? Wohlenberg and Swete (both Comm. Mk) suggest that Origen perhaps meant that no Gospel writer ever asserts such an identification, but that only the inhabitants of Nazareth said so.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 115

55. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 6:3 ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆτος καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος;

BYZ Mark 6:3 ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος

T&T #74

Ἰωσῆ	A, C, W, 0133, f1, 983(=f13^{c}), 22, 28, 157, 892, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj, Sy, sa^{mss}, goth
Ἰωσῆτος	B, D, L, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, pc^{2}, a, d, sa^{mss}, bo pc = 428, 693^{C}
Ἰωσὴφ	01, pc^{15}, Lat(aur, b, f, l, q, r^{1}, vg)
Ἰωάννης	860
omit:	953, c, ff^{2}, i

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Compare Mt 13:55:

NA28 Matthew 13:55

καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας;

BYZ Matthew 13:55

καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσῆς καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδα

Byz Ἰωσῆς	K, L, W, Δ, Π, f13, 565, 1241, Maj-part, k
txt Ἰωσὴφ	01^{C}, B, C, N, Θ, f1, 33, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Or
Ἰωάννης	01*, D, M, U, Γ, 2, 28, 579, 1424, Maj-part

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 27:56 καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσὴφ μήτηρ

BYZ Matthew 27:56 καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσὴ μήτηρ

Byz	A, B, C, D^{C}, f1, f13, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt	01, D*, L, W, Θ, pc, Lat, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 15:40

καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆτος μήτηρ

BYZ Mark 15:40

καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆ μήτηρ

NA28 Mark 15:47 καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται.

BYZ Mark 15:47 καὶ Μαρία Ἰωσῆ ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τίθεται

NA28 Acts 4:36 Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς
BYZ Acts 4:36 Ἰωσῆς δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς

Byz has in all Gospels Ἰωσῆς.
txt has Ἰωσῆτος in Mk and Ἰωσὴφ in Mt/Acts.
Ἰωσῆτος is the Genitive form of Ἰωσῆς.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 116

56. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

ἐθαύμασεν 01, B, 565, pc, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Tis, Bal

txt ἐθαύμαζεν A, C, D, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Sy-H, WH[mg]

Δ (spatio relicto) omits καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν
b, e, omit καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν
B: no umlaut

ἐθαύμαζεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular
ἐθαύμασεν indicative aorist active 3rd person singular

περιῆγεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 6:5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 5:20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.
ἐθαύμασαν 1424

NA28 Mark 15:44 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν
ἐθαύμαζεν 01, D

NA28 John 4:27 Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει· οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπεν· τί ζητεῖς ἢ τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς;
ἐθαύμασαν f13, 28, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj-part[E, H, S, U, Δ, Λ, Ω]

The words do not appear in the parallels.

ἐθαύμαζεν appears only here in the Gospels. It is possible that it has been changed to the more normal Aorist (compare Mk 5:20, Jo 4:27), perhaps as a conformation to ἐθεράπευσεν in the previous verse (so Güting, "Weakly attested original readings of D in Mk", 1996).

On the other hand compare Mk 15:44, where the Aorist was changed to the Imperfect.

Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that ἐθαύμαζεν is a conformation to the following imperfect περιῆγεν.
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 308-9) analyses the imperfects in Mk and concludes that of 19 imperfects that he considers original, B supports 15. Only in 4 cases (2:14, 6:6, 6:12, 14:54) B has the aorist.

Vogels explains the omissions by Δ and b, e as removing an objectionable word. That an omnipotent Jesus could be amazed was considered offensive.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 117

57. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:9 ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια, καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας.

No txt in NA and SQE!

	ἐνδύσασθαι	B^{C2}, S, Π*, Ω, 124, 892, pc, Gre, Trg^{mg}, WH
	ἐνδύσασθε	B*, 33, 788, pc
txt	ἐνδύσησθε	01, C, Θ, $Π^{C}$, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, Maj, NA^{25}, Weiss, WH^{mg}
	ἐνδύσησθαι	A, D, W, Δ, 28, 579, pc
	ἐνδεδύσθαι	L, N, Σ, 1424, al

B p. 1285 A 42: the Є is canceled by a slash. Both the Є and the slash are not enhanced and are faded. The ΑΙ is written above the line and is enhanced. Tischendorf assigned the correction to B^2 (in his notation B^3 is the enhancer). But in my view it is also possible that it was B^1.

B: no umlaut

ἐνδύσασθαι	infinitive aorist middle	B^{C2}
ἐνδύσασθε	imperative aorist middle 2nd person plural	
ἐνδύσησθε	subjunctive aorist middle 2nd person plural	txt
ἐνδύσησθαι	? (a form of txt?)	
	infinitive future middle would be: ἐνδύσεσθαι	
ἐνδεδύσθαι	infinitive perfect middle	

Compare LXX:

LXX Deuteronomy 22:5 οὐκ ἔσται σκεύη ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ γυναικί οὐδὲ μὴ ἐνδύσηται (subjunctive aorist middle 3rd person singular) ἀνὴρ στολὴν γυναικείαν ὅτι βδέλυγμα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σού ἐστιν πᾶς ποιῶν ταῦτα

Extremely difficult to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 118

NA28 Mark 6:11 καὶ ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 6:11 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

Byz A, C^{c}, D, Θ, 983(=f13^{c}), 33, 157, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Trg^{mg} (Lk)

txt 01, B, (C^{*vid}), L, W, Δ, (f1), f13, 28, 579, pc, Sy-S, Co
ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται C^{*vid}, f1, pc, Sy-S (Mt)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:14 καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.
NA28 Luke 9:5 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς.

txt "If any place will not welcome you"
Byz "Wherever they do not welcome you,"

Probably the Byzantine reading is a harmonization to Lk. The plural form is a conformation to the following plural μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν (so Weiss).
The omission of τόπος is a Minor Agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 119

NA28 Mark 6:11 καὶ ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 6:11 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνταί ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτοτερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

Byz A, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892^{mg}, Maj, a, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

txt 01, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, 28*, 565, 892*, 1342, 2542, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}

B: umlaut! (p. 1285 B, line 12) μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 12 Καὶ ἐξελθόντες

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:14-10:15 καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

NA28 Luke 9:5 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς. – does not have the words

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 11:24 πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι γῇ Σοδόμων ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ σοί.
NA28 Luke 10:12 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

The words clearly come from Mt 10:15.
Note that both Mt and Lk have this addition against Mk (Minor Agreement).

The wording here in Mk is slightly different to Mt.
Mk reads Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις [but 33, 579 have the Mt form]
Mt reads γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 120

58. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, **καὶ ἔλεγον** ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ **καὶ ἔλεγεν** ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ

T&T #75

"and they said ..."
"and he said ..."

Byz 01, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, i, l, q, r^1, vg), Sy, Co, goth, WH^{mg}, Gre, Trg

txt B, (D), N^{vid}, W, 0133, pc^8, a, b, d, ff^2, vg^{mss}, WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg^{mg}
pc = 64, 200, 271, 861, 1178, 1324, 2301, 2650
ἐλέγοσαν D, 2794

καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ	Φ (Mt 14:2)
καὶ εἶπεν	766

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:2 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

Context:
NA28 Mark 6:15 ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ...
NA28 Mark 6:16 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἔλεγεν· ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:28 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες [ὅτι] Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἠλίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν.

It is possible that scribes changed ἔλεγον to ἔλεγεν to conform it to the preceding ἤκουσεν (so Weiss). Also the missing subject for ἔλεγον could have been a problem.
On the other hand it is possible that ἔλεγεν has been replaced by ἔλεγον to conform it to the following two ἔλεγον in verse 15.

The variant must be seen in context of verses 14-16. First Herod heard things said about him:
14 King Herod heard of it, for Jesus' name had become known.
Some were saying, "John the baptizer has been raised from the dead; and for this reason these powers are at work in him."
15 But others said, ... Elijah. And others said, ... a prophet ...
16 But when Herod heard of it, he said, "John, whom I beheaded, has been raised."

It makes most sense when Herod first heard all these things and then acknowledged it himself.
The support for txt is very slim. Note that the support for txt is rather "incoherent" (8 Byzantine minuscules). This seems to indicate that the change was at least in part an accidental.

C.H. Turner notes (Marcan Usage): "And the plural is absolutely certain, for it is guaranteed by the parallel in Mark 8:28, and it is implied by the reproduction of the passage in Luke 9:7. Matthew omits all reference to the divergent contemporary views about Jesus, and therefore offers no real parallel. St Mark assuredly meant 'His reputation was now considerable, and different ideas were held about Him in different circles by His contemporaries: people were saying, Why, it's John the Baptizer redivivus, others No, it's Elijah, and others again A new prophet, just as there have been prophets from time to time before'."

Compare:
H. Ljungvik "Zum Markusevangelium 6:14" ZNW 33 (1934 90-92
[who argues for txt on syntactical grounds.]

Rating: - (indecisive)
External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 121

NA28 Mark 6:16 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἔλεγεν· ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη.

BYZ Mark 6:16 ἀκούσας δὲ Ἡρῴδης εἶπεν, ὅτι Ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν

T&T #78 (only partial)

"whom I beheaded, John, he has been raised."
"whom I beheaded, John, he is it; he was raised out of the dead."

Byz A, C, D, N, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 579, 1424, Latt
txt 01, B, L, W, Δ, 33, 372, 892, 1342, Sy-S, Co

Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν	A, 579, Maj, goth
Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη	124
Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπο τῶν νεκρῶν	C, N, 1424
Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐστιν· ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη	f13, Lat
Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη	28, 69, 788
Ἰωάννην οὗτος ἠγέρθη [ἐκ νεκρῶν]	892^{mg}, Trg (!)
οὗτος ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη	D

οὗτος ἐστιν Ἰωάννης αὐτὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη	Θ, 565, 700, it
οὗτος ἐστιν Ἰωάννης αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν	f1

Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη	01^{C2}, B, L, W, Δ, 372, 892*, 2737
οὗτος Ἰωάννην ἠγέρθη	01*
οὗτος Ἰωάννην αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη	01^{C1}
Ἰωάννην αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη	33, 1342

579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.
892: reads txt, the words ἐκ νεκρῶν have been added in the top margin, with an umlaut as insertion sign.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 6:14 Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν
01, B, D, L, Δ, 33, 565, 700, 892
BYZ Mark 6:14 Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη,
C, W, Θ, f1, f13, (579, 1241, 1424 ἀπο τῶν), Maj

NA28 Matthew 14:2 οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· <u>αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν</u> καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.
C, f1, pc: <u>οὗτος ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν</u>

NA28 Luke 9:7 ... λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης <u>ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,</u>
BYZ Luke 9:7 ... λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης <u>ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν</u>

It is clear that this large number of variants has its cause in a difficult original reading.
It is possible that the txt reading has been felt to be too short and it has been extended in various ways, inspired by the familiar Matthean reading.
Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) suggests to take οὗτος ἠγέρθη as a question.

Nestle (Textual criticism p. 263-4) points to a discrepancy in the Eusebian Canon tables for this verse which has not been explained. In Mt and Lk the complete incident is put into cannon II (= Mt, Mk, Lk):

Mt 14:1-2 = 143/II
Mt 14:3ff. = 144/II
and
Lk 9:7-9 = 90/II.

But in Mk Eusebius split the pericope up into the following:

Mk 6:14 = 57/II
Mk 6:15-16 = 58/X
Mk 6:17ff = 60/VI (Mt, Mk)

It is strange that Eusebius put Mk 6:15-16 into the tenth Canon as being one that contains material peculiar to Mark, whereas he has Lk 7:8-9 in cannon II. One would expect them in canon VIII, which is for material common to Mk and Lk (Mt does not have this part). Nestle concludes, that Eusebius must therefore have found something peculiar in verses 15-16 to make it 58/X.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 122

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:17 Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν <u>ἐν φυλακῇ</u> διὰ Ἡρῳδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν·

T&T #79

<u>καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς φυλακὴν</u>	D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, pc,
et misit in carcerem	it(a, b, d, f, ff^2, i, q, r^1)

Lat(aur, c, l, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 14:3 καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο

BYZ Matthew 14:3 καὶ ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 18:30 ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν <u>ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακὴν</u> ἕως ἀποδῷ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.

A natural expansion (possibly from Mt 18:30) of the slightly condensed form.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 123

NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ **ἠπόρει**, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.

BYZ Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ **ἐποίει**, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν

T&T #80

Byz A, C, D, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, arm, goth, Trg
ἃ ἐπόρει S, Ω, f13, 28, pc[6]

txt 01, B, L, (W), Θ, 27, L1043, Co, Trg[mg]
ἠπορεῖτο W

omit: Δ, 68, Diatess[Arab]

Δ omits ἠπόρει καὶ.
P45 reads only ...]ι, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤ[κουεν
579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.
B: no umlaut

ἀπορέω "be at a loss, be uncertain, be disturbed"
ἡδέως adverb; "gladly, with pleasure"

"and having heard him, he was greatly perplexed, and heard him gladly."
"and having heard him, he was doing many things, and heard him gladly."

Compare:
NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, note D(!): ἠπορεῖτο
Now Herod the ruler heard about all that had taken place, and he was perplexed, because it was said by some that John had been raised from the dead,

Compare also:
LXX Wisdom 11:17 οὐ γὰρ <u>ἠπόρει</u> ἡ παντοδύναμός σου χεὶρ καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης ἐπιπέμψαι αὐτοῖς πλῆθος ἄρκων ἢ θρασεῖς λέοντας
"For your all-powerful hand, which created the world out of formless matter, <u>did not lack the means</u> to send upon them a multitude of bears, or bold lions,"

ἠπόρει makes sense, but not perfectly: On the one hand he is disturbed, on the other hand he heard him gladly.
The strange "he was doing many things" is also not really clear: Who is doing many things? If it is Herod, it would be almost nonsensical. This reading could be considered the harder reading.
It is quite probable that one reading was an early error, because both words sound and look similar. ρ is often written with a very small loop only. In this case a transition from ρ to ι is no more probable than the reverse.

Hoskier notes (Codex B, I, p. 82) that πολλὰ ἐποίει is a Semitism which "offended Alexandrian recensors". Blass: πολλὰ ἐποίει is a "translation-semitism", with the meaning "he heard him often".
That it is a harmonization to Lk 9:7 (suggested by Hoskier) is improbable, in that case one would have expected διηπόρει, also the wording is completely different.

Bonner notes that it is also possible to translate ἠπόρει as "raise a question". In this case the passage would become:
"and having heard him, he was <u>want to raise many questions</u>, and heard him gladly."

Kilpatrick notes that adverbial πολλὰ "regularly follows" the verb. He writes: "At Mark 6:20 it is said of Herod ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει (v.l. ἐποίει). Mark's order is definitely in favor of taking πολλὰ with ἀκούσας. This, however, enables us to decide in favor of ἠπόρει against ἐποίει, because, while ἠπόρει makes sense standing alone, ἐποίει alone does not, whatever πολλὰ ἐποίει might have been taken to mean."
On this D.A. Black comments: "Can we not now go back and translate πολλὰ, quite simply and naturally, with its normal *adjectival* force: 'he did *many* things' (πολλὰ ἐποίει)? We can therefore regard ἐποίει as unquestionably Marcan in style and usage."

ἠπορεῖτο, as W has it, would be the more correct, classical Greek.

If one accepts that Lk used Mk as a source, then it is probable that ἠπόρει in Mk is correct, because Lk also has a form of ἀπορέω, but a different one (διαπορέω). A harmonization to Lk is also unlikely, because the overall wording is completely different.

Compare:
C. Bonner "Note on Mk 6:20" HTR 37 (1944) 41-44
G.D. Kilpatrick "Some notes on Markan usage" BT 7 (1956) 2-9
D.A. Black "The text of Mark 6.20" NTS 34 (1988) 141-45
K. Romaniuk "ἠπόρει ou ἐποίει en Mc 6:20?", ETL 69, 1993, 140f.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 124

59. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρῳδιάδος καὶ ὀρχησαμένης ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ· αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι·

BYZ Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος καὶ ὀρχησαμένης καὶ ἄρεσασης, τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ Αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς καὶ δώσω σοι·

T&T #81

txt "And when his daughter Herodias came in"
Byz "And when the daughter of Herodias herself came in"
(= not Herod's daughter)

Byz A, C, Θ, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy-H, goth, NA[25], Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, 565, (arm)

τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος W, pc[10], L253, L1043
"And when her daughter, Herodias, came in ..."
τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος f1, 22, pc[15], aur, b, c, f, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, geo
"And when Herodias' daughter came in ..."

Tregelles has additionally αὐτῆς in brackets in the margin.

579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.

892: There is an erasure between τῆς and θυγατρὸς, but nothing of the writing remains. The space (c. 3 letters) is left empty.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:6 Γενεσίοις δὲ γενομένοις τοῦ Ἡρῴδου ὠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ,

Compare previous verse 21:

NA28 Mark 6:21 Καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου ὅτε Ἡρῴδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας,

The daughter of Herodias is meant. According to the txt reading she has the name Herodias as well. This is possible, although other sources (Josephus) report the name Salome for her.
She is also not the daughter of Herod, but only a grand-niece of him. She is the daughter of Philip. So the txt reading is factually wrong.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 316-17) notes that Philip is also wrong. Salome was the daughter of Herodes Boethos, the first husband of Herodias. Philip was later however the husband of Salome.

Probably the non-txt readings are attempts to overcome this error.
The Greek of the Byzantine reading is awkward though and it is possible that the other readings are attempts to smooth this (so also Greeven).

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 41) thinks that the αὐτοῦ is a mechanical repetition of the two αὐτοῦ of the previous verse 21.

Iver Larsen on the BGreek list commented:
"What if the phrase had been the 'son of Herodias himself/herself'? If you choose 'himself', I assume primary stress is on son, but if you choose 'herself', I assume primary stress is on Herodias. This last option seems to be what we have in the Greek AUTHS hHRWiDIADOS."

Greeven writes that αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος does not mean "of Herodias herself", but "of the recently mentioned Herodias" (BDR §288 n. 3).
Güting notes that it is rather difficult to imagine that someone changed αὐτῆς τῆς into αὐτοῦ. He suggests that possibly originally no pronoun was present at all and conjectures: τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἡρῳδιάδος.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 125

60. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρῳδιάδος καὶ ὀρχησαμένης ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ· αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι·

ὁ δέ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν

P45^{C}, 01, B, C*, L, Δ, 33, 1342, L1043, sa, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt C^{C3}, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, Maj, it, Sy-H, bo-mss
εἶπεν ὁ Ἡρῴδης P45*

εἶπεν δέ ὁ βασιλεὺς A

ἤρεσεν 01, B, C*, L, Δ, 33, pc
ἄρεσασης P45, A, C^{C3}, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, SBL

579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 14:7 ὅθεν μεθ' ὅρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται.

It is not clear why the UBS committee chose the txt reading.

1. The external evidence is much stronger for the 01, B reading.

2. Internally one could argue that ὁ δέ seems to indicate a contrasting reply, but there is nothing Herod is replying to. Therefore the change to εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ.

Weiss notes (Comm. Mk) that the Byzantine reading is a mechanical continuation of the participle construction:

01, B	καὶ εἰσελθούσης	-	ἤρεσεν	-	ὁ δέ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν
txt	καὶ εἰσελθούσης	-	ἤρεσεν	-	εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
Byz	καὶ εἰσελθούσης	-	καὶ ἄρεσασης	-	εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς

This observation makes it probable that these two variants are connected. Note that the support for ἤρεσεν - εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς (= txt) is zero! If we assume that ἄρεσασης is a conformation to the preceeding participles, then also εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς must be secondary.

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)

TVU 126

61. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:23 καὶ ὤμοσεν **αὐτῇ [πολλὰ]** ὅ τι ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου.

BYZ Mark 6:23 καὶ ὤμοσεν **αὐτῇ** ὅτι, Ὅ ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου

αὐτῇ πολλὰ P45?, D, Θ, 565, 700, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, i, q), vg^{mss}, arm, Bois
πολλὰ P45?, 28

αὐτῇ 01, A, B, C^{C2}, Δ, (f1), f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, L1043, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth, **NA^{25}**, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

omit: L, sa^{ms}, bo^{ms}

C*^{vid}, W, Γ, 22, pc omit due to h.t. (22 δώσω σοι – 23 δώσω σοι).

P45: NA notes P45^{vid} for πολλά without αὐτῇ. Greeven and Comfort have P45 for txt. P45 starts from a lacuna with πολλά, which is clearly visible, but if there was αὐτῇ before it cannot be determined.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

L: A correction is mentioned by E. Güting/H. Greeven in their TC book on Mark (2005). But this is only a spelling error in ὤμοσεν, probably ὤμ<u>ω</u>σεν. A letter has been erased and an ο added. Nothing else. Checked at the BnF color image (85r).

Δ: (p. 155) After αὐτῇ is an erased word, the space is left blank. It is not possible to make the word out with certainty, but it looks like a redublicated αὐτῇ. The first letter does not look like a **Π**, but like a **Λ**.

f1 reads the verse: ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ. Possibly the words have been omitted (in an ancestor of f1, note 22!) due to h.t. (as in W et al.) and subsequently corrected, but with the insertion accidentally or deliberately at the wrong position.

Sy-S has (acc. to EJ Wilson, Old Sy Gospels): "Up to half my kingdom. And he swore it to her with an oath." (compare f1!)

579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.

B: no umlaut

ὤμοσεν from ὀμνύω "swear, vow, make an oath"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:7 ὅθεν μεθ' ὅρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:45 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, W, Latt
NA28 Mark 3:12 καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς
omit πολλὰ: W, 1424, it

NA28 Mark 4:2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: W, 28, b, c, e
NA28 Mark 4:36 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα_ ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.
πολλὰ D, 33, it(b, d, ff^2, i, q, r^1)
NA28 Mark 5:10 καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: L, 892, pc, e, g^1, Sy-S
NA28 Mark 5:23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, pc, it, Sy-S
NA28 Mark 5:43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, 1424, pc, it
NA28 Mark 6:34 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.
omit πολλὰ: Θ, Sy-S

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 6:20 καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, safe!

The addition of πολλὰ seems to be secondary. There is no reason for an omission. The supporting witnesses are not very reliable.
It is typical Markan style though (compare the examples above). Note that at almost every occurrence the word is omitted by some witnesses, especially by those (D, it) that have it here at 6:23. But in the immediate context 6:20 πολλὰ is safe.

Rating: - (indecisive)
External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = omit πολλὰ)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 127
62. Difficult variant
Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:23 καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ [πολλὰ] ὅ τι ἐάν **με αἰτήσῃς** δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου.

αἰτήσῃς	01, H, L, f13, 892, 1071, 1424, al, Lat(aur, b, c, l, q, vg), Sy-P, bo, WH^{mg}, **NA^{25}**
αἰτήσῃ	N
αἰτήσῃς με	A, Y, K, Π, pc
με αἰτήσῃς	P45?, B, C, D, Θ, 33, 124, 700, 1342, Maj, L1043, it(a, d, f, ff^{2}, i), Sy-H, sa, goth, WH
με αἰτήσῃ	Δ

C*^{vid}, W, Γ, pc **omit due to h.t.** (22 δώσω σοι - 23 δώσω σοι).

f1 has: 6:22 αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι 23 ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου. καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ.

Sy-S omits ὅ τι ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι and reads the two phrases reversed: "up to half my kingdom. And he swore it to her with an oath."

N: The reading of N is not really clear. In NA it is noted in brackets for both the 01 reading and the txt reading. In the appendix of the Lectiones Minores αἰτήσῃ is noted. Acc. to Klaus Witte from Muenster the notation in brackets for txt should be deleted. Swanson lists it for the 01 reading. Legg for με αἰτήσῃ.

P45: NA does not list P45. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 323) notes it for the 01 reading, but Comfort and Barrett for the B reading. Comfort gives it as:

ΑΥΤΗ]Ι ΠΟΛΛΑ Ο ΤΙ ΕΑΝ Μ[Ε

without any indication that the Μ is doubtful. Kenyon's ed. pr. has a dot under the Mu. The remaining ink is not completely clear, but most likely a Μ.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

B: no umlaut

αἰτήσῃ subjunctive aorist middle 2nd person singular
αἰτήσῃς subjunctive aorist active 2nd person singular

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:7 ὅθεν μεθ' ὅρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται.

Compare previous verse 22:
NA28 Mark 6:22 εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ· <u>αἴτησόν με</u> ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι· safe!

The omission of με could be accidental or to improve style. On the other hand it could have been added to harmonize with immediate context, verse 22 (including word-order: A et al.). Mt omits με, too.
f1 rearranged the sentence to omit the second rather redundant ὅ τι ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 128

Minority reading: verses 31-33

NA28 Mark 6:31 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν.

δεῦτε ὑπάγωμεν D, a, c, d, ff^2, i, r^1, r^2, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-P, aeth
Venite eamus

NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.

ἀπῆλθον 01, A, B, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13^c, 28, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj-part(K, Π, M, N, S, U, Σ, Φ), Latt, Sy, Co, arm, geo, aeth, Stephanus, Scrivener, Complutensian Polyglot, Robinson

ἀπῆλθεν f13^{a,b}, 2, 22, 157, 700, Maj-part(E, F, G, H, V, Y, Γ), Erasmus, Lut

NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ … καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

1. αὐτὸν W, Θ, 700, pc
αὐτὸν f13, 2, 22, 157, 565, 1071, Maj-part(E, F, G, H, S, V, Γ, Φ, Ω), TR, Erasmus, Lut, Robinson
αὐτοὺς 01, A, L, Δ, 33, 579, 892, 1424, pm, Lat
3. αὐτοῦ D, 565 (not d)
3. αὐτῷ 69, 788, 28, 700, pc, Sy-P

TR: Erasmus has ἀπῆλθεν/abiit in verse 32.
700: Swanson has it for ἀπῆλθον, but this is in error (checked at the image).
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Context:
31 **He** said to them, "Come away to a deserted place all by yourselves …
32 And **they/he** went away in the boat to a deserted place …
33 Now many saw **them/him** going and recognized **them/him**, and they hurried there on foot from all the towns and arrived ahead of **them/him**.
34 As **he** went ashore, **he** saw a great crowd; and **he** had compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and **he** began to teach them many things.
35 When it grew late, **his disciples came to him**

The phrase δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν is a bit difficult and equivocal. Literally it says "Come, you yourself, privately, by yourself".
δεῦτε means "Come" or "Come now" or "Come on". It is not clear if this means the disciples alone or the disciples plus Jesus. The Western text is clarifying this by changing the text to "Come, let us go" (δεῦτε ὑπάγωμεν).

In verse 32 some witnesses have the singular, which means that Jesus is separating himself from the disciples: "And he went away in the boat …"
This is also the reading of Luther:
"Und er fuhr da in einem Schiff zu einer Wüste besonders."
Luther used the Greek text of Erasmus.

ἀπῆλθεν is probably either a typical unintentional scribal error or it is an intentional change due to the interpretation of verse 31, that Jesus is sending his disciples away.

The variant continues to verse 33, where again some manuscripts have the singular ("him"), but the support is not consistent. Only 700 has the singular in all three cases.

In verse 34 it is Jesus alone, who is acting. Then, in verse 35 it it said that his disciples came to him, but it is unclear from where.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 129

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

No txt in NA and SQE!

	ἔγνωσαν	B*, D, f1, Trg, WH
txt	ἐπέγνωσαν	01, A, B^C, L, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, WH^{mg}

0187: lacuna, but space considerations strongly suggest txt.

B p. 1286 A 38: The ЄΠ is written above the line. It is enhanced and it is probably impossible to say which corrector it was. Tischendorf writes in his Vaticanus edition: "B^3 demum ut vdtr", but assigns it in his NT 8th edition to B^2.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:13 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

NA28 Luke 9:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰᾶτο.

ἐπιγνόντες Ψ

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 11:27 Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ

γινώσκει C

Variation in both ways occurs. The meaning is the same, but γινώσκω is the more frequent word.

Possibly a coincidence of a simple error?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 130

63. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν _____ πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν πολλοί καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν.

Byz P84[vid], A, K, Π, f13, (33), 157, 1071, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H
... συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτὸν. A
... συνεισῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν. f13
συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν 33

καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς	01, B, 0187, 892, 1342, pc, Lat, Co
καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτούς	L, f13, 579, 713, 1241, 1675, 2766
καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοῖς	Δ, Θ, 1424, pc
καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ	D (not d)
καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτῷ	28, 700, pc
καὶ συνεισῆλθον αὐτῷ	788
καὶ ἦλθον αὐτοῦ	565
καὶ ἦλθον ἐκεῖ	f1 (omitting first ἐκεῖ)

omit: W, c, Sy-S

P84 (6th CE, Khirbet Mird): The reading is difficult to establish, because only few letters are extant and the papyrus consists of several fragments. NA has it as "vid" for Byz, but the ed. pr. (Le Museon 2003) shows doubt ("moins bonne"). A reconstruction shows that it is impossible to fit in the txt reading, but the Byzantine reading fits quite good. "vid" is justified.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

565: ECM-Parallels has it for the D reading, with the addition "f" (Fehler, error). The above reading is given in Swanson.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:13 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι <u>ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ</u> πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.
NA28 Luke 9:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες <u>ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ·</u>

		Mk	4Gospels
προέρχομαι	go ahead, go on before	2	5
προσέρχομαι	come or go to, approach;	5	67(Mt 51)
συνέρχομαι	come together, gather; meet;	2	7
συνεισέρχομαι	go in with, enter with	0	2

One of WH's conflation readings, see WH intro, §134ff. p. 95-99.
They think that it is difficult to imagine how the short readings could emerge out of the longer text, but the other way round it is easily understandable that the longer reading is a conflation of the two short ones.

Bousset (Studien NT, 1894, p. 98) cannot really see how the D reading could have been created out of the 01, B reading:

> "If προῆλθον αὐτούς was unintelligible, why has it not simply been omitted? Instead it has been changed rather unskillful (in light of the preceding συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ) into the συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ? If we accept the long reading as original, then the short readings are quite easy to understand: συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ was omitted [accidentally] and D et al. omitted [deliberately] the difficult προῆλθον αὐτούς. - If finally συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ or συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν was original, is difficult to decide."

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) thinks that the words have been added to prepare for the abrupt ἐξελθὼν in verse 34. This view is incompatible with the above of WH. Since the D reading appears quite early, it is improbable that it arose out of the Byz reading by omission.
Wohlenberg further notes that προῆλθον αὐτούς is bad Greek for ἔφθασαν αὐτούς.

Note that in this verse there is also one of the so called <u>Minor Agreements</u>:
οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ is not in Mk.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 36) notes: "W. Hendriks has noted correctly in his talk at the Lille colloquium, that in this verse only c, W and Sy-S have preserved the original."

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 131
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς **κύκλῳ** ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν.

Not in NA and only incomplete in SQE!

ἔγγιστα D, 700, Latt
proximas

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἔγγιστα superlative of ἐγγύς "near, close to; on the verge of"
κύκλῳ as an adjective with the article: "around, nearby"

Context:
NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:15 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.
NA28 Luke 9:12 ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν,

It is possible that κύκλῳ is a harmonization to Lk, but the support is just too bad. In the Gospels only ἐγγύς appears elsewhere. ἔγγιστα appears 11 times in the LXX. Probably ἔγγιστα is a stylistic improvement. It is also possible that it's a back-translation from the Latin with 'proximas' being just a free translation of κύκλῳ.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 132

NA28 Mark 6:36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν.

BYZ Mark 6:36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

Not cited in NA, but in SQE!

Byz P84(6th CE), A, K, Π, f13, 33, 700, 1342, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H
omit ἄρτους U, f1, 22*

txt P45, 01, B, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, (0187), 788(=f13), 28, 892, 2542, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Co
βρώματα τί φάγωσιν 01, Θ
τί φάγειν D

f1 reads εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσιν from Lk for εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς.

P84: A new arrangement of the fragments shows that the papyrus is supporting the byz reading.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

0187: The parchment deteriorated considerably since the ed. pr. 1905 appeared. The recently presented online images show nothing anymore. The ed. pr. reconstructs the passage with ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους. There appears to be very little space after ἑαυτοῖς, so that even τί φάγωσιν appears to be too long. They suggested ἄρτους therefore. At least it is clear that 0187 does not read Byz.

579 omits due to h.t.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:15 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.
NA28 Luke 9:12 … ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

NA28 Luke 9:13 … εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα.
NA28 Matthew 15:32 ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν·
NA28 John 6:5 Ἐπάρας οὖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγει πρὸς Φίλιππον· πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν·

Looks like a harmonization to Mt (and Jo), although not exactly. Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that it is a conformation to 8:2.
Note that both Mt 14:15 and Lk 9:13 agree in βρώματα against Mk (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 133

64. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

Feeding of the 5.000:

NA28 Mark 6:38 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε. καὶ γνόντες λέγουσιν· πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.

ἔχετε ἄρτους;

B, L, Δ, Θ, 0187[vid], 1342, 2542, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Trg[mg], SBL

txt P45, 01, A, D, W, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj

0187: πό
[σους ἔχ]ετε
[ἄρτους;] ὑπά
[γετε ἴδ]ετε

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel: Feeding of the 4.000:

NA28 Matthew 15:34 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· ἑπτὰ καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια. safe!

NA28 Mark 8:5 καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτούς· πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· ἑπτά.

ἔχετε ἄρτους A, B, L, Δ, f1, 346, 788, 157, 1071, Maj
ἄρτους ἔχετε 01, D, W, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1424, al
(not in NA but in SQE!)

The same variation occurs in Mk 8:5.

Interestingly the order in Mt is safe. It is quite probable that the Markan form was in both cases ἔχετε ἄρτους, and the change is a harmonization to Mt, so also Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 339).

The analysis is hampered by the fact that the two feedings are separated in the Synopsis.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 134
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:39 καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς **ἀνακλῖναι** πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ.

T&T #85

	ἀνακλιθῆναι	01, B*, G, Θ, Φ, 047, 055, 0187, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 892^{C}, 1071, 1342, L2211, al^{160}, Sy-S, Or^{pt}, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Bois
	ἀνακληθῆναι	13, 346, 2, 565
txt	**ἀνακλῖναι**	A, B^{C1}, D, L, W, Δ, 33, 579, 892*, 1424, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, Or^{pt}, WH^{mg}

0187: αὐτοῖς ἀν[ακλι]θῆναι πάντας
B p. 1286 B 30: The **ΘΗ** is not enhanced. There are two dots above the two letters, indicating the error.
892: A θ has been added above the line between the letters λι and ν.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἀνακλῖναι infinitive aorist active
ἀνακλιθῆναι infinitive aorist passive

Parallels: Feeding of the 5.000
NA28 Matthew 14:19 καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, ἀναπεσεῖν 28

NA28 Luke 9:14 ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας [ὡσεὶ] ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. ἀνακλίνατε 700
Feeding of the 4.000
NA28 Mark 8:6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·
NA28 Matthew 15:35 καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν

Both forms appear only here in the Gospels. It is possible that the 01, B reading is a harmonization to Mt 14:19. So also Metzger: "It appears that copyists, perhaps not understanding the use of the active voice here, assimilated ἀνακλῖναι to the parallel reading (ἀνακλιθῆναι) in Mt 14:19."
But note that the wording in Mt is completely different.

Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that ἀνακλιθῆναι has been changed into the transitive ἀνακλῖναι to indicate that the disciples should order the crowd to rest.
But note that the Matthean parallel has ἀνακλιθῆναι safe.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 135

65. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς **[αὐτοῦ]** ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.

omit 01, B, L, Δ, 0187[vid], 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc, d, sa-mss, bo, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa-mss

0187: within a lacuna, but space considerations rule out an αὐτοῦ.
P45 omits πέντε and δύο.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare also complete discussions at Mt 8:21 and Lk 20:45.

NA28 Mark 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας.
omit αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 Mark 4:34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.
omit αὐτοῦ: 01, B, C, L, Δ, 700
add αὐτοῦ: A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 1424, Maj

NA28 Mark 5:31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἥψατο;
omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 Mark 6:35 Καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή·
omit αὐτοῦ: W, f1, 28

NA28 Mark 7:17 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

omit αὐτοῦ: Δ

NA28 Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς·

omit αὐτοῦ: 01, D, L, N, Δ, 0131, f1, 28, 892, L2211, pc

add αὐτοῦ: A, B, W, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj

NA28 Mark 8:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας;

omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 Mark 8:6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ.

omit αὐτοῦ: 33, 579, 1424

NA28 Mark 8:27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

omit 2nd αὐτοῦ: A

NA28 Mark 8:33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτου ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

omit αὐτοῦ: 579

NA28 Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς.

ADD αὐτοῦ: Θ, f13, 1424, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν· ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;

omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 Mark 10:10 Καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν <u>οἱ μαθηταὶ</u> περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν.
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 28, 579, 1424
<u>add αὐτοῦ:</u> A, D, W, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj
(not in NA but in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται· <u>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ</u> ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.
<u>ADD αὐτοῦ:</u> D, Θ, 565, 700, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 10:24 <u>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ</u> ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·
<u>ADD αὐτοῦ:</u> D, Δ, Θ, f1, 565, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 10:46 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ καὶ <u>τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαῖος, τυφλὸς προσαίτης, ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν.
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> Θ

NA28 Mark 12:43 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος <u>τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ</u> εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν τῶν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον·
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> W

NA28 Mark 14:12 Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ <u>οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·</u> ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα;
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> D

NA28 Mark 14:16 καὶ ἐξῆλθον <u>οἱ μαθηταὶ</u> καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> 01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, f1, 28, 579, 892, 1424, pc
<u>add αὐτοῦ:</u> A, C, D, W, Θ, f13, 565, 700, 1342, Maj

NA28 Mark 14:32 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανὶ καὶ λέγει <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·</u> καθίσατε ὧδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι.
<u>omit αὐτοῦ:</u> A

At the following verses the pronoun is safe:

2:15, 2:16, 3:7, 3:9, 6:1, 6:29, 6:45, 7:2, (7:5), 8:10, 8:27a, 8:34, (9:18), 10:23, 11:1, 11:14, 13:1, 14:13, (14:14), 16:7

At the following verses the words without pronoun are safe: none!

At the following verses the Byzantine text adds the pronoun:
4:34, 6:41, 8:1, 10:10, 14:16

At the following verses a minority adds the pronoun: 9:14, 10:13, 10:24

At the following verses a minority omits the pronoun:
2:23, 5:31, 6:35, 7:17, 8:4, 8:6, 8:27b, 8:33, 9:28, 9:31, 10:46, 12:43, 14:12, 14:32
(smaller font size indicates singular readings)

17 times the pronoun is safe. Interestingly nowhere the reading without the pronoun is safe! This is in strong contrast to Mt, where this happens 10 times.
W omits the pronoun 5 times! A and D two times. Θ add the pronoun 3 times and D and 565 two times.

In contrast to Mt (where the pronoun is more often added than omitted, 21 : 9), here in Mk the pronoun is less often added than omitted (7 : 13).
Only in about 5 cases the reading without the pronoun is comparatively safe. In the overwhelming number of cases, 31 times, the reading with the pronoun is safe.
Thus in Mk the reading with the pronoun is the norm.

Only the following two cases are problematic:

Mk 6:41 καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς,

	omit	01, B, L, Δ, 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, pc, d, sa-mss, bo, WH
txt	add	P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa-mss

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:19 καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους,
NA28 Luke 9:16 καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

It is possible that the omission of the article is a harmonization to the parallels, so also Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 343). Or it has been omitted to tighten the narrative and avoid two pronouns so near each other.
On the other hand the addition could be a conformation to Markan usage.
It is interesting that both Mt and Lk omit the pronoun. Did they read it in Mk?
Externally the omission is clearly superior.
Ellingworth writes: "Our tentative preference is therefore for the … longer reading in Mk."

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

Mk 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς·

txt	omit	01, D, L, N, Δ, 0131, f1, 28, 892, L2211, pc, **NA[25]**, Gre, WH, Trg, Bal
	add	A, B, W, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Weiss

Δ: reads τοὺς μαθητὰς πάλιν λέγει αὐτοῖς·
Lacuna: C

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:32
Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν·

Interestingly this case is again a feeding.
The addition of the pronoun could be a harmonization to Mt 15:32 or to Markan usage. Again the omission could be due to avoid two pronouns so near each other.
Externally the support is very evenly divided. In 8:4 the pronoun is safe.
Ellingworth: "Both the balance of external evidence, and Mk's tendency to include αὐτοῦ favour the longer reading here."
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 343) assigns αὐτοῦ secondary, without arguments.

Compare:
P. Ellingworth "(His) disciples" NovT 42 (2000) 114-126

Rating: - (indecisive) (6:41, brackets ok)
Rating: 1? (= NA probably wrong) (8:1, also in brackets)

TVU 136

66. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.

BYZ Mark 6:44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες

T&T #86 (partial, unfortunately it does not list the ὡσ(εὶ) variants)
cp. ECM-Parallels also!

Western-non-interpolation?

omit: P45, D, W, 788(=f13), 79, 2193, Lat, sa

ὡς 01, Θ, 565, 700, 2542
ὡσεὶ f1, 28, 372, 2737

τοὺς ἄρτους	A, B, L, Δ, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, f, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους	M, pc^4 (= 162, 174, 1220, 2661)
τοὺς ἄρτους ὡς	176, 2680
τοὺς ἄρτους ὡςεὶ	pc
τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἰχθύας	c
αὐτοὺς	Sy-S ("that ate *of them* ", acc. to Burkitt)

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:21 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι
D, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 700, pc: ὡς

NA28 Matthew 15:38 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι
B, Θ, f13, 33, 892, 1582: ἦσαν ὡς
01, 579, pc: ἦσαν ὡςεὶ

NA28 Luke 9:14 ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι.
D, it: ὡς

NA28 John 6:10 ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι

P66, A, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj: <u>ὡςεὶ</u>

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε <u>ἄρτους</u> ... καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς <u>ἄρτους</u>
NA28 Mark 8:9 ἦσαν δὲ <u>ὡς</u> τετρακισχίλιοι.
BYZ Mark 8:9 ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι

The argument that scribes found the fishes missing and therefore omitted the bread too, is unconvincing, because it would be more probable that they would have added the fishes (one OLat manuscript: c has both).
It appears (also from the parallels) that ὡς / ὡςει is a natural addition.
The omission of τοὺς ἄρτους could be simply a harmonization to the parallel accounts. Both Mt and Lk don't have it (<u>Minor Agreement</u>). The quite strong support is strange nevertheless. There should be no problem with τοὺς ἄρτους here.
There is the idea that the men did not eat any of the distributed bread, that ALL bread is coming back to the disciples.
Jan Sammer on Crosstalk (03/2002):
"The language of the account carefully avoids saying what the crowds ate. The entire purpose of the exercise, breaking the bread and fish into fragments and distributing them to the crowds, and then collecting the fragments, was to demonstrate to the disciples that the crowds were already full. The narrative flits back and forth between the concepts of real and symbolic sustenance, false and true doctrines. [. . .] I would go so far as to admit that at one level, the loaves broken by Jesus at the two feedings are symbolic of the false doctrines of the Pharisees and of Herod, as a contrast to the true doctrine by which the crowds were fed and filled. Esurientes implebit vobis. But the question of what has filled the crowds, was it the false doctrines of the Pharisees and of Herod, symbolized by the loaves, or the true doctrine, symbolized by Jesus' words, cannot be decided unless we analyze what proportion of that leavened bread was returned unconsumed. And I believe that the analysis will show that all of it was returned unconsumed. By the process of elimination, then, the crowds were fed on the true doctrine alone, and rejected the false doctrine."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 137

67. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον.

	πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν	P45[vid], W, Sy-S
	a Bethsaida	q ("a" = "from"!)
trans fretum	a Bethsaida	b, i
αὐτὸν	πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν	118 (Lake: "αὐτὸν nunc habet partim deletum")
αὐτὸν	εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν	f1
αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν	πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν	D, N, Σ, Φ, f13[a,b], Lat
αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν	εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν	Θ, 28, 565, 700, Or, sa[pt], bo, Sy-P
αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν		f13[c] (Mt?)
εἰς τὸ πέραν	πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν	

01, A, B, K, Π, L, Δ, 33[vid], 157, 1071, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-H

33: has a lacuna, but from space considerations probably reads txt.

Or: Mt Comm tom. 11:5

Lacuna: C, Ψ, e, k, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:22 Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους.

NA28 Matthew 14:34 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ.

NA28 Luke 9:10 Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά.

BYZ Luke 9:10 ... εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδάν.

NA28 John 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.
NA28 Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.
NA28 Mark 6:1 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ,
NA28 Mark 6:6 Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.
NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.
NA28 Mark 6:53 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:22 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.
NA28 Mark 14:28 προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
NA28 Mark 16:7 ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·
NA28 John 10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον

In Mk 6:1 Jesus is in Nazareth. Then he went about among the villages teaching. Where the feeding of the five thousand took place is not said in Mk. In Lk 9:10 it is in or near Bethsaida (east coast), Mt assumes the same, because Mt 14:34 says (after the feeding): "When they had crossed over, they came to land at Gennesaret" (west coast).
But Mk says: "he made his disciples get into the boat and go on ahead to the other side, to Bethsaida". This indicates a place on the west coast for the feeding. If a scribe wanted to harmonize this with Mt/Lk he could do several things:

a) he omitted εἰς τὸ πέραν to indicate that they just went to Bethsaida "nearby" (P45, W, Sy-S)
b) he changed the "to" into "from" (b, i, q).
c) he omitted πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν (f13^{c})

On the other hand it has been suggested (e.g. Burkitt, Lagrange) that εἰς τὸ πέραν is a harmonization to Mt 14:22. Also, in Mk 6:53 it is said (like Mt 14:34): " When they had crossed over, they came to land at Gennesaret".

Considering Mk 14:28 (προάξω εἰς) and Mk 16:7 (προάγει εἰς) Mk seems to favor εἰς over πρὸς.
If one accepts a difference in meaning for πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν ("in the direction of") and εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν ("inside the city"), εἰς is clearly the harder reading.

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) suggests that εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν means "on the other side, (looking back) to Bethsaida". I don't think that this is an acceptable translation, πρὸς does not have a meaning like that. In that case one would have expected Mark to have used κατέναντι or ἐξ ἐναντίας or something like that. εἰς and πρὸς appear to have the same meaning here. Also πρὸς Β. modifies προάγειν, so the words must express similar ideas.
In the case of the D et al. reading, it is possible to take πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν with the following:
πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν <u>αυτὸς δὲ</u> ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον. D, Θ, 565, b
This could be read as:
"But he dismissed the crowd to Bethsaida."

Regarding αὐτὸν: Bauer (προάγω) explains the missing pronoun here by pointing out that it could be supplied from the αὐτός in the following ἕως clause. In D, Θ, 565, however, αὐτὸν is indispensable, because these manuscripts do not have this ἕως-clause but a new clause.

Compare:
L. Vaganay "Marc 6:45. Essai de critique textuelle" RB 49 (1940) 5-32
[He favors the f1 reading: εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν, he isn't discussing αὐτὸν though.]

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 138

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:47 καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης **ἦν** τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος [1] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [2].

T&T #87

ἦν πάλαι P45, D, f1, 22, 28, 2542, pc[8],
iam erat it(a, b, d, ff[2], i), vg[mss], geo[mss], Gre, Bois
pc = 251, 660*, 697, 791, 1192, 1210, 1365, 2372
omit: Δ

[1] **ἦν** A, U, 124
[2] **ἦν** M

Δ: The scribe, who is unaccustomed to Greek, is probably confused here. He takes γενομέν for one word and ης for ην, since he writes erat above ης.
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, r[1], vg) read txt.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

πάλαι "already"
ἤδη "now, already"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
BYZ Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης

NA28 John 6:16 Ὡς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν 17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

Compare next verse:

NA28 Mark 6:48 ... περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 15:44 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν· 1st ἤδη: safe
ἤδη for πάλαι: B, D, W, Θ, pc
καὶ εἶπεν for εἰ πάλαι: Δ

NA28 Hebrews 1:1 Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις

There is no reason why it could have been omitted. Probably a natural addition.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 156) sees πάλαι as a preparation for the specification of time in verse 48. It is also possibly a reminiscence of Jo 6:16-17.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 346) argues that the rare πάλαι was not really self-suggesting here. He would have expected an ἤδη (from the parallels). ἤδη versus πάλαι in the Gospels: 41 : 3. Greeven thinks that the word has been omitted as being equivocal, the word could also mean: "long ago, formerly" (so in the well known Heb 1:1).
Note a similar variation in Mk 15:44, but here ἤδη is a conformation to immediate context.
Noteworthy is the curious support from Byzantine minuscules.
The support from the versions should not be taken too serious, this could simply be translation freedom. Perhaps they back-influenced the Greek manuscripts?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 139

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:48 καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν, ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς,

(Incomplete in NA. The "minor variant", indicated by brackets, in the appendix for 565, 700 is simply a repetition of the apparatus.)

ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος αὐτοῖς	01, A, 1342, 1424
ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος	f1
ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος σφόδρα	565
ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς σφόδρα	P45[vid], W, Θ, f13, 28, 700, pc

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπεῖχεν βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων, ἦν γὰρ ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος.

σφόδρα is clearly a secondary addition for intensification.

The omission of αὐτοῖς is a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 140

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:49-6:50 οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν,
καὶ ἀνέκραξαν· 50 πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον καὶ ἐταράχθησαν.

T&T #88

Western non-interpolation?

καὶ ἀνέκραξαν 50 πάντες _____ καὶ ἐταράχθησαν.
et exclamaverunt omnes et conturbati sunt.
D, Θ, 565, 700, pc^2, it(a, b, c, d, ff^2, i, q, r^1)
pc = 989, 1668

καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἀνέκραξαν· 50 πάντες γὰρ ...
1342 (:: Mt 14:26)

Lat(aur, f, l, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

An omission with different interpunction:
" they thought it was a ghost and cried out all and were terrified."
txt:
"they thought it was a ghost and cried out; for they all saw him and were terrified."

Compare for 1342:
NA28 Matthew 14:26 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἐταράχθησαν λέγοντες ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν.

Difficult.
It is possible that the term has been omitted because it is redundant (it has been noted already in verse 49: οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν).
A deliberate insertion is difficult to explain.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 141

68. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ **λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ]** ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο·

BYZ Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ **λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ** ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαύμαζον.

T&T #89

λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ	A, X, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, NA[25], Bois, Weiss
λίαν	01, B, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc[5], Co, WH, Gre pc = 49, 294, 759, 1032, 2533
περισσῶς	D, (Θ), 700
ἐκ περισσοῦ	W, 1582, 2193*(=f1), 28, 72, 1313
ἐκ περισσῶς	1, 2542(=f1)

περισσῶς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	565
λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐκ περισσοῦ	Σ, pc
περιέσωσεν αὐτοὺς καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	Φ

omit:	Sy-S, Sy-P

Θ reads: καὶ περιέσωσεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαύμαζον.
(checked at the film)

Swanson and Gregory also agree in περιέσωσεν, but probably περιέσωσεν αὐτοὺς is just a scribal error for περισσῶς ἐν ἀυτοῖς and the D reading is intended. Note Φ, which has the same word. T&T have Θ for the 1, 2542 reading, but this is not fully correct, since Θ is missing ἐκ.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

λίαν	adv. "exceedingly, greatly, very much"
περισσός	adj. "more, all the more, even more"
λίαν ἐκ π.	"utterly, completely"
περιέσωσεν	"safe from death" from περισώζω

Compare:

NA28 Mark 7:37 καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες·

ὑπερεκπερισσῶς D, U, f1, 700

NA28 Mark 10:26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες omit: F

NA28 Mark 14:31 ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει·
ἐκ περισσοῦ A, f1, 28, 700, 1071, Maj

NA28 Mark 15:14 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραξαν·
περισσοτέρως P, 28, 1071, Maj-part(E, S, U, Γ, Ω)

Note also:
NA28 Mark 1:35 Καὶ πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν
omit: W

NA28 Mark 9:3 καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν
omit: Δ, 1424

NA28 Mark 16:2 καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται
omit: W

Mk uses λίαν alone 3 times and ἐκ περισσός once. The exact phrase appears only here in the Greek Bible.
In this verse the Byzantine reading looks like a conflation of the two other readings. It is possible that one of the two expressions was an alternative reading, suggested in the margin, which subsequently got into the text.

On the other hand it could be that scribes felt that the double superlative is a bit too much and reduced it to one expression. Note also the rearrangements by Σ, 565 etc. Note that W omits two other times of the three occurrences of λίαν in Mk.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 349) thinks that the different forms περισσῶς, ἐκ περισσοῦ and ἐκ περισσῶς are suspect and look like independent secondary corrections.

It should be noted that the witnesses supporting the omission of λίαν (D, W, f1, 28, 700) are among the most unreliable in Mk. Note further that these witnesses also manipulate other instances of περισσῶς (see above).

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
slight tendency to omit bracketed clause.

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong = clearly omit bracketed clause)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 142

NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο·

BYZ Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαύμαζον.

T&T #90

Byz A, D, W, X, Θ, f13, 33, (565), 700, Maj,
it(a, aur, b, d, f, q, r^1), vg^{ms}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Trg^{mg}
ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς 565
ἐθαύμαζον καὶ ἐξίσταντο 517, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc^9
pc = 261, 695, 723, 780, 950, 1076, 1396, 1534, 1557

txt 01, B, L, Δ, (f1), 28, 892, 1342, pc^5,
Lat(c, ff^2, i, l, vg), Sy-S, Co, WH, **NA^{25}**
f1: ἐξεπλήσσοντο (be amazed)
pc = 79, 130, 392, 566*, 872

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἐξίστημι and ἐξιστάνω intrans. "be amazed or surprised; be out of one's mind"

Compare previous verses:
NA28 Mark 5:20 καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.
NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 12:23 καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι
NA28 Luke 2:47 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ
NA28 Acts 2:7 ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λέγοντες·

θαυμάζω is a typical verb used 33 times in the Gospels. A natural addition. This combination is used in Acts 2:7. ἐξίσταντο is rare and it is possible that it is remembered from Acts 2:7.

It is interesting to mention that two enhancements happened in this verse: ἐκ περισσοῦ (see previous variant) and καὶ ἐθαύμαζον.

Basically it is also possible, as in the previous case that one of the two expressions was an alternative reading, suggested in the margin, which subsequently got into the text.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 143

69. Difficult variant

Minority "Western" reading:

NA28 Mark 6:56 καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγρούς, ἐν ταῖς **ἀγοραῖς** ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται·

Not in NA but in SQE!

πλατείαις D, 565, 700, 2542, Lat("plateis" a, b, d, f, i, l, q, r^1, vg)

ἀγυιαῖς conj. A. Pallis (1932)
"street, highway"

Acc. to Lewis Sy-S reads: "in the cities, villages or fields and streets".
aur, c, ff^2 omit the words ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

πλατεῖα "broad way, open street, wide road"
ἀγορά "market place, especially as the center of public life forum, public square"
ἀγυιά "a street, highway"

No parallel.
But compare:
NA28 Acts 5:15 ὥστε καὶ εἰς τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς καὶ τιθέναι ἐπὶ κλιναρίων καὶ κραβάττων,

πλατεῖα appears nowhere in Mk, but 3 times in Mt and 3 times in Lk.
ἀγορά appears 3 times in Mk.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 27) sees πλατείαις as a correction, because "there are no market-places in the ἄγροι".
The conjecture by A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) is noteworthy.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 144

NA28 Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσίν,
τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους

BYZ Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κοιναῖς χερσίν
τοῦτ ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις ἐσθίοντας ἄρτους ἐμέμψαντο.

Byz (D), W, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 579, 788, Maj-part, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}	
ἄρτους ἐμέμψαντο	f1, 22, Maj-part, a, f, i, vg
ἄρτον ἐμέμψαντο	2^{c}, pc, it, Sy
τοὺς ἄρτους ἐμέμψαντο	W, Θ, f13, 33, 579, 700
τοὺς ἄρτους κατέγνωσαν	D

txt 01, A, B, L, X, Γ, Δ, 0274, 157, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj-part, b, Sy-S, Co, goth	
ἄρτους	A, X, Γ, 157, 1424, Maj-part
ἄρτον	01, 2*, 1342, b
τοὺς ἄρτους	B, L, Δ, 0274, 892
αὐτοὺς	Y

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

μέμφομαι	"find fault with, blame" ("they found fault")
καταγινώσκω	"condemn"

Compare:

NA28 Mark 7:5 διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναῖς χερσὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

NA28 Matthew 15:2 διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.

1. The omission of the article is natural, because it is not clear which bread is meant, when "they noticed that some of his disciples were eating ... the bread".

2. It is possible that ἐμέμψαντο has been added to indicate their thoughts. There is no reason why it should have been omitted.

3. It is also possible that some kind of parablepsis is involved:

ΤΟΥϹΑϤΤΟΥϹ

4. It is possible that the D reading is a back-translation of the Latin "vituperaverunt".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 145
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν,

πυκνὰ 01, W, (aur), b, f, l, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, Tis
omit: Δ, Sy-S, sa

"momento"	a	"for a moment?" (στιγμὴ?)
"subinde"	b	"repeatedly"
"primo"	d	"first"
"crebro"	f, l, vg	"repeatedly"
"crebro pugillo"	aur	"repeatedly, fist"
"pugillo"	c, ff^2, i, q, r^1	"fist"

Arabic Diatessaron: "mit guter Waschung" (Preuschen)
"thoroughly" (Hill, Hogg)
"crebro" (Ciasca)

Note also:
πυκμη D

πηγῇ conj. A. Pallis (1932)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

πυγμῇ πυγμή "fist", dative feminine singular
πυκνὰ πυκνός "frequent, often"

Compare:
NA28 Luke 5:33 οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν

BDAG: A difficult pass. lit. "unless they wash their hands with (the) fist" Mk 7:3 (where the v.l. πυκνά is substituted for π. [Vulgate crebro], thus alleviating the difficulty by focusing on the vigor of the action. Itala codex d has 'primo' [on this and other Itala readings s. AJülicher, Itala II '40, p. 59]). The procedure is variously described and interpreted as a washing: "in which one clenched fist is turned about in the hollow of the other hand", or "up to the elbow" or "the

wrist", or "with a handful" of water. FSchulthess, ZNW 21, 1922, 232f thinks of it simply as a rubbing w. the dry hand.

πυγμῇ is certainly the harder reading.
An old crux interpretum:
J. Wellhausen (1909): "What πυγμῇ means, we don't know."
R. McL. Wilson (1962): "No satisfactory explanation has yet been offered."

Epiphanius (4th CE): πυγμη μεν τας χειρας νιπτομενοι, πυγμη δε και μολυσμους τινας δι' υδατων και λουτρων αποσμηχομενοι.
This seems to require the understanding of πυγμῇ as "frequent".

Theophylact (11th CE): Ου γαρ εν τω νομω γεγραπται νιπτεσθαι πυγμη, τουτεστιν, αχρι του αγκωνος (πυγμη γαρ λεγεται το απο του αγκωνος αχρι και των ακρων των δακτυλων).
= "from the elbow to the fingertip"
This understanding is also confirmed by the Byzantine exeget Euthymius Zigabenus. Hengel explains this understanding from the fact that in Greek πυγμή means "ell, ulna".

Wettstein suggests that πυγμῇ is an ellipsis for πυγμῇ ὕδατος = "a handful of water". Against this interpretation must be noted that in our sources πυγμῇ always means "fist" or is a long measure.

Hengel notes that an explanation must be
a) short and clear
b) intelligible for the contemporary Gentile Christians
c) philologically and factually plausible.

Hengel now suggests that πυγμῇ is a Latinism from the diminutive "pugillo" which in fact means "a hand full". He notes that instead of pugillus sometimes simply pugnus has been used. Thus pugnus/pugillus gave the Latinism πυγμῇ. The measure also accords with the rabbinic instructions (e.g. Jad 1, 1.2).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932): "The explanations given as to how a man is able to wash his hands with his fist cannot even be called serious. ... Common sense says that, the object of the washing being purification, the Jews must have been enjoined to do their ablutions by using pure fresh water *from the spring*, i.e. πηγῇ. ... The correction πηγῇ is so obvious that I should not be surprised if it existed somewhere in the catacombs of learned periodicals."

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 356) writes: "There remain serious doubts, if πυγμῇ is a meaningful reading and if Mark really wrote it."

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) supports Theophylact's understanding:

> "Now πυγμῇ means 'fist'; but it was also used as a measure of length 'from the fist to the elbow', and the Greek commentators Euthymius and Theophylact in fact interpret it here to mean thrusting the arm into the water up to the elbow (Swete). More than twenty years ago I called attention in this Journal (vi 353), when reviewing Dom Butler's edition of the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, to the phrase in chapter lv, p. 148, 1. 21, νίψασθαι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῇ ὕδατι ψυχροτάτῳ. A certain young deacon Jovinus was a member of a party travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt, and one very hot day on arriving at their destination he got a washing-tub and plunged hands and feet πυγμῇ into ice-cold water. Whereupon an elderly lady of the party rebuked him for self-indulgence in so pampering himself in his youth: she herself, though in the sixtieth year of her age, never washed anything ἐκτὸς τῶν ἄκρων τῶν χειρῶν. Since χείρ in Greek means properly the forearm, τὰ ἄκρα τῶν χειρῶν may mean 'the fingers' or even as much as 'the hands' in the modern sense of the word, but not more: and in contrast with this, Jovinus' washing must clearly have been 'up to the elbow'. That gives excellent sense also to the passage in Mark, and justifies the exegesis of Euthymius and Theophylact."

Compare:

- S.M. Reynolds "PYGMI (Mk 7.3) as 'Cupped Hand' ", JBL 85 (1966) 87-88
- M. Hengel "Mc 7.3 πυγμῇ: Die Geschichte einer exegetischen Aporie und der Versuch ihrer Lösung" ZNW 60 (1969) 182-98
- W.D. Hardy "Mark 7.3: A Reference to the Old Testament?" ExpTim 87 (1975-76) 119
- J.M. Ross "With the Fist" ExpTim 87 (1975-76) 374-75
- T.C. Skeat "A note on πυγμῇ in Mk 7.3" JTS 41 (1990) 525-27
- James G. Crossley "Halakah and Mark 7.3: 'with the hand in the shape of a fist" NTS 58 (2012) 57-68

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 146

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:4 καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν,

ὅταν ἔλθωσιν D, W, pc, it(all!), vg^{mss}, arm

cum venerint

Lacuna: C

B: umlaut! (p. 1287 B, line 6) καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ

No parallel.

Probably an addition to improve the condensed style. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 147
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:4 καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ **βαπτίσωνται** οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινῶν]-

T&T #92

ῥαντίσωνται 01, B, pc[55], sa, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Bal

WH have βαπτίσωνται in the margin. Tis reads txt.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ῥαντίζω "sprinkle"; middle "wash oneself"

Compare:
NA28 Luke 11:38 ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.
"The Pharisee was amazed to see that he did not first wash before dinner."

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
BYZ Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων· καὶ ἀλλὰ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

Rare word (in the NT only 4 times, in Heb), but it fits better than the more general βαπτίζω.
The letters of the two words are so extremely similar, that it is probable that one was an early scribal error. This is supported by the fact that 55 Byzantine minuscules show this change too.

ΡΑΝΤΙ
ΒΑΠΤΙ

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 49) thinks that βαπτίσωνται is a conformation to the following βαπτισμοὺς.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 356) notes that βαπτίζω in the NT is always used for the Christian baptism, except for Lk 11:38. Therefore it would be difficult to imagine that scribes would change ῥαντίζω, which fits perfectly, into

βαπτίζω. Perhaps scribes changed βαπτίσωνται to avoid a possible tautology with νίψωνται, verse 3.
The Byzantine text adds the words once more in Mk 7:8.
See also next variant and cited article.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 148

70. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:4 καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων **[καὶ κλινῶν]**

BYZ Mark 7:4 καὶ ἀπό ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων **καὶ κλινῶν**

T&T #93

omit: P45^{vid}, 01, B, L, Δ, 28*, 1342, pc^{3}, (Sy-S), sa^{ms}, bo, WH, **NA^{25}**
Sy-S also omits καὶ χαλκίων
pc = 440, 1053, 2200

txt A, D, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, goth, Or

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

The word could have been omitted either due to h.t. (WN - WN, so Weiss) or deliberately because it seemed inappropriate to wash beds. On the other hand it could have been added inspired by the purity laws of Lev 15.

Early rabbinic material, such as *m. Miq. 7.7* and *m. Kel. 19.1* actually mentions the immersion of beds. It thus seems to be a genuine Jewish tradition.

Crossley did a word study on κλίνη and concludes that it should be translated as "dining couch" here:

> "Mk 7:4 is a remarkably accurate representation of what was a contemporary Jewish practice described later in the Mishnah. [...] I would suggest that as immersing couches was more unusual for Gentile Christians this may account for why it is missing from a number of important manuscripts. Other Jewish practices caused problems in the textual traditions in the immediate narrative context, notably πυγμῇ in 7.3 where a variant πυκνά ('often') is clearly an attempt to deal with a tricky word. βαπτίσωνται in 7.4 would also have been alien to many Gentile readers whereas the variant ῥαντίσωνται looks like an alteration by a writer removed from Jewish practices."

Compare:
J.G. Crossley "Halakah and Mark 7.4: '... and beds' " JSNT 25 (2003) 433-47

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 149

NA28 Mark 7:5 καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς· διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ **κοιναῖς** χερσὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

BYZ Mark 7:5
ἔπειτα ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου οὐ περιπατοῦσιν κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀλλὰ **ἀνίπτοις** χερσὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον

Byz 01^{C2}, A, L, X, Δ, 892, Maj, it(aur, b, c, f, ff^{2}, l), Sy, goth

txt 01*, B, (D, W), Θ, f1, 33, (565), 579, 700, 1342, 2542, pc,
Lat(d, i, q, r^{1}, vg), Co
κοιναῖς ταῖς χερσὶν D, W, 565

κοιναῖς χερσὶν **καὶ ἀνίπτοις** P45, f13(omit καὶ)

immundis ("dirty") a

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι
κοιναῖς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους

NA28 Matthew 15:2 διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.
NA28 Matthew 15:20 ταῦτά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

The reading of P45, f13 is clearly a conflation. κοιναῖς χερσὶν is probably the more unknown term, because there was already a need to explain it in verse 2.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 150

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:6 οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με **τιμᾷ,** ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ·

ἀγαπᾷ D, W, a, b, c, Cl?, Tert?
diligit

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Quote from Isaiah:

LXX Isaiah 29:13 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσίν με ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 22:37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου·

Metzger suggests, that it may be "an otherwise lost variant reading of the Septuagint text."

Weiss (Mk Com.) suggests a reminiscence of Mt 22:37.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 151

71. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

BYZ Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων· καὶ ἀλλὰ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

T&T #94

add after ἀνθρώπων: A, X, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, l, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, [Trg]
A: omits ἀλλὰ.

add before ἀφέντες: D, Θ, 0131^{vid}, 28, 565, 1071, it
Θ, 565: ... ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν ...

βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων 1342 (:: 7:4)
omitting καὶ ἀλλὰ ... ποιεῖτε.

sine add: P45, 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 22, pc^{14},
Co, arm, geo, Diatess^{Arab}
pc = 17*, 26, 29, 34, 251, 660*, 697, 791, 924, 1005, 1210, 1278, 1365, 2372

omit verse 8: Sy-S (probably h.t. ἀνθρώπων - ἀνθρώπων)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Diatessaron: The verse is not commented upon in Ephrem's commentary, but it is in the Arabic Diatessaron. Here it comes without the addition. This is certain, because after verse 8, verse 9 is given (ch. 20):

8. Relinquentes enim mandatum Dei, tenetis traditionem hominum.
9. Bene facitis, delinquentes in praeceptum Dei, ut traditionem vestram servetis?

Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:4 αἰ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινῶν]
NA28 Mark 7:13 ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ᾗ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.
W omits at verse 13 too.

Addition at different places is a strong indication for a secondary origin. Weiss (Mk Com.) suggests that it has been added, because the βαπτισμοὺς from verse 4 has not been mentioned in the following.
On the other hand the words could have been omitted because it sounds a bit awkward to come back to pots and cups with the general statements before and after.

A conformation to context as a combination from two different verses (4 and 13) is strange.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 152

72. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 7:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ , ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν **στήσητε.**

BYZ Mark 7:9 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν **τηρήσητε.**

T&T #95

Byz 01, A, (B), L, X, Δ, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, aur, l, vg, Sy-H, Co, goth, WH, **NA**[25], Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
τηρῆτε B, pc[4](= 294, 519, 571, 1432)

txt D, W, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 2542, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Cyp, Bois

κρατήσητε 0211, pc[3] (from context)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἀθετεῖτε indicative present active 2nd person plural
ἀθετέω "reject, refuse, ignore; make invalid, set aside; break"
τηρήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural
τηρῆτε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
τηρέω "keep"
στήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural
ἵστημι "establish"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 15:3 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· διὰ τί καὶ ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε (break, disobey) τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν;

NA28 Matthew 15:6 καὶ ἠκυρώσατε (cancel, disregard) τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν.

NA28 Matthew 19:17 τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς.

NA28 John 15:10
ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου,

Context:
NA28 Mark 7:3 κρατοῦντες (hold) τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,
NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες (abandon) τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε (hold) τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
NA28 Mark 7:13 ἀκυροῦντες (cancel, disregard) τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ᾗ παρεδώκατε (deliver, hand down)·

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the στήσητε is reminiscence of Rom 3:31 and Rom 10:3. Compare:
NA28 Romans 3:31 νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον <u>ἱστάνομεν.</u>
NA28 Romans 10:3 ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν [δικαιοσύνην] ζητοῦντες <u>στῆσαι,</u>

Compare also:
LXX Exodus 6:4 καὶ ἔστησα τὴν διαθήκην μου πρὸς αὐτοὺς

στήσητε fits better in the context: "you put away the command of God so that you can establish your (own) tradition." On the other hand "tradition" can only be kept and not set up.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 366) notes that τηρέω is the normal word that is used with ἐντολή (13 times in the NT). But here τηρέω refers to παράδοσιν and not to ἐντολή. Greeven thinks that it is possible that τηρέω has been changed because it normally refers to following the true law. Also, the sin was not the keeping of the tradition, but already its establishment.
Metzger: "It is most difficult to decide whether scribes deliberately substituted στήσητε ("establish") for τηρήσητε ("keep"), as being the more appropriate verb in the context, or whether, through inadvertence in copying and perhaps influenced subconsciously by the preceding phrase τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, they replaced στήσητε with τηρήσητε. The Committee judged that, on the whole, the latter possibility was slightly more probable."
Vogels (TC, p. 179) saw in στήσητε a Tatianism and an intensification of an already present "antijewish polemic" in the text.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 153
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:13 ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν __ᾗ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

T&T #96

__τῇ μωρᾷ__ D, it, vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}
stultam
= "the foolish"

Lat(aur, f, l, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

No parallels. Obvious gloss.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 154
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:13 ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ᾗ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

omit: W

omit τοιαῦτα: Δ, 983, 1689(=f13^{c})

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut p. 1287 C 14 R
(It is not clear though if the umlaut really indicates this variant. The umlaut indicates the line: ποιεῖτε. 14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος)

No parallels.
Compare:
NA28 Matthew 15:6-7 καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. 7 ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἠσαΐας λέγων·

Compare verse 8:
NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
BYZ Mark 7:8 ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων· καὶ ἄλλὰ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.
txt P45, 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 22, pc^{18}

Omitted probably because this addition is not really needed. Note that W does not have the words in Mk 7:8, too.
Mt omits them also.
It's also possible that it's an omission due to parablepsis:
13 παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ
ποιεῖτε. 14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 155

NA28 Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος **πάλιν** τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε.

BYZ Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος **πάντα** τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Ἀκούετέ μου πάντες καὶ συνίετε

Byz A, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 700, Maj, f, Sy, sa^{mss}, goth
txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, 892, 1342, Lat, Sy-H^{mg}, sa^{ms}, bo

omit: 565, 579, pc, c, sa^{mss}, bo^{mss}

Swanson has wrongly 579 for Byz against NA and Schmidtke! K. Witte from Muenster confirms that NA is right. 579 has a strange "scribble" for ὄχλον, perhaps a scribal error of some kind.

Lacuna: P45, C
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:10 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος _____ τὸν ὄχλον εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:56 καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγρούς, ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ ἐσῴζοντο.
"And wherever he went, into villages or cities or farms, they laid the sick in the marketplaces, and begged him that they might touch even the fringe of his cloak; and all who touched it were healed."

πάλιν has probably been changed, because it is not clear to what it refers. No ὄχλον has been mentioned specifically for quite some while. Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks it refers back to 6:56.

It is also possible that πάντα was some kind of confusion or conformation to immediate context, πάντες later in the same verse.

πάλιν is typical for Mark:

Mt	17	=	1.6% (relative, per verse)
Mk	28		4.1%
Lk	3		0.2%
Jo	45		5.1%

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 156
NA28 Mark 7:16

BYZ Mark 7:16 Εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.

T&T #97

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ^{c}, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}, goth, Gre, Bois, [Trg]

txt 01, B, L, Δ*, 0274, 28, 1342, 2786, pc^{9}, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}, $Lect^{pt}$
pc = 30, 274, 512, 669, 1013, 1662, 2474, 2508, 2532

Δ: (p. 159) The words have been added later in a different ink, but possibly by the same scribe.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

First it should be noted that this sentence was widely used as concluding remark after reading the Gospel lection. It has thus often been added at the end of a pericope in the lectionaries.

This sentence appears safe at:
Mt 11:15; 13:9, 13:43; Mk 4:9, 4:23; Lk 8:8; 14:35
579 has this addition at Lk 8:15 (with many), 12:21 (with many), 15:10 (with Θ^{c}), 16:18 (alone) and 18:8 (alone)! The addition also appears at Mt 13:23, Mt 25:30, Lk 21:4.

NA28 Matthew 11:15 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.
BYZ Matthew 11:15 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω
NA28 Matthew 13:9 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.
BYZ Matthew 13:9 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω
NA28 Matthew 13:43 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.
BYZ Matthew 13:43 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω

NA28 Mark 4:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.
NA28 Mark 4:23 εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

NA28 Luke 8:8 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.
NA28 Luke 14:35 ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

There is no reason why it should have been omitted. The wording of the verse is identical with 4:23 and has probably been derived from there.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 370) thinks that the words have been omitted as a harmonization to Mt, where the words also do not appear (after Mt 15:11). Compare:

NA28 Matthew 15:11-12	NA28 Mark 7:15-17
οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
	16 Εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.
12 Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν;	17 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

Overall, a harmonization by omission like this is not very probable though.
The support from a number of Byzantine minuscules for the omission is curious and points to a secondary omission. Greeven also suggests that the words might have been omitted because they interrupt the narrative. A better insertion point would have been after 7:23.
But note that the lection in the Synaxarion runs from 7:5-16 (Tue, 16th week after Pentecost). But the next day (Wed) the lection runs from 7:14-23. Teunis van Lopik notes that here vs. 16 is omitted (cp. "Licht uit het Byzantijnse Oosten: liturgische invloed" in: Heimwee naar de Middeleeuwen, E. de Bijll Nachenius et al., Leiden, 1989, p. 62, note 2).

This sentence might be worth a little study.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 157

NA28 Mark 7:19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα;

BYZ Mark 7:19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα

Byz 33, 157, 700, 1582^{c}, 2542, Maj-part(K, Π, M, U, V, Y, Γ, Φ, Σ)

txt 01, A, B, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, 0274, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj-part(E, F, G, H, S), Co, Or, Chr, GrNy

καθαρίζει D, (i, r^{1}, arm, geo = et purgat)
καθαρίζεται 1047, Sy-S

Note also: … πάντα τὰ σώματα 0274^{c} (see comment below)

The Latins (it, vg) read: purgans omnes escas which can come from either reading.

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

txt "since it enters, not the heart but the stomach, and goes out into the sewer?" - **Thus he declared all foods clean.**

Byz "since it enters, not the heart but the stomach, and goes out into the sewer, **cleaning all the food."**

καθαρίζων participle present active nominative masculine singular
καθαρίζον participle present active nominative neuter singular

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:17 οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται;

Compare:
NA28 Acts 10:15 καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν· ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου.

Origen: καὶ μάλιστα επεὶ κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἔλεγεν ταῦτα ὁ Σωτήρ, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα; (Comm. Mk 11.12)
"and especially when, according to Mark, the Savior said these things 'making all meats clean."

Chrysostom: Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος φησίν, ὅτι καθαρίζων τὰ βρώματα;
(homilies on Mt)

καθαρίζων could

a) be an anacoluthon … (= "Thus he declared all foods clean") as an addition by Mark. It is not spoken by Jesus anymore. This is slightly difficult to understand, but it makes sense. Problematic in this case is that it refers back to a subject (Jesus) which appears not in the immediate context. The nearest possibility is καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς from verse 18, which is 35 words away. Burgon wrote, that with this interpretation "the passage would have absolutely no parallel in the simple and transparent sentences of St. Mark." In the parallel Matthew omits this phrase.
b) refer to the masculine τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα: "and goes out into the sewer, (which) cleans all foods." But this is also very difficult to understand.
c) Albert Pietersma suggests (BGreek, 1st Nov. 2009): Since ANQRWPOS is clearly the thematic subject of the passage, might ANQRWPOS therefore account for the masculine participle? It is thus ANQWRWPOS, or rather his digestive process that "purifies," i.e., separates the waste from the nutrients.
To be sure, the comment is an aside (an editorial comment on Jesus' words), and not strictly a propos the contrast between what goes into the KOILIA in distinction from what comes out of the KARDIA. Yet, without the aside, might the text be read to suggest that what a person eats simply enters the mouth, passes through the bowels, and is then excreted? Surely the ancients knew better than that!
One might thus gloss KAQARIZWN PANTA TA BRWMATA as:
"… seeing that he (ANQRWPOS) purifies (purges?) all foodstuffs."

The neuter καθαρίζον is even more difficult. It is not clear to what it refers, the only grammatical possibility is πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον, but this makes no sense. Carl Conrad (BGreek, 31st Oct. 2009):
"Neuter nominative plural construing with a finite singular verb is one thing, but neuter plural noun construing with a neuter singular participle is hardly conceivable, a solecism of the first order (cf. BDF § 136)."

Is it possible that the intended meaning of καθαρίζον is that it refers to the whole process described by Jesus? "It (= this process) makes all foods clean" (see Caragounis below). On this Carl Conrad commented (7th Nov. 2003):
"The neuter participle cannot be used independently (accusative absolute) except with impersonal verbs; the accusative absolute, although not uncommon in classical Attic, is exceedingly rare in NT Koine. The neuter participle must agree with an implicit or explicit substantive or itself be used as a substantive."

"I've never been able to understand how the TR or MT reading can make sense of KAQARIZON in Mk 7:19; while KAQARIZWN is difficult enough to construe with Jesus as implicit subject of LEGEI AUTOIS, KAQARIZON simply cannot construe by any known syntactical rule with its context. I suppose that it's been interpreted as having the meaning you suggest and as being another instance of Mark's supposed incompetence in Greek."

The meaning of καθαρίζω could be: "cleanse", but also "make clean, purify", and also "declare ritually acceptable" giving possible translations:

- "(It) cleanses all foods."
- "(It) makes clean all foods."
- "(It) declares all foods clean."
- "Thus he declared all foods clean."

Against the understanding of καθαρίζων as referring to Jesus A. Pietersma notes that the next verse 20 begins with ἔλεγεν δὲ:
NA28 Mark 7:20 ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖ νο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

> "What strikes me as worthy of note, however, is that v. 20 reads ELEGEN DE. While after the author's comment (KAQARIZWN PANTA TA BRWMATA) one expects the verb of speaking to be restated, the use DE seems surprising if KAQARIZWN refers to Jesus. For in that case the grammatical subject in v.20 is the same as in v. 19, and the topic continues, seemingly without a shift in focus. For comparison see e.g., 7:9."

Note the Sy-S interpretation: "and goes out into the sewer and all foods are cleansed." This presupposes the passive καθαρίζεται.
But P. Williams comments:

> "For *txt's* καθαρίζων UBS4 reconstructs a Greek variant καὶ καθαρίζεται for which *S* stands as a lone witness. NA27 cites ms 1047 and *S* together as supporting just καθαρίζεται. Irrespective of whether *S*'s participle ܡܬܕܟܝܢ supports the present passive καθαρίζεται, the *waw* is obligatory to coordinate the participle with the previous action. It cannot therefore be used to support καί. Manuscript 1047, from the twelfth or thirteenth century, lacks καί. Syntactically 1047 probably reads καθαρίζεται πάντα τὰ βρώματα as a distinct sentence, which is quite different from *S*, where the equivalent phrase functions more as an apodosis. It is therefore rather likely that the agreement between 1047 and *S* results from independent forces."
>
> P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 154-55.

The intended meaning of the Sy-S (and D) reading is thus about the same as that of καθαρίζον.

Chrys Caragounis (Development of Greek , 2004, p. 538-41) writes:
"On the other hand, the alternative reading καθαρίζον would constitute the last of a long line of verbal forms (εἰσπορευόμενον, δύναται, κοινῶσαι, οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται, ἐκπορεύεται) that have πᾶν τὸ as their subject. In this case, the meaning would be: 'whatever enters into a man from outside cannot defile him, since it does not enter his heart, but his stomach, and goes out to the latrine purging all foods.' This way of construing καθαρίζον is syntactically unexceptionable. This seems to be the understanding of the other alternatives (D, it, Sy-S) mentioned above. The expression πᾶν τὸ refers to the imagined uncleanness that one receives when eating with unwashed hands. ... The exit of the waste from the body was understood in antiquity as a cleansing or a purging. It must be pointed out that precisely the verb καθαίρω/καθαρίζω along with a number of other words derived from the same stem, were used in ancient medicine of the purging of the stomach (κοιλία). ... The language used here would, consequently, be a natural way of expressing the view that whatever unclean had entered into a man also came out together with the other foods, and thus the κοιλία was purged of them all. ... But precisely because this reading gives good sense it may have been a deliberate correction (though not necessarily) for the difficult reading of the masculine participle. On the other hand, the masculine participle may have been an unconscious mistake caused by the identical pronunciation of the two words. Once this reading came into the manuscripts, a sense for it was sought, and was found by joining it to λέγει αὐτοῖς. Thus, while intentional change to make better sense cannot be ruled out – in which case καθαρίζων would be the correct reading – also the possibility of unintentional change should be entertained, in which case καθαρίζον would be the original reading. All things considered, the present state of the (especially external) evidence renders the chosen reading the better alternative, albeit not thoroughly satisfactory."

Regarding the reading of 0274^{c} (5th CE) καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ <u>σώματα:</u>
Plumley writes:
"The erasing of the original letters βρ was skillfully carried out, for a careful examination of the surface of the parchment revealed to the eye no traces whatsoever of either β or ρ. It is impossible to state if the text was worked over before it was brought to Nubia or afterwards. If the alteration had been effected before its arrival in Nubia, it might have been a highly individual attempt to solve the problem which this verse has always raised for commentators. If, however, the alteration was made in Nubia, the reason might have been on the grounds of vocabulary if the word had acquired there as a loan word the meaning, as in Modern Greek, of 'filth, ordure'. Against this explanation is the fact that in papyri of the Byzantine period βρώματα

invariably means 'foods' or 'feeding stuff'. Coptic, the version closest geographically to Nubia, renders the word in common with all other versions by 'food'."
Roberts writes: "The Ⲥ of σώματα occupying the space of two letters has been written over an erasure; no doubt βρώματα."

Compare:
JM Plumley and CH Roberts "An Uncial text of St. Mark in Greek from Nubia" JTS 27 (1976) 34-45, with 2 plates

Overall, I think it is correct what Iver Larsen wrote (BGreek, 1st Nov. 2009):
"The reading [καθαρίζον] does not give good sense. It is unlikely to be a deliberate correction, but rather a careless mistake by a copyist who couldn't see the forest (καὶ λέγει) for the trees (the embeded discourse from οὕτως to ἐκπορεύεται)."
καθαρίζον arose from (a) indistinguishable sound and/or (b) plausibility of the reading in the immediate context of the words of v. 18, 19.
καθαρίζων therefore has to be understood as a comment by the evangelist. Note again that Mt leaves it out.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 158
NA28 Mark 7:24+7:31 Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου.

BYZ Mark 7:24 καὶ Ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ μεθόρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.

T&T #98 (7:31)

7:24:
Byz 01, A, B, X, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth, WH, Trg, Bal
τὰ ὅρια 01, B, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc
τὰ μεθόρια A, K, Π, N, 124, 157, 1071, 1424, Maj

txt D, L, W, Δ, Θ, 28, 565,
it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, i, n, r^{1}), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Or, WH^{mg}, **NA^{25}**, Tis

Tregelles has καὶ Σιδῶνος additionally in brackets in the margin.
Or: Mt Comm. tom. 11:16
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

This reading must be taken together with verse 31:
NA28 Mark 7:31 Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως
BYZ Mark 7:31 Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος ἦλθεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως

T&T #98

Byz P45, A, W, 0131, 0211, f1, f13, 28, Maj, q, Sy, sa^{mss}, goth,

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1342,
Lat, sa^{mss}, bo, WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg, Tis, Bal
Τύρου ἦλθεν εἰς 579
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 11:21 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι
NA28 Matthew 15:21 εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.
NA28 Mark 3:8 καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα
NA28 Luke 6:17 καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος,
NA28 Luke 10:13 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι
NA28 Luke 10:14 πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι

Verse 24:
There is no reason why Sidon should have been omitted. "Tyre and Sidon" appears in combination at several points in the Gospels so it is likely that Sidon had been added. The parallel Mt 15:21 also has it. It is interesting how many good witnesses (01, B!) adopt the Byzantine reading here.
τό μεθόριον "boundary, border, frontier"; plural, "of the outer areas of any land or city, region, vicinity". This word occurs only here in the NT (and only once in the LXX (Jos 19:27). The meanings of ὅριον and μεθόριον are the same. Possibly colloquial variation.

Verse 31:
The txt reading is clearly the more difficult one. Sidon lies north of Tyre and it is strange to go from Tyre "through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee". Swete suggests that the Byzantine reading "avoids the reference to the Lord's passage through a Gentile city".

The Byzantine text reads in both verses Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, which is smooth and straightforward.

<u>7:24</u>
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

<u>7:31</u>
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 159

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:24 Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι,
καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη λαθεῖν·

ἠδυνάσθη 01, B, WH, **NA**[25], Gre, Tis, Bal

txt ἠδυνήθη A, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Weiss

ἠδύνατο 565, pc (Mk 6:19)

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

ἠδυνήθη	indicative aorist	passive 3rd person singular
ἠδυνάσθη	indicative aorist	passive 3rd person singular
ἠδύνατο	indicative imperfect middle	3rd person singular

Compare:

NA28 Mark 6:19 ἡ δὲ Ἡρῳδιὰς ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο·

The words are not in the parallel.

Both forms are possible and both appear only here in the NT. In the LXX ἠδυνήθη appears 3 times and ἠδυνάσθη 5 times.

Weiss notes that ἠδυνάσθη is the more rare Ionic form.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 160

73. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 7:28 ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· **κύριε· καὶ** τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων.

BYZ Mark 7:28 ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ **Ναὶ, κύριε καὶ γὰρ** τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων

Ναὶ, κύριε καὶ γὰρ	A, K, Π, L, X, f1, 124, 346(=f13), 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(a, aur, f, l, n, q, vg), Sy-H, goth
Ναὶ, κύριε καὶ	01, B, H, Δ, 0274?, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Sy-P, Co, WH, **NA**[25], Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
κύριε καὶ	P45, W, Θ, f13, 565, 700, Sy-S, Bois
κύριε ἀλλὰ καὶ	D, it("sed" b, c, d, ff[2], i), WH[mg]

0274: has a lacuna, but space considerations prefer the 01, B reading (see Plumley, Roberts JTS).
Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (p. 1288 A, line 41) λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε· καὶ

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:27 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· ναὶ κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.
omit γὰρ: B

One of the very few cases where a pure Caesarean reading is adopted by NA!
The Ναὶ readings are probably harmonizations to Mt, where Ναὶ is safe. Note that this is the only Ναὶ in Mk, whereas it appears 8 times in Mt and 4 times in Lk.
The Ναὶ and the καὶ γὰρ appear not really appropriate here.

He said to her, "Let the children be fed first, for it is not good to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs." But she answered him, **"Yes, Sir, for even** the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs."

On would expect here a protest,

either: κύριε καὶ	**"Sir, even**
or: κύριε ἀλλὰ καὶ	**"Sir, but even**
or: Ναὶ κύριε, τὰ δὲ	**"Yes Sir, but**

The third is not recorded, but the first two exist and they could be attempts to avoid the rather inappropriate "Yes, Sir, for even". Interestingly it has not been changed in Mt.
So, perhaps the 01, B reading is original. The Byzantine reading is a harmonization to Mt and the D and P45 readings are stylistic improvements. The versional evidence is probably not very reliable.

C.H. Turner notes (Marcan Usage) that Mark nowhere else uses Ναὶ (Mt: 8 times, Lk/Acts 6 times) and suggests that it is coming from Mt here.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong) = prefer the 01, B reading
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 161
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:33 καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ᾽ ἰδίαν
ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ
καὶ πτύσας ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ,
"and he put his fingers into his ears and spitting he touched his tongue."

Not in NA but in SQE!
T&T #99

πτύω "spit"
ἅπτω "touch"

0131 (old = W^d, 9th CE), $Diatess^{Arab}$:
ἔπτυσεν εἰς τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ κωφοῦ
καὶ ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ μογιλάλου
"and he spat into his fingers and put them into the ears of the deaf and touched the tongue of the *hardly-able-to-talk*."

D, (Θ, 565), it:
πτύσας ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ,
Θ, 565 have:
ἔβαλεν πτύσας ...-
"and spitting he put his fingers into his ears and touched his tongue."

(W), f13, 28, 2542, pc^3, Sy-S:
ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ,
"and he put his fingers, spitting into his ears and touched his tongue."

124:
ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ
ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ πτύσας

... ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς/manus αὐτοῦ ... Δ (from Mt 8:15)

omit first αὐτοῦ: 01, L, W, 892

Lacuna: C

B: umlaut! (p. 1288 B, line 26) for the words: **δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς**
At the next line a spot of unknown origin is visible in the left margin, below the umlaut. Could be a letter or some other sign.

Diatessaron: Unfortunately the story is not covered by Ephrem. The Arabic Diatessaron reads (Ciasca):
Et expuens super digitos suos, misit in auriculas eius, et tetigit linguam eius.

Compare verse 32:
NA28 Mark 7:32 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ <u>μογιλάλον</u>

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:23 καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης <u>καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα αὐτοῦ</u>, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· εἴ τι βλέπεις;
and having spit on his eyes, having put *his* hands on him, he asked him, "Can you see anything?"

NA28 John 9:6 ταῦτα εἰπὼν <u>ἔπτυσεν</u> χαμαὶ (on the ground) καὶ ἐποίησεν πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος καὶ ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
"When he had said this, he spat on the ground and made mud with the saliva and spread the mud on the man's eyes."

This is the reading that made 0131 kind of famous because it is unique.
The main question is where Jesus is spitting. The txt reading is very condensed and difficult to understand. So 0131 expanded the sentence to make it better intelligible. D and W et al. changed the position of πτύσας for that reason.
The omission of the first αὐτοῦ has probably a stylistic reason. It refers to Jesus, whereas the following two αὐτοῦ refer to the deaf man.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 162

74. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:35 καὶ **[εὐθέως]** ἠνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί, καὶ__ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς.

omit 1: 01, B, D, L, Δ, 0131, 0274, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, it(a, b, d, ff^2, i, q, r^1), sa^{mss}, bo, WH, **NA^{25}**, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

add 1: = txt P45, A, K, Π, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy, sa^{mss}, arm, geo, goth, Trg^{mg} (all read εὐθέως, no εὐθὺς appears !)

T&T #100 (add 2)

add 2:

...καὶ **εὐθὺς** ἐλύθη ...	01, Δ, 69, 2786, **NA^{25}**, Bois, Weiss, Tis
...καὶ **εὐθέως** ἐλύθη ...	L, 0274, 892, 1342
...καὶ **τοῦ μογιλάλου** ἐλύθη ...	0131

➔ omit completely: B, D, 33, 579, pc, it, bo, WH, Gre, Trg, Bal, SBL

There is a discrepancy here regarding εὐθὺς/εὐθέως at pos. 2:

	T&T	Gre	Swanson	NA
εὐθὺς	01, L, Δ, 69, 2786	01, Δ, 1342	01, Δ	01, Δ
εὐθέως	0274, 892, 1342	L, 0274, 892	L	L, 0274, 892

1342 reads εὐθέως, Swanson is in error (checked from the film).
L also reads εὐθέως (checked at the BnF image).

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:31 καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.
εὐθέως D
NA28 Mark 2:12 καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον
omit: W, Θ, 1342
NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ .
εὐθέως D
safe:
NA28 Mark 1:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα,
NA28 Mark 5:29 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς
NA28 Mark 5:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει·
NA28 Mark 10:52 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

εὐθέως appears only here in Mk, he normally uses the form εὐθὺς which appears 41 times in Mk. So, εὐθέως as such appears to be secondary. It is noteworthy that some witnesses who omitted the word at the beginning, inserted εὐθὺς or εὐθέως later in the verse. This is an indication that it is probably not original, but a natural addition.

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the εὐθὺς fell out accidentally before ἐλύθη.

Other examples of εὐθὺς variants: Mk 1:28 and 5:42.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
better omit εὐθέως

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)
if εὐθὺς should be retained, the addition at pos. 2 has stronger support externally.

TVU 163

75. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 7:37 καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες· καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν, καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ [τοὺς] ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

omit:	W, 28, Sy-S
ἀλάλους	01, B, L, Δ, 33, 892, 1241, WH, **NA**[25], Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
τοὺς ἀλάλους	A, D, X, Θ, 0131, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Co

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 15:31 ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι βλέποντας κωφοὺς λαλοῦντας, κυλλοὺς ὑγιεῖς καὶ χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας·

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 11:5 τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται·

NA28 Matthew 12:22 Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν.

NA28 Luke 7:22 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται·

NA28 Luke 11:14 Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον [καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν] κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφὸς καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.

NA28 Mark 7:32 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα.

NA28 Mark 9:17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου· διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντα <u>πνεῦμα ἄλαλον</u>·
<u>omit ἄλαλον:</u> Sy-S

NA28 Mark 9:25 ἰδὼν ... λέγων αὐτῷ· <u>τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα</u>, ...

LXX Isaiah 35:5 τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν καὶ ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται

The meaning of κωφός is quite broad. It can mean "dumb, mute; deaf". Mark seems to separate the two meanings "deaf" and "mute". For him κωφός means "deaf" and ἄλαλος "mute". Mt and Lk do not separate this. For some scribes, therefore, ἀλάλους might have been considered redundant. It's also possible that the complete omission is stimulated by Mt 12:22.
ἄλαλος is a word that is used in the NT by Mk only (9:17, 25). Note that Sy-S omits ἄλαλος in Mk 7:17, too.

Regarding the addition or omission of τοὺς, arguments for both can be given: The omission could be a stylistic improvement, the nouns are connected with καὶ, so the article can be taken for both, especially since the words refer to one person only, in this context.
The addition could be a conformation to immediate context to make the saying more symmetrical (so already Weiss). Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 393) notes that the words can be taken as not to refer to one person, but to several (as a generalization) and therefore the article has been added.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok?)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong) remove τοὺς
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 164

76. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις **πάλιν πολλοῦ** ὄχλου ὄντος

BYZ Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, **παμπόλλου** ὄχλου ὄντος,

No txt in NA and SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, X, Γ, 0131, 118, 2, 22, (157), 700, Maj, q, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, bo^{mss}
πανπόλου X, 157

txt 01, B, D, G, L, M, N, W, Δ, Θ, Σ, Φ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, al, Lat, Sy-S, Co, arm, geo

πάλιν παμπόλλου 124, 472, pc

Swanson has 565 twice, once for txt and once for πάλιν παμπόλλου. Tischendorf and Legg have 565 for txt. Perhaps Swanson wanted to note 124 instead?
Lacuna: P45, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:34 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον
NA28 Mark 12:37 Καὶ [ὁ] πολὺς ὄχλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

πάμπολυς "vast, very great"

The word πάμπολυς appears only here in the Greek Bible and only as a variant. It is possible that the unusual word has been changed, either accidentally or deliberately. Interestingly though, no simple πολλοῦ (without πάλιν) occurs.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 165

77. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν,
προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς **μαθητὰς** λέγει αὐτοῖς·

BYZ Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος, καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν,
προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς **μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ** λέγει αὐτοῖς,

txt	omit **αὐτοῦ**	01, D, L, N, Δ, Σ, Φ, 0131, 0211, f1, 28, 892, 2680, L2211, pc, WH, **NA**[25], Gre, WH, Trg, Tis, Bal
Byz	add **αὐτοῦ**	A, B, W, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, 2766, Maj, Weiss

Δ: reads τοὺς **μαθητὰς πάλιν** λέγει αὐτοῖς·
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare discussion at Mk 6:41!

Rating: 1? (= NA probably wrong)

TVU 166

NA28 Mark 8:3 καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· καί τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν **ἥκασιν.**

BYZ Mark 8:3 καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· τινες γὰρ αὐτῶν μακρόθεν **ἥκουσιν**

Byz **ἥκουσιν** K, Π, X, 0131, f13, 157, Maj

txt **ἥκασιν** 01, A, D, N, W, Θ, Σ, Φ, f1, 69, 124(=f13), 28, 33, 372, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2542, 2680, 2737, 2766, al, sa, goth

omit: 346(=f13)
εἰσιν B, L, Δ, 0274, 892, sa^{mss}, bo, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Bal

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἥκω "have come, be present; come"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:32 καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

Compare:
1 Clement 12:2 ἐκπεμφθέντων γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ τοῦ Ναυὴ κατασκόπων εἰς τὴν Ἰεριχώ, ἔγνω ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς γῆς, ὅτι **ἥκασιν** κατασκοπεῦσαι τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξέπεμψεν ἄνδρας τοὺς συλλημψομένους αὐτούς, ὅπως συλλημφθέντες θανατωθῶσιν.
For when spies were sent by Joshua, the son of Nun, to Jericho, the king of the country ascertained that they **had come** to spy out their land, and sent men to seize them, in order that, when taken, they might be put to death.

ἥκουσιν and ἥκασιν are both derived from ἥκω. Even though the basic meaning is already perfect, perfect endings are sometimes, as in this case, used. Both verb forms appear only here in the NT. But it appears in 1. Clement. Mk used it nowhere else. Mt used it 4 times, Lk 5 times (always safe). In the NT it appears 26 times.

It is possible that εἰσιν from B, L et al. has been inserted to avoid the rare form ἥκασιν. But the word appears 20 times in the LXX, always as ἥκασιν. No ἥκουσιν is found. ἥκουσιν is here clearly a secondary grammatical correction.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 47) thinks that ἥκασιν is a more precise term which replaced the colorless εἰσιν. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 396), too, notes the colorless εἰσιν as one of the peculiarities of Mark (cf. 6:3, 10:43, 14:67).
To the contrary C.H. Turner considers εἰσιν a correction by Alexandrian grammarians ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Mt omits the complete phrase καί τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἥκασιν.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 167

78. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 8:7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα·
καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν **καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι.**

BYZ Mark 8:7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα·
καὶ εὐλογήσας ____ εἶπεν **παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτὰ**

cp. ECM-Parallels!

παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτὰ	A, X, f13, Maj, goth
παραθεῖναι αὐτὰ	V, 22, 157, 346, 1071, pc, Sy-H, arm
παραθεῖναι καὶ ταῦτα	Φ_
παρατιθέναι αὐτὰ αὐτοῖς	sa_
παρατιθέναι τῷ ὄχλῳ	M^{c}, 713

παραθεῖναι	W, Θ, 0131, f1, 28, 565, 2542, pc, Sy-P, Gre
παραθεῖναι αὐτοῖς	N, Σ, vg^{mss}, Sy-S
παρατιθέναι	124, Lat (et iussit adponi)
παρεθηκεν	01* (and omit εἶπεν)

καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι	01^{c1}, B, L, Δ, 372, 892, 2786, pc, q, bo(adds αὐτοῖς), Sy-Pal
καὶ αὐτὰ παραθεῖναι	700 (checked at the film)

καὶ ταῦτα παράθετε	C, 1342, pc, bo^{ms}
καὶ αὐτὰ παράθετε	33, 579, pc

καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν	καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσεν παρατιθέναι	D
et gratias agens dixit	et ipsos iussit adponi	d

The Latin translator ("iussit adponi") also possibly read ἐκέλευσεν like D. Or the D reading comes from the Latin, which then is only translation freedom.
So possibly also the Sahidic.

B: no umlaut

παραθεῖναι	infinitive aorist active
παρατιθέναι	infinitive present active
παράθετε	imperative aorist active 2nd person plural

No direct parallel. Mt omits this sentence with the fish and Luke does not have the feeding of the Four Thousand.

Compare pervious verse 6:
NA28 Mark 8:6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ.
παρέθηκεν 579, 1071, pc

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 15:36 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.
NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.
NA28 Luke 9:16 ... καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.
NA28 John 6:11 ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 5:43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν. safe!

The 01* reading implies that Jesus himself gives out the fishes, so also some witnesses in the previous verse 6. Very probably an accidental error.

The large number of variant readings in this sentence is interesting.
There are two differences in meaning. One difference is the reading of C et al. in the imperative mood:
txt he said that these too should be given out.
C et al.: he said: "Give out these too!"
This is probably a natural change because indirect speech with εἶπεν is comparatively rare. There would be no reason to change direct speech so universally.

The other difference is if the manuscripts read καὶ (τ)αῦτα (= "also these") or not.

It is possible that the short reading is at least in part accidental due to parablepsis in the Byzantine reading from καὶ to the καὶ at the beginning of verse 8.

On the other hand the addition of καὶ ταῦτα would be only natural and a deliberate omission is difficult to imagine. Also the two different insertion points before and after παρατιθέναι are suspicious.

Externally the txt word order has very good support.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 168

NA28 Mark 8:9 ἦσαν δὲ _____ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι.

BYZ Mark 8:9 ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι.

Byz A, C, D, W, X, Θ, 0131, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Latt, Sy, sa, bo^{pt}, goth, [Trg]
add ἄνδρες after τετρακ. G, Δ, 1071, pc, it

txt 01, B, L, Δ, 0274?, 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc, sa^{ms}, bo^{pt}
omit ὡς: 01

0274: has a lacuna, but space considerations allow for the short reading only.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.
οἱ φαγόντες ὡς 01, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 700

Probably added from 6:44 (so Weiss). Some manuscripts harmonize further by adding ἄνδρες. Note that in return in 6:44 several witnesses added the ὡς from 8:9.

Hoskier suggests (Codex B, I, p. 112) that the words have been removed as unnecessary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 169

79. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη D
Et ipse ascendens b, d, i, k, r^1

Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς αὐτὸς B, WH^{mg}, Weiss
Καὶ εὐθέως ἐμβὰς αὐτὸς 372, 2737

txt Et statim ascendens a, aur, f, l, q, vg
Iesus autem ascendens c, ff^2
B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 8:23 Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον …
ἐμβάντος αὐτοῦ 1071
NA28 Mark 4:1 ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα
NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Luke 5:3 ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων,
NA28 Luke 8:37 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν.
ἐνβὰς δὲ D
NA28 John 6:24 ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια
ἀνέβησαν 01*, pc

Quite a strong support for αὐτὸς.

It is possibly a partial conformation to either Mt 8:23, Mk 5:18, Lk 8:37 or to Jo 6:24.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 138): "The αὐτὸς has either not been understood, or it has been omitted because it separated the verb from the preposition."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 170

80. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.

T&T #103+104

τὰ ὅρια Δαλμανουθά	N, Σ, 124, 517, 1071, 1241, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc[17]
τὸ ὅρος Δαλμουναι	W
τὰ μέρη Μαγδαλά	Θ, f1, f13, 2542, 2680, pc[7], Sy-Pal, geo[2], goth pc = 4, 191, 271, 273, 537, 1502, 2394
τὰ μέρη Μαγεδά	565, it("Magedam" b, ff[2], i, r[1])
τὰ ὅρια Μαγεδά	aur, c, k
τὸ ὅρος Μαγεδά	28, Sy-S (Sy-S: MGDN), Eus?
.....Μαγεδ]αν	P45 (conj.)
τὰ ὅρια Μελεγαδα	D*
τὰ ὅρια Μαγαιδά	D[C1], d(Magidan)
τὰ μέρη	118

txt 01, A, B, C, L, X, Δ, 0131, 0274, 1582[C], 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, f, l, q, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, arm, geo[1]

P45: Both letters are very doubtful, even though Kenyon in the editio princeps writes: "ut vid." From the published image nothing can be made out at all.

1582: There is a tilde sign ~ above Μαγδαλά and Δαλμανουθά is given in the margin by the original scribe Ephraim (10th CE).

Sy-S: NA: Mageda, Wilson: Magadan, Legg: Magedan

PJ Williams, Cambridge comments: "Consonants: MGDN, therefore Legg and Wilson's vocalisations are both possible, and NA could correctly give the Vorlage."

B: umlaut? p. 1289 A 10 L Δαλμανουνθά 11 Καὶ ἐξῆλθον

B reads Δαλμανουνθά

There is a problematic umlaut for this line. The dots are smaller, not in the middle of the line but further down and they are three dots, possibly only blots? A fourth spot is very near the beginning vertical bar of the M.

Augustine (De Cons. Evang. 2.106):

> Hunc sane ordinem etiam Marcus tenens post illud de septem panibus miraculum hoc idem subicit quod Mattheus, nisi quod Dalmanutha, quod in quibusdam codicibus legitur, non dixit Mattheus, sed Magedan. non autem dubitandum est eundem locum esse sub utroque nomine. nam plerique codices non habent etiam secundum Marcum nisi Magedan.
>
> In this case, indeed, Mark also keeps the same order; and after his account of the miracle of the seven loaves, subjoins the same intimation as is given us in Matthew, only with this difference, that Matthew's expression for the locality is not **Dalmanutha**, as is read in certain codices, but **Magedan**. There is no reason, however, for questioning the fact that it is the same place that is intended under both names. For most codices, even of Mark's Gospel, give no other reading than that of **Magedan**.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 15:39 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν.

Μαγδαλά	L, X, Δ^{Gr}, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 892, Maj, Sy-H
Μαγδαλάν	C, N, W, 33, 565, 579, al, q, mae-1, bo
Μαγαδάν	01*, B, D, d
Μαγεδάν	01^{C2}, Lat, Δ^{Lat}, Sy-S, Sy-C, (Sy-P), sa, Eus

Dalmanutha appears only here. Its location is completely unknown. See Mt 15:39 for a detailed discussion of the places.

Nestle (Philologica Sacra, p. 17) thinks that Μαγδαλά is probably correct. JR Harris (Codex Bezae, 1891, p. 178) completes the following interesting idea by Nestle: In Syriac the letters for εἰς τὰ μέρη are an almost exact transcript of "λμανουθά". Is it then possible that the txt reading is simply the Syriac with a dittography: εἰς τὰ μέρη - εἰς τὰ μέρη and that the real name Μαγεδά or Μελεγαδα has dropped out? Dalman objects to this.

Thielscher notes that the δαλ appears in Μαγδαλά. He speculates that some scribal error occurred: ΔΑΛ
ΜΑΓΧΧΧΧΑ out of which then was formed:
ΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ
This is of course highly speculative and rather improbable.

τὰ ὅρια Δαλμανουθά or τὸ ὄρος is probably a harmonization to Mt.

Burkitt writes (Euangelion Intro, 1904, p. 249):

> "The name Dalmanutha is almost certainly corrupt, and there is much to be said for Dr. Cheyne's suggestion (Ency. Bibl. 1635) that the place meant is *Migdal-nunaya*, a suburb of Tiberias. On this hypothesis the name was miswritten in a very early copy of S. Mark and the various texts, including S. Matthew's Gospel, give more or less independent attempts at emendation. Codex B has ΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΝΘΑ which is a step nearer to the hypothetical ΜΑΓΔΑΛΝΟΥΝΕΑ, or Μαγδαλνουναία, conjectured by Dr. Cheyne. The Armenian *Dalmanounea* is still nearer.
> But be that as it may, the agreement here between 28 and Sy-S is of considerable interest for the history of the text. […] As it is, we must recognize that even singular readings of the group of minuscules which we are considering, viz. f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, may be genuine relics of a Greek text akin to that from which the Old Syriac was translated."

Burkitt makes another suggestion in JTS 1916:

> "What appears to have escaped notice is that τὰ μέρη is quite as odd as Δαλμανουθά. If Dalmanutha be so important a place that you do not simply say εἰς Δ., like εἰς Βηθσαιδάν or even εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, then it is inexplicable that the name should be unfamiliar. And that this difficulty was felt in ancient times we see from the crop of various readings. Probably therefore there is a primitive graphical error not only in the place-name, but also in τὰ μέρη. I now think that
>
> εἰς ΤΑΜΕΡΗΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ
>
> may be a corruption of
>
> εἰς ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΔΑΑΜΑΘΟΥϹ
>
> (or some such form). Probably St Mark wrote εἰς Ἁμαθους, and on second thoughts wrote Τιβεριάδα above the native name, and so the double form may have been perpetuated by all copyists. That Tiberias was called Am(m)athus, i.e. the Biblical Hamath (2 Kings xiv 25), before its new foundation by Herod we know from Josephus (Ant. xviii 2,3 ; B.I. iv 1). When it is considered that we are in search of an important town, containing Pharisees, on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and further that a hurried visit there makes Jesus refer to 'the leaven of Herod' (Mk. 8:15), it is difficult not to think that Tiberias must be meant. And when the inexplicable τὰ μέρη is included in the letters supposed to contain the corrupted form of the name, the very name Tiberias in the required accusative case is found almost intact."

Compare the discussion at:

- F.C. Burkitt "W and Θ, Studies in the Western text of St. Mark" JTS 17 (1916) 1-21
- B. Hjerl-Hansen "Dalmanutha (Mk 8:10) enigme geographique et linguistique dans l'evangile de S. Mark." RB 53 (1946) 372-84

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 171

81. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει· τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον;
ἀμὴν **λέγω ὑμῖν,** εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.

T&T #105

No txt in NA and SQE!

λέγω B, L, 892, 923, 1342, WH

omit: P45, W

txt 01, A, C, D, Δ, Θ, 0131, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss, WH[mg]

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [ὑμῖν] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:39 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.

NA28 Matthew 16:4 γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

NA28 Luke 11:29 Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων ἤρξατο λέγειν· ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρά ἐστιν· σημεῖον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.

Robertson ("Wordpictures") writes:

"Mt 16:4 has simply οὐ δοθήσεται, plain negative with the future passive indicative. Mark has εἰ instead of οὐ, which is technically a conditional clause with the conclusion unexpressed (Robertson, Grammar, p. 1024), really aposiopesis in imitation of the Hebrew use of *im*. This is the only instance in the N.T. except in quotations from the LXX (Heb 3:11; 4:3,5). It is very common in the LXX."

ἀμὴν (δὲ/γὰρ) λέγω ὑμῖν appears 86 times in the Gospels (12 times in Mk)! It would be only natural to complete it.

On the other hand the phrase ἀμὴν λέγω is quite strange. It appears nowhere else. Probably it is an early error, but there is no apparent reason for it. Curiously it is supported by one Byzantine minuscule. Perhaps the P45, W reading is an attempt to smooth this early error out?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 172

82. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

BYZ Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς ἐμβὰς πάλιν εἰς πλοῖον ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν

T&T #106

ἐμβὰς πάλιν εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον	A, X, 0131, f1, 124, Maj, Sy-H, sa, goth
πάλιν ἐμβὰς εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον	P45, D, W, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 2542, pc, it(a, b, c, d, f, i, l, q, r^1, vg^{mss}), (Sy-S), bo^{pt}, arm, geo, [Trg]

ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον πάλιν	1424
εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν	1241 (UBS3c omits πάλιν)

πάλιν ἐμβὰς	01, B, C, L, Δ, 2144, aur, ff^2, vg, bo^{pt}

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 16:4 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς _____ ἀπῆλθεν.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Mark 6:45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ... ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 **Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον**

NA28 Matthew 8:23 Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον
BYZ Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 14:22 Καὶ εὐθέως ... ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 14:32 καὶ ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 15:39 Καὶ ... ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

NA28 Luke 8:22 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.
omit: P45[vid], D, Θ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc[30], it, Sy-S
(here too the position of πάλιν is variable!)

The main parallel is verse 10.
It is possible that εἰς τὸ πλοῖον accidentally fell out or has been added as superfluous after ἐμβὰς. On the other hand it could have been added from verse 10.
In the Gospels all 15 other occurrences of ἐμβαίνω are connected with a form of εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, except in this case (Matt. 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22; 15:39; Mk. 4:1; 5:18; 6:45; 8:10, 13; Lk. 5:3; 8:22, 37; Jn. 6:17, 24; 21:3). This is a strong argument.

Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that πάλιν has been put after ἐμβὰς, to make clear that πάλιν refers to ἐμβὰς and not to ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς. The same reason holds for the addition of εἰς πλοῖον.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 173

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:15 καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου.

T&T #107

txt ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε	01, A, B, L, W, X; 33, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, goth
ὁρᾶτε καὶ βλέπετε	P45, C, Φ, 0131, f13, 28, 1424, pc[50]
one of these	Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

ὁρᾶτε	Δ, 700, pc[4] (= 176, 577, 1138, 2806)
βλέπετε	D, Θ, f1, 565, pc[3] (= 2*, 939, 1699)
one of these	Sy-S, geo, arm

ὁρᾶτε φυλάσσεσθε	1342 (:: Lk)
ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε	79, 208 (:: Mt)

Lat:	"Videte"	b, d, ff[2], i, q, r[1]
	"Cavete" (beware)	a, k, vg
	"Videte et cavete"	aur, c, f, l, vg[mss]

Δ: In the Latin a later hand added + cavete above videte, but not in the Greek.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 16:6 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

NA28 Luke 12:1 ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον· προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις, τῶν Φαρισαίων.

NA28 Luke 12:15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 12:38 Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν· βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς

NA28 Matthew 9:30 ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω.

= "Beware, let no one know."

NA28 Matthew 18:10 <u>Ὁρᾶτε</u> μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἑνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων·

= "Take care that you do not despise one of these little ones,"

The only other reading that has any claim to be original would be that of D, Θ et al. Compare Mk 12:38 with the same clause. The addition of ὁρᾶτε then would be a conflation with Mt, Lk. But in this case the reading of P45 et al. would probably be the result.
The two words have essentially the same meaning here ("watch out, beware!"), so it is more probable that one word would be omitted, than one of the same meaning added.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 174

NA28 Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ **συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην** ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;

BYZ Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ **συνίετε ἔτι πεπωρωμένην** ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν

Byz A, K, Π, X, 157, 700, 892^{c}, 1071, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt P45^{vid}, 01, B, C, D, L, N, W, Δ, (Θ), 0143^{vid}, f1, f13, 28, 33, (565), 579, 892*, 1241, 1342, pc, it, Co
μνημονεύετε; πεπωρωμένην Θ, 565

συνίετε ὅτι πεπωρωμένην 047, 1424, pc

892: ἔτι is written above the line by a later hand. Also ὁ Ἰησοῦς is added after γνοὺς.

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:18 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε,

It is possible that the ἔτι has been omitted accidentally: συνίετε ἔτι (so Hoskier).
On the other hand it is possible that the word has been added as a conformation to immediate context: οὔπω - ἔτι. "Do you still not perceive - yet have you your heart hardened?"
The μνημονεύετε from Θ, 565 probably comes from the next verse 18.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 175

NA28 Mark 8:22 Καὶ **ἔρχονται** εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλὸν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται.

BYZ Mark 8:22 Καὶ **ἔρχεται** εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται.

Not in NA but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz 01*, A, N, X, f1, 22, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy

txt 01^{C2}, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, Latt, Co, arm, geo

P45: Only the topmost part of the letters is visible. Kenyon reconstructs ἔρχονται with underdots, but does not give a note.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19

Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Compare context:

8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς

8:22 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.

8:27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας …

Possibly the plural has been changed to the singular because of the following αὐτῷ (or the previous ἔλεγεν). There is no reason why at this point one should change a singular to the plural. Note that in several other similar instances a change of the plural into the singular has happened.

It is interesting that the last mention of "Jesus" as explicit subject was in 6:30 only. The Byzantine text is adding the name in 7:27, 8:1 and 8:17.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 176
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:22 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.

T&T #112

Βηθανίαν D, 199, 566, 1118, 1187, 1424^{mg}, pc,
it(a, b*, d, f, ff^{2}, i, l, q, r^{1})

"unreadable" (T&T): 262*, 1060*

aur, b^{c}, c, k, vg read Bethsaida.
1424 (cp. CSNTM image 0068a): There is a wavy line with two dots above Βηθσαϊδάν in the text and Βηθανίαν is written in the margin.
B: no umlaut

Probably just an error, note the Byzantine minuscules.
WH have Βηθανίαν in the margin, but between special signs, which indicate "noteworthy rejected readings", often Western interpolations and substitutions.

It has been argued that Mark would not have called Bethsaida a κώμη (v. 23 and 26), since it was developed into a city by tetrarch Philippus (and renamed Julias).
Compare Josephus (Ant. 18:2,1):
Φίλιππος δὲ Πανεάδα τὴν πρὸς ταῖς πηγαῖς τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατασκευάσας ὀνομάζει Καισάρειαν, κώμην δὲ Βηθσαϊδὰ πρὸς λίμνῃ τῇ Γεννησαρίτιδι πόλεως παρασχὼν ἀξίωμα πλήθει τε οἰκητόρων καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει Ἰουλίᾳ θυγατρὶ τῇ Καίσαρος ὁμώνυμον ἐκάλεσεν.
When Philip also had built Paneas, a city at the fountains of Jordan, he named it Cesarea. He also advanced the village Bethsaida, situated at the lake of Gennesareth, unto the dignity of a city, both by the number of inhabitants it contained, and its other grandeur, and called it by the name of Julias, the same name with Caesar's daughter.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 177

NA28 Mark 8:23 καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· εἴ τι βλέπεις;

BYZ Mark 8:23 καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν εἴ τι βλέπει

T&T #114

Byz 01, A, D^c, L, W, X, f1, f13, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, geo^{2B}, WH^{mg}, Trg, Tis, Bal
εἴ τι βλέπειν 13, 732, 2106
εἴ βλέπει W

txt B, C, D*, Δ, Θ, 565, 579, 1342, 2737, pc^3,
Sy-S, Co, $geo^{1,2A}$, $Diatess^{Arab}$, WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg^{mg} pc = 160, 1010, 1293

33: omits due to parablepsis vs. 23 τὰς χεῖρας … vs. 25 τὰς χεῖρας.
B: no umlaut

Byz he asked him, if he can see anything.
txt he asked him, "Can you see anything?"

No parallel.
Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:9 καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· τί ὄνομά σοι;
NA28 Mark 10:17 καὶ … ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, …
NA28 Mark 13:3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ᾽ ἰδίαν … · 4 εἰπὸν ἡμῖν, …
NA28 Mark 14:61 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;
NA28 Mark 15:4 Πιλᾶτος … ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν;

In Mk all appearances of ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν are followed by direct speech.
The txt reading is not normal (classical) Greek usage of εἴ τι. Thayer notes in his lexicon: "Contrary to the usage of Greek authors, like the Hebrew …, it is used in the Septuagint and the NT (especially by Luke) also in direct questions (cf. the colloquial use of the German *ob; e.g. ob ichs wohl tun soll?*)."
So, too, Weiss (Textkritik, p. 78): "The ει seemed superfluous in direct speech."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 178

83. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα.

T&T #115

No txt in NA and SQE!

	ἔθηκεν	B, L, 892, pc[3] (222, 1093, 2517), Trg, WH
txt	ἐπέθηκεν	01, A, C, W, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 579, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss, Trg[mg]
	ἐπιθεὶς	D, Θ, 565, 700, pc[9], a

33: omits due to parablepsis vs. 23 τὰς χεῖρας … vs. 25 τὰς χεῖρας.

B: no umlaut

ἐπέθηκεν	ἐπιτίθημι	indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
ἔθηκεν	τίθημι	indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
ἐπιθεὶς	ἐπιτίθημι	participle aorist active nominative masculine singular

No parallel.

Context, verse 23:

NA28 Mark 8:23 ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· εἴ τι βλέπεις;

safe!

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 9:18 ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν,

NA28 Matthew 19:13 ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται·

NA28 Matthew 19:15 καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν.

NA28 Mark 5:23 ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.

NA28 Mark 6:5 εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.

NA28 Luke 4:40 ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.

NA28 Mark 10:16
καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει <u>τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά.</u>
<u>ἐπιτιθεὶς</u> W, 565, 700

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 21:7 καὶ <u>ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ'</u> αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια
NA28 Matthew 23:4 καὶ <u>ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ</u> τοὺς ὤμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

NA28 Matthew 27:29 <u>ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ</u> τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ
<u>ἔθηκαν ἐπὶ</u> W, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 1071, 1424, al[K, Π, N, Y]

NA28 Luke 15:5 καὶ εὑρὼν <u>ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ</u> τοὺς ὤμους αὐτοῦ χαίρων
<u>τίθησιν ἐπὶ</u> 28
NA28 John 9:15 πηλὸν <u>ἐπέθηκέν</u> μου <u>ἐπὶ</u> τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

On the one hand it is possible that the prefixed ἐπι has been omitted because the preposition follows later: ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας **<u>ἐπὶ</u>** τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς (compare Mt 27:29, Lk 15:5).

On the other hand it is possible that the prefix has been added to conform it to common usage (10 times in the Gospels ἐπιτίθημι + χείρ). Only once the simplex is used (Mk 10:16).
Or the prefix has been added to conform it to immediate context, verse 23. There ἐπιθεὶς is safe, but no preposition is following.

ἐπιθεὶς is a conformation to the previous verse 23.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 179

NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα.

BYZ Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν αναβλέψαι καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη καὶ ἐνέβλεψεν τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντας.

Not in NA, but in SQE (in part)!

καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν αναβλέψαι	A, X, 33, 124, Maj, a, f, q, Sy-H, goth
ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν αναβλέψαι	565, 700
ἐποίησεν αναβλέψαι	Θ
καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν αναβλέψαι καὶ διέβλεψεν	f13
καὶ ἤρξατο αναβλέψαι	D, Lat ("et coepit videre")
καὶ διέβλεψεν	P45[vid], 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 579, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co
καὶ αναβλέψεν	892, 1342

B: no umlaut

Byz: "and he made him look up (or look clearly)"
D: "and he began to see clearly"
txt: "and he saw clearly"

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:24 καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγεν· βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας.
NA28 Mark 10:51 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ῥαββουνί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω
NA28 Mark 10:52 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὕπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέβλεψεν

The txt reading is redundant with what follows.
It is not really clear what αναβλέψαι means here. It could either mean "look up" or "see clearly". The second meaning is probably intended by the D reading. ἀναβλέψας already appears in the previous verse 24. The Byzantine reading is probably intended as a parallel to it.

Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that the Byzantine reading is probably intended to avoid the abrupt subject change. This is a good argument.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 180

NA28 Mark 8:26 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ λέγων·
μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς.

BYZ Mark 8:26 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ λέγων
μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ.

T&T #116

Byz A, C, K, Π, X, Δ^{C}, 33^{vid}, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, Trg

txt 01^{C1}, B, L, W, Δ*, f1, 900, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, geo^{1}
μὴ for μηδὲ: 01*, W, Tis

μηδενὶ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ
pc^{8}, c, k

ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου καὶ μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην D, d, q

ὕπαγε εἰς [τὸν] οἶκον σου καὶ
ἐὰν εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς (μηδὲ) ἐν τῇ κώμῃ
Θ, Φ, f13, 28, 565, 1071, 2542, 2680, pc^{30}, Lat, (Sy-H^{mg})
pc = 16, 61, 79, 130, 152, 165, 176, 184, 348, 382, 555, 752, 780, 829, 968, 1012, 1216, 1243, 1279, 1289, 1451, 1528, 1579, 2174, 2200, 2405, 2726

Δ: (p. 163) wrongly listed in NA (implicitely under Maj). Δ* reads txt, the other words have been added later in a different ink, but possibly by the same scribe.

33: has a small lacuna:
μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλ[θῃς μηδὲ] εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ.

Tregelles has additionally μηδὲ εἴπῃς τ. ἐ. τ. κώμῃ in brackets in the margin.
B: umlaut! (p. 1289 B, line 40) for the words: αὐτοῦ λέγων μηδὲ εἰς

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς, ἀλλὰ ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ ...
NA28 Mark 2:11 σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.
NA28 Mark 5:19 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου

The reading of k et al. is possibly an omission due to parablepsis (μηδὲ ει.. - μηδὲ ει..).
The last (longest) reading is the one that makes the best sense. Thus it is probably the endpoint of the evolution. Similarly the D reading makes perfect sense. The ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου suggested itself, because it already appeared twice in Mk in a similar context.
So, the decision must be between the Byzantine or the txt reading.

Bousset (Studien NT, 1894, p. 98f.) thinks that the short reading might have arisen, because the Byzantine reading appears illogical: When he is not entering the village, how can he tell anyone? Therefore the second part has been omitted. The command for silence is typically Markan.
That the second part of the Byzantine reading could accidentally be omitted is supported by minuscule 900, which reads txt.

On the other hand Bousset mentions (but rejects) the suggestion that the second part has been added to create a μηδὲ ... μηδέ ("neither . . . nor") case. Normally μηδὲ follows another negation like: μὴ, μηκέτι, μήπω or another μηδὲ. There is no other instance of a single μηδὲ in the Gospels. It is therefore possible that the 01*, W reading μὴ is a correction of this grammatical rule.
Also, the short txt reading is slightly difficult, because it is not clear why he should not enter the village. So the other readings might be attempts to overcome this.
NET Bible: "While these expansions are not part of Mark's original text, they do accurately reflect the sense of Jesus' prohibition."
μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ presents the true intention of Jesus' order μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς. It is rather improbable that the words would have been omitted, if original.

Probably txt is the original reading. The Byzantine and the Western reading are independent attempts to explain the difficult order. The Θ reading is a conflation of the two.
Hort on the other hand thinks that only the Western is second and that the Θ reading is the conflation. The Byzantine reading finally is a late smoothing (see WH Intro §140).

The txt reading is quite diversely supported (01^{C1}, B, L, Co), W, f1, Sy-S.

It is basically also possible that the text is completely corrupt here (so already Lachmann). Jesus sends the cured home! But then says "Do not go into the village!" Blass: "eine Zumutung (an impertinence)". Wellhausen suggests that

perhaps the man was not from Bethsaida. This is probably correct. The meaning is: "Go directly home. Do not go back into the village (Bethsaida, where we have found you)."

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) conjectures this:

> "Westcott and Hort *Introduction* §140 cite this verse with good cause as a typical 'conflate' reading of the received text: it is demonstrable that behind the form μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ lie two earlier readings, (1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς, and (2) μηδὲ εἴπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ which the Antiochene text has combined. Westcott-Hort treat the two briefer readings as rivals, and decide for the former, which is given by 01 B L W 1 Syr^{sin}. But what if we repeat the process of analysis, and ask whether both (1) and (2) cannot be explained as developements of a reading that lay further back than either of them? If we bear in-mind (a) the accumulation of evidence in favour of the Marcan use of εἰς for ἐν: (b) the tendency of codex B to get rid of this unclassical idiom: (c) the actual presence of the phrase μηδενὶ εἴπης εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of the reading in D, and of 'ne cui diceret in castellum' as the whole reading in the Old Latin MS c: (d) the ease with which the other early readings can be explained if we postulate μηδε[νὶ] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπης as the original source of the different developements: then I do not think it too much to say that the problem has solved itself."
>
> Footnote: "When I first published my Inaugural Lecture, *The Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920* (1920), I had not grasped the evidence for St Mark's usage of εἰς = ἐν, and thought that the original text must have run μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην, without any verb: but my friend the Rev. H. N. Bate had already divined the true reading, as I have there recorded (p. 59 *ad fin.*)."

Compare:

- J.I. Miller "Was Tischendorf really wrong? Mark 8:26b revisited." NovT 28 (1986) 97-103
- C.H. Turner "Notes on Marcan Usage II", JTS 26 (1924) 12-20 (p. 18)

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 181

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός .

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	01, L, 157, pc, b, r^1, Sy-Pal^{mss}
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος	W, f13, pc, Sy-P, sa^{mss}, Sy-Pal^{ms}

B: umlaut p. 1289 C, line 16,

for the words: **λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός 30 καὶ**

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Clearly a harmonization to the parallels.

The addition of τοῦ θεοῦ represents one of the so called Minor Agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Jülicher/Aland have it in their Itala edition as txt ("Tu es Christus Iesus, filius Dei vivi" read by b. - r^1 omits "Iesus" and "vivi".).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 182

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:31 Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι·

NA28 Mark 8:32 καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον **ἐλάλει.**

λαλεῖν or εἰπεῖν Sy-S, k, Diatess[Arabic]?

"et cum fiducia sermonem loqui." k

B: no umlaut

"… and on the third day he will rise and openly speak the word."

txt "… and on the third day he will rise. He said all this quite openly."

Both Mt and Lk omit the words καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει, possibly due to its difficulty.

The infinitive makes very good sense. Maybe it is just a misunderstanding? It is inconceivable that the infinitive would have been changed to the more difficult imperfect.

F.C. Burkitt writes:

> "As this striking reading had a place in the Diatessaron - for all the readings of the Arabic Diatessaron that do not agree verbally with the Peshitta are doubtless genuine survivals of Tatian's Harmony - we must not claim the agreement of S and k in its favour as an independent consensus of East and West. At the same time there are very few, if any, traces of the influence of the Diatessaron in the African Latin, so that the reading represents a very early strain of the Western text, and there is much to be said in its favor from internal evidence." (cp. Evangelion Intro, 1904, p. 240)

Compare also: Burkitt "St. Mark 8:32, a neglected various reading" JTS 2 (1900) 111-13, where he suggests that the original Greek word was ἐκλαλεῖν:

"Graphically ЄΚΛΑΛЄIN (with the final N perhaps only indicated by a horizontal stroke) is nearer to ЄΛΑΛЄI than either λαλεῖν or ἐκλαλῆσαι and it may be defended on internal grounds."

The Diatessaron evidence is doubtful. Hogg, in his edition of the Arabic Diatessaron, has "And he was speaking plainly" (so also Ciasca and Preuschen) and

writes in a footnote: "The Arabic might perhaps be construed *and to speak,* depending on *began* in § 23.40; but the clause agrees with the Sinaitic of Mark, as does the following."

But Ayman Turky responded to me in private email (Nov. 2011).
"According to translation by Abul Faraj ibn Tayyeb from Syrian to Arabic in 11th century it says: *He will rise and will say a saying openly* (exactly as Burkitt said). I can confirm Burkitt's reading, because the reading in Arabic talking in Futur not Past as it translated in Hogg and others!"

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 183

84. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:34 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου **ἀκολουθεῖν**, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

ἐλθεῖν	01, A, B, C^{C}, K, Π, L, Γ, Σ, 047, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 2542, 2737, al, it(aur, c, k, l), bo, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Trg^{mg}, Bal, SBL
txt	P45, C*, D, W, X, Θ, 0214, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 157, 565, 700, 1675, Maj, Lat(a, b, d, f, ff^{2}, i, n, q, vg) Sy, sa, goth, Or, Tis
ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν	Δ, sa^{mss}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:38 καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος. safe!

NA28 Luke 14:27 ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

ἀκολουθεῖ K, Π, pc^{11} (:: Mt 10:38)

NA28 Matthew 16:24 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. safe!

NA28 Luke 9:23 Ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

ἔρχεσθαι	P75, 01, A, B, C*, D, K, Π, L, W, Θ, Ξ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, al, Or
ἐλθεῖν	01^{C1}, C^{C3}, Ψ, Maj (:: Mt 16:24)

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:20 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν <u>ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.</u>

<u>ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ</u>	D, W, 1424, Latt
<u>ἦλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ</u>	Θ

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that ἀκολουθεῖν is either a conformation to Mt 10:38 or to the immediately following ἀκολουθείτω.
Note a similar change in Mk 1:20!
Both Mt and Lk have a form of ἔρχομαι against Mk (<u>Minor Agreement</u>). It is not clear why both should have changed an ἀκολουθεῖν independently into a form of ἔρχομαι.

On the other hand ἐλθεῖν could be a harmonization to Mt 16:24.

Interestingly both readings in Mt are safe:
10:38 ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου
16:24 ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν
This indicates that both readings are per se not objectionable.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 184

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

T&T #117

No txt in NA and SQE!

τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν

B, 28, pc[3] (344, 2206, 2317), Or, WH

txt P45[vid], 01, A, C, D*, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss, WH[mg]

(τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν)[pos.2] C[C3], W, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 700, Maj, Tre, Gre

τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν D[C]

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 34:

NA28 Mark 8:34 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ 01

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:39 ὁ εὑρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν.

NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν. τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ - τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν 28

NA28 Luke 9:24 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

NA28 Luke 14:26 εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ἔτι τε καὶ <u>τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ,</u> οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

<u>τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ</u> P75, 01, B, 788, 579, 1241, pc

<u>τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν</u> P45, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, Maj

NA28 Luke 17:33 ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ <u>τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ</u> περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ ζῳογονήσει αὐτήν.

NA28 John 12:25 ὁ φιλῶν <u>τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ</u> ἀπολλύει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ μισῶν <u>τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ</u> ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν.

It is possible, that the ἑαυτοῦ has been used from the previous verse. Note that 01 wrote in 34: τὸν σταυρὸν <u>ἑαυτοῦ</u>.

Interestingly the Byzantine text has τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν in the 2nd instance. Perhaps both the Byzantine and the B reading are independent attempts to avoid the double τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The parallels are completely safe though for this reading.

Of course the txt reading could be a harmonization to the parallels.

The support for the B reading slim and not coherent. Note that 28 has a similar variation in Mt 16:25.

Any other reading than txt would create a <u>Minor Agreement</u> between Mt and Lk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 185

85. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:35
ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν·
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν **ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** σώσει αὐτήν.

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	P45, D, 28, 700, it(a, b, d, i, k, n, r^1), Sy-S, arm, Or, Bois WH have the words in brackets. Lat(aur, c, f, ff^2, l, q, vg) reads txt.
ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει	33, 579, ff^2 (:: Mt)
ἐμοῦ ἢ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	Δ

Sy-S reads (acc. to Burkitt):
"and every one that shall lose his life because of **my** Gospel shall save it"

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν.
NA28 Luke 9:24 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 10:29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	A, B*, 700, 1424, pc
ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ ἢ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	D, Θ, f1, 565
ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	01*

The omission by 33, 579 is clearly a harmonization to Mt. The Byzantine text adds οὗτος from Lk (see next variant).

The omission of ἐμοῦ καὶ is difficult to explain except as scribal oversight.

It is possible that ἐμοῦ καὶ has been added as a harmonization to Mt/Lk, but in that case one would have expected either εὑρήσει (Mt) or οὗτος (Lk).
The long form could also be a conformation to Mk 10:29. But in any case it is rather improbable such a partial harmonization is supported so universally.
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 436) nevertheless thinks that the P45 reading is original.

If the omission is original this would create a <u>Minor Agreements</u> between Mt and Lk.

Note that this is one of the few cases where the textcritical decision in NA depends on a certain source theory (here Markan priority: both Mt and Lk have ἐμοῦ so they must have got it from Mk). Note also that both Mt and Lk omit καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 186

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου **σώσει αὐτήν.**

BYZ Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου **οὐτὸς σώσει αὐτήν.**

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz C^{C2}, X, f13, 157, 700, 1342, Maj

txt P45, 01, A, B, C*, D, K, Π, L, M, W, X, Y, Δ, Θ, 0211, 0233, f1, 565, 892, 1071, 1424, 2542, pc, Latt, Sy, Co, goth

εὑρήσει αὐτήν 28, 33, 579 (not in NA and SQE, from Mt)

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 16:25
ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν.

NA28 Luke 9:24
ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

Clearly a harmonization to Luke.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 187
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:38 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς **λόγους** ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ,

"whoever is ashamed of me and the mine (my followers)"
"whoever is ashamed of me and of my words"

omit: P45[vid], W, k, sa

D has the word
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 9:26 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, omit: D, a, d, e, l, Sy-C
P45, W have the word

The words make good sense both ways. But an omission is more likely, probably due to h.t. (ΟΥϹ - ΟΥϹ). Accidental omission is also supported by the fact that the supporting witnesses are not the same in both cases.

But note what Ross writes: "The decisive consideration in this case is that neither Mark nor Luke would have written τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους unless with the intention of giving special emphasis to ἐμοὺς, of which there is no sign in the context; had they wished to convey the sense "ashamed of me and my words" they would have written τοὺς λόγους μου. Mark uses the possessive μου 29 times elsewhere but both he and Luke rarely use ἐμός, and never in a possessive sense with a noun. […] It therefore seems highly probable, on stylistic grounds alone, that λόγους was missing from the original text both here and in Luke."

Compare:
J.M. Ross "Some unnoticed points in the text of the NT" NovT 25 (1983) 59-72

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 188

86. Difficult variant:

NA28 Mark 9:2 Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν,

BYZ Mark 9:2 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ_____Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους· καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν·

Byz A, B, Δ, Θ, 0131, 118, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, L844,
Maj-part[E, F, G, H, M, N, S, Γ, Σ, Φ, Ω],
Robinson, WH, NA[25], Weiss, Gre, Trg, SBL

txt P45, 01, C, D, L, W, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 1342, 1424,
Maj-part[K, Π, U, X, Y], TR, WH[mg]

καὶ ___ Ἰάκωβον καὶ ___ Ἰωάννην
Γ, Δ, Θ, Ω, 0131, 118, 157, 700, pc (:: Mt)

καὶ ___ Ἰάκωβον και τὸν Ἰωάννην
X, 983, 1689(=f13[c])

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:1 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν.

τὸν Ἰάκωβον 01, D, Θ, 33, 157, 892, L844, pc
τὸν Ἰωάννην D*, 892

NA28 Luke 9:28 Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ [καὶ] παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. safe!

Compare:

NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.
safe!

NA28 Mark 10:41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

περὶ <u>τοῦ</u> Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. D

NA28 Mark 14:33 καὶ παραλαμβάνει <u>τὸν</u> Πέτρον καὶ <u>[τὸν] Ἰάκωβον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην</u> μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν

<u>τὸν²</u> A, B, K, Π, L, W, Y, f1, f13, 22, 1071, al
<u>τὸν³</u> A, B, K, Π, W, Y, f13, , pc

The problem is that the Matthean reading itself is not safe. It is possible that the 01, D reading in Mt is correct. In that case the txt reading could be a harmonization to Mt. But the evidence is indecisive. Overall the wording of Mt and Mk is almost the same in this verse.
The reading of Γ et al. seems to be a harmonization to the Byzantine text of Mt (= txt).

It is possible that the omission of the article before Ἰωάννην is meant to bracket the two brothers James and John: "And after six days Jesus took [Peter], and [James and John]…" = he took Peter and (the group, the two brothers) James and John.
παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>**τὸν** Πέτρον</u> καὶ <u>**τὸν** Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην</u>
In this understanding the article before John is not needed.

Overall it appears to be slightly more probable that the article has been added than omitted.

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

TVU 189

NA28 Mark 9:3 καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν, _____οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

BYZ Mark 9:3 καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένοντο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν ὡς χιὼν, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται λευκᾶναι

T&T #119

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, D, X, 0233, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1424, 2542, Maj[1173], Lat, Sy, bo, goth
ὡσεὶ χιὼν Y, K, Π, 28, 1071, 1241, pm[401]
ὡς W
omit λίαν: 1424, al[55]
ὡς τὸ φῶς 1577, Or!

txt P45, 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, 892, 1342, 2713, d, k, sa
omit λίαν: Δ, 544

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 12:39 τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ λευκὰ καὶ στίλβοντα ὡς τὸ φῶς οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι·
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 28:3 ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπὴ καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιών.
NA28 Luke 9:29 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων.

A harmonization to Mt 28:3.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 190

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός __, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

ὃν ἐξελεξάην	0131
ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	01^{C1}, Δ, 983

Note that some Latins read for ὁ ἀγαπητός:

"dilectus"	aur*, f, q
"dilectissimus"	k

"dilectus" can mean both, "select" and "beloved".

The other Latins read "carissimus" (beloved).

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. ("electus")

BYZ Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε ("dilectus")

Probably a reminiscence to the parallels.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 191

87. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:8 καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν.

T&T #120

Ψ exists from here on!

txt A, C, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Sy-P, WH^{mg}, Tis

εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν
01, D, N, Σ, Ψ, 517, 892, 954, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, ps^{50},
Lat(b, d, ff^{2}, n, q, r^{1}, vg), Sy-H, **NA^{25}**, Weiss

μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
B, 33, 579, aur, c, f, WH

εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
0131, pc^{17}, a, k, l, Sy-S, Bal(!) (:: Mt)

In Syriac and Coptic ἀλλὰ and εἰ μὴ cannot be distinguished. They do not read the short reading.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:8 οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.
BYZ Matthew 17:8 οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τόν Ἰησοῦν μόνον

NA28 Luke 9:36 εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος.

Compare οὐκέτι - ἀλλὰ:
NA28 Matthew 19:6 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία.
NA28 Mark 10:8 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ.

NA28 John 11:54 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι παρρησίᾳ περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν
NA28 John 16:25 ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν.

Compare οὐδεὶς - εἰ μὴ:

NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν <u>οὐδένα</u> μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι <u>εἰ μὴ</u> τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον ...
NA28 Mark 6:5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι <u>οὐδεμίαν</u> δύναμιν, <u>εἰ μὴ</u> ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.
NA28 Mark 9:29 τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν <u>οὐδενὶ</u> δύναται ἐξελθεῖν <u>εἰ μὴ</u> ἐν προσευχῇ.
NA28 Mark 10:18 <u>οὐδεὶς</u> ἀγαθὸς <u>εἰ μὴ</u> εἷς ὁ θεός.
NA28 Mark 11:13 καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν <u>οὐδὲν</u> εὗρεν <u>εἰ μὴ</u> φύλλα·

Here we have external against internal evidence. Internal evidence favors the txt reading as being more different to the Mt reading and with ἀλλὰ having the more unusual construction. External evidence clearly favors the εἰ μὴ reading.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 95) thinks that ἀλλὰ is inspired by the preceding οὐκέτι and notes that the εἰ μὴ is characteristically Markan.
οὐκέτι - ἀλλὰ: Isa 10:20; 32:3; Mt 19:6; Mk 9:8; 10:8; Jo 11:54; 16:25; Rom 7:17, 20; Gal 4:7; Eph 2:19
οὐδεὶς - εἰ μὴ: Mk 2:21-22; 5:37; 6:5; 9:29; 10:18; 11:13; 13:32

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 446) notes that the B reading is probably a smoothing, by bringing together εἶδον and μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν.

The 0131 reading is clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν (<u>Minor Agreement</u>).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 192

88. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 9:14 Καὶ **ἐλθόντες** πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς **εἶδον** ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 9:14 Καὶ **ἐλθὼν** πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς **εἶδεν** ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας αὐτοῖς·

Byz A, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Gre, Bois, Trg^{mg}
txt 01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1342, pc, k, sa, arm, geo^{2A}, goth

ἐλθὼν … εἶδον Sy-S, geo^{mss}?
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος ἐλθὼν D, pc

NA28 Luke 9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς. safe!

Compare next verse 15:
NA28 Mark 9:15 καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν καὶ προστρέχοντες ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν.
τὸν Ἰησοῦν D, Lat, Diatess^{Arabic}

Both readings make sense, the Byzantine reading focuses on Jesus alone, the txt reading focuses on Jesus, Peter, James and John as a group coming back to the rest.
Both Mt and Lk have the plural, so the plural in Mk could be a harmonization. On the other hand Mt and Lk could have taken the plural already from Mk.
Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that the singular is probably a conformation to the singular αὐτὸν in the next verse.
Vogels (Handbuch Textkritik, p. 188) thinks that the singular in verse 14 and the αὐτὸν in verse 15 naturally fit together and that the plural in verse 14 is secondary. He notes the interesting fact that D, Lat have the singular in verse 14, but change αὐτὸν into τὸν Ἰησοῦν in verse 15. He suggests this to be a relict of an earlier plural in verse 14, which then needed a specification in verse 15. He further notes that the Diatessaron has the plural in verse 14 and τὸν Ἰησοῦν in verse 15 and thinks that Tatian was the original creator of the plural.

The Arabic Diatessaron reads (Ciasca):

Et in die, quo descenderunt de monte, occurrit ei turba multorum hominum,
stans cum discipulis suis, et Scribae disputabant cum illis.
This is clearly from Lk 9:37, not from Mk. Vogels was probably misled by Ciasca, who assigns the verse to Mk. Only the next verse comes from Mk:
Et cum vidissent homines Iesum, recesserunt, et prae gaudio properantes, salutarunt eum.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:33, 11:19
Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 193
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:15 καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν καὶ **προστρέχοντες** ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν.

προσχέροντες = προσχαίροντες
"gaudentes" = "rejoice"
D, it (b, c, d, ff^2, i, k), Diatess^{Arabic}

The Arabic Diatessaron has:

Ciasca: et **prae gaudio** properantes, salutarunt eum.
Hogg: and in the **midst of their joy** hastened, and saluted him.
Preuschen: und eilten **inmitten ihrer Freude** hin und grüßten seine Begrüßung.
Preuschen writes in a footnote: *inmitten ihrer Freude* = "probably χαίροντες."

Belsheim and Tischendorf list "cadentes" for b. It's not in Jülicher.
txt = aur, f, l, q, vg
B: no umlaut

προστρέχω "run up (to someone)"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν

It has been suggested that this is a misreading of χέροντες for τρέχοντες. Since it underlies a large part of the Western tradition, it might indicate a common origin of the text.

προσχαίρω appears only once in the LXX:
LXX Proverbs 8:30 ἤμην παρ' αὐτῷ ἁρμόζουσα ἐγὼ ἤμην ᾗ προσέχαιρεν καθ' ἡμέραν δὲ εὐφραινόμην ἐν προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) regarding "rejoice": "too characteristic to be a correction".

P. Burton ("The Old Latin Gospels", p. 59) notes the similar event in Lk 19:37.
NA28 Luke 19:37 … ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων,
Perhaps this was an influence?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 194
NA28 Mark 9:23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τὸ εἰ δύνῃ,
πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι.

BYZ Mark 9:23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι,
πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι

εἰ δύνῃ,	P45
τὸ εἰ δύνῃ,	01*, B, Δ, f1, 892, pc, WH, NA[25]
si potes	k
τοῦτο εἰ δύνῃ	W
τὸ εἰ δύνασαι	01[C2], C*, L, N, 579
one of the above:	Co

What, then, is (this, namely) as to that which is possible for thee? bo (Horner)
Art thou saying, That which thou wilt be able to do? sa (Horner)

Quid est, si quid potes a

εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι	D, K, U, Y, Θ, Π, f13, 28, 565, 1071, pc, Sy, Lat
τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι	A, C[C3], X, Ψ, 33, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, goth

ἐν ὀδύνῃ Wohlenberg (conj.)
"with grief"

Tregelles reads txt, but has δύνῃ [πιστεῦσαι] in the margin.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 9:22 ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνῃ,
BYZ Mark 9:22 ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνασαι,

22: "... but if you are able to do anything,..."
23 txt: "If you are able !?"
23 Byz: "If you are able to believe..."

In the txt reading Jesus is repeating the words of the father:
"Regarding the 'if you are able' ...". This is a Greek idiom, with the article representing the "Regarding the" (nominativus absolutus).
It appears that many scribes had problems with this and changed it. P45 simply omitted the article. W changed it to τοῦτο. Others did not understand it anymore and added πιστεῦσαι, to get back some sense. In the Byzantine reading they left the article τὸ which is quite awkward now.

To take τὸ εἰ δύνῃ as a question ("Why do you say 'If you can'?"), as Codex Vercellensis and some commentators and translations have it, would require something like τί τὸ εἰ δύνῃ or τί ἐστιν τὸ εἰ δύνῃ.

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) calls τὸ εἰ δύνῃ an Aposiopesis, the breaking off of a sentence mid-way: "The If-you-can ... All things can be done for the one who believes."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 195

NA28 Mark 9:24 εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου _____ __ ἔλεγεν· πιστεύω· βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ.

BYZ Mark 9:24 καὶ εὐθὲως κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου μετὰ δακρύων ἔλεγεν Πιστεύω· Κύριε βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ

T&T #121

Byz A^c, C^c, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, goth
εἶπεν: f13, pc
λέγει: D, Θ, 565

txt P45, 01, A*, B, C*, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 28, 700, 2542, pc^5, k, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}
pc = 267, 1093, 1651, 1654*, 2555
εἶπεν: P45, W
λέγει: 700

W has:
καὶ εὐθὲως κράξας τὸ πνεῦμα (sic!) τοῦ παιδαρίου εἶπεν· Πιστεύω·
B: no umlaut

No parallels.
Compare:
NA28 Acts 20:31 διὸ γρηγορεῖτε μνημονεύοντες ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην μετὰ δακρύων νουθετῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον.
NA28 Hebrews 12:17 ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 196

NA28 Mark 9:24 εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου __ ἔλεγεν· πιστεύω· βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ.

BYZ Mark 9:24 καὶ εὐθὲως κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου μετὰ δακρύων ἔλεγεν Πιστεύω· Κύριε βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ

Not in NA and SQE!

Byz C^c, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565^c, 700, 1342, Maj,
a, aur, b, c, f, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, $Sy\text{-}P^{mss}$

txt P45, 01, A, B, C*, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 565*, 579, 892,
d, i, k, l, r^1, vg, $Sy\text{-}P^{mss}$, Sy-H, $Sy\text{-}Pal^{mss}$, Co, goth
βοήθησον W, Ψ (from verse 22)

B: no umlaut

βοήθει imperative present active 2nd person singular
βοήθησον imperative aorist active 2nd person singular

Compare verse 22:
NA28 Mark 9:22 ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνῃ, βοήθησον ἡμῖν __σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.
__Κύριε D, G, Θ, 067, 565, it(a, b, d, ff^2, i, q), Sy-S (not in NA but in SQE)
aur, c, f, l, vg don't have it.

Compare:
LXX 1 Samuel 7:12 καὶ εἶπεν ἕως ἐνταῦθα ἐβοήθησεν ἡμῖν κύριος
LXX Psalm 36:40 καὶ βοηθήσει αὐτοῖς κύριος
LXX Psalm 40:4 κύριος βοηθήσαι αὐτῷ ἐπὶ κλίνης ὀδύνης αὐτοῦ
LXX Psalm 43:27 ἀνάστα κύριε βοήθησον ἡμῖν
LXX Psalm 85:17 ὅτι σύ κύριε ἐβοήθησάς μοι καὶ παρεκάλεσάς με
LXX Psalm 93:17 εἰ μὴ ὅτι κύριος ἐβοήθησέν μοι
LXX Psalm 93:18 ὁ πούς μου τὸ ἔλεός σου κύριε βοηθεῖ μοι
LXX Psalm 108:26 βοήθησόν μοι κύριε ὁ θεός μου σῶσόν με
LXX Isaiah 50:9 ἰδοὺ κύριος βοηθεῖ μοι

NA28 Matthew 15:25
ἡ δὲ ἐλθοῦσα προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα· κύριε, βοήθει μοι.

The addition of κύριε is only natural and a common exclamation.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 197

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:25 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὄχλος, ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ λέγων αὐτῷ· τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι, ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν.

T&T #122

omit: P45, W, f1, pc[3], Sy-S
pc = 1139, 1571, 2454

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:18 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

NA28 Luke 9:42 ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.

Compare verse 20:

NA28 Mark 9:20 καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς συνεσπάραξεν αὐτόν, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων.

τὸ ἀκάθαρτον 565

Compare verse 17:

NA28 Mark 9:17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου· διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον·

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 10:1 ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων

NA28 Mark 1:23 ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἀνέκραξεν
NA28 Mark 1:26 καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον
NA28 Mark 1:27 καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει
NA28 Mark 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν
NA28 Mark 3:30 ὅτι ἔλεγον· πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει.
NA28 Mark 5:2 ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ,
NA28 Mark 5:8 ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρω
NA28 Mark 5:13 καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα
NA28 Mark 6:7 ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,
NA28 Mark 7:25 τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον,

NA28 Luke 6:18 ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο,
NA28 Luke 8:29 παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ

The words could be a harmonization to Lk. It is a common, typically Markan term. It is possible that the words have been added from common usage.
In verse 17 the spirit is called πνεῦμα ἄλαλον (= dumb spirit). Immediately following our words, Jesus addresses the spirit as τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα. Possibly the words have been omitted as considered redundant and/or for stylistic reasons.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 198

89. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 9:29 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ.

BYZ Mark 9:29 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ **καὶ νηστείᾳ.**

T&T #123

Byz P45^{vid}, 01^{C2}, A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ^{C}, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co, goth, Gre, Trg
καὶ τῇ νηστείᾳ Δ^{C}
νηστείᾳ καὶ προσευχῇ Sy-S, Sy-P, bo^{ms}

txt 01*, B, Δ*, 0274, k, geo^{1}

Note further:
οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται ... 33, 579, 1391, 1574, L7, L184 (= y^{Scr}), arm (from Mt)
ἐν οὐδενὶ ἐξέρχεται 1342, pc

Δ: (p. 167) wrongly listed in NA (implicitely under Maj). Δ* reads txt, the other words have been added later in a different ink, but possibly by the same scribe. Δ* left a space for the words, perhaps to consult another authority first. Compare also Mk 10:19 (p. 170, last line), where such a space is left, but not filled.

Tregelles reads Byz, but has additionally καὶ νηστείᾳ in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 17:21 -
BYZ Matthew 17:21 τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ.
Byz 01^{C2}, C, D, L, W, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, (Sy-P, Sy-H)
... ἐξέρχεται... 118, 205, 209, al
txt 01*, B, Θ, 0281, 33, 579, 788, 892*, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C
[Rating: - (indecisive)]

Diatessaron:

The words are not cited in Ephrem's commentary, but are in the Arabic translation of the Diatessaron, <u>with</u> *fasting.* The following is taken from Preuschen, which is very close to the Arabic:

Mk 9:28 Und als Jesus hineingegangen war in das Haus, kamen seine Jünger heran und fragten ihn zwischen sich und ihm und sprachen zu ihm: Warum haben wir nicht gekonnt ihn gesund zu machen?

Mt 17:20 Es sprach zu ihnen Jesus: Wegen des Mangelns eures Glaubens. Wahrlich, ich sage euch: Wenn in euch Glauben wäre wie ein Körnchen Senf, so würdet ihr sprechen zu diesem Berg: gehe weg von hier, und er wird weggehen, und nicht wird euch etwas bezwingen.

Mk 9:29? <u>Denn dieses Geschlecht kann man durch nichts austreiben, außer durch Fasten und Gebet.</u>

Mk 9:30 Und als er von dort hinausgegangen war, gingen sie weiter nach Galiläa und nicht wollte er, dass jemand etwas wusste von ihm.

Mk 9:31 Und er lehrte seine Jünger und sprach zu ihnen: …

It is not clear and cannot be decided, whether the words in question were taken from Mt or Mk. But one can at least acknowledge that the Arabic Diatessaron is attesting the long form.

Compare next verse:

NA28 Mark 9:30 <u>Κἀ</u>κεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο ...

BYZ Mark 9:30 <u>καὶ</u> ἐκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο ...

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 2:37 καὶ αὐτὴ χήρα ἕως ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων, ἣ οὐκ ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ <u>νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσιν</u> λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν.

"then as a widow to the age of eighty-four. She never left the temple but worshiped there with <u>fasting and prayer</u> night and day."

NA28 Luke 5:33 οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου <u>νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται</u>

John's disciples, like the disciples of the Pharisees, <u>frequently fast and pray</u>,

NA28 Acts 10:30 καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος ἔφη· ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην <u>τὴν ἐνάτην προσευχόμενος</u> ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἔστη ἐνώπιόν μου ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ

<u>νηστεύων, καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος</u>

P50, A^c, D, Ψ, 33, Maj, it, Sy, sa

txt P74, 01, A*, B, C, 81, 1739, pc, vg, bo

NA28 1 Corinthians 7:5 μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μήτι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρόν, ἵνα σχολάσητε τῇ <u>προσευχῇ</u> καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε, ἵνα μὴ πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν.

<u>νηστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ</u> 01^{C2}, Maj, Sy
txt P11, P46, 01*, A, B, C, D, 33, 81, 1739, al, Latt, Co, Cl

NA28 Romans 14:17 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη__καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ·
<u>καὶ ἄσκησις</u> 1646, 1827

Further references for the combination of the two words:
Neh 1:4; Tob 12:8; Ps 34:13; Sir 34:26; Dan 9:3; Act 13:3; 14:23

In Mt the verse is completely omitted by important witnesses. In Mt no Byzantine witness omits καὶ νηστείᾳ. The internal analysis in Mt remains indecisive. Externally, this verse is probably secondary.

It is difficult to judge if the words have been added or deleted. The support is rather slim. It is possible that the omission is accidental (parablepsis), because the next verse starts with καὶ or κα... (κἀκεῖθεν).

It is important to note on the other hand that in Act 10:30 and 1.Co 7:5 the Byzantine text adds νηστείᾳ, too! Some witnesses add the a similar word in Rom 14:17. The words appear several times together in the Bible. Fasting was considered important not only in the old church, but also throughout the monasticism of the middle ages.

Note that 33 and 579 read here the Matthean form of the saying, but omit the sentence in Mt!

From context, the time for fasting was not yet, cp. Mk 2:19, "The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them, can they?"

Compare the discussion at Mt 17:21.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 199
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:30 Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ·

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἐπορεύοντο
B*, D, pc, a, aur, c, f, Trg, WH

txt P45, 01, B^{C2}, C, L, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, d(!), **NA**[25], Weiss, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

B, p. 1291 B 11: ΠΑΡ is written above the line, according to Tischendorf by the enhancer. This is probably correct.
Ψ: Swanson notes a correction, $Ψ^{C}$ for ἐπορεύοντο (cp. INTF film image 070). There are two dots above πα, which could be interpreted as a deletion sign, but it probably means something else, since these dots appear elsewhere above πα, too, check e.g. Mk 10:33 (film image 110). Probably some kind of diaeresis. A correction is not noted in NA and also not in the text published by Lake.
B: no umlaut

παραπορεύομαι "pass by, go through, go"

Parallel:
NA28 John 7:1 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων

διαπορεύεσθαι	B, C, D
πορεύεσθαι	W, f13

The ἐξελθόντες refers to verse 28:
NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον

παραπορεύομαι appears four times in Mk, but elsewhere only once in Mt. Probably the word has been changed because it is not exactly fitting in its strict sense as "pass by".
Note that B and D change the word also in Mk 2:23!

Weiss, who has studied the manuscripts in detail, notes that D changed the compositum into the simplex some 50 times (TC, p. 53).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 200

90. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 9:33 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε;

BYZ Mark 9:33 Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Καπερναούμ·

Byz A, C, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 28, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
f, q, Sy-S, Sy-H, bo, Gre
εἰσῆλθεν f13, 700
ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς 1071

txt 01, B, D, W, 0274, f1, 565, 1424, pc, Lat, Sy-P, sa
ἦλθοσαν D

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Context, previous verses:

NA28 Mark 9:30 Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,

NA28 Mark 9:32 οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ·
εἰσπορεύεται f1

NA28 John 4:46 Ἦλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,
Ἦλθαν 01

NA28 Matthew 15:39 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν.
ἦλθον C, 118

NA28 Luke 2:51 καὶ κατέβη μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρὲθ
ἦλθον 579

The previous verse has two plurals. Also, in verse 30 we read "They went on from there and passed through Galilee". It would be only natural to expect a plural here, too. Also, in verse 33, Jesus asks the disciples, so they are still together.

On the other hand the singular could be a conformation to the following ἐπηρώτα, which is connected by καὶ with ἦλθεν: Καὶ ἦλθεν ... καὶ ἐπηρώτα ... (so Weiss).

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 11:19
Minor cases: 10:46 (D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32 (Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 201

91. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:34 οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων· πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μείζων.

T&T #124

omit: A, D, Δ, Π, pc[16], it(a, aur, b, d, f, i, l, q, r[1]), Sy-S, goth
pc = 19, 64*, 149*, 264[s], 265, 274, 692, 766, 1079,
1128, 1500, 1546, 1602, 1664, 2290, 2411

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ in brackets in the margin.
c, ff[2], k, vg have the words.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

διελέχθησαν διαλέγομαι indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural
"discuss, debate"

No direct parallel.
Compare previous verse 33:
NA28 Mark 9:33 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε;

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 9:46 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν.

It is possible that the words have been repeated here from the previous verse. On the other hand it is possible that they have been omitted, because of redundancy (so Weiss).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 202

92. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:35 καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα **καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος.**
9:36 καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

T&T #125

omit: D, d, k

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·
εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων διάκονος
f1, pc[22] (h.t.?)

txt, but: ... πάντων δοῦλος M*, pc[39] (:: Mt/Mk!)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallels: both omit this word!

NA28Matthew 18:1-3 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; 2 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν 3 καὶ εἶπεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Luke 9:46-48 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰδὼς τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ 48 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 10:31
πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ [οἱ] ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.
NA28 Matthew 19:30
πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.

NA28 Matthew 20:16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι.
NA28 Luke 13:30 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι.

NA28 Mark 10:43-44 οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
44 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν <u>εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος·</u>
NA28 Matthew 20:26-27 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
27 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν <u>εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·</u>
NA28 Luke 22:26 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

Mt and Lk use a different wording and omit this sentence (<u>Minor Agreement</u>?).
Perhaps the omission is due to parablepsis?
9:35 <u>καὶ λ</u>έγει … 36 <u>καὶ λ</u>αβὼν
<u>et a</u>it illis … <u>et a</u>ccepit

A similar sentence appears later in Mt and Lk, but also in Mk:
Mk 10:44 / Mt 20:27 / Lk 22:26

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 203

93. Difficult reading

NA28 Mark 9:38 Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης· διδάσκαλε,
εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια
_____
καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, **ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν.**

BYZ Mark 9:38 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης λέγων, Διδάσκαλε
εἴδομέν τινα τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια
ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν
καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν **ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν·**

T&T #126

Byz A, K, Π, N, 157, Maj, Sy-H, goth, (**NA^{25}**, Weiss), Tis, [Trg]

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0274, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, pc^{11},
aur, f, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, WH, Trg^{mg}
pc = 10, 115, 237, 873, 895, 1015, 1091, 1194, 2200, 2528, 2606

add pos. 1 omit pos. 2:
D, W, X, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc^{60},
Lat(a, b, c, d, ff^{2}, i, k, l, q, r^{1}, vg), arm, geo, Gre, Bois

omit: (due to h.t.) καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν **ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν·**
124, 472, pc^{120} !

μεθ' ἡμῶν instead of ἡμῖν: D, L, Φ, pc^{11}, a, d, k (:: Lk)
Swanson, Legg have L, but it's not in T&T.

NA^{25} and Weiss have basically Byz, but with ἐκωλύομεν and ἠκολούθει as in txt. This special reading is supported only by pc. Possibly caused by splitting up this variation unit.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 9:49 Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν· ἐπιστάτα,
εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια
καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν.

"Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name,
who does not follow us
and we tried to stop him,
because he does not follow us."

Byz appears to be a conflation of the Western and Alex. text. See WH Intro §141.
On the other hand it is possible that one of the two phrases has been omitted as redundant (so Weiss: "typical Markan tautology"). Weiss (Mk Com.) and also Tischendorf think that the omission of the relative clause might be due to harmonization to Lk.
Ross writes: "The difficulty here is how to account for variant (B) [the Western variant]. The UBS committee explains this as 'a transposition of the last clause to bring it into proximity with its subject', but this is hardly a sufficient motive for so radical an alteration. […] The result [the Byzantine variant] is an effective but rather prolix sentence typical of Mark's diffuse style of writing, and both (A) and (B) are easily explained as alternative attempts to remove the redundancy."

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 472-3) actually argues for the reading of D:
ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν
He thinks that the ὅτι clause has been taken over from Lk. His argumentation for μεθ' ἡμῶν is inconclusive. He thinks that Lk took the present ἀκολουθεῖ, the imperfect ἐκωλύομεν and μεθ' ἡμῶν from Mk, but only changed the sentence structure.

Overall the arguments are indecisive. It appears tempting to accept the Byzantine text as original here. A similar case occurs a few verses later, see Mk 9:49.

Compare:
J.M. Ross "Some unnoticed points in the text of the NT" NovT 25 (1983) 59-72

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 204

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν.
οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου
καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με·

"Do not stop him;
for there is no one who does a deed of power in my name
and is able soon afterward to speak evil of me."

Not in NA and not in SQE!

με κακολογῆσαί	W, f1, 28, 565,
	it(a, b, c, d, ff^{2}, i, k, r^{1}), Sy-S, arm, geo
κακολογῆσαί με	F*
με ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί	1582^{c}

Θ, f13, 700, aur, f, l, q, vg have ταχὺ.

1582: There is a space between δυνήσεταί με and κακολογῆσαί and ταχὺ appears with a tilde sign ~ in the margin. This has been written by the original scribe Ephraim (10th CE). Someone later added the word also in the space.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Certainly not a simple omission (as in F*), since the word order has been changed. Either stylistic, idiom, or omitted as irrelevant in context.

There is no reason for a secondary addition of the word.

Tischendorf notes in his GNT the catena ("catt"):
τὸ δὲ ταχὺ πρόσκειται διὰ τοὺς εἰς αἵρεσιν ἐκπεσόντας.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 205

NA28 Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν.

BYZ Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν

Byz A, D, K, Π, 124, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H

txt 01, B, C, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 2542, k, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, goth

ἡμῶν ... ὑμῶν L, 124, pc
ὑμῶν ... ἡμῶν X, 118, pc

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 9:50 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν.
BYZ Luke 9:50 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν

Byz 01^{C2}, f1, f13, Maj
txt 01^{C1}, B, C, D, K, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, pc, Latt, Sy, Co
ὑμῶν ... ἡμῶν 01*, A, Δ, pc
ἡμῶν ... ὑμῶν Θ, 2542, pc

The Byz/txt readings are exactly opposite in Mk and Lk.

Compare next verse 41:
NA28 Mark 9:38 Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης· διδάσκαλε, εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν.
NA28 Mark 9:41 Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

Possibly the readings have been changed as a harmonization to the ὑμᾶς in the next verse 41. On the other hand it is possible that it was a harmonization to the ἡμῖν in verse 38.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 206

NA28 Mark 9:41 Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 9:41 Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ

T&T #127 (partial)

txt	ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε	B, C*, K, L, N, Π*, Ψ, f1, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, Sy, sa, WH, **NA[25]**
	ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔσται	01[C2], A, 579, 1424
Byz	ἐν ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε	C[C3], Π[C], X, 2[C], Maj, Latt, Sy-H[mg], Co, goth, Tis
	ἐν ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔσται	W, 2*
	ἐν ὀνόματι μου ὅτι ἐμὸν ἔσται	01*
	ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε	M, Θ, 565, 700, 2542
	ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔσται	D, Δ, 28
	ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε	f13 (:: 9:37,39)

Byz	(01*), C[C], W, Maj, Latt, bo
Byz + τῷ	D, H, M, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 372, 565, 700, 2542, 2737

txt 01[C2], A, B, C*, K, L, N, Π*, Σ, Φ, Ψ, 0211, f1, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2766, al[60], Sy, sa

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 10:42 καὶ ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 9:37 ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται <u>ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου</u>, ἐμὲ δέχεται·
NA28 Mark 9:38 εἴδομέν τινα <u>ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u> ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν.
NA28 Mark 9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν. οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν <u>ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου</u> καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με·

The meaning of the Greek idiom ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι which means "under the category that" = "because" was probably not fully understood by many scribes or they felt uncomfortable with it. In the NT it appears only here. In the Gospels only ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου appears. See W. Heitmüller "Im Namen Jesu" FRLANT 12, Göttingen, 1903.

Tischendorf notes: "vdtr propter pleonasmum omissum esse; si quis intulisset μου, eiecisset opinor ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε". = "Probably omitted to avoid pleonasm. If someone added μου, he would probably have deleted ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε".
Hoskier (Codex B, I, P. 113): [the omission] "is a smoothing away of a supposed difficulty."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 207

94. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:42 Καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων [εἰς ἐμέ], καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

BYZ Mark 9:42 Καὶ ὃς ἐάν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται λίθος μύλικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

omit εἰς ἐμέ: 01, C*, D, Δ, it(a, b, d, ff^2, k)
πιστευόντων 01, C*?, Δ, it, NA^{25}, WH, Weiss, Gre, Tis, Bal
πίστιν ἐχόντων C*?, D, a, Bois

txt A, B, C^{C2}, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy, sa, bo^{pt}, goth

According to Tischendorf two readings are possible for C*. He prefers the second.

ΠΙCΤΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ
ΠΙCΤΙΝΕΧΟΝΤΩΝ

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [εἰς ἐμέ] in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 18:6 Ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ,

Compare for absolute πιστεύω:

NA28 Mark 5:36 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ· μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.

NA28 Mark 9:24 εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου ἔλεγεν· πιστεύω·

NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε·

NA28 Mark 15:32 ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν.

Possibly the words were added from Mt (so Weiss). This is the only occurrence of the words in the Synoptic Gospels. In John πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ appears 11 times, though: Jo 6:35; 7:38; 11:25-26; 12:44, 46; 14:1, 12; 16:9; 17:20.

πιστεύω absolutely used appears several time sin Mk.

The story 9:38 ff. deals with an exorcist, who "does not follow us". Therefore possibly the phrase τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ appeared somewhat inappropriate and lead to the omission of εἰς ἐμέ, leaving a more general τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 208

95. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:43 Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον.

	σκανδαλίσῃ	01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, (579), 892, 1342, pc, WH, NA[25], Bois, Tis, Bal
	σκανδαλήσῃ	579
txt	σκανδαλίζῃ	A, C, D, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, Weiss, WH[mg]
	σκανδαλίζει	E, X, Θ, 28, 565, 1424, pc

B: no umlaut

σκανδαλίζῃ	subjunctive	present	active 3rd person singular
σκανδαλίσῃ	subjunctive	aorist	active 3rd person singular
σκανδαλίζει	indicative	present	active 3rd person singular

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:29 εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.

σκανδαλίζῃ L, 1582*, 346, 2, 1071

NA28 Matthew 5:30 καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιά σου χεὶρ σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτὴν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ.

safe!

NA28 Matthew 18:6 Ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης.

safe!

NA28 Matthew 18:8 Εἰ δὲ ἡ χείρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν κυλλὸν ἢ χωλὸν ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.

σκανδαλίζῃ F, L, V, X, 579, pc

NA28 Matthew 18:9 καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου <u>σκανδαλίζει</u> σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοί ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. safe!

NA28 Luke 17:2 λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλικὸς περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα <u>σκανδαλίσῃ</u> τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα.

<u>σκανδαλίσει</u> 579

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 9:42 Καὶ ὃς ἂν <u>σκανδαλίσῃ</u> ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων [εἰς ἐμέ], καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

<u>σκανδαλίζῃ</u> D
<u>σκανδαλίσει</u> H, 1071, pc
<u>σκανδαλίσι</u> Θ
<u>σκανδαλήσει</u> 2, 28, 579
<u>σκανδαλίσῃ</u> txt all others, W

NA28 Mark 9:45 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου <u>σκανδαλίζῃ</u> σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν· καλόν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.

<u>σκανδαλίζει</u> 01, Θ, 2, 28, 565, 1342, 1424
<u>σκανδαλίσει</u> L
<u>σκανδαλίσῃ</u> W

NA28 Mark 9:47 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου <u>σκανδαλίζῃ</u> σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν,

<u>σκανδαλίζει</u> D, Θ, 2, 28, 565, 700, 1424
<u>σκανδαλίσῃ</u> W, 579

Mt uses the present active σκανδαλίζει, except for 18:6 σκανδαλίση, subjunctive aorist, but here the subjunctive is required because of the ὃς δ' ἂν. The same is true for Mk 9:42 (ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίση). In Mk 9:45 and 47 subjunctive present σκανδαλίζῃ is basically safe.
It could thus be argued that σκανδαλίσῃ in verse 43 is a conformation to the immediately preceeding context, verse 42 (so already Weiss).
A problem remains why Mark uses two different subjunctives here. In verse 42 he uses the aorist and in 45 and 47 the present.
Interestingly W uses the aorist consistently in all 4 verses.

Externally the support is very strong for the aorist.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 209
9:43 + 9:45 + 9:47

NA28 Mark 9:43 Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον.

T&T #128 (verse 47)

9:43 Minority reading
txt 01$^{(*),C2}$, A, B, C, (D), X, Θ, f13, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy-H, Co, goth
D, k: βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν ...

ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν 01^{C1}, L, Δ, Ψ, 0274, 700, 892, pc, Sy-P
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον W, f1, 788(=f13), 28, pc, Sy-S
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς F
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

NA28 Mark 9:45 βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.
BYZ Mark 9:45 βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον,

βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν 01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 0274, 892, 1342, pc, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν W, f1, 28

ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς F

βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον
A, D, Θ, Ξ, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, goth
βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον 700
B: no umlaut

NA28 Mark 9:47 βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν,
BYZ Mark 9:47 βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς,

T&T #128

βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν 01, B, L, (W), Δ, Ψ, 0274, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc[3], it(a, b, c, d, ff[2], k, r[1]), Co
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν D, f1, Sy-S
pc = 1312, 1668, 2144

βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς A, C, X, Θ, f13, Maj, Lat(aur, f, i, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Trg[mg]
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς 1241, 1424

βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον pc[10]
βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον F, 1330

The omission of the article is discussed as an extra variant. See below.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 18:8 βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.
(Mt puts foot and hand in one saying.)
NA28 Matthew 18:9 βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 5:22
ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ· μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.
safe!

NA28 Matthew 5:29 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν. safe!

NA28 Luke 12:5 φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν.
add τοῦ πυρὸς: 1424, L1663

This nest of variants is difficult to understand.
We have here a threefold saying of Jesus: hand, foot, eye. The question is if these three sayings were originally symmetric or if the symmetry has been added (or removed) later. Compare also the variants for verse 44, 46, below.

It can be noted that

1. the Byzantine text has always the fullest form. This is as it should be.
2. W, f1 and 28 have one short form in the first and the other short form in the second saying. The same is true for 700, but the other way round. Deliberately?
3. only 01 and B have txt in all three sayings (one long, two short forms).
4. (01), L, Δ, Ψ, 892 have the short reading in all three cases.

Thus it can be said that the complexity of the variants can best be explained by different intentions of the scribes:
- some always used the fullest possible form (Byz).
- some always used the shortest form (to get symmetry?): L, Δ et al.
- same wanted some variation to break the monotony: W, f1, 28, 700
This of course does not really help us to find the original.

It is possible that the variant of W et al. in the first saying is due to homoioarcton (EIST - EIST). It is also possible that it has been changed deliberately to get different readings for each verse.
There is also the possibility that the txt reading is a conflation of the two other variants. Against this can be said that no different text types are involved. And what would be the correct one of the two short readings?

εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον must be original at least once. Otherwise it would be extremely difficult to explain the different distribution of witnesses. If this is correct, then the long reading must be correct in saying one.

It is probable that in the second saying the Byzantine reading is a harmonization to verse 43. On the other hand the long reading could have been shortened deliberately again to get some variation.

In the third saying the τοῦ πυρὸς is strange. One would have expected εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον here again. So it is either original or it must be a harmonization to Mt (so many commentators). If it is original, why should it have been omitted? Compare Mt 5:22 γέεννναν τοῦ πυρός. Probably not an unusual term. F/09 reads τοῦ πυρὸς in all three verses.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 210

96. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 9:47 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν,

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, L, Ψ, 28, WH

txt 01, D, W, Δ, Θ, 0274, f1, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc,
NA[25], Weiss, WH[mg]

εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς A, C, f13, Maj

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [τὴν] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:22 μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.
safe!

NA28 Matthew 5:29 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.
εἰς τὴν γέενναν W, L

NA28 Matthew 5:30 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ.
εἰς τὴν γέενναν L

NA28 Matthew 18:9 καλόν σοί ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.
safe!

NA28 Luke 12:5 ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν.
εἰς γέενναν D, Ψ, 157, 700

Context:

NA28 Mark 9:43 καλόν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν <u>εἰς τὴν</u> ζωὴν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν <u>εἰς τὴν γέενναν,</u> εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον.
safe!

NA28 Mark 9:45 καλόν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν <u>εἰς τὴν</u> ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι <u>εἰς τὴν γέενναν.</u>
<u>εἰς γέενναν</u> M*, N, Ψ, f13, 28, 700

L, Ψ and 28 deviate in the parallels, too. Ψ and 28 read εἰς γέενναν in verse 45, too.

It is important to note that verse 47 is different in that a specification follows: βληθῆναι εἰς (τὴν) γέενναν, 48 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.
Of course the addition of the article could be a conformation to the immediately preceeding context (verse 43 and 45). That the omission of the article is a harmonization to Mt is rather improbable, because in verse 43 the article is safe.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 211
NA28 Mark 9:44 + 9:46 + 9:48

BYZ Mark 9:44 + 9:46
ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.

Byz A, D, X, Θ, f13, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, [Trg]
txt 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 0274, f1, 28, 565, (892), pc, k, Sy-S, Co

892 only in verse 46.

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Safe:
NA28 Mark 9:48
ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.

derived from:
LXX Isaiah 66:24 καὶ ἐξελεύσονται καὶ ὄψονται τὰ κῶλα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν παραβεβηκότων ἐν ἐμοί ὁ γὰρ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτήσει καὶ τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ σβεσθήσεται

It seems more likely that the verses have been added than accidentally omitted by so large a range of witnesses.
It is noteworthy that the witnesses are (almost) the same for both verses (see UBS[4] for details). This indicates a deliberate rather than an accidental cause for the origin of this variant. Mk 9:42 - 10:1 was a Monday lection. The "semi-liturgical, incantatory style of this passage" (Ross) may have led to the addition.

Buttmann notes (TSK 33, 1860) that Eusebius does not separate these words into different Canones. He therefore has read them only once.

Looking back to the variants in 9:43-48, it seems that the Byzantine text is designed to make the three sayings symmetric and better memorable by repetition. Only in the last sentence εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς the last two words are not identical anymore, probably to indicate the end.

txt:	Byz:
43 Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον.	**43** Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν σοι ἐστίν κυλλὸν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον
	44 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.
45 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν· καλόν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.	**45** καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν· καλόν ἐστίν σοι εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον,
	46 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.
47 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν,	**47** καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σοι ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς,
48 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.	**48** ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 212

97. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 9:49 Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται.

BYZ Mark 9:49 πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται
καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται,

T&T #129

Byz	A, C, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 28^{c}, 579, 892, Maj,	
	Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, Weiss, Vogels, [Trg]	
	… ἐν πυρὶ …	C
	Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ δοκιμασθήσεται…	46, 52, 2614, g^{1}
	(= "will be tested")	from Theophylact Comm.
	Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀναλωθήσεται…	Θ, pc^{3}
	… καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀναλωθήσεται	Ψ
	(= "will be consumed")	

txt	01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 788, 826(=f13), 28*, 565, 700, 1342, pc^{100},	
	Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, Did	
	ἐν πυρὶ	01, 1342
	ἁλισγηθήσεται	W (= "will be polluted")

καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται	1364*, 2173, 2426, 2465 (h.t.)
πᾶσα γὰρ θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται	D, Ambrose, Chromatius
Omne enim sacrificium sali salietur	d
Omnis enim victim sale salietur	b, ff^{2}, i
Omnis enim victim salietur	aur, c
Omnis hostia insalabitur	a
Omnia autem substantia consumitur	k (misread θυσία as οὐσία)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

The reading δοκιμασθήσεται clearly comes from Theophylact's commentary to the passage who writes: "ἁλισθήσεται, τουτέστιν, δοκιμασθήσεται". Compare: E.W. Saunders JBL 71 (1952) 85-92

"For everyone will be salted with fire
and every sacrifice with salt will be salted."

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 5:13 ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς·
NA28 Luke 14:34 Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται;

LXX Leviticus 2:13 καὶ πᾶν δῶρον θυσίας ὑμῶν ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται
"And every gift of your sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt"

One of WH's conflation readings, see WH § 142, p. 101f.

The addition is strange. Why should it have been added?

It is possible that one part had been accidentally omitted due to h.t. (so Weiss and Vogels).
Please note the support from Ψ and also the partial omission by D, it.

It is possible that the reading of (D, it) is just an omission due to h.t.:

9:48 σβέννυτ**αι.** 49 **Πᾶς** γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται.
καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται
(note that 4 Byzantine minuscules have the D reading too! See T&T 129)

Bousset (Studien NT, 1894, p. 98) argues for the long version: "The heavy-handed sentence [long version] is difficult to understand and provokes corrections." He finds it hard to believe that (as WH think) a reminiscence of Lev. 2:13 has replaced the words of 01, B et al. He would expect that the words would have been added as a gloss and not that they replaced the other words.

On the other hand the Byzantine reading can in principle be explained as a conflation of the Western and Alexandrian readings (see WH Intro §142).
It is also possible that the Byzantine text came from a text where Lev. 2:13 was written in the margin as a note and then crept into the text, but this scenario is very improbable, because the context and wording is very different.
It is possible though that due to the difficulty of the original short text, interpreters tried to find a meaning from the LXX reference.

NET Bible:
"The statement *everyone will be salted with fire* is difficult to interpret. It may be a reference to (1) unbelievers who enter hell as punishment for rejection of Jesus, indicating that just as salt preserves so they will be preserved in their punishment in hell forever; (2) Christians who experience suffering in this world because of their attachment to Christ; (3) any person who experiences suffering in a way appropriate to their relationship to Jesus. For believers this means the suffering of purification, and for unbelievers it means hell, i.e., eternal torment."

Note that both Mt and Lk don't have the verse (Minor Agreement?).

Baarda suggests a mistranslation from the Aramaic:
"yittabal" = seasoned, salted
"yitbol/yittbel" = baptized
"For everyone will be baptized with fire." Compare: Mt 3:11 and Lk 3:16
αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·

Linder suggests to take πυρί not as an instrumental dative, but as an object dative with the meaning:

"For everyone will be salted **for** [the holy sacrifice] fire."

Compare for example:
NA28 2 Peter 3:7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρί
But by the same word the present heavens and earth have been reserved for fire
The other (Byz, Western) phrase reads:
καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται,
"and every sacrifice with salt will be salted."
(here with instrumental dative)
With Linder's translation both phrases mean essentially the same. It is possible that the textual situation at this verse indicates some corruption, that the first part is corrupt or incomprehensible and led to the "explanatory" second part.

Burkitt (JTS 1916) writes:

> "Another reason, equally cogent, is that the shorter reading (πᾶς γὰρ ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται) is the only one that fits the context. There is really nothing in the whole set of Sayings about sacrifices; to cut off your hand or your foot, if it be a 'scandal' to you, is not a θυσία but a precaution. If we are to seek for a theological expression corresponding to being 'salted with fire' I venture to think it would be 'baptized by the Holy Ghost and with fire'. The only salting I know in Hebrew literature of living persons is that alluded to in Ezek. 16:4, according to which properly cared for new-born infants are washed in salt water. I don't suppose the passage in Ezekiel was in our Lord's mind, but the custom alluded to may have been. The whole context speaks about 'entering into life' and about 'little ones', and ἁλισθήσεται may refer to the first bath of a Jewish infant.
> But the wording, apart from the context, suggested Lev. 2:13; so we get the Western interpretation, and (at a later period) the curious interpretation of πᾶς as every sacrificial (? eucharistic) loaf. This sacrificial interpretation, in any case, starts from ἁλισθήσεται, so that for this reason also ἁλισγηθήσεται and ἀναλωθήσεται must be regarded as later alterations of ἁλισθήσεται.

It should be noticed that Θ Ψ and k appear to have arrived at ἀναλωθήσεται independently. Θ and Ψ are both supporters of the conflate Constantinopolitan text, but whereas Θ has 'for every one shall be consumed (ἀναλωθήσεται) with fire and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt', Ψ, on the contrary, tells us that 'every one shall be salted with fire and every sacrifice shall be consumed'. k has *omnia autem substantia consumitur* (sic), where it is supposed that *substantia* stands for οὐσία a corruption of θυσία, but the false concord of *omnia* seems to shew that the corruption is more extensive. No other Latin text has *autem* for γάρ here.
It is possible that πᾶσα γὰρ οὐσία ἁλισθήσεται was the earliest form of the Western text here, and the direct parent of k on the one hand and D lat.eur on the other."

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) suggests that the text is corrupt and one has to read ἁγνισθήσεται (purified) for ἁλισθήσεται (salted).

Note the similar case of redundancy some verses above in Mk 9:38.

Compare:

- F.C. Burkitt "W and Θ, Studies in the Western text of St. Mark" JTS 17 (1916) 1-21
- N.D. Coleman "Note on Mk 9:49 A new meaning for ἅλας." JTS 24 (1923) 387-396
- T.J. Baarda "Mark 9:49" NTS 5 (1958/59) 318-21
- J.R. Linder "Bemerkungen über einige Stellen der Evangelien" TSK 32 (1859) 511-19

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive, reconsider, in brackets?)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 213

98. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 10:1 Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας [καὶ] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 10:1 Κακεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου Καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς

T&T #130

πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου — C^{C2}, D, G, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 517, 565, 579, 954, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2786, pc^{200}, Latt, Sy-S, Sy-P, goth

"He went to the region of Judea beyond the Jordan"

καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου — 01, B, C*, L, Ψ, 0211, 0274, 892, pc^{3}, Co
pc = 703, 1009, 1515

"He went to the region of Judea and beyond the Jordan"

διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου — A, N, X, 700, Maj, Sy-H

"He went to the region of Judea through the other side of the Jordan"

καὶ διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου — 1071

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 19:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, μετῆρεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

"he left Galilee and went to the region of Judea beyond the Jordan."

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ... πλῆθος πολὺ ... ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

Context:

Mk 9:33 Then they came to Capernaum.
Mk 10:32 They were on the road, going up to Jerusalem,

Jesus went from Galilee to Judea. The question is how to interpret "beyond the Jordan". Galilee and Judea are only West of the Jordan. Thus there is no need to cross the Jordan.
If one accepts καὶ as original, one has to interpret this as not describing a journey, but a stay for a longer time. He "comes" into the area of Judea <u>and</u> trans-Jordan (and is staying and preaching there).
It is interesting to note that the Matthean parallel has no variants. If that reading caused any geographical difficulty, a change in Mt would be even more likely. Robertson in his Wordpictures calls τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου a curious expression. He writes: "It apparently means that Jesus left Galilee to go to Judea by way of Perea as the Galileans often did to avoid Samaria."
So, if the καὶ is original, this introduces a difference in meaning between Mt and Mk. It is possible that καὶ in the 01, B reading means "that is, namely" (epexegetic, explicative καὶ), but this does not really help.

It is possible that the omission of καὶ is a harmonization to Mt.
On the other hand it is possible that the short reading is original. The other readings are attempts to explain its ambiguity. Some scribes changed it by adding a καὶ to make clear the he visits two different areas. Others added διὰ τοῦ to clarify that it indicates his journey, beyond the Jordan into Judea (so Weiss).
The short reading as original would also remove the difficulty to explain why Mt has changed any of the other (rather straightforward) readings into a more obscure one.

Possibly Bathanaea is meant? This is the view of R. Riesner (compare his book "Bethanien jenseits des Jordan", Giessen, 2002, p. 65ff.). Compare also Act 2:9, where a Judea is mentioned, which seems to be located in Syria.

Rating: - (indecisive)
brackets ok.

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 214
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 10:2 Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.

T&T #131

omit: D, 1661, 2615^{c}, it(a, b, d, k, r^{1}), Sy-S, geo^{A}, sa^{mss}, Bois, SBL
WH have the term in brackets

Lat(aur, c, ff^{2}, l, q, vg) have the words.

D*: καὶ πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν
D^{c}: καὶ _____ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Compare previous verse 1:
NA28 Mark 10:1 καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.
D: καὶ πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:3 Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι πειράζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες· εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;

The txt reading could be a (partial) harmonization to Mt. But the support for the omission is very slim.
The omission in D seems to be accidental. The scribe first repeated the last part of verse 1 (KAI P.. - KAI P..). After the erasure the correct term has not been inserted then.

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) accepts the short reading:

> "I believe both that this is the true reading, and that ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν is the impersonal plural - not 'the multitudes asked Him' but 'the question was asked of Him'. It would not be reasonable to suppose that the question of divorce was the dominant one in the minds of the crowds:

Peter simply remembered the question being raised at that time. There is no parallel in Luke: Matthew supplies προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι, from which many authorities have borrowed προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι for the text of Mark."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 215

NA28 Mark 10:6

ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς·

BYZ Mark 10:6

ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς ὁ θεός.

αὐτούς ὁ θεός A, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, l, q, vg), Sy, Gre, Trg^{mg}

ὁ θεός D, W, pc, it(b, d, f, ff^2, k, r^1), goth, Bois
D, b, d, ff^2, q additionally omit κτίσεως.

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, 872(=f1), 579, 1342, pc, c, Co

WH have txt with αὐτούς in brackets.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:4 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς;
omit: a, ff^1, Sy-S
add ὁ θεός: pc

LXX parallel:
LXX Genesis 1:27 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς

Compare LXX:
LXX Genesis 1:1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν
LXX Genesis 1:7 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα ...
LXX Genesis 1:16 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς δύο φωστῆρας ...
LXX Genesis 1:21 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα ...
LXX Genesis 1:25 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς ...
LXX Genesis 1:27 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ...

ὁ θεός has probably been added to provide the subject for ἐποίησεν (so Weiss). In verse 4 and 5 Moses was the subject.
Possibly αὐτούς sounded similar to ὁ θεός and this was the origin of the Western reading?

Hoskier thinks that the omission is a harmonization to Mt, which is safe. It is also possible that it is a harmonization to the LXX Gen 1:27. But in both verses we have a subject: In Genesis ὁ θεός is used at the beginning of the verse and Mt has ὁ κτίσας.

On the other hand ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς is a prominent phrase from the beginning of Genesis (10 times) and could have suggested the addition.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 216

99. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:7 ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα [καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ],
8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ.

BYZ Mark 10:7 ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ

omit: 01, B, Ψ, 892*, Sy-S, goth, WH, NA[25], Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal

καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ
A, C, L, N, Δ, Σ, f1, 579, 1342, al

txt D, K, Π, W, X, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700[c], 892[c], 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

700*: μητέρα for γυναῖκα

μητέρα αὐτοῦ 01, (D), M, 579, 1241, pc, it, vg[mss]

Tregelles has the words without brackets in the text and with brackets in the margin.
892: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand (triplet insertion sign).
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

προσκολλάομαι "be united (in marriage)"
κολλάομαι "unite oneself with"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:5 καὶ εἶπεν· ἕνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

Compare:
LXX Genesis 2:24 ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ <u>καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

NA28 Ephesians 5:31 ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος [τὸν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα <u>καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,</u> καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

omit: 1739, pc, Cyp, Jerome

The phrase is not really a harmonization to Mt. It has possibly been omitted due to h.t. (KAI … KAI). It has also been suggested that it was omitted due to h.t. from a reading that had αὐτοῦ after μητέρα. But in that case one would have expected an αὐτοῦ for all the omitting witnesses here, but only 01 has it.

The omission is probably wrong. It is needed for a correct understanding of verse 8. Without the phrase it would be: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and the two shall become one flesh."

The support for the omission is very good though.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 494) suggests that it is possible that the words have been omitted deliberately to suit the ascetic beliefs of Egyptian scribes.

The words have apparently been taken from the LXX Genesis and not from the Matthean parallel, which is unusual if the addition is secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 217

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:11 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν·

NA28 Mark 10:12
καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.

T&T #132

ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ ἀνὴρ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ	f13, 28
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ	D, Θ, 565, 700, arm, geo^2 it(a, aur, b, c, d, ff^2, k, q)
ἐὰν ἀπολύσῃ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ ἐὰν ἀνὴρ ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα μ.	W, f1, pc, Sy-S, geo^1
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ	A, K, Π, X, 157, 1071, Maj, Lat(f, l, vg), goth, Gre
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς	01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Co

Note also:

γαμήσῃ ἄλλον 01, B, C*, D, L, (Δ), Θ, Ψ, (f1), f13, 28, 565, 892, pc
("marries another")

γαμηθῇ ἄλλῳ A, C^c, X, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
("is married to another", better Greek)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:31 Ἐρρέθη δέ·
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον.

NA28 Matthew 5:32 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.

NA28 Matthew 19:9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται.

NA28 Luke 16:18 Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 10:2 Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν
εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.

There are two things involved:

1. W+f1 and f13+28 give direct subjects/objects in verse 11.
   f13+28 have: ἀνὴρ τὴν γυναῖκα
   W+f1 have: γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα (change of order)

2. D, Θ, 565, 700, it and f13+28 change
   ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα
   into
   ἐξέλθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς.

ἐξέλθη simply means "go away, leave" whereas ἀπολύω means "release, set free; divorce".
txt:
"and if she **divorces** her husband and marries another, she commits adultery."
Lat+Caes:
"and if she **leaves** her husband and marries another, she commits adultery."

Under Roman law a woman could initiate divorce. Under Jewish law only a man could initiate divorce and the woman was required to get her husband to initiate it. The Western reading looks like an accommodation of the text for a Jewish audience. Initiating divorce was impossible for a Jewish woman.

M. Holmes (JBL 109, 1990, 651-664) writes:
"the variants … do not reflect any apparent harmonizing tendencies. This last point is quite remarkable; I find it amazing that the 'Matthean exception', for example, is not known to occur in any Markan manuscript."

It should be noted that the original question of the Pharisees in verse 2 was: "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?" It would thus be only natural to answer: "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery."
The W, f1 reading is quite curious. It reverses the order: "If a wife divorces her husband ...". Possibly accidental? It has been suggested (Merx, Burkitt, Birdsall) that this reading is the original and the others are attempts to overcome the inappropriate order.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 218

100. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ **ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.**

BYZ Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα ἅψηται· αὐτῶν οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ **ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν**

Byz A, D, W, X, Θ, f1, f13[a,b], 157, 700, 1071, Maj,
Lat, Sy, sa[pt], goth, Gre, Tis, Trg, Bal
τοῖς φέρουσιν Θ, f1, f13[c], 1424

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, pc, c, k, sa[pt], bo, Trg[mg]

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:13 Τότε προσηνέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.
ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς C

NA28 Luke 18:15 Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅπτηται· ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς.
txt 01, B, D, L, T, f1, f13, 157, 579,892, 1241, al
ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς A, W, Θ, Ψ, Maj

The txt reading could be a harmonization to Mt/Lk (so Hoskier). Both parallels are safe regarding αὐτοῖς.
It is probable that τοῖς προσφέρουσιν has been added to make sure that the disciples rebuke those bringing them, and not the children (so Weiss). It is interesting that both Mt and Lk did not change this and leave the equivocal αὐτοῖς. There is no addition recorded for Mt and Lk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 219

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:14 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκτησεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

ἠγανάκτησεν καὶ ἐπιτιμήσας

W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, arm, geo, [von Soden]

ἐπετιμήσεν καὶ 1342

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἐπιτιμάω "command, order; rebuke; scold"

Compare previous verse 13:

NA28 Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.

The support is chiefly Caesarean. This makes this reading very suspect. If original, it would be very difficult to explain its omission in all other witnesses. Elliott suggested (Metzger Festschrift 1981, p. 58) that the word has been omitted to correct the monotonous style of Mk.

On the other hand the addition, if secondary and inspired from the previous verse, looks rather dilettantic.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 220

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

ἰδοὺ τις πλούσιος προσδραμὼν	A, K, Π, M, W, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700
(omit εἷς)	1071, 2542, 2680, pc^{20+}, Sy-H^{mg}, arm, sa^{mss}

Clement (Swanson): ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσελθὼν τις εγονυπέτει λέγων ...

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;

NA28 Matthew 19:22 ... ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

NA28 Matthew 19:23 ... πλούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Luke 18:18 Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

NA28 Luke 18:23 ... ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.

Compare immediate context:

NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

The verse is the beginning of a lection. The story is generally known as "The Rich Man" from early on and it is therefore only natural to add this characterization here.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 221

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:19 τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, **μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς**, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

T&T # 135

"you shall not defraud"

omit: B*, K, Π, W, Δ(*), Σ, Ψ, f1, f13b,c, 28, 579, 700, 2542, pm240, vgms, Sy-S, arm, Cl

txt 01, A, B C2, C, D, X, Θ, 0274, f13a, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

omit μὴ φονεύσῃς f1
omit μὴ μοιχεύσῃς 01*

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

B has a correction here. (p. 1292 C, line 17) ἀποστερήσῃς is written in the right margin. It is not clear if the preceding μὴ is original, probably not, it is enhanced. The ἀποστερήσῃς is not enhanced. Tischendorf labels it B2.

Δ: (p. 170) The scribe left an extra space for these words, indicating that he was aware of the words, but decided not to write them. This was already noted by Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 105).

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:18-19 λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, _____19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

NA28 Luke 18:20 τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, _____ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

Compare:
LXX Psalms of Solomon 4:1 τέκνον τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ πτωχοῦ μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς
"do not cheat the poor of their living,"
LXX Psalms of Solomon 34:21 ἄρτος ἐπιδεομένων ζωὴ πτωχῶν ὁ ἀποστερῶν αὐτὴν ἄνθρωπος αἱμάτων
"whoever deprives them of it is a murderer."

LXX Psalms of Solomon 34:22 ἐκχέων αἷμα ὁ ἀποστερῶν μισθὸν μισθίου
"to deprive an employee of wages is to shed blood."
LXX 1 Corinthians 6:8 ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε,
"But you yourselves wrong and defraud"
LXX 1 Corinthians 7:5 μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους,
"Do not deprive one another" (husband and wife)

Note that both Mt and Lk omit the term, both safe (Minor Agreement). The term has probably been omitted, because it does not fit into a list of the ten commandments. It is a common term, see above.
Here in Mk it has possibly been omitted as a harmonization to Mt and Lk. It is also quite possible that it has accidentally been omitted due to h.t. (..ρήσῃς - ..ρήσῃς), compare the similar omissions by 01* and f1.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 222

NA28 Mark 10:21 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἕν σε ὑστερεῖ· ὕπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ δὸς [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

BYZ Mark 10:21 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἓν σοί ὑστερεῖ· ὕπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ [1] δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι **ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν.**

T&T #138

Byz [2] A, X, 700, 1424, Maj, q, Sy, sa, bo^{mss}, goth, Gre
[1] G, N, W, 0257, f1, f13, 28, 2542, pc^{8}, a, geo^{1}, (W, f13 add σου)
pc = 191, 299, 447, 495, 563, 872, 1542, 1654
These different insertion points are indicated unintelligible (with) in NA!

txt 01, B, C, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0274, 565, 579, 892, 1342, pc^{11},
Lat, sa^{ms}, bo, geo^{2}, Cl, Hil
pc = 16^{c}, 79, 92, 136, 406, 417, 766, 830, 1187, 1416, 2633

Lacuna: L, 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1292 C, line 30)

καὶ δεῦρο ἀκο**λούθει μοι. 22 ὁ δὲ στυ**γνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:21

καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.
ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν σου Sy-C, Aphraates

NA28 Luke 18:22

καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:34 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

NA28 Matthew 16:24 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

NA28 Luke 9:23 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

Probably copied from Mk 8:34 (so Weiss) or the other parallels. The two different insertion points clearly indicate a secondary cause. It is interesting that in the parallel accounts no addition is known, except Sy-C in Mt.
On the other hand the words could have been omitted as a harmonization to the direct parallels in Mt 19:21/Lk 18:22.
It's noteworthy that the Majority text has the words a the end, contrary to the position in all other parallels.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 223

101. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 10:24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·

BYZ Mark 10:24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τέκνα πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν **τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ χρήμασιν,** εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·

T&T #139

" those trusting on the riches"

Byz A, C, D, X, Θ, Ψ^{c}, f1, f13, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, goth, Cl, Diatess, Gre, Trg

οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες 1241, pc^{5} (= 588, 973, 1090, 2791, 2812) (verse 23)
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν **πλούσοιν** W
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ. **τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν** 2786

txt 01, B, Δ, Ψ*, $1463^{94\%\ Byz}$, k, sa, bo^{pt}, WH, **NA^{25}**

Tregelles additionally has τοὺς πεπ. ἐπὶ χρήμ. in brackets in the margin.
Ψ: The words have been added in the margin, probably by the same hand, at least contemporary.

Lacuna: L, 33
B: no umlaut

The Diatessaron has the Byzantine form:
Arabic (Ciasca): Discipuli autem obstupescebant in hisce verbis. At Iesus rursus respondens ait illis: Filioli mei, quam difficile est iis, qui confidunt in substantiis suis, in regnum Dei introire!
Ephrem (McCarthy): But when he turned away, our Lord said: *It is difficult for those who trust in their own riches*.

Compare previous verse 23:

NA28 Mark 10:23 Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· πῶς δυσκόλως <u>οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες</u> εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται.

Compare next verse 25:
NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.
"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God."

On the one hand it can be an early addition to soften the rather rigorous statement. On the other hand it could have been omitted accidentally due to h.t. (IN -IN).

It is interesting that both Mt and Lk omit Mk 10:24:

NA28 Matthew 19:23-24	NA28 Mark 10:23-25	NA28 Luke 18:24-25
Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πλούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.	Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται.	ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [περίλυπον γενόμενον] εἶπεν· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται·
	24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦ ντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ . ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·	
24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.	25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.	25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Note that D, it have the verses in the order 23, 25, 24, 26!

The sentence is a very hard one. It is only natural to soften it down. The easiest solution would be to omit it completely (Mt and Lk). The addition of A, D et. al must be a very early one. "Evidently inserted to bring the verse into closer connexion with the context by limiting its generality" (Hort). Independent other additions are those by W and 1241.

In light of verse 26 ("Then who can be saved?") it is needed to have a "hard" saying here.
Weiss (Mk Com.) notes that it might have been added to secure the connection with verse 25.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 224
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν **κάμηλον** διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

κάμιλον f13, 28, 124, 579, arm, geo
"ship's cable"

Lacuna: L, 33
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 3:4 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου
τριχῶν καμίλου 28, 565

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
καμίλου 579, 1424, pc (10 minuscules), Or

NA28 Matthew 23:24 ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, οἱ διϋλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες.
κάμιλον M, Θ, Π*, 579

NA28 Mark 1:6 καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.
κάμιλον G^s, 2, 28

NA28 Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.
κάμιλον S, 124, 579, 788, 1424

579	4 times
28	3 times
124, 1424	2 times

In the early christian centuries Eta, η, was sometimes pronounced like "e" and sometimes like "i". In the second case κάμηλον and κάμιλον sounded identical. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 513) seems to have accepted the meaning "ship's cable".

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 225

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

omit 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj-part[K, Π, M, N, U, Y], Trg, WH

omit τῆς[1] F, Γ, 28, 157, 565, al

omit τῆς[2] G

τρυπήματος βελόνης f13, pc

τρήματος ῥαφίδος 01* (corrected by 01[C2])

txt B, Maj-part[E, H, S, V, X], Cl, Robinson, **NA[25]**, Weiss, WH[mg]

Lacuna: L

B: no umlaut

Compare also the discussion for τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος, next page!

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

In both parallels no articles appear. It is thus very probable that the omission of the articles is a harmonization.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) argues that the articles have been omitted because they have not been understood. The articles indicate the eye of the needle more determined as the well known smallest hole.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 226

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

τρυπήματος βελόνης	f13, pc	
τρήματος ῥαφίδος	01*	(corrected by 01^{C2})
τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς βελόνης	Cl	

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

(meaning is the same for all.)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

διὰ τρυπήματος	01^{C2}, D, L, W, Z, Γ, Δ, f1, f13, 2, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1010, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part (Robinson)
διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς	C, K, M, U, Θ, 124(f13), 157, 565, 700, Maj-part
διὰ τρήματος	01*, B, WH, NA^{25}

NA28 Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Byz	τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος	A, W, Ψ, 1071, 1424, Maj
	τρυμαλιᾶς βελόνης	f1, f13, 579
txt	τρήματος βελόνης	01, B, D
	τρυπήματος βελόνης	L, Θ, 157, 1241, pc

Harmonization errors. See discussion at Mt 19:24.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 227

102. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες **πρὸς ἑαυτούς**· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

T&T #140

πρὸς αὐτόν	01, B, C, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1555, 2586, Co, WH, Trg^{mg}
πρὸς ἑαυτόν	788
omit:	569, pc^{13}, bo^{ms}, Cl
txt	A, D, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, goth, NA^{25}, Weiss
πρὸς ἀλλήλους	M*, 731, k, Sy-P (can this be distinguished for the versions?)

ἐξεπλήσσοντο **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς** λέγοντες Sy-S

NA wrongly writes "579" instead of "569" (= 7pe) for the omission! Legg and Tischendorf correctly have 569. Schmidtke and Swanson confirm the reading of 579.

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:25 ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι;

NA28 Luke 18:26 εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

Compare:

NA28 Mark 1:27 καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας·

____ αὐτοὺς	01, B
πρὸς αὐτοὺς	G, L, 2
πρὸς αὐτὸν	565^{c}

NA28 Mark 9:10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες

πρὸς ἀλλήλους Θ, 565

NA28 Mark 11:31 καὶ διελογίζοντο <u>πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς</u> λέγοντες·
πρὸς αὐτοὺς W, 157

NA28 Mark 12:7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ <u>πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς</u> εἶπαν
πρὸς αὐτοὺς Δ, f13, 28, 157, 1424

NA28 Mark 14:4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες <u>πρὸς ἑαυτούς</u>·
πρὸς αὐτοὺς 01*

πρὸς ἑαυτούς is a typical Markan expression. He uses it 6 times (Mk. 1:27; 9:10; 11:31; 12:7; 14:4). Elsewhere it occurs only twice in Lk and twice in Jo. Weiss notes (correctly) that Mark does not use πρὸς αὐτὸν with the verbs of speech (so already Tischendorf). On internal grounds the WH reading would thus be un-Markan. But πρὸς αὐτὸν alone appears 16 times in Mk. A change from πρὸς αὐτὸν to πρὸς ἑαυτούς in Mk is not recorded.

Metzger: "The reading πρὸς αὐτόν appears to be an Alexandrian correction". So already C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage).
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 515) notes that 01, B already changed the first occurrence of πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς into αὐτοὺς. Compare above Mk 1:27.

On external grounds the WH reading clearly has to be preferred.

The omission by 569, pc is probably a harmonization to Mt, Lk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 228

NA28 Mark 10:29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν
ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα _____ ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

BYZ Mark 10:29 ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν
ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα <u>ἢ γυναῖκα</u>, ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

T&T #141

Byz A, C, X, Ψ, f13, 1342, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
omitting ἢ τέκνα: Γ, pc[14]

txt 01, B, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 565, 700, 892, 1241, pc[10], Lat, Sy-S, Co
pc = 16[c], 154, 156, 664, 677, 750, 855, 943, 1065, 1068, 1138, 1330, 1453, 2715, 2745
D omits (as in Mt !) also ἢ πατέρα
Δ, 68 omit also ἢ τέκνα

Lacuna: L, 33
B: umlaut! p. 1293 A 27 R <u>ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀ</u>γροὺς

Note also the minority reading:
<u>omit 2. ἕνεκεν</u> A, B*, S*, 2, 700, 1424, pc, aur, c, k
B* corrected probably by B[C1] (added in small uncial script).

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:29
οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα _____ ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς
BYZ Matthew 19:29
οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα <u>ἢ γυναῖκά</u> ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς
<u>omitted by:</u> B, (D, f1), pc, Sy-S

NA28 Luke 18:29 οἰκίαν <u>ἢ γυναῖκα</u> ἢ ἀδελφοὺς <u>ἢ γονεῖς</u> ἢ τέκνα
BYZ Luke 18:29 οἰκίαν <u>ἢ γονεῖς</u> ἢ ἀδελφοὺς <u>ἢ γυναῖκα</u> ἢ τέκνα

ἢ γυναῖκα is safe only in Lk.
It is possible that ἢ γυναῖκα has been added to Mt and Mk from Lk (so Weiss). The omission is probably at least in part accidental (parablepsis). This is indicated by the support from Byzantine minuscules and similar omissions of the other words.

Güting argues (with Turner) that the omission of ἢ πατέρα by D is original, because it is so unusual ("Weakly attested original readings of D in Mk", 1994).

See also next verse 30.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 229

103. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

NA28 Mark 10:30 ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ __οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς **μετὰ διωγμῶν**, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον _.

29 "Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news,
30 who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age, houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields **with persecutions**, and in the age to come eternal life."

ὅς δὲ ἄφηκεν οἰκίαν καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς **μετὰ διωγμοῦ**, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον **λήμψεται**. D, it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, r^{1})

Latin: **Qui autem reliquerit ... cum persecutionibus ...** vitam aeternam **accipiet.**

30 who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age. **But who has left** houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields **with persecutions**, in the age to come **will get** eternal life."

omit οἰκίας ... διωγμῶν 01*, c, (k)
corrected by 01^{C1}

"with persecutions all is affliction and anxiety" Diatess^{Pers} (cp. Petersen p. 81)

k reads: Et non relinquet centumplicia cum persecutionibus in isto saeculo, in saeculi autem venturo vitam aeternam consequetur.

Lat(aur, f, q vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Clement ("Quis dives salvetur" IV.10 and XXV.2):
ἀπολήμψεται ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν δὲ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ἀγροὺς κὰι χρήματα καὶ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς **ἔχειν μετὰ διωγμῶν εἰς ποῦ; ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν ἐστιν αἰώνιος.**

Possibly the following meaning is intended (with a period after ἑκατονταπλασίονα): "Now in this age to have fields and riches and houses and brothers with persecutions? For what? In the coming (age) life is eternal!"

Metzger translates: "And to what end [does he expect] to have now in this time fields and riches and houses and brothers, with persecutions? But in the coming age there is life eternal."

From Clement's treatise (XXV):

XXV. And to this effect similarly is what follows. "Now at this present time not to have lands, and money, and houses, and brethren, with persecutions." For it is neither penniless, nor homeless, nor brotherless people that the Lord calls to life, since He has also called rich people; but, as we have said above, also brothers, as Peter with Andrew, and James with John the sons of Zebedee, but of one mind with each other and Christ. And the expression "with persecutions" rejects the possessing of each of those things. There is a persecution which arises from without, from men assailing the faithful, either out of hatred, or envy, or avarice, or through diabolic agency. But the most painful is internal persecution, which proceeds from each man's own soul being vexed by impious lusts, and diverse pleasures, and base hopes, and destructive dreams; when, always grasping at more, and maddened by brutish loves, and inflamed by the passions which beset it like goads and stings, it is covered with blood, (to drive it on) to insane pursuits, and to despair of life, and to contempt of God.

More grievous and painful is this persecution, which arises from within, which is ever with a man, and which the persecuted cannot escape; for he carries the enemy about everywhere in himself. Thus also burning which attacks from without works trial, but that from within produces death. War also made on one is easily put an end to, but that which is in the soul continues till death.

With such persecution, if you have worldly wealth, if you have brothers allied by blood and other pledges, abandon the whole wealth of these which leads to evil; procure peace for yourself, free yourself from protracted persecutions; turn from them to the Gospel; choose before all the Saviour and Advocate and Paraclete of your soul, the Prince of life. "For the things which are seen are temporary; but the things which are not seen are eternal." And in the present time are things evanescent and insecure, but in that to come is eternal life.

Parallels:

Matthew 19:29 And everyone who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or fields, for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold, and will inherit eternal life.

Luke 18:29-30 And he said to them, "Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or wife or brothers or parents or children, for the sake of the kingdom of God, 30 who will not get back very much more in this age, and in the age to come eternal life."

This verse is difficult to understand. Only Mk has the μετὰ διωγμῶν. Both Mt and Lk omit it together with the repetition of the "houses ... fields" (<u>Minor Agreement</u>) and reconstruct the sentence.

Clement's quote is also strange. Nestle calls the εἰς ποῦ; "rätselhaft" (=puzzling). It seems to be unique in the Greek literature. Textual corruption is improbable in Clement, because Clement cites the passage twice with identical wording.

Metzger cites two editors of Clement's text, both are not satisfied with the εἰς ποῦ. E Schwartz conjectures εἰς τί (= why).

Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 201) writes: [the εἰς ποῦ] "seems to represent εσθ' ὅπου and must be some kind of colloquial equivalent of *in aeuo* of the Latin b, d, which short Greek form would fit the lines of a Graeco-Latin bilingual in Clement's hands to correspond with the six letters in 'INAEUO'."

The reading of D removes the difficulty by inserting ὅς δὲ ἄφηκεν οἰκίαν (already in the previous verse). Similarly k.

Is it possible that we have here a very early corruption?
Look at verses 29 and 30:

29 "Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left
house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields,
for my sake and for the sake of the good news,
30 who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age
houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields
with persecutions,
and in the age to come eternal life."

We have manuscripts evidence for the omission: 01*, c, k ! A simple copying error must be excluded though, because in the first part the words are separated with ἢ and in the second with καὶ.

Compare:

Mt 19:29	**Mk** 10:29 Jesus said,	**Lk** 18:29 And he said to them,
And everyone who has left	"Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left	"Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left
houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or fields, for my name's sake,	house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news,	house or wife or brothers or parents or children, for the sake of the kingdom of God,
will receive a hundredfold,	30 who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age -- **houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions** --	30 who will not get back very much more in this age,
and will inherit eternal life.	and in the age to come eternal life.	and in the age to come eternal life."

Both Mt and Lk follow Mk here with only slight variation. Both omit the strange "insertion". Some kind of corruption in Mk is possible.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 230

104. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:30 ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ
οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς μετὰ διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

omit οἰκίας ... διωγμῶν	01*, c
omit οἰκίας ... ἀγροὺς	k

add καὶ πατέρα	01^{C2}, K, Π, N, M, X, f1, 346(f13), 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc, l, bo
add καὶ γυναῖκα	Ψ^{C}, 1424, pc
πατέρα for μητέρας	1342

Ψ: the words have been added in the margin, probably by the original hand.

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 29:

NA28 Mark 10:29

οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς

Byz A, C, Ψ, f13, 1342, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H:

οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται
καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.

NA28 Luke 18:30 ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ [ἀπο]λάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ
καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

The sentence looks like an intrusion. It has been omitted by Mt and Lk!
ἢ πατέρα and ἢ γυναῖκα are omitted, although some added it later. ἢ γυναῖκα is even in verse 29 supported by Byz only.
The "wife" is problematic because you will get it back "hundredfold"!
Compare previous variant!

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 231

105. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:34 καὶ ἐμπαίξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν, **καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.**

B: no umlaut

T&T #142 (for μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας)

Secret Mark adds here the Lazarus story:

α μελει μετα το ησαν δε εν τη οδω αναβαινοντες εις ιεροσολυμα
και τα εξης εως μετα τρεις ημερας αναστησεται *ωδε επιφερει κατα λεξιν*

και ερχονται εις βηθανιαν και ην εκει μια γυνη ης ο αδελφος αυτης απεθανεν και ελθουσα προσεκυνησε τον ιησουν και λεγει αυτω υιε δαβιδ ελεησον με οι δε μαθηται επετιμησαν αυτη και οργισθεις ο ιησους απηλθεν μετ αυτης εις τον κηπον οπου ην το μνημειον και ευθυς ηκουσθη εκ του μνημειου φωνη μεγαλη και προσελθων ο ιησους απεκυλισε τον λιθον απο της θυρας του μνημειου και εισελθων ευθυς οπου ην ο νεανισκος εξετεινεν την χειρα και ηγειρεν αυτον κρατησας της χειρος ο δε νεανισκος εμβλεψας αυτω ηγαπησεν αυτον και ηρξατο παρακαλειν αυτον ινα μετ αυτου η και εξελθοντες εκ του μνημειου ηλθον εις την οικιαν του νεανισκου ην γαρ πλουσιος και μεθ ημερας εξ επεταξεν αυτω ο ιησους και οψιας γενομενης ερχεται ο νεανισκος προς αυτον περιβεβλημενος σινδονα επι γυμνου και εμεινε συν αυτω την νυκτα εκεινην εδιδασκε γαρ αυτον ο ιησους το μυστηριον της βασιλειας του θεου εκειθεν δε αναστας επεστρεψεν εις το περαν του ιορδανου

επι μεν τουτοις επεται το και προσπορευονται αυτω ιακωβος και ιωαννης *και πασα η περικοπη το δε* γυμνος γυμνω *και ταλλα περι ων εγραψας ουκ ευρισκεται*

Translation: Clement of Alexandria writes:

[begin quote]

For example, after ,"*And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem,*" and what follows, until "*After three days he shall arise,*" [the secret Gospel] brings the following material word for word:

"*And they come into Bethany. And a certain woman whose brother had died was there. And, coming, she prostrated herself before Jesus and says to him, 'Son of David, have mercy on me.' But the disciples rebuked her. And Jesus, being*

angered, went off with her into the garden where the tomb was, and straightway a great cry was heard from the tomb. And going near Jesus rolled away the stone from the door of the tomb. And straightway, going in where the youth was, he stretched forth his hand and raised him, seizing his hand. But the youth, looking upon him, loved him and began to beseech him that he might be with him. And going out of the tomb they came into the house of the youth, for he was rich. And after six days Jesus told him what to do and in the evening the youth comes to him, wearing a linen cloth over his naked body. And he remained with him that night, for Jesus taught him the mystery of the kingdom of God. And thence, arising, he returned to the other side of the Jordan."
After these words follows the text, *"And James and John come to him,"* and all that section. But *"naked man with naked man,"* and the other things about which you wrote, are not found. [end of quote]

There is an exhaustive monograph on this letter by Morton Smith ("Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark").
The authenticity of "Secret Mark" is disputed.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 232

106. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης **οἱ υἱοὶ** Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν.

T&T #143

οἱ δύο υἱοὶ	B, C, 579, 1342, Co, Diatess^{Arab}, Weiss NA^{25}, WH have δύο in brackets.
οἱ υἱοὶ	01, D, G, L, W, Γ, Δ, Φ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj-part^{1100}, Or
υἱοὶ	A, K, M, N, U, X, Θ, Π, Σ, 0233, 828(=f13), 28, 157, 517, 565, 700, 954, 1071, 1675, 2766, Maj-part^{520}
one of the last two:	Latt, Sy, goth

Or: Mt. Comm. tom. 16:4

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 4:21 καὶ προβὰς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, ε

NA28 Matthew 20:20 Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου **δύο** U, r^2

NA28 Matthew 20:21 εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.
omit **δύο** H

NA28 Matthew 20:24
Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν.

NA28 Matthew 26:37 καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.

There is no reason for an addition, except perhaps remotely a reminiscence of Matthean usage.

Possibly an oversight of the many similar letters: ΟΙΔΥΟΥΙΟΙ
ΟΙΥΙΟΙ

Perhaps also the similar pronunciation may have lead to an omission, at least this may be true for the omission of the article.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 233

107. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί θέλετέ [με] ποιήσω ὑμῖν;

BYZ Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί θέλετέ ποιῆσαι με ὑμῖν

T&T #144

τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω	01^{C1}, B, Ψ, 0233, 954, 2766, WH^{mg}, **NA^{25}**, Tis
τί θέλετε ποιήσω	C, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 1424, 1675, pc^{30}, WH, Trg, Bal, SBL
τί θέλετε ἵνα ποιήσω	1241, pc
ποιήσω	D, d
τί θέλετέ με ποιῆσαι	01^{C2}, L, W^{C}, 579, 892, 1342, 2542, 2786, pc^{7}
τί θέλετε ποιῆσαι	W*, Δ, pc^{40}
τί θέλετε ποιῆσαι με	A, X, 28, 124, 157, 372, 517, 700, 2737, Maj, Gre

01* omits (due to homoioarcton) from verse 35 INA to verse 37 INA.
k also omits due to h.t. 35: … nobis, 36: … vobis.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 20:21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· τί θέλεις;

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 20:32 τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; (to the blind men)
01^{C}, L, 565, 579 τί θέλετε ἵνα ποιήσω ὑμῖν;

NA28 Matthew 26:15 τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, (Judas to the chief priests)

NA28 Mark 10:51 τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω;
BYZ Mark 10:51 τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοι;

NA28 Mark 15:12 τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω (Pilate to the crowd)
BYZ Mark 15:12 Τί οὖν θέλετε ποιήσω
θέλεται 579, 1071
θέλετε ἵνα 1424

The readings of D and 1241 are clearly secondary and singular readings.
The readings with ποιῆσαι are an AcI. Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 520) notes that in the Gospels the accusative always preceds the infinitive. So he thinks that the 01^{c2} reading is a stylistic correction of the A reading.
Note that in both Mk 10:51 and 15:12 ποιήσω is safe and no AcI has been introduced.
Robertson (Wordpictures) writes (on 10:51): "Neat Greek idiom with aorist subjunctive without ἵνα after θέλεις. For this asyndeton (or parataxis) see Robertson, Grammar, p. 430."

The only question is if με is original or not. It is noteworthy that about 70 Byzantine witnesses omit με after θέλετε. 7 of them have been corrected to the Byzantine text. Probably the omission is in part accidental: ΘΕΛΕΤΕΜΕ
Without με the C et al. reading is identical to Mt 20:32. Here some manuscripts added ἵνα.

It is possible that the txt reading is original and that the awkward με caused problems in the first place. It looks like a mixture of AcI and deliberative subjunctive. Possible corrections would then be either the omission of με or the introduction of an AcI.

Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
that με is original.

TVU 234
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 10:40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται.

ἄλλοις 225, it("aliis" a, b, d, ff^{2}, k), sa^{ms}
ἄλλοις δὲ Sy-S

ἀλλ' οἷς B^{C2}, C^{C2}, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, i, l, q, r^{1}, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, geo, goth

no decision: 01, B*, C*, D, L, N, W, X, Δ, Σ, 0146, 0233

Δ: (p. 173) The Latin has sed quibus (= txt).
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

ἄλλοις: "for others it has been prepared"
ἀλλ' οἷς: "but it is for those, for whom it has been prepared."

This variant is kind of famous, because it represents an interpretative decision of the uncial ΑΛΛΟΙϹ without any accents or spaces.

ἄλλοις is clearly a misinterpretation of the scriptio continua. With ἄλλοις the sons of Zebedee are excluded, with ἀλλ' οἷς the question is open.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 235

108. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 10:46 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαῖος, τυφλὸς προσαίτης, ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν.

omit: B*, 63^{Legg}, sa^{ms}
(added by B^{C1} in the right margin, p. 1293, C 34)

(not in NA and not in SQE, but in Tis:)

Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Ἰεριχώ D, 0211, 2, 788, pc^{3},
it(a, b, d, ff^{2}, i, r^{1}), Sy-S, Or$^{2\ times}$,
Sec. Mark$^{(s.b.)}$, Lachmann, Tregelles^{mg}
pc = 740, 1337, 1347 (ECM-Parallels)
61, 258, 481 (Tis and Legg)

Origen: Com. Matth. tom. 16, 12 line 8f.
… κατὰ τὸν Μᾶρκον, οὕτως ἀναγράψαντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον·
"*Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαῖος, τυφλὸς*" καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς, ἕως τοῦ "*καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.*" *(verse 52)*
same in Latin: "et venit in Hiericho. et exeunte eo inde et discipulis eius et turba multa"

Origen: Com. Matth. tom. 16, 13 line 33f.
ὁ δὲ Μᾶρκος· "*Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖθεν*"
same in Latin: "*et venit in Hiericho. et exeunte eo inde*"

ἐκεῖθεν instead of ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ: D, Θ, (565), 700, it(a, b, f, ff, i, q, r^{1}), Or
565 reads both!
ἰδοὺ after ἱκανοῦ: f13, 28, 700, pc, c, f, l, Or

B: no umlaut

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19
Minor cases: 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

The verse is curious, because nothing happens in Jericho. It has been suggested that this break indicates an early editing of the Gospel of Mark. Actually we know one document that has a longer text here, the "Secret Gospel of Mark" inserts:

μετα δε το· καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Ἰεριχώ *επαγει μονον·*
καὶ ἦσαν ἐκεῖ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ νεανίσκου ὃν ἠγάπα αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ Σαλώμη καὶ οὐκ ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τα δε αλλα τα πολλα α εγραψας ψευσματα και φαινεται και εστιν· η μεν ουν αληθης και κατα την αληθη φιλοσοφιαν εξηγησις

Translation:
And after the words, "And he comes into Jericho," *the secret Gospel adds only,*
"And the sister of the youth whom Jesus loved and his mother and Salome were there, and Jesus did not receive them."
But the many other things about which you wrote both seem to be and are falsifications. Now the true explanation and that which accords with the true philosophy…

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 20:29 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς.
NA28 Luke 18:35 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχὼ τυφλός τις ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπαιτῶν.
NA28 Luke 19:1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἰεριχώ.
NA28 Luke 19:28 Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

The reading of D et al. is probably an improvement to make both verbs singular: "And they came to Jericho. And he left Jericho…". Note that Secret Mark also has the singular! Luke has a singular too. A further correction is the replacement of the second ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ with ἐκεῖθεν.
It is interesting that B* omits the first sentence. This could be a harmonization to Mt, who omits it, too. It is also quite possible that it is just accidental (Καὶ ἔρ… - Καὶ ἐκ…).

Several scenarios are possible:

1. Some early scribe added the first sentence to overcome the difficulty that Jesus left Jericho but did not enter it. After that the writer of Secret Mark inserted here the short incident to overcome the additional difficulty that nothing happened in Jericho.

2. B* omitted the first sentence, because nothing happened in Jericho and it was unnecessary. So did also Mt in his Gospel.
3. B* omitted the first sentence due to parablepsis: ΚΑΙϹ ... ΚΑΙϹ.
4. Secret Mark has the oldest version and someone omitted very early the incident with Salome and the young man for whatever reason, but left (the now unnecessary) first sentence.

Only the first three are justifiable on textcritical grounds. The first two are not really probable. Parablepsis seems the most likely.

There is an exhaustive monograph on the "Secret Mark" letter by Morton Smith ("Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark"). Regarding this variant compare especially pages 65 and 188-194. The authenticity of "Secret Mark" is disputed.

This curious verse was treated differently by Mt and Lk, assuming Markan priority. Mt omitted the first part καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Lk, to the contrary, omitted the second part καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ ... καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ.

Note that in Lk several things happen in Jericho:

1. Jesus heals a blind beggar
   (at a different place in Mt: 9:27-31)
2. Jesus and Zacchaeus (no parallel)
3. Jesus tells the Parable of the Ten Pounds
   (at a different place in Mt: 25:14-30)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 236

NA28 Mark 11:3 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἴπατε· ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε.

BYZ Mark 11:3 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο εἴπατε ὅτι Ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει καὶ εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει ὧδε

αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν	01, D, L, 579, 892, 1241, pc, d, Or, WH, **NA^{25}**
ἀποστέλλει πάλιν αὐτὸν	B, WH^{mg}, Weiss
ἀποστέλλει πάλιν	Δ
πάλιν αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει	C*
πάλιν ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν	Θ
one of these:	sa
αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει	A, C^{c}, W, X, Ψ, f1, f13, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo, goth
ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν	U
ἀποστελεῖ τὸν πῶλον	conj. A. Pallis (1932)

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally πάλιν in brackets in the margin.
Or: Mt Comm. tom. 16:8
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:3 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τι, ἐρεῖτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς.
NA28 Luke 19:31 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ· διὰ τί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε· ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει.

This passage is difficult to understand. Is this still part of the message or a statement of what will happen?

1. "The Lord needs it and will send it back here immediately."
2. "The Lord needs it." - And he will send it immediately.

Matthew (on the 2ST) took it in the second meaning. In this case the πάλιν is problematic. Luke omits the problematic clause altogether.

The readings with πάλιν have the first meaning. Its presence in so many important witnesses is difficult to accept as a secondary insertion. The many permutations of the words indicate a certain difficulty for the scribes.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 206f.) notes that the B reading is original and that the αὐτὸν has been set first to emphasize it. If B would be secondary, the scribe would not have put the αὐτὸν after πάλιν but after ἀποστέλλει. This is generally interesting, that no one reads ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν πάλιν ὧδε.

Compare:
J. Duncan and M. Derrett "ΠΑΛΙΝ: The Ass again (Mk 11:3)" Filologia Neotestamentaria 14 (2001) 121-130 [who argue for the Byzantine reading]

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 237

NA28 Mark 11:6 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 11:6 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς

Not in NA but in SQE!

αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν	01, B, C, L, Δ, 892, 1342, WH, **NA**[25]
αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	W, Ψ, f1, 124, 28, Sy-S, sa, bo[pt]
καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς	D, it(b, c, ff[2], i, k, q)
καθὼς εἰρήκεν αὐτοῖς	579
αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο	A, K, Π, X, Maj, Sy-H
αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς	Θ, f13, 118, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, al, Lat(a, aur, d, f, l, vg), goth

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

εἰρήκει indicative pluperfect active 3rd person singular
εἰρήκεν indicative perfect active 3rd person singular

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 15:4 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς εἶπεν·
BYZ Matthew 15:4 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο λέγων,

Byz	01*, C, L, W, 0106, f13-part, 22, 33, Maj, f, Sy-H, Gre
txt	01[C2], B, D, Θ, 073, f1, 124, 788(=f13-part), 579, 700, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co(+ mae-2), Or

NA28 Luke 22:13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.
BYZ Luke 22:13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα

Parallels:

NA28 Luke 19:32-34 ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. 33 λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον; 34 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει.

NA28 Matthew 21:6 πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
BYZ Matthew 21:6 πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

It is improbable that the specific ἐνετείλατο would have been changed to the colorless, normal εἶπεν. ἐνετείλατο is probably inspired by the Matthean συνέταξεν.
The εἰρήκει variant is probably inspired from Lk 22:13.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 238

NA28 Mark 11:8 καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν **ἀγρῶν.**

BYZ Mark 11:8 πολλοὶ δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν ἄλλοι δὲ στοιβάδας ἔκοπτον ἐκ τῶν **δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννυον εἰς τὴν ὁδόν·**

T&T #149

Byz A, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

...εἰς τὴν ὁδόν·	A, (D), G, X, Φ, f1, f13, 28, 1342, Maj^{1280}
...ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ·	K, M, N, Y, Θ, Π, Σ, 69*, 565, 579, 700, pm^{270}

ἀγρῶν ... ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ·	579
ἀγρῶν ... εἰς τὴν ὁδόν·	892^{c}, 1342

δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννυον· k

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 892*, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, Or

B: no umlaut

omit ἄλλοι δε ... εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· W, 2*, pc^{18}, i, Sy-S (h.t.)

892: After ἀγρῶν is an insertion sign (wavy line plus two dots) and the words have been added in the margin.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:8 ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἐστρώννυον ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

NA28 Luke 19:36 πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ὑπεστρώννυον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

There is no reason for an omission. Very probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

Note the mixed version of 579, 892^{c} and 1342 where ἀγρῶν is left from txt and only the remaining words have been added.

The omission of W et al. is due to h.t. from the Byzantine version (εἰς τὴν ὁδόν - εἰς τὴν ὁδόν).

Note that both Mt and Lk have ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ against εἰς τὴν ὁδόν in Byz Mk. If the short text of Mk is original, then we have here a significant <u>Minor Agreement</u> of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 239
NA28 Mark 11:10 εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία
τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

BYZ Mark 11:10 Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου,
τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ· Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις

Not noted in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, M, N, X, Γ, 2, 118, 157, 1071, 1424, Maj, f, q, Sy-H, goth

txt 01, B, C, D, L, U, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342,
pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, arm, geo

Δ omits ἐρχομένη.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 21:9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.
NA28 Luke 19:38 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς
ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 11:9 καὶ οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον· ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·

LXX:
LXX Psalm 117:26 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου εὐλογήκαμεν ὑμᾶς ἐξ οἴκου κυρίου

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context. In verse 9 we have
ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου
In verse 10 again ἡ ἐρχομένη appears and some scribe added ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

For other variants and a general discussion of this verse compare:
F.C. Burkitt "W and Θ, Studies in the Western text of St. Mark" JTS 17 (1916) 139-152

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 240

109. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:11 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, **ὀψίας** ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

ὀψὲ 01, C, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc, Or, WH, **NA[25]**, Gre, Trg[mg], Tis, Bal, SBL
ὀψὲ δὲ Δ (perhaps just a misreading: ΛΕ for ΛC)

txt A, B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 069, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Weiss, WH[mg]
omit τῆς ὥρας: B, 1424, pc

ὀψίνης 565

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ὀψίας noun genitive feminine singular
ὀψέ adverb
the meaning is the same: "late, late in the day, evening"

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.
safe!

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 1:32 Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, safe!
NA28 Mark 4:35 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης· safe!
NA28 Mark 6:47 καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης safe!
NA28 Mark 13:35 ἢ ὀψὲ ἢ μεσονύκτιον safe!
NA28 Mark 14:17 Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης safe!
NA28 Mark 15:42 Καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης, safe!

NA28 John 20:19 Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων

ὀψία is clearly the more common word (15 times in the Gospels against 3 times for ὀψέ). Mark uses both forms. Interestingly all other occurences of the words are safe.

This is the first occurrence of ὀψέ, and it would be only natural to change it into ὀψία. That ὀψέ is a conformation to the following ὀψέ in verse 19 is rather improbable.
Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that ὀψίας has to be taken as an adjective here. Misunderstanding this, it was changed into ὀψέ, or, as in B, τῆς ὥρας was omitted. Already Hort has noted that τῆς ὥρας has to be included into the analysis.
ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας = "since the hour was already late"
Is it possible that τῆς ὥρας is secondary?

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 546) suggests as an alternative to the txt reading ὀψέ ἤδη οὔσης as possible original text. He thinks it is possible that scribes found the genitivus absolutus difficult and inserted the common phrase. ὀψέ ἤδη οὔσης is a conjecture, strictly speaking, there is no MS that reads thus.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 241

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:11 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

ἤδη οὔσης	B, 1424, pc, sa^{ms}
ἤδη οὔσης ὥρας	D, 565
οὔσης τῆς ὥρας	W
ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ἡμέρας	f13, 28, pc

WH have τῆς ὥρας in brackets in the margin and without brackets in the text.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:17 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ηὐλίσθη ἐκεῖ.

NA28 Luke 21:37 Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ηὐλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν·

αὐλίζομαι "spend the night"

The words omitted by B et al. are redundant. There is no reason for an addition.

It is interesting to mention that in Mt and Mk ὀψίας always occurs in the form:

Ὀψίας (δὲ) γενομένης 12 times

It is only here that we have ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 129) notes that ὀψίας is an adjective here ("late") and not a noun ("evening"). If scribes took it for a noun, the τῆς ὥρας is not fitting.

Compare a similar case::

NA28 John 20:19 Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ...

The whole verse is strange. It reminds one of verse 10:46 where the Secret Mark addition took place: "And they came to Jericho. And he left Jericho...".

Here we have a similar thing:

"Then he entered Jerusalem and went into the temple; and when he had looked around at everything, as it was already late, he went out to Bethany with the twelve. On the following day, when they came from Bethany, he was hungry."

We have quite an unmotivated mentioning of entering and leaving Jerusalem. Possibly some editorial intervention happened here?

Note also that 1424 omits verse 12 (not in NA!).

This is also one of the more significant Minor Agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk. Both have a form of αὐλίζομαι ("spend the night"), a rare word which appears only here in the NT.

In Mt the Cleansing of the temple happens after Jesus entered the temple. Only after the cleansing he left for Bethany. After that the complete fig tree pericope is placed:

Mk	Mt
Entering Jerusalem	Entering Jerusalem
fig tree 1	Cleansing the temple
Cleansing the temple	fig tree
fig tree 2	

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 21:12 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλεν πάντας ...
NA28 Matthew 21:17 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ηὐλίσθη ἐκεῖ. 18 Πρωὶ δὲ ἐπανάγων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπείνασεν.

NA28 Mark 11:11 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.
NA28 Mark 11:15 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν ...

In Mk the day of Jesus' entering Jerusalem ends quite unspectacular. In Mt on the other hand he starts immediately the Cleansing of the temple. In any event the direction of editing is from Mk to Mt.
But this is a source-critical question and not a textcritical one.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 242

110. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:17 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν **αὐτοῖς·** οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, 2542, f13, 28, b, Sy-S, sa, arm, WH

txt 01, A, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Or, **NA[25]**, Weiss, WH[mg]

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:13 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· γέγραπται· ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.

NA28 Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας 19:46 λέγων αὐτοῖς· γέγραπται· καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.

Both readings in the parallels are safe.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 4:2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ·

omit αὐτοῖς: L, (W, 28)

NA28 Mark 4:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.

add αὐτοῖς: M[mg], 2, pc

NA28 Mark 4:11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται

omit αὐτοῖς: 33

NA28 Mark 4:26 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ

add αὐτοῖς: 124, 1071

NA28 Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ

add αὐτοῖς: 01[C1], 69

NA28 Mark 6:4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

omit αὐτοῖς: W, f1, f13, 28

NA28 Mark 6:10 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν
omit αὐτοῖς: W

NA28 Mark 7:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ,
omit αὐτοῖς: 579

NA28 Mark 7:27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ· ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκανν
omit αὐτῇ: f1, 28

NA28 Mark 8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὔπω συνίετε;
omit αὐτοῖς: N

NA28 Mark 9:31 ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων
omit αὐτοῖς: B, k, sa-mss

NA28 Mark 12:38 Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν· βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς
add αὐτοῖς: A, D, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj
omit αὐτοῖς: 01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, 124, 28

NA28 Mark 15:14 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τί γὰρ ἐποίησεν κακόν
omit αὐτοῖς: 01*, Ψ

The B reading just cries for the addition of the pronoun.
Elsewhere the pronoun is sometimes added by Byzantine MSS. On the other hand the pronoun is quite often omitted. Especially W, f1, and 28 omit several times.
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 547) notes that Mk quite often has even two pronouns in a redundant manner with two verbs of speech. It would be therefore probable that some witnesses omit the pronoun to tighten the narrative.
The support for the omission is incoherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 243

111. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.

BYZ Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὅτε ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύετο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως

Byz 01, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(a, b, f, ff^2, i, k, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-H, Co, goth, WH^{mg}, Gre

txt A, B, K, M, W, Δ, Π, Ψ, 28, 124, 565, 700, 1071, al,
aur, c, d(!), r^1, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, WH, NA^{25}

L omits the verb, probably due to h.t. (ETO - ETO) or h.a. (EX - EX).

ὅτε: A, D, M, N, f1, f13, 22, 157, 700, al

B: no umlaut

3rd plural or 3rd singular

No parallels, but compare:
NA28 Luke 21:37 Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ηὐλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν·

Context:
NA28 Mark 11:18-20 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. 19 Καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως. 20 Καὶ παραπορευόμενοι πρωὶ εἶδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν.
παραπορεύετο 01*

In the previous verses Jesus alone is mentioned. In the following verse 20 the plural participle is used. It is therefore possible that the immediately preceding context lead to the change to the singular. Note that 01* changed even in verse 20 into the singular.
It is also possible that some scribes associated the ἐξεπορεύοντο with the previously mentioned subject ὁ ὄχλος which took the singular. Note that some manuscripts have in verse 18 the plural ἐξεπλήσσοντο: 01, M, Δ, 579, 892, 1424, 2542, al.

So, one or the other could be either a conformation to the previous verses or to the following verse. The support is curiously divided, suggesting a multiple origin of the reading(s).
Difficult.

Compare similar cases at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33
Minor cases: 10:46(D, 788, it, Sy-S), 11:27 (D, X, 565, it), 14:32(Θ, 1, 565)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 244

112. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 11:23 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ· ἄρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὃ λαλεῖ γίνεται, ἔσται αὐτῷ _____.

BYZ Mark 11:23 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ ἄρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύσῃ ὅτι ἃ λέγει γίνεται ἔσται αὐτῷ **ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ**

T&T #150

"... whatever he may say"

Not in NA but in SQE, Tis!

Byz A, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj,
k, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth
ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ Θ, 565, 700, pc[7]

txt 01, B, C, D, K*, L, W, Δ, f1, 28, 892, 2786, pc[3], Lat, Sy-S, Co
pc = 130, 1542, 1654

ὃ: 01, B, L, N, Δ, , Σ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1342
λαλεῖ: 01, B, L, N, Δ, Θ, Σ, Ψ, 33, 565, 579, 892
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 21:21-22 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε, οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, ἀλλὰ κἂν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἴπητε· ἄρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, γενήσεται· 22 καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε.

Difficult. The words in Mt are completely different, but the sense is the same. Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the words have been added to point back to the beginning of the verse.

Note also the different ὃ λαλεῖ (txt) and ἃ λέγει (Byz).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 245

113. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 11:26

BYZ Mark 11:26 εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε, οὐδε ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφησεὶ τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν .

Byz A, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, Weiss
add here: Mt 7:7-8 M, 346, 579, 713, pc, Lectionaries
omit ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: 33, 579, 1424, pc, Lectionaries

txt 01, B, L, S, W, Δ, Ψ, 2, 157, 565, 700, 892, pc, k, l, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}
pc = 27**, 63, 64, 66, 121*, 179, 258, 265*, 348, 440, 475*, 482,
1216, 1574, 1606 (from Legg)

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 6:14-15 Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· 15 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆ τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 11:25 Καὶ ὅταν στήκετε προσευχόμενοι, ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατά τινος, ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῇ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

An omission due to h.t. is of course possible (so Weiss) and in fact at least in part quite probable, note the Byzantine minuscules.
On the other hand it could be a harmonization to Mt, but the wording is not the same. It is possibly an allusion to Mt, using the words from the previous verse.

Mk	Mt
εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε,	ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
οὐδε ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν
ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς	
ἀφησεὶ τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν	ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε is safe in Mk. No harmonization to Mt occurred. But some witnesses omitted ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, probably to harmonize with Mt.
It seems possible that the verse has been added as a continuation of verse 25, adapting the Matthean wording to the Markan (εἰ for ἐὰν and ἀφίετε for ἀφῆτε).

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks to the contrary that the words in Mt are based on the Markan source.
Some commentators suggested that already verse 25 is not original (Bultmann, Blass, Klostermann, Strecker).

Possible stemma:
1. Originally no verse
2. Verse added as harmonization to Mt
3. Omission due to h.t.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 246

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:28 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς;

Not in NA (only the omission by D is noted) but in SQE!

omit: W, Θ, 28, 565, pc, it(a, aur, b, ff^2, i, r^1), Sy-S

omit ἢ τίς ... ποιῇς; D, pc, d, k

c, f, l, q, vg have the words

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:23 ... λέγοντες· ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

NA28 Luke 20:2 καὶ εἶπαν λέγοντες πρὸς αὐτόν· εἰπὸν ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς ἐστιν ὁ δούς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

The omission by D could be due to h.t. (ταῦτα ποιεῖς - ταῦτα ποιῇς).

The words could have been omitted because they are considered redundant. Both Mt and Lk don't have them (Minor Agreement), so it could be also a harmonistic omission. There is no reason for an addition.

The words as they are in the text look like a conflation of two similar expressions:

ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς;

ἢ

τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 247

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες· ___ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί [οὖν] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

Τὶ εἴπωμεν; D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, pc, it(a, b, c, d, ff^2, i, r^1), [von Soden], Bover, Kilpatrick, SBL

aur, f, l, q, vg omit the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:25 οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

NA28 Luke 20:5 οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

Compare:

NA28 Luke 12:17 καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου;

Not from the parallels.

It has been suggested that the words fell out due to h.t. But in that case one would have expected Τὶ εἴπωμεν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

On the other hand the words are supported by witnesses only, which are fond of such additions. Both Mt and Lk don't have it.

It is very difficult to explain the omission is so wide a range of witnesses.

Güting: "I take this phrase as an obvious completion meant to clarify Mark's vivid narrative ("Weakly attested original readings of D in Mk", 1994).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 248

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 11:32 ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;- ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον· ἅπαντες γὰρ **εἶχον** τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν.

ᾔδεισαν D, W, Θ, 565, 2542, it("sciebant"), arm, geo
οἴδασιν 700

l, vg have εἶχον ("habebant")

B: no umlaut

ἔχω here as: "regard, consider, think"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:26 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς <u>προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην.</u>

NA28 Luke 20:6 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ὁ λαὸς ἅπας καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς, πεπεισμένος[be certain] γάρ ἐστιν <u>Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι.</u>

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 14:5 καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς <u>προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.</u>

NA28 Matthew 21:46 καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς <u>προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.</u>

ἔχω has an unusual meaning here. It has probably been changed therefore into the more explicit οἶδα.

There is no variation in the occurrences in Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 249

NA28 Mark 12:4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον _____ ἐκεφαλίωσαν καὶ ἠτίμασαν.

BYZ Mark 12:4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον **λιθοβολήσαντες** ἐκεφαλαίωσαν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἠτίμωμένον.

"And again he sent another slave to them; this one (they threw stones at) they beat over the head and insulted."

Byz A, C, X, Θ, f13, 892, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
txt 01, B, D, L, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1342, pc, Latt, Co

Sy-S omits the verse due to haplography (καὶ πάλιν).
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:35 καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν.

There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added as an allusion to Mt (so Weiss) and/or to explain the difficult ἐκεφαλίωσαν.

An interesting conjecture has been proposed by Linwood for ἐκεφαλίωσαν, a hapax legomenon in Greek literature. The meaning of this word has been deduced by analogy from similar words like γαστρόω "to punch in the belly." Linwood suggested ἐκολαφίσαν ("they hit") for ἐκεφαλίωσαν, the two words could be easily mixed up. Cp. also Mk 14:65.
William Linwood, Remarks on conjectural emendation as applied to the New Testament, London, 1873.

W.C. Allen suggests a misread Aramaic word, cp. "Difficulties in the text of the Gospels explained from the Aramaic" JTS 2 (1901) 298-9

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 250

NA28 Mark 12:4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον ἐκεφαλίωσαν καὶ _____ ἠτίμασαν.

BYZ Mark 12:4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον λιθοβολήσαντες ἐκεφαλαίωσαν καὶ **ἀπέστειλαν** ἠτίμωμένον.

Byz A, C, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, Maj, Sy, sa, goth
txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Lat, sa^{ms}, bo

k omits καὶ … ἠτίμασαν.
Sy-S omits the verse.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:3 καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν.

NA28 Luke 20:10-11 οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δείραντες κενόν. 11 καὶ προσέθετο ἕτερον πέμψαι δοῦλον· οἱ δὲ κἀκεῖνον δείραντες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν.

The word ἀποστέλλω appears 5(6) times in the 12:2-6. It especially appears in the previous verse 3: καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν. It would be natural to change verse 4 to have a similar ending: καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἠτίμωμένον.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 251

114. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:9 τί [οὖν] ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις.

omit B, L, 892*, 1342, pc, k, Sy-S, sa-mss, bo,
WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Bois, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 892[c], 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa-mss, bo-ms

Tregelles reads txt without brackets, but has additionally τί [οὖν] in brackets in the margin.

892: οὖν has been added in the margin by a later hand (umlaut as insertion sign).

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:40 ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις;

NA28 Luke 20:13 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται.

NA28 Luke 20:15 καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέκτειναν. τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος;

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 27:22 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν; λέγουσιν πάντες· σταυρωθήτω.

NA28 Luke 3:10 Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες· τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν; omit οὖν: D, N

NA28 John 6:30 Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον
omit οὖν: 01, L, 33, 1071, 1424

This variant should be considered together with:
NA28 Mark 11:31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες· ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί **[οὖν]** οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

omit A, C*, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 28, 565, 892, 1241, al,
it, vg-mss, Sy-S, Sy-P, sa-ms, bo, Trg, WH

txt 01, B, C^{C2}, D, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-H, sa-mss

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:25 τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;
omit οὖν: D, L, 28, 700, 892, 1071, al[20]

NA28 Luke 20:5 οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;
add οὖν: A, C, D, f1, 33, 157, 1071, al[K, Π, M, N, Q]

Mk 11:31
The addition of οὖν is probably a harmonization to Lk 20:15.

Mk 12:9
This is only 12 verses later so it could be a conformation (either way) to 11:31.
It is also possible that the omission of οὖν is a harmonization to Mt. Note though that there is an οὖν in Mt, but earlier in the verse. That the addition is a harmonization to Lk is rather improbable.

οὖν is a rather un-Markan word: Mt-Mk-Lk-Jo: 56-5-33-200.
C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage, JTS 28, 1926/27) writes: "The weight of 'Markan usage' is so strong that omission is presumably right where there is even a small body of good witnesses in support of it; and possibly right where a parallel in Matthew will account for its insertion, without any external evidence at all."

Güting thinks (with Turner) that οὖν is secondary also in 10:9, 11:31, 12:9, 12:14, 12:37, 13:35, possibly also 15:12. Kilpatrick agrees (Tuckett, Synoptic Studies, 1984, p. 177-85).

Rating: 1? (= omission probably right) (Mk 11:31)
Rating: - (indecisive) (Mk 12:9)

TVU 252

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:14 καὶ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός· οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις·

T&T #155+156

οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες ἤρξαντο ἐρωτᾶν αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ λέγοντες

G, W, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 28, 565, 700, al[40], it(b, i, q, r[1]), Sy-S, sa[mss], arm, geo,

von Soden

καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

D, 1579, d, k

ἐλθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ

ff[2]

ἐλθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες

472, 1009, 1515, c

B: no umlaut

ἐν δόλῳ "by stealth" (lat = subdole)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:16 καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἡρῳδιανῶν λέγοντες· διδάσκαλε,

NA28 Luke 20:21 καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· διδάσκαλε, …

Justin, Apol. 17:2: (not clear which Gospel)

προσελθόντες τινὲς ἠρώτων αὐτὸν, …

Compare:

NA28 Mark 12:18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες·

NA28 Mark 14:1 καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν·

There is no reason for a change to the txt reading, especially no reason for an omission of the ἐν δόλῳ. It is probably inspired from Mk 14:1.

The D reading is probably a harmonization to Lk.

It may be noted a nice scribal blunder in k here:

k*: non enim vides in facie hominum, set honestatem viam Domini dices
for you does not look to the face of men, but you say that the Lord's way means wealth

normal text:

non enim vides in facie hominum, set in veritatem viam Domini doces
for you does not look to the face of men, but in truth the way of God you teach;

Burkitt calls this a "fine perversion of the text".

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 253
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:14
ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;

T&T #157

ἐπικεφάλαιον D, Θ, 124, 565, 1071, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, Bois
ἐπικεφάλαιον δοῦναι κῆνσον 1071

it = "tributum"
k = "capitularium"

B: umlaut! (p. 1296 A 14 L) ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:17 εἰπὲ οὖν ἡμῖν τί σοι δοκεῖ· ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ;
NA28 Luke 20:22 ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὔ;

The meaning is the same for all words: "poll tax"

κῆνσος is a Latin loanword "census" (of which Mk has several). It has here probably been replaced by a more normal Greek word.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 254

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:15 ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί με πειράζετε __;

__ὑποκριταί__ P45, F, G, N, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, al, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-H**, sa^{mss}

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:18 γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν· τί με πειράζετε, __ὑποκριταί;__

NA28 Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·

BYZ Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί μέ πειράζετε;

(add ὑποκριταί: C, pc)

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. Similarly in Lk.

Quite good support.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 255

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:17 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν **αὐτοῖς·** τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ. καὶ ἐξεθαύμαζον ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, D, d, WH

txt 01, A, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, all versions, **NA**[25], Weiss

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [αὐτοῖς] in brackets in the margin.

In more detail:

	ὁ δὲ	Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν	B
	ὁ δὲ	Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	01, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, pc
ἀποκριθεὶς	δὲ ὁ	Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν	D, d
ἀποκριθεὶς	δὲ		εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	Θ, 565
ἀποκριθεὶς	δὲ ὁ	Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	700
καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς			εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	W, pc
καὶ			λέγει αὐτοῖς	1424
καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς	ὁ	Ἰησοῦς	εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	A, f1, f13, (28), 157, (700), 1071, Maj
	ὁ δὲ		εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	1342
			εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	k, r^1

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:21 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος. τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

NA28 Luke 20:25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

Context:

NA28 Mark 12:15 ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω. safe!

Compare:
NA28 Mark 11:17 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.

omit αὐτοῖς	B, 2542, f13, 28, b, Sy-S, sa, WH
txt	01, A, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

The addition of the pronoun is only natural. It could also be a conformation to context (verse 15) or a harmonization to the parallels. There is no reason for an omission.
It must be noted that the variant is not just the addition/omission of the pronoun, but is larger as is shown above. Therefore B and D do not really support the same variant. Possibly the omission occurred independently.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 579) has an interesting different view. For him k alone has the correct text in reading simply εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (dixit illis). He argues that only this short text explains the great variation. Scribes tried to expand this short text by various additions.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 256

115. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως·

BYZ Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως·

T&T #158

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, d, l, q, vg), Sy, sa^{pt}, goth

txt 01, B, C, L, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1093, 1342, 2786, c, sa^{pt}, bo

αὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς **οὐκ** ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα D

Δ: (p. 177) It seems like Δ* omitted καὶ ὁ δεύτερος … σπέρμα originally. The words have been added later using another ink. Curiously enough space is present.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

καταλιπὼν "leave, leave behind"
καταλείπω participle aorist active nominative masculine singular

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 12:19 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνον, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 12:20 ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα καὶ ἀποθνήσκων οὐκ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα·
NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:25 καὶ <u>μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα ἀφῆκεν</u> τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ·
NA28 Luke 20:29 ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν <u>ἄτεκνος</u>· 30 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος 31 καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ <u>οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα</u> καὶ ἀπέθανον.

Mt and Lk have a different wording, although Lk has κατέλιπον once. Either καταλιπὼν has been inserted to break the monotonous style (previous and next verse read ἀφίημι), or it has been removed to create a more symmetric story (conformation to verse 20, so Weiss).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 257

NA28 Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως·
NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ _____ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα. ἔσχατον πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

BYZ Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως·
BYZ Mark 12:22 καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα ἔσχατη πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ

ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ	01, B, C, L, Δ*, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Co
ὡσαύτως· οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ	W, 28
ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ	M*, f13
simili modo. Et omnes septem	(c), k

ὡσαύτως ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ	Θ
ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὡσαύτως· οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ	f1, 700
ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ	565

καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἑπτὰ· καὶ D, b, ff^{2}, r^{1} (omit ὁ τρίτος),
ὡσαύτως· καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν ὡσαύτως καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ
A, pc, l, vg, Sy-H, goth
ὡσαύτως· καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἑπτὰ καὶ
K, M^{c}, Δ^{c}, Π, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy

Δ: (p. 177) ἔλαβον αὐτὴν has been added in the margin with an insertion sign. It appears to have been added at the same time when verse 21a has been added (see previous variant).
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:26 ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἕως τῶν ἑπτά.

NA28 Luke 20:31 καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα καὶ ἀπέθανον.

There is no reason for an omission.
The reading of Θ et al. is just a repetition of the words from the previous verse (harmonization to immediate context).

The Byzantine (and D) text indicates that scribes felt uncomfortable with the short text. The first, the second and the third man are mentioned, but not the rest.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 258

116. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει [ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν] τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.

BYZ Mark 12:23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα

T&T #159

txt	A, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat(a, aur, b, ff^{2}, i, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-H, goth, NA^{25}, Weiss ὅταν οὖν ἀναστῶσιν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει f13 add οὖν: A, K, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, al
ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει	01, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 33, 69, 579, 892, 1342, al^{22}, c, d, k, r^{1}, Sy-P, Co, WH, Trg add οὖν: D, W, 33, 579, 892
ἐὰν οὖν ἀναστῶσιν	aeth (Tis)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:28 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή;
πάντες γὰρ ἔσχον αὐτήν·

NA28 Luke 20:33 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή;
οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

It is difficult to imagine a reason why the term should have been added (possibly from verse 25?) It is slightly awkward (ironic? "whenever"?) and redundant. Mt and Lk also omitted the term (Minor Agreement). So it is probable that scribes omitted it in Mk too.

On the other hand the support for the omission is very strong. WH speculate that possibly the aeth version also existed in Greek and was the first change of the original 01, B reading. The txt reading then is a conflation of both.
Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν has been omitted as either redundant or accidentally after ἀναστάσει. 22 Byzantine minuscules omit it.

Rating: - (indecisive)
brackets ok.

TVU 259

117. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς **ἄγγελοι** ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

BYZ Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ εἰσὶν ὡς **ἄγγελοι οἱ** ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

T&T #160

ἄγγελοι οἱ	A, G, X, Φ, Ψ, 565, 788, Maj-part^{1500}, Sy-P, goth, [Trg]
οἱ ἄγγελοι	W, 892, pc^{2}, bo
οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ	B, Θ, pc^{13}, sa, Or, WH^{mg}, Weiss, [Trg^{mg}]

ἄγγελοι θεοῦ οἱ	f13, pc^{4}
ἄγγελοι θεοῦ	69, 1071, pc^{50}, l
ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ	33, pc^{2}

txt ἄγγελοι	01, C, D, F, K, L, M, U, Δ, Π, Ω, f1, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1612, 2542, al$^{>40}$, Lat, Sy-H, WH, **NA^{25}**

Δ: εἷς ἄγγελοι instead of ὡς ἄγγελοι.
Tregelles reads ἄγγελοι [οἱ] as txt and has [οι ἄγγελοι] in the margin.
B: no umlaut

There is an error here in T&T on which Klaus Wachtel comments:
"Hier ist es tatsächlich einmal geschehen, dass uns die doppelte Erfassung der Kollationen nicht vor einem Irrtum geschützt hat. Beide Bearbeiter haben hier aufgrund mißverständlicher Darbietung des Befundes in der (handschriftlichen) Vorlage die folgenden Handschriften nicht bei Lesart 2 verzeichnet:

01 04 05 09 017 019 021 030 037 041 042 045
339 982 986 1034 1035 1038 1039 1040 1042 1096
1124 1490 1550 1567 1582 1612 1804
2203 2439 2806 2808 2810 /Σ = 34

Daher wurden sie bei der elektronischen Weiterverarbeitung wie Zeugen der Mehrheitslesart (1) behandelt. Das ist natürlich sehr ärgerlich. Wegen der großen Zahl der Teststellen meine ich dennoch, dass das Gesamtergebnis, die erste Einschätzung des Textwertes der betroffenen Handschriften, durch den Fehler nicht in Frage gestellt wird. So kommt denn auch keine der genannten Handschriften, soweit sie als Koinehandschriften geführt werden, durch die zusätzliche Lesart 2 über die Grenze von 10% Abweichungen vom byzantinischen Text hinaus."

This is not all. Additionally f1 reads txt and not Byz as in T&T! Other witnesses, too, like 579 or 1342. T&T cannot be trusted for this variant!

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:30 ἀλλ᾽ ὡς <u>ἄγγελοι</u> ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν.

BYZ Matthew 22:30 ἀλλ ὡς <u>ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ</u> ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰσιν

ἄγγελοι θεοῦ	01, L, f13, 28, 33, 892, 1241, 1424, pc Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H
ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ	W, Δ, 565, 579, Maj
ἄγγελοι	B, D, 700, it, Sy-C
οἱ ἄγγελοι	Θ, f1, Or

NA28 Luke 20:36 <u>ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν</u>

Compare:

NA28 Mark 13:32 οὐδὲ <u>οἱ ἄγγελοι</u> ἐν οὐρανῷ

BYZ Mark 13:32 οὐδὲ <u>οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ</u> ἐν οὐρανῷ

Byz	A, C, K^c, Π, W, Ψ, 0116, f1, 157, 579, Maj, Sy-H
txt	01, D, K*, L, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, al
<u>ἄγγελος</u>	B, bo^{pt}

It is possible that the οἱ has been accidentally omitted after ἄγγελοι. But note the same addition at Mk 13:32. Thus it is more probable that the article has been added for stylistic reasons.

The term ἄγγελοι θεοῦ appears nowhere else in Mk. It appears only in Lk 12:8, 12:9; 15:10 and Jo 1:51. In the LXX it appears 26 times. It is probably a natural expansion, compare Mt 22:30.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 260

118. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων· ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰακώβ;

omit first ὁ: 157, 579, 983, 1689(=f13^{c}), pc

omit ὁ^{2,3}: B, Trg, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss

omit all three ὁ: D, W, Or

txt P45^{vid}, 01, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, (579), 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

P45: Acc. to Swanson P45 has a lacuna for the first two ὁ, but the third ὁ is visible.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:

NA28 Mark 12:27 οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων·

BYZ Mark 12:27 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς ζώντων·

θεὸς B, D, K, L, M^{c}, U, W, Δ, Π, 28, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, al, Lat, Co,

ὁ θεὸς 01, A, C, F, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Sy-H,

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:32 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ; οὐκ ἔστιν [ὁ] θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

omit ὁ^{2} and ὁ^{3}: 01

Origen to this verse (acc. to Tischendorf): ου γαρ γεγρ. εγω θε. αβρ. κ. ισ. κ. ια. αλλ εγω ειμι θε. αβρ. κ. θε. ισ. κ. θε. ια. και ουτως γε ανεγραψαν ματθ. κ μα. κ. λουκ.

NA28 Luke 20:37 ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει κύριον τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ.

txt, omit ὁ^{2} and ὁ^{3}: 01, B, D, L, R, 579, 892, pc, Or

add articles: A, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj

Compare:

NA28 Acts 3:13 ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ [ὁ θεὸς] Ἰσαὰκ καὶ [ὁ θεὸς] Ἰακώβ

add ὁ θεὸς:	P74, 01, C, (049), 88, 104, 1175, 2147, pc
add θεὸς:	A, D
omit:	B, E, Ψ, 0236, 33, 1739, Maj

NA28 Acts 7:32 ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ.

ὁ θεὸς Ἰ. κ. ὁ θεὸς Ἰ.	E, H, P, 049, 056, 33, 1739, Maj
θεὸς Ἰ. κ. θεὸς Ἰ.	D
txt = omit:	P74, 01, A, B, C, Ψ, 36, 81, 614, 1175, al

LXX:

LXX Exodus 3:6 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ

LXX Exodus 3:15 ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ

LXX Exodus 3:16 θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ

LXX Exodus 4:5 θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ

In the LXX the phrase appears without the article. Mt has the articles. It is possible that the addition in Mk is a harmonization to Mt. This happened in Lk, too.

Note that D and W omit the article three times. It is possible that this is an independent harmonization to the LXX. This also probably happened in Acts.

It's interesting that 01 omits the articles in Mt, since it has them in Mk.

It is possible, though improbable that these omissions are harmonizations to Lk.

The decision is difficult as Metzger writes: "It is difficult to decide whether the weight of B, D, W, supporting the absence of the second and third instances of ὁ, is sufficient to counterbalance the weight of almost all other witnesses that include the article in all three instances."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 261

119. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:27 οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων·
BYZ Mark 12:27 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς ζώντων·

θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλα	B, D, K, L, M^{c}, U, W, Δ, Π, 28, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, al, Lat, Co, WH, **NA^{25}**
ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλα	01, A, C, F, X, Ψ, f1, 157*, 565, 700, 1424, WH^{mg}
one of the above:	goth
ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς	Γ, 157^{c}, Maj, q, Sy-H
ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλα	Θ, f13, 33, 1342, pc, Sy-S
ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς	M*, 1241, 1582^{c}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:32 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ; οὐκ ἔστιν [ὁ] θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων	B, L, Γ, Δ, f1, 33, pc
θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων	01, D, W, 28, 1424*, Lat
ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων	Θ, 0138, f13, 565, 579, Maj, Sy-H
ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς ζώντων	157

NA28 Luke 20:38 θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων,
ὁ θεὸς W, Θ, 124, pc

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 113) thinks that scribes took θεὸς as subject and added the article plus another θεὸς therefore:
"Not is the God (subject) a God (object) of the dead ..."
The subject is implicit in ἔστιν:
"He (subject) is not a God (object) of the dead ...".

The txt reading is therefore equivocal. Taking θεὸς as predicative noun (object), the fuller form θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς ζώντων suggests itself.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 262

120. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, **ἰδὼν** ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν· ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;

BYZ Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, **εἰδὼς** ὅτι καλῶς αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίθη, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, Ποία ἐστὶν πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή;

Byz 01^{C2}, A, B, X, Δ, 124, 33, 157, 579, 1424, Maj,
Co, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Trg^{mg}

txt 01*, C, (D), L, W, Θ, Σ, Φ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 2542, 2680, 2766, 2786, al, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Trg, Tis, Bal
εἰδὼν D

B: no umlaut

ἰδὼν = ὁράω
εἰδὼς = οἶδα

Context, verse 15 + 34:
NA28 Mark 12:15 ὁ δὲ **εἰδὼς** αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω.
ἰδὼν 01*, D, f13, 28*, 565, 1342(!), pc, it
corrected by 01^{C2} (= C^{a} Tisch.)

NA28 Mark 12:34 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς **ἰδὼν** [αὐτὸν] ὅτι νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ· οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.
εἰδὼς H*, 579, 700, pc
ἰδὼς Ψ, 28

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, **εἰδὼς** αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.
ἰδὼν 565
ἰδὼς L, N, W, Θ, Σ, 28
NA28 Matthew 9:4 καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ἱνατί ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;

<u>εἰδὼς</u>	B, Θ, Π^{c}, f1, 565, 700, 1424, L844, L2211, al^{50}, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, mae, arm, WH, NA^{25}, Weiss, Bois, Gre
txt	01, C, D, E*, L, N, W, Π*, 0233, 0281, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy-S, bo

NA28 Matthew 12:25 <u>εἰδὼς</u> δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.

<u>ἰδὼν</u> P21, 01^{C1}, D, 0281^{vid}, 33, 892, pc, ff^{1}, k, Sy-S, Sy-C, bo

<u>Occurrences:</u>	<u>Mt</u>	<u>Mk</u>
ἰδὼν	12	12 times
εἰδὼς	1	2 times (Mk 6:20, 12:15)

All other occurrences of ἰδὼν in Mk are basically safe (note only 7:2 εἰδότες for ἰδόντες by D, perhaps accidental itacism?). Both occurrences of εἰδὼς show an ἰδὼν variant (see above). Compare also Jo 6:14 εἰδότες by L and Jo 6:61 ἰδὼν by C.

It is possible that the variation is at least in part accidental, because ει and ι are pronounced alike (compare the ἰδὼς and εἰδὼν variants).

ἰδὼν is clearly the more common word. It is possible that the change from εἰδὼς to ἰδὼν at 12:15 is a conformation to common usage.

The εἰδὼς variant at 12:28 could be a conformation to 12:15. On the other hand ἰδὼν could be a conformation to 12:34.

The εἰδὼς variant at 12:34 is more difficult to explain. Again, it could be accidental, but it could also be explained as a conformation to a previous εἰδὼς at 12:28.

Compare also discussion at Mt 9:4.

Difficult!

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 263

121. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:29 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν·
ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστιν,

BYZ Mark 12:29 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν,
ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν

omit:	229, k, sa
ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν	01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892*, 1342, pc, sa^{ms}, bo, WH, NA^{25}
Πάντων πρώτη	D, W, Θ, 565, al, it(a, b, d, i, r^{1}), Sy-S
Πάντων πρώτον	28, 700
Πρώτον πάντων	f1, 2542
Πρώτη πάντων	788(=f13)
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων	X (h.t.?)
ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν ἐντολή	892^{c}
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή	A, K, M, U, Π, 33, 1424, al, Trg^{mg}
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή ἐστιν	C
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν	124, 157, Maj, Lat(aur, c, ff^{2}, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐστιν	f13

892: ἐντολή has been added in the margin by a later hand, with a triplet as insertion sign.

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, ἰδὼν ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν· ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;

ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700
(Not noted in NA, but connected!)

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:36 διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; 37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ...

There are no parallels of the words in the Gospels. We have here an interesting clear-cut separation of texttypes. The Byzantine text takes up the words from the previous verse. The Alexandrian text has a short version of it and the Western/Caesarean text is different again.
It actually appears that the complete omission of the words (represented only by k et al.) best accounts for the rise of the others. Scribes felt the need to add something to smooth the abrupt start of the law. Unfortunately the support is extremely slim.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 264

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου

1 ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου

2 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου

3 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου

4 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

omit 1	349
omit 2	K, Π*, 472, pc
omit 3	D, H, pc, c, Bois
omit 2+3	157, k, (Justin$^{2/5}$)

Justin does not give his sources. He cites the passage 5 times, two times the short form above, once the Markan form, once Mt and once Lk. Compare Bellinzoni.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου·

omit καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου: 33

add καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ: Θ, f13, 33

NA28 Luke 10:27 ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

omit καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου: 157

LXX:

LXX Deuteronomy 6:5 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου for καρδίας B^{c} has διανοίας (Rahlfs)

Only the D reading has any claim for being taken seriously: But with this weak, incoherent support it is more probable that it's an omission due to h.t. and not that the words are a harmonistic addition.

Note: Both Mt and Lk read ἐν ὅλῃ against ἐξ ὅλης in Mk (Minor Agreement).

And, if one would allow the D reading to be original, this would create another Minor Agreement, namely that both Mt and Lk read διανοίᾳ against Mk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 265

122. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:30 + 12:33 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, D*, X, f13, pc, WH

txt 01, A, D^c, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA^{25}, Weiss, WH^{mg}

omit τῆς in front of ψυχῆς: 346

B omits the article also in front of ψυχῆς and διανοίας.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

NA28 Mark 12:33 καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, U, X, Ψ, pc, WH

txt 01, A, D^c, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, NA^{25}, Weiss, WH^{mg}

omit τῆς in front of ἰσχύος: 01* (corrected by 01^{C2})

Lacuna: C (in both verses)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου·

NA28 Luke 10:27 ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

omit τῆς: P75, B, Ξ, 070, f1, L844, L2211, pc
txt 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, Maj

LXX:
LXX Deuteronomy 6:5 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου for καρδίας, read by A, B^c has: διανοίας (Rahlfs)

See complete discussion at Mt 22:37

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 266

NA28 Mark 12:30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

BYZ Mark 12:30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή.

T&T #162

Byz	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Trg	
	αὕτη πρώτη	W, Θ, 28, 565, pc, k
	αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή	A, D, X, f1, f13, 700, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy
	αὕτη πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή	K, U, Π, Φ, 33, 517, 579, 954, 1424, 1675, 2766, al[187]
	αὕτη ἐστιν ἡ πρώτη ἐντολή	1071, pc[5]
	αὕτη ἐστιν πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἐντολή	pc[4]
txt	01, B, E, L, Δ, Ψ, 1342, pc[10], a, Co	
	pc = 375, 1011, 1416, 1547, 2109, 2477, 2528, 2555, 2578, 2757	

Tregelles has additionally αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή in brackets in the margin.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:38 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή.
BYZ Matthew 22:38 αὕτη ἐστὶν πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἐντολή

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, ἰδὼν ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν· ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;

There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added from Mt or from the previous verse 28 (so Weiss). The different readings indicate a secondary cause. See also next verse 31.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 267

NA28 Mark 12:31 δευτέρα αὕτη· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν.

BYZ Mark 12:31 καὶ δευτέρα ὁμοία αὕτη Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν

Byz	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth	
	καὶ δευτέρα ὁμοία αὕτη	A, W, X, f1, f13, Maj, Sy, goth
	δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὕτη	D, Θ, 33, 565, 579, 700, Lat
	δευτέρα ὁμοία αὕτη	1675, Trg (!)

txt	01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Co	
	δευτέρα αὕτη ἐστιν	01, 1342
	ἡ δευτέρα αὕτη	Δ, Ψ
	δευτέρα δὲ αὕτη	579
	ἡ δὲ δευτέρα αὕτη	892

1342 omits μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:39

δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Again a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 268
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:32 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεύς· καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ·

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, pc, WH

txt 01, A, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss, WH[mg]

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare 12:29 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ...

An asyndeton would fit good to verse 29 and is consistent with Markan style. Because of the very slim support probably omitted either accidentally or to improve style.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 269

NA28 Mark 12:33 καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας
καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως
καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος
καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν.

BYZ Mark 12:33 καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας
καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως
καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς
καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος
καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν πλεῖόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν

Byz A, X, 087, f13, 33, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, bo^{mss}, goth, Trg

txt 01, B, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 28, 565, 892, 1241, 1342, 2542, pc,
a, sa, bo

Tregelles has additionally καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς in brackets in the margin.
Sy-S omits καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

The evidence in more detail is as follows:
1 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως
2 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως
3 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς
4 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος
5 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου, verse 30

1 + 4	01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 28, 892, 1241, 2542, pc, a
4 + 1	f1, pc
4	579
2 + 3	D (Deu 6:5)
2 + 4	Θ, 565
1 + 3 + 4	A, 087, f13, Maj, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H
3 + 1 + 4	1424
4 + 5 + 3	33 (verse 30)

The Latins are completely chaotic here.

Compare:
LXX Deuteronomy 6:5 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου
3 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
2 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου
LXX Joshua 22:5 καὶ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ
5 ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν
3 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς ὑμῶν

Verse 30:
NA28 Mark 12:30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου
ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου
3 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
5 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου
4 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

3	+ 4	D, H
	5 + 4	K, Π*
4 + 3 + 5		1424

(These omissions are probably simply due to h.t.)

NA28 Luke 10:27 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου
3 καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου
4 καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου
5 καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου,
καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

NA28 Matthew 22:37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου
3 καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου
5 καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου·

The readings of the Western witnesses are probably inspired from the LXX text. So we are left basically with 1 + 4 (txt) or 1 + 3 + 4 (Byz). The omission could of course be due to h.t.
ψυχῇ (3) appears in all parallels (LXX, Mt, Lk, Mk verse 30). It would be natural as an addition. The support is also not that good.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 270
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:34 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν **[αὐτὸν]** ὅτι νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ· οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

νουνεχῶς "wisely, sensibly"

omit: 01, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1342, 2542, pc, Lat, Sy-S

txt A, B, X, Ψ, 087, f13, Maj, a, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

εἰδὼς for ἰδὼν: H*, 579, 700, pc (cp. 12:28)
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare:
NA28 Luke 19:4 καὶ προδραμὼν εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτὸν ὅτι ἐκείνης ἤμελλεν διέρχεσθαι.

The construction of ὁράω with accusative and ὅτι is rare in Hellenistic Greek (Lk 19:4 is not really parallel, because it's a ἵνα clause). We have here a prolepsis of the subject of the subordinate clause into the main clause. Mk shows this elsewhere (1:24, 7:2, 8:24, 11:32).
The ὅτι clause is the real object here already and a pronoun is not needed. αὐτὸν is redundant. There is no reason for an addition, but a clear one for the omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Omission wrong

TVU 271

123. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:36 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου **ὑποκάτω** τῶν ποδῶν σου.

BYZ Mark 12:36 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου **ὑποπόδιον** τῶν ποδῶν σου

Byz 01, A, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 087, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm, goth, Trg

txt B, D, W, 28, 2542, Sy-S, Co, geo

Lat = "scabellum" = ὑποπόδιον
k = "suppedaneum"

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:44
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου;
BYZ Matthew 22:44
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου
Byz K, Π, W, f1, 13, 33, 1342, Maj, Lat, mae-1+2, Sy-P, arm
txt 01, B, D, G, L, U, Z, Γ, Θ, f13, 22, 579, 892, al, it, Sy-C, Sy-H, Co

NA28 Luke 20:43
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
ὑποκάτω D, pc, it, Sy-C, Sy-P

LXX quote:
LXX Psalm 109:1
ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου

Compare:
NA28 Acts 2:35 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

ὑποπόδιον is the LXX reading. This verse of the psalms is one of the most often cited or alluded to OT verse in the NT.
It is not probable that the reading ὑποκάτω is secondary in Mt and Mk.
In Mt, on external rating, ὑποκάτω is very probably original. Perhaps he took it over from Mk?

So the question is, if ὑποκάτω here in Mk is a harmonization to Mt or if ὑποπόδιον is a harmonization to Lk or LXX. The support for txt is not very good.
Mk uses ὑποκάτω two more times (6:11, 7:28) but nowhere else ὑποπόδιον.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 272

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 12:40 οἱ κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν ___καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι· οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

καὶ ὀρφανῶν	D, W, f13^{a,b}, 28, 565, it(a, b, c, d, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1}), Sy-Pal
"orphaned"	
et pupillorum	a, b, d, i, q, r^{1}, vg^{ms}
et orphanorum	c, ff^{2}

aur, e, k, l, vg do not have the word.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

LXX Exodus 22:21 πᾶσαν χήραν καὶ ὀρφανὸν οὐ κακώσετε

LXX 2 Maccabees 8:28 μετὰ δὲ τὸ σάββατον τοῖς ᾑκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία διεμερίσαντο

LXX Zechariah 7:10 καὶ χήραν καὶ ὀρφανὸν καὶ προσήλυτον καὶ πένητα μὴ καταδυναστεύετε

NA28 James 1:27 θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὕτη ἐστίν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν

Both words are often used together and the addition is natural here. There is no reason for an omission, except h.t. (WN - WN).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 273

NA28 Mark 12:41 Καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. καὶ πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον πολλά·

BYZ Mark 12:41 Καὶ καθίσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον καὶ πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον πολλά·

T&T #163 (partial, απ- or κατ-)

καθίσας κατέναντι	01, L, Δ, 892, 1342, WH, **NA^{25}**, Trg^{mg}
καθίσας ἀπέναντι	B, Ψ, WH^{mg}, Weiss, Trg
one of these:	a, k, sa^{ms}, bo
καθίσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατέναντι	A, X, 700, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa
καθίσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπέναντι	U, 33, 579, 1424, pc
	517, 954, 1675, 2766 (ὁ Ἰ.?, from T&T)
ἑστώς ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατέναντι	W, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Or
	69, 124, 788, 983 (=f13-part)
	κατενώπιον 13, 346, 543, 826, 828 (=f13part)

κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου καθεζόμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς D

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

The last time Jesus had been mentioned as a direct subject was in verse 35. It is only natural to add it here.

ἑστώς is interesting. It probably originated by someone who thought that it is inappropriate for Jesus to sit in the temple.

If it is κατέναντι or ἀπέναντι is difficult to decide.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 274

124. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς;
οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ **ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον** ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

BYZ Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς
οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ **λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ,** ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ

T&T #165 (partial)

λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ	A, K, Byz-Majuscules, Maj-part
λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον	M, X, Γ, Π, 69, 1241, 2542, pc,
	NA^{25}, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal
one of these:	Lat(e, ff^{2}, i, k, l, r^{1}, vg)
ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον	01, B, G, L, U, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 372, 517, 579, 700, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2766, 2786, Maj-part, WH
ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ	D, Σ, 565, 1342
one of these:	it(a, aur, b, d, q), Sy, Co

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:2
οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.
W* omits ὧδέ, otherwise save.

NA28 Luke 21:6 οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ	A, G, Δ, Θ, Π, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H
λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον	S, W, Ψ, 157, 1071
λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὧδε	01^{c}, L, f13-part
ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον	f1, 33, 579, 1241, pc, Sy-C
λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὧδε	01*, B, (D, it), f13-part, 892, 2542, pc
	D, it add ἐν τοίχῳ

Here I consider the txt reading probably wrong and think that the 01, B reading is original (compare Lk commentary).

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 19:44 καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν <u>λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον</u> ἐν σοί,
Byz: ἐν σοί <u>λίθον ἐπὶ λίθῳ</u> A, C, W, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy

NA28 Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ <u>ὧδε</u> ἀπόλλυμαι.
BYZ Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ____ ἀπόλλυμαι

Byz		A, P, Q, W, 69, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 1071, Maj, sa^{ms}
txt	λιμῷ <u>ὧδε</u>	P75, 01, B, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 2542, pc, e, ff^{2}, Sy-H, Sy-Pal
	<u>ὧδε</u> λιμῷ	D, N, R, U, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 700, 1241, al,
		Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, arm, geo

The reading of NA^{25} is probably a relict of considering the omission of ὧδε and the rest as two different variants. Then a completely different picture emerges.

It is interesting that the reading in Mt is save. Therefore there must have been something different in the other Gospels that led to the diversity.
Possibly the addition of ὧδε is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). ἐπὶ λίθῳ might be from Lk.
The support for a reading without ὧδε is very bad, though.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 275

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ___.

T&T #166

__ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν

D, W, it(a, b, c, d, ff^2, i, n, r^1), Cyprian (3rd CE)

et in triduo	aliud resuscitetur	sine manibus	b
et in triduo	illud resuscitetur	sine manibus	ff^2
et in triduo	resuscitabo illud	sine manibus	c
et in triduo	alius resurget	sine manibus	n
et in triduo	aliud resurget	sine manibus	r^1
et in tridum	aliud resurget	sine manibus	i
et post triduum	alius resurget	sine manibus	a
et post tertium diem	aliud resuscitetur	sine manibus	d
et post triduum	alium ut excitabitur	sine manibus	k
et post triduum	aliud excitabitur	sine manibus	Cyp$^{Testim. I,15}$
et post triduo	alius excitabitur	sine manibus	e

Latin at Mk 14:58 for comparison:

et per triduum	aliud non manu factum aedificabo		vg
et post triduum	aliud non manu factum aedificabo		aur, l
et post tertium diem	aliud suscitado	non manu factum	a
et post tertium diem	aliud suscitado	non manibus factum	d
et post tertium diem	illud suscitado	non manu factum	ff^2
et post triduum	aliud aedificabo	non manibus factum	q
et post triduum	suscitado illud	non manu factum	c
et post triduum	aliud excitabo	non manu factum	k

aur, l, q, vg do not have the addition.

T&T omits erroneously this addition for W.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

"and in three days another will arise, (made) without hands."

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:58 ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω.

! D, it: … ἀναστήσω ἀχειροποίητον

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:2 οὐ βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.
NA28 Luke 21:6 ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

Compare also:
NA28 John 2:19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν.

The words in D and W are exactly the same.
To the contrary the Latin shows extreme variation. And there is not much agreement between 13:2 and 14:58. This points to a Greek origin of this addition (so also Burkitt).
A notable Latin agreement between 13:2 and 14:58 is the *et post triduum aliud excitabitur* by the Afra (k, e, Cyp).
Burkitt adds:
"The interpolation does not come from the Diatessaron: Tatian joined the story of the Widow's Mites to John 2:14-22 (Diat. Arab 32), but gave what corresponds to Mk. 13:1-2 much later, in connexion with John 12:36 (Diat. 41)."

Possibly the words were borrowed from 14:58, and cited from memory.
On the other hand it is basically possible that the words have been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Lk, where no addition occurs, but this is rather improbable.

Interesting is the uniform *sine manibus* in 13:2.
For ἄνευ χειρῶν compare Dan 2:34, 45.

Compare:
F.C. Burkitt "W and Θ, Studies in the Western text of St. Mark" JTS 17 (1916) 1-21

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 276

NA28 Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους,
ἔσονται λιμοί · ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

BYZ Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους
καὶ ἔσονται λιμοί καὶ ταραχαί· ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα

T&T #167

καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί	A, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, q, Sy, sa^{mss}
ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί	28, 892, Weiss
καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί	565, 700
καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί	Θ, pc^{23}
καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί	Σ, 1342, pc^{5}
λιμοὶ ταραχαί	W

ἔσονται λιμοί	01, B, L, Ψ, pc^{2}, Lat, sa^{mss}, bo, WH, **NA^{25}** (pc = 130, 2236)
καὶ λιμοί	D, Lat
καὶ ἔσονται λιμοί	579, Trg (with καὶ in brackets) , Gre
ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί	2542, pc^{3}

have καὶ^{2}	A, Θ, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, Maj
omit καὶ^{2}	01, B, D, L, W, Ψ, 892, pc

have καὶ^{3}	A, D, Θ, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1342, Maj
omit καὶ^{3}	01, B, L, W, Ψ, 28, 892, 2542, pc

have ταραχαί	A, W, Θ, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy, sa^{mss}
omit ταραχαί	01, B, D, L, Ψ, 579, 2542, pc, Lat, sa^{mss}, bo

01* omits κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί due to h.t. ταραχαί is not present and was very probably also not present in the exemplar of 01.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ταραχή "stirring up; disturbance, trouble, disorder"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:7 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους·
BYZ καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους·
Byz C, L, W, Θ, 0102, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt 01, B, D, E*, 892, pc, it-part, Sy-S

NA28 Luke 21:10-11 ἐγερθήσεται ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, 11 σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβητρά τε καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται.

Compare:
LXX Isaiah 22:5 ὅτι ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις παρὰ κυρίου

BYZ John 5:4 ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ , καὶ ἐτάρασσεν τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγιὴς ἐγίνετο, ᾧ δήποτε κατειχετο νοσήματι.

This variation is very strange. Almost all thinkable readings are present. Internally it is extremely difficult to recover the original.
The clumsy pleonasm of the double καὶ ἔσονται could be a stumbling block (so Greeven, TC Mark, 2005, p. 621).
The following witnesses have both καί: A, Θ, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, Maj
Possibly the addition of καὶ[2] is a harmonization to Mt?

ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ
ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος
καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν,
ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους,
ἔσονται λιμοί - - - ?

The simple ἔσονται λιμοί looks a bit lost after ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους and probably was the original reading. Several variations have been introduced to smooth this:
1. the addition of a καὶ (579)
2. the addition of a καὶ plus the omission of ἔσονται (D, Lat)
3. addition of καὶ λοιμοὶ (2542, pc)
4. the addition of καὶ ταραχαί. (28, 892)
All other readings are tertiary variations.
Already WH speculated that καὶ ταραχαί has been added possibly for the sake of rhythm. Both Mt and Lk don't have it (and don't need it).

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 186) thinks that καὶ ταραχαί fell out before ἀρχαὶ accidentally.

Interestingly both Mt and Lk have the same text up to βασιλείαν and then go different ways:

Mk	Mt	Lk
ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί	καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους	σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται

Probably they felt some problem here, too.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 277
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί·
ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

BYZ Mark 13:8 ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

Not in NA and SQE!

Θ, f13, 28, 69, 565, (1071) read:

ταῦτα δὲ πάν ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.	Θ
ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.	f13, 28, 565
ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων.	69
ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα πάντα.	1071
ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων	1582*
omit(!)	W, Φ, c

1582: The word is written by the original scribe Ephraim (10th CE) into a space within the text.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ὠδίνων	genitive feminine plural "birth-pains; pain, suffering"
ἀρχὴ	nominative feminine singular
ἀρχαὶ	nominative feminine plural

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:8 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.
W, f1, f13, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.

The Caesarean variation is clearly a harmonization to Mt.
ἀρχαὶ is possibly a conformation to the plural ὠδίνων.
Weiß defends ἀρχαὶ with the argument that otherwise the omission of καὶ ταραχαί cannot be explained (see previous variant). But this is only true if καὶ ταραχαί is original at all, which is not clear.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 278
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:9
Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς· παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

εἶτα (δὲ) ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς παραδώσουσιν
D, Θ, 565, 700, it(a, b, d, ff^2, i, n, r^1)
καὶ παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς
W, f1, 28, 124, pc, Sy-S

Deinde vos ipsos trident it
Videte, deinde vos ipsos trident k

Lat(aur, c, l, q, vg) has the words.

1582: The words of the majority reading are written by the original scribe Ephraim (10th CE) into the margin.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

εἶτα adverb; (1) temporally: "then, afterward, next"
(2) in enumerations: "then, next"; to make a transition to a new point in an argument: "furthermore, then, besides"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 10:17 Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς· 18 καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 24:9 Τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλῖψιν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦ σιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. 10 καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους·

NA28 Luke 21:12 Πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς,

NA28 2 John 1:8 βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἃ εἰργασάμεθα ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε.

There is no parallel for the Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς, except for 2.Jo 8.
= "But you, for yourselves, beware (or take care)!"

Mt has προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων instead.
= "Be on guard against men!"

A very emphatic note!
The phrase is slightly unusual and strange and was probably omitted therefore.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 279

NA28 Mark 13:11 καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, _____ ἀλλ᾽ ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ το λαλεῖτε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

BYZ Mark 13:11 ὅταν δὲ ἄγαγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε μηδὲ μελετᾶτε· ἀλλ ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, X, Δ, f1, f13, 22, 1071, Maj, a, n, Sy-P, Sy-H
μηδὲ προμελετᾶτε τί λαλήσητε Θ, (28), 565, 700, pc, arm, Or

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, 69, 788(=f13^{b}), 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, 1424, Lat, Sy-S, Co, geo

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

μελετᾶτε μελετάω imperative present active 2nd person plural
"practice, cultivate, plot, think about"

Parallel:

NA28 Luke 21:14 θέτε οὖν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι·
προμελετᾶν προμελετάω verb infinitive present active
"prepare ahead of time"

Probably an allusion to Lk (so Weiss). The support is not very good.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 280

NA28 Mark 13:14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως _____ ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη,

BYZ Mark 13:14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἑστὼς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 28, 157, 579, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj,
it(aur, c, e, k, l, q), vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H
διὰ Φ, f1, 28, 579, 1424, pc
quod dictum est ante profeta k* (k^{c} removes 'ante' and adds 'a Danielo')

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Ψ, 565, 700, 892,
Lat(d, ff^{2}, i, n, r^{1}, vg), Sy-S, Co, arm, geo

Lacuna: C, 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1297 C 33 R) τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:15 Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω,

ὑπὸ pc^{2} (Legg: 1402, 2145)

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Note that some manuscripts read διὰ as in Mk.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 1:22 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου
NA28 Matthew 2:15 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου
NA28 Matthew 2:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου ὑπὸ: L, Maj
NA28 Matthew 2:23 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὑπὸ: 01^{c}, C
NA28 Matthew 4:14 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαΐου
NA28 Matthew 8:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαΐου ὑπὸ: 1424
NA28 Matthew 12:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαΐου ὑπὸ: C, N, 1424
NA28 Matthew 13:35 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου
NA28 Matthew 21:4 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ὑπὸ: L, Θ, f13, 700
NA28 Matthew 22:31 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ

NA28 Matthew 24:15 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ
NA28 Matthew 27:9 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου

τὸ ῥηθὲν appears only in Mt. If it is connected with κυρίου/ θεοῦ Mt uses ὑπὸ. In the case of prophets he is using διὰ.
There is no convincing reason, why the phrase should have been deleted.

Compare:
Maurice Robinson "Two passages in Mk" Faith & Mission 13 (1996) 66-111 [very detailed study, but not convincing for this passage.]

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 281

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:15 ὁ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἆραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

omit B, F, H, 1342, 1424, 2542, pc, c, Co, WH, NA[25], Weiss, SBL

txt 01, A, L, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1071, Maj, Sy-H, WH[mg], [Trg]

καὶ ὁ D, Θ, 565, 700, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

καὶ ὁ	124, 346, 157, 700[c], pc
ὁ δὲ	D, 33

NA28 Luke 17:31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ,

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 13:14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη,

NA28 Mark 13:16 καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

Probably a harmonization to Mt. The support is incoherent.

καὶ ὁ appears to be a harmonization to the next verse 13:16.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) thinks that δὲ has been added secondarily as a connecting conjunction.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 624) thinks that the asyndeton fits good to the order to hasty flight and thinks that Mt took it over.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 282

125. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 13:15 ὁ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω
μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἆραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Mark 13:15 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω **εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,**
μηδὲ εἰσελθέτω ἆραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ

T&T #168

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, 0211, 0233, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H, Gre, Trg

txt 01, B, L, Ψ, 892, 1342, pc[35], c, k, Sy-P, Co

The citation in NA of c, k for the omission is doubtful, because it not only omits εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, but also μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω, probably due to h.t. (ατω – ατω).

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω
ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,
NA28 Luke 17:31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι αὐτά,

Mt does not have it (safe). Lk has a completely different wording. It might be an addition to clarify the sense (see below). There is no reason for an omission, except as an harmonization to Mt. Note that that 35 Byzantine minuscules omit the words.
Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 115) thinks that it has been omitted as redundant.

C.H. Turner (JTS 29, 1927/28) considers the reduplication of εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν - ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας as typically Markan. He also notes the interesting argument that "the one on the housetop must not come down" is really nonsense. He must come down to fly. What is meant is that he "must not come down into the house". The question only is if these words are original or have been added secondarily as a clarification. Mt skillfully changed this into "the one on the housetop must not go down to take what is in the house".

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 626) notes a conjecture by Zuntz to omit the μὴ before καταβάτω (Zuntz in Cancik, 1984). But then a single μηδὲ remains.
Güting elsewhere writes: "I am inclined to read against the witness of Codex Bezae. For to interpret μὴ καταβάτω as an independent injunction is to misunderstand its close relation to what follows. This misunderstanding caused the scribes to add εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ("Weakly attested original readings of D in Mk", 1994).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 283

126. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:15 ὁ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω **ἆραί τι** ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

τι ἆραί B, K, Π*, L, Ψ, 892, pc, WH, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Gre[old], Trg, SBL

txt 01, A, D, Δ, Θ, Π[c], f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Gre[new]

ἆραί (W), 2542

W reads: (Swanson and Facsimile)

ἆραί ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ **τι**

Greeven changed his view in his TC book on Mk (TC Mark, 2005, p. 627).

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

ἆραί τι D, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 1424, TR

ἆραί 2

NA28 Luke 17:31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι αὐτά, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἀγρῷ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.

Context, verse 16:

NA28 Mark 13:16 καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

It is interesting that no witness in Mk changed τι into the Matthean τὰ (Greeven notes L17), but that several witnesses changed τὰ into the Markan τι. Nevertheless it is possible that the order ἆραί τι is a harmonization to the Matthean order.

There is no reason to change τι ἆραί.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 627) notes a possible chiasm:
τι ἆραί ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, … ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 284

NA28 Mark 13:18 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος·

BYZ Mark 13:18 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος·

Byz 01^{C2}, A, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, 124, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Θ, 083, f13, 28, 565, Lat, Sy-S, bo^{ms}

Note also:

	χειμῶνος	ἢ σαββάτου	L, n^{c}
ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν	χειμῶνος	ἢ ἐν σαββάτου	346, 1424, k
ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν	χειμῶνος	μηδὲ σαββάτου	1071, 1342, pc

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:20 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαββάτῳ.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 285

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:22 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ <u>δώσουσιν</u> σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

<u>ποιήσουσιν</u> D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, pc, a, geo^2, Or?,
<u>NA^{25}</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

<u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u> read txt.

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 17:1

ὅτι ἐν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐξουσίᾳ <u>ποιεῖ</u> πᾶσαν δύναμιν καὶ <u>σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα</u>, …

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:24 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ <u>δώσουσιν σημεῖα</u> μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

Compare:

NA28 John 2:11 Ταύτην <u>ἐποίησεν</u> ἀρχὴν τῶν <u>σημείων</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 John 2:23 θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ <u>σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει</u>·
NA28 John 3:2 οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ <u>σημεῖα ποιεῖν</u> ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς,
NA28 John 4:54 Τοῦτο [δὲ] πάλιν δεύτερον <u>σημεῖον ἐποίησεν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 John 6:2 ὅτι ἐθεώρουν τὰ <u>σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει</u> ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων.
NA28 John 6:14 Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ὃ <u>ἐποίησεν σημεῖον</u>
NA28 John 6:30 Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν <u>ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον,</u>
NA28 John 7:31 μὴ πλείονα <u>σημεῖα ποιήσει</u> ὧν οὗτος <u>ἐποίησεν;</u>
NA28 John 9:16 ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα <u>σημεῖα ποιεῖν;</u>
NA28 John 10:41 Ἰωάννης μὲν <u>σημεῖον ἐποίησεν</u> οὐδέν,
NA28 John 11:47 οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ <u>ποιεῖ σημεῖα;</u>
NA28 John 12:18 ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν <u>πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον.</u>
NA28 John 12:37 Τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ <u>σημεῖα πεποιηκότος</u>
NA28 John 20:30 Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα <u>σημεῖα ἐποίησεν</u>

It is possible that δώσουσιν is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). The combination of σημεῖον with ποιέω is characteristically Johannine. It appears nowhere in the Synoptic Gospels.

δώσουσιν σημεῖα is Hebrew-Aramaic idiom (Act 14:3).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 286

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:28 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἁπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα __, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν·

Not in NA but in SQE, Tis!

ἐν αὐτῇ D, Θ, 28, 124, 565, 700, pc, q, arm

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:32 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἁπαλὸς καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύῃ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος·

NA28 Luke 21:29 Καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς· ἴδετε τὴν συκῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα· 30 ὅταν προβάλωσιν ἤδη, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤδη ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν·

Possibly a conformation to immediate context ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς.

Compare previous variant 13:22 with similar support.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 287

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:31 ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται,
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου <u>οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται.</u>

<u>οὐ παρελεύσονται</u>	B, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA[25]</u>**, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Trg</u>
<u>οὐ παρέλθωσιν</u>	D*
<u>οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται</u>	01, L, 892, 1342, 1424, pc, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν</u>	A, C, D[c], W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, Maj, <u>WH[mg]</u>, <u>Trg[mg]</u>

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:35 ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται,
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου <u>οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν.</u> (safe!)

NA28 Luke 21:33 ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται,
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου <u>οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται.</u>
<u>οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν</u> A, C, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

Context, previous verse 30:

NA28 Mark 13:30 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι <u>οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ</u> ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη μέχρις οὗ ταῦτα πάντα γένηται.

The parallels are safe.

It is certainly possible that οὐ μὴ is a harmonization to the parallels and/or to context. But the support is extremely slim.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) argues that Mark never has οὐ μὴ with indicative future, which is not exactly true (Mk 14:31 οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι). BDR (§ 355[1]) note that οὐ μὴ with subjunctive aorist is lower Koine.

The correct negation for the future would be οὐ, whereas the negation for the subjunctive aorist would be μὴ or οὐ μὴ.

It is therefore probable that the "ungrammatical" οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται has been corrected either by the omission of μὴ or by the change of the future into the subjunctive aorist.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 288

127. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 13:32 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ **οἱ ἄγγελοι** ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.
BYZ Mark 13:32 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν οὐδὲ **οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ** ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ

Byz	A, C, K^c, Π, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 0116, f1, 157, 579, 1342, Maj, Sy-H, sa, Weiss
txt	01, D, K*, L, U, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, bo^{pt}, **NA^{25}**, WH
ἄγγελος	B, bo^{pt}, Aug, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
BYZ Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

ἄγγελοι οἱ	A, G, Φ, Ψ, (f13), 565, 788, 1342, Maj, Sy-P
οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ	B, Θ, pc^{13}, sa, Or, WH^{mg}, Weiss
ἄγγελοι	01, C, D, K, L, (W), Δ, Π, f1, 28, 157, 579, 700, (892), 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, al, Sy-H, Lat, WH, NA^{25}

It is possible that the οἱ has been accidentally omitted after ἄγγελοι. But note the same addition at Mk 12:25. Thus it is more probable that the article has been added for stylistic reasons.
The reading by B might be due to harmonization to immediate context, the singulars οὐδεὶς, ὁ υἱός, ὁ πατήρ.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 289

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 13:32 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ **οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός,** εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

omit: X, 983, 1689(=f13^{c}), pc, vg^{mss}

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:36 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος.

BYZ Matthew 24:36 Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν _____ εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μου μόνος

Byz 01^{C2}, L, W, Σ, f1, 22, 33, 892, Maj^{1500}, vg, Sy, Co(+ mae-2), Hier^{mss}

txt 01*, B, D, Θ, Φ, f13, 28, 2680, al^{90}, it, vg^{mss}, Sy-Pal, arm, geo^{1,B}, Ir, (Or), Chrys, Cyr(Hesych), Hier^{mss}

Compare also next verse:

NA28 Mark 13:33 Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ_ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν. **εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υιὸς** W

Full discussion at Mt 24:36

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 290

128. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 13:33 Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε· _____ οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν.

BYZ Mark 13:33 βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε **καὶ προσεύχεσθε·** οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν

T&T #170

Byz 01, A, C, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 700, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, ff^2, i, l, q, r^1, vg), Sy, Co, Gre, [Trg]

txt B, D, 0233, pc^6, it(a, c, d, k), vg^{ms}
pc = 122, 1467, 1494, 1632, 1657, 2773
UBS3c adds: Cop^{fay}

For the addition of W in this verse, compare Mt 24:36.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 25:13 γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν.
NA28 Luke 21:36 ἀγρυπνεῖτε δὲ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι ἵνα κατισχύσητε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:41 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.
NA28 Mark 14:38 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

It is a natural addition, possibly from 14:38. There is no reason for an omission, except a (partial) harmonization to the parallels. The support for the omission is rather slim. Note the 6 Byzantine minuscules.

Note that both Mt and Lk don't have βλέπετε here (Minor Agreement).

C.H. Turner (1928): "The addition is quite inappropriate in this context, and has doubtless been introduced from 14:38".

Wayne C. Kannaday argues that the words have been added to "to soften the harsh apocalyptic tone of the passage", … to smooth the pugnacious edge from an ambiguous apocalyptic saying of Jesus and transform it into a phrase that was an unambiguous plea for piety."
("Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 114-15)

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 291
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:37 ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω **πᾶσιν λέγω**, γρηγορεῖτε.

omit: D, E, Θ, 565, a, d, ff^{2}, i, vg^{ms}
πᾶσιν W

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
There is no reason for an addition. Probably omitted as being redundant. Possibly also due to h.t. (...ῖν λέγω - ...ῖν λέγω).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 292

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:3 Καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς, **συντρίψασα** τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς.

θραύσασα D, Θ, 565

fracto	"break"	aur, d, ff^2, i, l, q, r^1, vg
frangens	"break"	f
confingens	"break"	c
aperiens	"open"	a
quassavit	"shake"	k

c, k omit ἀλάβαστρον.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

θραύω	break in pieces, as pottery
συντρίβω	break in pieces, break open (of bottles)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:7 καὶ κατέχεεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου.

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ.

Rare word, occurs only once in Lk 4:18 in the NT and 17 times in the LXX. συντρίβω occurs 7 times in the NT, but 179 times in the LXX.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον and have only καὶ against Mk (Minor Agreement).

Compare next variant 14:4 with the same support!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 293
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς· εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν;

οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ διεπόνουντο καὶ ἔλεγον
D, Θ, 565, it (a, d, ff^2, i, r^1), arm
discipuli autem eius indigne ferebant (a: fremebant inter se) dicentes

ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν μαθητῶν ἀγανακτοῦντες καὶ λέγοντες
W, f13, Sy-P

Lat(aur, c, f, k, l, q, vg), Sy-S read txt.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

ἀγανακτέω "be indignant or angry"
διαπονέω here: "much annoyed"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:8 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἠγανάκτησαν λέγοντες· εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη; it = "indignati"

διαπονέω: Again a rare word, nowhere else in the Gospels, but twice in Acts (4:2; 16:18). Not clear where this comes from.
Compare previous variant 14:3: Same witnesses, also rare word change.
ἀγανακτέω appears twice elsewhere in Mk (10:14 and 10:41).

Perhaps a (partial) harmonization to Mt from memory. Note that D also omits γέγονεν like in Mt.

It has been suggested (Wayne C. Kannaday "Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 169-71) that perhaps the meaning of διαπονέω here is not "disturbed, annoyed", but "to work hard, toil constantly", a meaning used by Clement. That doesn't make much sense though. Another meaning is "to be much grieved". Kannaday suggests that it was meant "to mollify the character of the disciples".
On the other hand it is also possible that διαπονέω is an even stronger word than ἀγανακτέω.

By the way, it has been conjectured that instead of ἦσαν one should read ἐλάλησαν (compare I.A. Heikel-Helsingfors TSK 106, 1934/35, p. 314-17). Of ἐλάλησαν the ἐλάλ fell out and left ησαν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 294

NA28 Mark 14:5 ἠδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς· καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ.

BYZ Mark 14:5 ἠδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο _____ πραθῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς· καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ

Not in NA and SQE!

τοῦτο πραθῆναι
E, F, G, H, M, S, V, X, Γ, 2, 22, 157, Maj, c, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo, goth, TR

τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι
A, B, C, K, Π, Λ, U, Δ, Ψ, f1, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, al, sa, Sy-H, Or

τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι	01
πραθῆναι τὸ μύρον τοῦτο	D, f13, 700
πραθῆναι τὸ μύρον	W
πραθῆναι τοῦτο τὸ μύρον	Θ
τὸ μύρον τοῦτο πραθῆναι	28, 565, pc

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:9 ἐδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο _____ πραθῆναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι πτωχοῖς.
BYZ Matthew 26:9 ἠδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς
Byz f13, 33, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, Maj(divided), Robinson
txt 01, A, B, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Π, f1, 565, Maj(divided)

NA28 John 12:5 διὰ τί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη τριακοσίων δηναρίων καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς;

Compare previous verse 4:
NA28 Mark 14:4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς· εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν;
omit τοῦ μύρου: W, f1, pc, Sy-S

The omission of τὸ μύρον is ruled out by support. Probably omitted to harmonize to Mt. Interestingly the word has been added there, too.

The word order variants are probably for stylistic reasons.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 295

129. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:7 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς _____ εὖ ποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

πάντοτε εὖ 01^{C2}, B, L, (Ψ), 892, 1071, 1342, pc, sa, bo, WH, Trg^{mg}

txt (01*), A, C, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, goth, NA^{25}, Weiss

01* reads: δύνασθε _____ _____ εὖ ποιῆσαι
Ψ reads: πάντοτε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς εὖ ποιεῖν

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:11 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε·

NA28 John 12:8 τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

Compare LXX:

LXX Deuteronomy 15:11 οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἐνδεὴς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
"because the poor one does not cease out of the land"

Interestingly Matthew omits this part of the sentence completely.
There are no obvious reasons to add or omit πάντοτε here. It is possible that πάντοτε has been omitted to avoid the word three times in the sentence. On the other hand it could have been added for symmetry reasons or as a mechanical repetition (so Weiss).
The external support is extremely good.

Rating: 1? or – (NA probably wrong)
(with brackets in text)

TVU 296

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:16 καὶ ἐξῆλθον __οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Not in NA and not in Tis, but in SQE!

ἑτοιμάσαι	W, Θ, 124, 565, pc, sa^{mss}
ἑτοιμάσαι αὐτοῦ	28, 1071

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:19 καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

NA28 Luke 22:13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 14:15 καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἕτοιμον· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν.

Not in the parallels, but a natural addition. The only reason for an omission would be to avoid the repetition of the several ἑτοιμάζω.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 297

130. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς κατὰ εἷς· μήτι ἐγώ;

BYZ Mark 14:19 οἱ δὲ ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς καθ' εἷς Μήτι ἐγώ καὶ ἄλλος, μήτι ἐγώ;

T&T #171

εἷς κατὰ εἷς = "one after another"

Byz D, X, Θ, f1, 700, 892, Maj,
it(a, d, f, ff^2, i, k, q), Sy-H^{mg}, arm, geo, Or, Gre, Bois, Trg^{mg}

εἰμὶ κύριε καὶ ἄλλος, μήτι ἐγώ	517, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, pc^2
εἰμὶ Ραββὶ καὶ ἄλλος, μήτι ἐγώ	A, 267
εἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλος, μήτι ἐγώ	f13, 28, 1071, pc^{30}
εἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλος, μήτι ἐγώ εἰμὶ	Σ, pc^6
καὶ ὁ ἄλλος;	579
ἢ ἄλλος;	c

txt 01, B, C, L, P, W, Δ, Ψ, 828(=f13), 1342, 2786, al^{125},
Lat(aur, l, vg), Sy, Co

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1299 B, line 28) εἷς· μήτι ἐγώ; 20 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:22 καὶ λυπούμενοι σφόδρα ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς ἕκαστος· μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε;

NA28 Matthew 26:25 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν εἶπεν· μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ῥαββί; λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶπας.

NA28 Luke 22:23 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν.

The omission could be due to haplography: μήτι ἐγώ - μήτι ἐγώ. This is probably true at least in part, note the 125 Byzantine manuscripts!

The longer text is rather awkward, since the "saying to him one after another" includes already the ἄλλος and allows no continuation (Hoskier: "very pleonastic clause", "absolutely Mark-like"). Perhaps this was the reason for the omission?

On the other hand the words could have been added as an intensification or enhancement (so Güting TC Mark, 2005, p. 657).

The reading of A, f13 et al. is a (partial) harmonization to Mt (note the ῥαββί by A). The reading of 579 makes good sense. "Is it me or another one?"

Note that both Mt and Lk have εἰμι against Mk (<u>Minor Agreement</u>).

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 298

131. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:20 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ __τρύβλιον.

T&T #172

τρύβλιον dish, bowl (of food)

__ἓν B, C*, Θ, 565, Weiss, [WH], [NA[25]]
C is corrected by C2.

Note:

ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ 047, 1424, pc[53] (Mt?)
ἐν τῷ τρύβλιον 2446
εἰς τὸ τρυβλίῳ 648[c]

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:23 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ οὗτός με παραδώσει.
εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον D (not in NA and SQE)

NA28 Luke 22:21 Πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

Compare:

NA28 1 John 5:8
τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν.

First it must be noted that the word ἐντρύβλιον is unknown. It is of course possible that there was once such a word.
The next thing that must be noted is that the (secondary) breathing over ἐν in B is a smooth one and not a rough one as WH have it. According to Gregory Θ reads εἰς τὸ ἐντρύβλιον. I don't know what the exact reading of C is. According to Tischendorf C has no accent (he notes that ἐντρύβλιον is also possible). 565 reads εις το εν τρυβλιο (checked at the film).

From this evidence one must conclude that the ἓν with rough breathing is a conjecture. The word, taking as "one", then is either an addition for more clarity or intensity ("into the same dish"), or it has been omitted for stylistic reasons.
Is it possible that the origin was an unsuccessful correction? That someone wanted to correct the words from εἰς τὸ into ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ as a harmonization to Mt and started by writing ἐν in the margin or between the lines and forgot to correct the rest. But this is not very probable, because the supporting witnesses are not clearly related.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 132) thinks that ἓν had been omitted, because it was not understood anymore.
For the phrase εἰς τὸ ἓν τρύβλιον there is no parallel inside or outside of the Bible (to my knowledge).

Lampros F. Kallenos suggested (TC list, 2nd March 2003) that the possible word ἐντρύβλιον might be in some way connected with ἐντρυφάω ("revel, carouse, cavort"). In a figurative sense it could be possibly also translated as "to bath in". The word appears in 4Ma 8:8; Eccl 2:8; Hab 1:10; Isa 55:2; 57:4; Jer 38:20; 2Pet 2:13.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 299

NA28 Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν·
λάβετε _____, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

BYZ Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν
Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου

Byz X, Σ, f13, 28, 1241, 1342, Maj, ff^2, bo^{ms}

txt 01, A, B, C, D, K, Π, L, P, U, W, Δ, Θ, Φ, Ψ, f1, 788(=f13), 565, 700, 892, 1424, 2680, 2766, pc, Lat, Sy, Co

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1299 C, line 3) λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦ τό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

NA28 Luke 22:19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. Liturgical usage.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 300

NA28 Mark 14:24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς _____ διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

BYZ Mark 14:24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον

T&T #173

Byz A, X, Δ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 2509*, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}

txt 01, B, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0211, 565, 2509^{c}, d, (ff^{2}), k, sa^{pt}, bo^{pt}
τὸ τῆς διαθήκης D, W, 0211
ff^{2} omits τῆς διαθήκης.

892: There is a correction in the word διαθήκης, but the original letters are erased. Probably just a scribal error.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:28
τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης
BYZ Matthew 26:28
τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης
Byz A, C, D, W, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy, sa, bo
txt P37(3rd CE), $P45^{vid}$(3rd CE), 01, B, L, Z, Θ, 33, pc, bo^{ms}, mae-1, Ir^{arm}

NA28 Luke 22:20 τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου
omit καινὴ Marcion

Compare:
NA28 1 Corinthians 11:25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

The term has probably been inserted for liturgical reasons. It is not original in Mt and Mk, but comes from Lk or 1.Co.

Compare: J.A. Emerton "The Aramaic underlying τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης in Mk 14:24" JTS 6 (1955) 238-40

The original words are based on Exo 24:8:

LXX Exodus 24:8 λαβὼν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασεν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ <u>τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης</u> ἧς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων

> Moses took the blood and dashed it on the people, and said, "See the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 301

132. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι **οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω** ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

T&T #174

οὐ μὴ πίω	01, C, L, W, Ψ, 0103, 892, 1342, pc[34], c, bo
οὐ μὴ προσθῶ πεῖν	D, a, d, f
οὐκέτι οὐ προσθῶ πιεῖν	565
οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ προσθῶμεν πιεῖν	Θ
οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω	A, B, X, Δ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Lat(aur, b, ff[2], i, k?, l, q, vg), Sy, sa

Non bibam	c
Quoniam non bibam	k, quoniam = quod iam?
Quia non adaucam bibere	a
Quia non adponam bibere	d
Quia non adiciam bibere	f
Quod iam non bibam	Lat

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

προστίθημι "proceed, go ahead, continue, do again"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:29 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ...

NA28 Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Luke 22:18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

Compare:
LXX Amos 7:8 + 8:2 οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῶ τοῦ παρελθεῖν αὐτόν
I will never again pass them by.

It is possible that the omission of οὐκέτι is a harmonization to Mt/Lk. The addition of προσθῶ is possibly idiom (one of the several remarkable agreements of D, Θ, 565 in Mk).
Note that both Mt and Lk don't have οὐκέτι (Minor Agreement).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 302

NA28 Mark 14:27 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, _____ ὅτι γέγραπται· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται.

BYZ Mark 14:27 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε <u>ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ</u>, ὅτι γέγραπται Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα

Byz A, C^c, K, N, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, 2542, Maj-part, c, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, bo^{mss}

txt 01, B, C*, D, L, X, Γ, Δ, Ψ*, Ω, 828(=f13), 2, 1342, Maj-part, it^{pt}(b, d, ff^2, q), sa^{ms}, bo^{pt}

<u>ἐν ἐμοὶ</u> G, Ψ^c, 28, 157, pc, it^{pt}(a, aur, f, i, k, l), Sy-S, sa^{mss}, bo^{ms}

<u>ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ</u> vg

Faijum-fragment, P.Vindob G 2325 (3rd CE):
εν ταυτη] τη νυκτι σκανδαλισ[θησεσθε

Ψ: The words have been added in the margin in a different ink.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:31 Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε <u>ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ</u>, γέγραπται γάρ· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης.

Probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 303

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:30 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ **σήμερον** ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

omit: D, Θ, f13, 565, 700, pc, it(a, b, d, f, ff^{2}, i, q, r^{1}), sa^{ms}, arm, Bois

Lat(aur, c, k, l, vg) has the word.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

NA28 Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι. δὶς Sy-C

σήμερον is probably omitted as redundant. It is also possible that it is a harmonization to Mt.

On the other hand the addition of σήμερον could be a harmonization to Lk, creating a conflation.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 304

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:30 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι	01, D, W, 579, 983(=f13), pc
ἢ ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι	C
one of these:	it(a, b, c, d, ff^2, i, r^1), vg^{mss}

txt A, B, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, f1, f13, 565, 700, 892, 1342, 2542, Maj, Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg), Sy, Co

Faijum-fragment, P.Vindob G 2325 (3rd CE):
πρὶ]ν ἀλεκτρύων δὶς κοκ[κύξει

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

BYZ Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λέγω σοι Πέτρε οὐ μή φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μή εἰδέναι με

οὐ μή φωνήσῃ δὶς ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν Sy-C

NA28 John 13:38 ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.

Probably the δὶς has been omitted to harmonize the account with the parallels which have only one cock-crowing. See below verse 68 for a detailed discussion of the whole complex!

Note the interesting support from the Faijum fragment!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 305

NA28 Mark 14:31 ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει·
ἐὰν δέῃ με συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.

BYZ Mark 14:31 ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον,
ἐὰν με δέῃ συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσωμαι ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον

Not in NA, but SQE!

ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει	01, B, D, Ψ, 083, 1342, Co, WH, NA[25]
ὁ δὲ περισσῶς ἐλάλει	L
ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐλάλει	892
ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον	K, Π, X, Γ, 2, 157, 579, 828(=f13), Maj
ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισίας ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον	Δ
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἐκπερισσῶς ἔλεγεν	C, 700, 1424
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος περισσῶς ἔλεγεν	Θ, 565
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον	A, N, al, Sy-S, Sy-H
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος μᾶλλον ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν ὅτι	f1
ὁ δὲ Πέτρος μᾶλλον περισσῶς ἔλεγεν ὅτι	W, f13, 2542

μᾶλλον	A, W, K, Π, f1, f13, 157, 579, Maj, (c), k, Sy-S, Sy-H
sine μᾶλλον	01, B, C, D, L, Θ, Ψ, 083, 565, 700, 892, 1424, Lat
ἐκπερισσῶς	01, B, C, D, Ψ, 083, 700, 1424
περισσῶς	L, W, Θ, f13, 565, 1342, 2542
ἐκ περισσοῦ	A, K, Π, f1, 22, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1071, Maj

Δ: (p. 184) wrongly noted in Swanson. It does not omit ἔλεγεν.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

μᾶλλον	"more"
ἐκπερισσῶς	"emphatically, again and again"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:35 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος·
NA28 Luke 22:33 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

No reason for an omission of μᾶλλον.

Note that both Mt and Lk don't have ἐκπερισσῶς (<u>Minor Agreement</u>).

The word ἐκπερισσῶς appears nowhere else. It has probably been changed into the more normal ἐκ περισσοῦ. Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 134) notes: "Perhaps from a Latin colloquialism 'tanto magis' as indeed re-rendered by a."

Compare Mk 6:51:
NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο·
<u>omit:</u> 01, B, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc[4], Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, WH, Gre

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 306
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:36 ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ.

ὃ ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ᾽ ὃ σύ θέλεις	D, it, vg^{mss}, Co
ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ θέλεις	Θ
ὡς ἐγὼ ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ θέλεις	565
ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ	f13, 2542 (Mt)
μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ θέλεις	Justin

Lat(aur, k, l, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:39 πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ.
NA28 Luke 22:42 πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.

There is no reason for an omission, but the addition of θέλεις is quite natural. No such addition is known in the Matthean parallel.
Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 117): "It is indeed a question whether Mark's pleonastic manner has not been pruned at this place also." He also mentions Mk 14:29 where D, it add οὐ σκανδαλισθήσομαι at the end of the verse.

Note that both Mt and Lk have πλὴν here against Mk (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 307
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών.

Western non-interpolation

omit: D, it(a, b, c, d, ff^2, k)
WH have the term in brackets.
Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg) have the words.

Lacuna: 33
B: umlaut! (p. 1300 A, line 39) λόγον εἰπών. 40 καὶ πάλιν
(It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the next one, see below.)

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:42 πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο λέγων· πάτερ μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πίω, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου.
NA28 Matthew 26:44 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο ἐκ τρίτου τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν πάλιν.

There is no reason why the words should have been added except as a harmonization to Mt 26:44.
Güting ("Weakly attested original readings of D in Mk", 1994) writes: "Since Mark's Gospel does not explicitly tell of a threefold prayer and thus has no reason to give the content of a third prayer, we conclude that this clause is not original to its text."
Kilpatrick writes: "ὁ αὐτός seems to be going out of use in ordinary Greek at this time. Apart from this passage it does not occur in the four works which belong to the lowest level of Greek in the NT, Mark, John, Revelation and the Pastoral Epistles." ("Literary fashions ...", 1976, cited by Güting).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 308

133. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν ...
NA28 Mark 14:40 καὶ **πάλιν ἐλθὼν** εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 14:40 καὶ **ὑποστρέψας** εὗρεν αὐτοὺς **πάλιν** καθεύδοντας ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν βεβαρήμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῶσιν

T&T #175

Byz	A, C, N, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Lat(aur, f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Gre	
	ὑποστρέψας πάλιν εὗρεν	Θ, 565, 2542, pc[29]
	omit πάλιν	Σ, pc[30]
	καθεύδοντας **πάλιν**	N, X
txt	01, B, (D), L, Ψ, 083, 892, 1342, it, Sy-S, Co, Trg[mg]	
	omit πάλιν:	
	ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς	D, it(a, b, c, d, ff[2], k), Trg
	ἐλθὼν εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς	409, 416, 2703 (Mt)

Greeven and Tischendorf note that N has πάλιν after καθεύδοντας. T&T note N for the omission, probably erroneous.
Lacuna: 33
B: umlaut! (p. 1300 A, line 39) λόγον εἰπών. 40 καὶ πάλιν
(It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the previous one, see above.)

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:43 καὶ ἐλθὼν πάλιν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας,
BYZ καὶ ἐλθὼν εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 14:35 καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν
NA28 Mark 14:37 καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς
NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν
NA28 Mark 14:40 καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς
NA28 Mark 14:41 καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον

The txt reading could be a harmonization to immediate context. It's also possible that it is a harmonization to Mt.

On the other hand it is quite probable that the txt reading has been changed into the Byzantine reading to avoid the double καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν ... καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν (so Weiss). The πάλιν then has been moved to the καθεύδοντας which seemed more important.

ὑποστρέφω appears nowhere else in Mk (and also not in Mt). It's a Lukan word: 34 times in Lk/Acts. It therefore makes the impression of a secondary alteration.

Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 309

134. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:41 καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· **ἀπέχει·** ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν.

ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος	D, W, Θ, Φ, 0233, f13, 565, 713, 1071, 2542, L844, pc, it, Sy, arm, geo^2, (sa)

ἀπέχητο τὸ τέλος	Θ et al.
ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος ἰδοὺ	W
ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ ὥρα	D (omit ἦλθεν)
the hour has come, the end is near	Sy-S
the end is near and the hour has come	Sy-P, Sy-H
the end has come and the hour has come	geo^2
"The work is ended!"	sa

"Adest finis! Venit hora,"	b, f, r^1
"Adest enim consummatio! Venit hora,"	c, ff^2
"Consummatus est finis! Advenit hora,"	a
"Sufficit finis! Venit hora,"	d, q
"Sufficit! Venit hora,"	aur, l, vg
" Iam ora est"	k

ἀπέστη (τὸ τέλος) conj. A. Pallis (1932)

ὅτι Ψ

omit 892, (k) (892 has a big semicolon ; after ἀναπαύεσθε)

k reads:

Et venit tertio et ubi adoravit dicit illis: Dormite iam nunc?

Ecce adpropinquavit qui me tradit et post pusillum excitavit illos et dixit

Iam ora est ecce traditur filius hominis in manu peccatorum

txt 01, A, B, C, K, Π, L, X, Δ, 083, f1, (157), 579, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, l, vg), bo, geo^1

ἀπέχει ἡ ὥρα 157 (omit ἦλθεν)

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1300 B, line 7) ἀναπαύεσθε· **ἀπέχει·** ἦλθεν

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:45 τότε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε [τὸ] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· <u>ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν</u> ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 22:37 καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ <u>τέλος ἔχει.</u>

NA28 Mark 3:26 καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ <u>τέλος ἔχει.</u>
<u>τὸ τέλος ἔχει.</u> D

ἀπέχει = "Enough!"
ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος = "The end has fully come!" (B. Metzger)
"Enough of that! It is the end" (NET)

ἀπέχει is a colloquialism with impersonal usage. The meaning is not completely clear. Mt omitted it, also Ψ et al.

Baljon: "ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα absurda lectio est"

Augustinus (de cons. ev. III,4) suggests that Jesus said: "Sleep on from now, and take rest." Then he (Jesus) remained silent for some time. And then, finally, he said: "Enough. The hour has come."

De Zwaan suggests that ἀπέχει alludes to Judas' deal with the high priest. He translates: "He (Judas) did receive (the promised money)."
Boobyer similarly connects ἀπέχει with the following words: "ἀπέχει means that Judas with the help of the accompanying ὄχλος is about to take possession of the Lord." (compare Philemon 15). He translates: "He is taking possession of (me)!"

Mueller makes the interesting suggestion that ἀπέχει is not from ἀπέχω, but from ἀποχέω ("pour out"), ἀπέχει = 3rd Sing. Imperfect.
This then is related to the previous verse 14:36 "Father, for you all things are possible; remove this cup from me;" This cup is the LXX cup of wrath (e.g. Jer 25:15) poured out by God at the judgment day. The hour has come. ἀπέχει = He has poured out! God did not remove the cup, he poured it out.
The problem with this suggestion is that the implied subject (= God) is not self-evident. The change is quite abrupt.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) conjectures ἀπέστη instead of ἀπέχει. He notes that the same variation occurs in Mk 7:6.

NA28 Mark 7:6 ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω <u>ἀπέχει</u> ἀπ' ἐμοῦ·

<u>ἀπέστιν</u> L, Θ, 565, 892

<u>ἀπέστη</u> Δ

For the addition of τέλος Scrivener (Codex Bezae, p. LI) thinks that it "seems plainly a marginal note, obtruded into the text to the detriment of the sense, having been first designed to indicate the end of the lesson..." This would be quite an early indication of a lesson, being in the archetype of all the above manuscripts.

Weiss (Mk Com.) on the D reading: "Quite peculiar in D is the connection with the following: ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ ὥρα, about which already the Latins were at a loss."

Compare:

- J. de Zwaan Expositor VI, 12, p. 452ff.
- G. H. Boobyer "Απεχει in Mk 14:41." NTS 2 (1958/59) 44-48
- K.W. Mueller "Απεχει (Mk 14:41) – absurda lectio?" ZNW 77 (1986) 83-100

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 310

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

ὁ Ἰούδας (A), B, [WH], [NA[25]], Weiss, Bal

txt 01, C, (D), L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, f1, f13, 28, 157, 700*, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-S, Co

ὁ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης	A, [Trg]
Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης	K, Π, M, U, Y, Θ, Φ, 0116, 579, 700[c], 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, al, Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, Gre
Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης	124, 346, 565, pc, Or
Ἰούδας Σκαριώτης	D, Latt

Greeven notes 22 for ὁ Ἰούδας.

Tregelles has: ὁ Ἰούδας [ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης].

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 42:

NA28 Mark 14:42 ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν.

NA28 Mark 14:10 Καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριὼθ ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα

Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριὼθ	01*, B, C*, D, Ψ, f13, 28, 892, 1071, 1424
Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριὼθ	01[c], A, C[c], L, Δ, Θ, 565, Maj-part
ὁ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριὼθ	W, f1, 157, 579, 700, Maj-part

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:47 Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ. safe!

NA28 Luke 22:47 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα προήρχετο αὐτοὺς καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλῆσαι αὐτόν. add Ἰσκαριώτης D, 157

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 10:4 Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ <u>Ἰούδας</u> ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν. <u>ὁ Ἰούδας</u> 01*

NA28 Matthew 26:25 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ <u>Ἰούδας</u> ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν εἶπεν·
<u>ὁ Ἰούδας</u> D

NA28 Matthew 27:3 Τότε ἰδὼν <u>Ἰούδας</u> ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν ὅτι κατεκρίθη
<u>ὁ Ἰούδας</u> f1

NA28 Luke 22:3 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς <u>Ἰούδαν</u> τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα·
<u>τὸν Ἰούδαν</u> D

NA28 John 6:71 ἔλεγεν δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου·
<u>omit τὸν</u> 01*, D, K, f1, 565

NA28 John 13:29 τινὲς γὰρ ἐδόκουν, ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν Ἰούδας
<u>ὁ Ἰούδας</u> P66, C, D, Θ, Ψ, 1582, Maj

Normally Judas Iscariot appears without the article. There are two antagonistic tendencies involved here. On the one hand scribes tend to add the article, especially in Byzantine MSS. On the other hand the article also seems to represent some kind of privilege, so it has been avoided with evil characters (compare Jo 6:71).

Both parallels do not have the article. The support is very slim. The reading of A cannot be taken together with B, because A here follows its normal rule of giving the fullest possible form.

Weiss (Comm. Mk) thinks that the article refers intentionally back to the previous verse 42.

In Mk 14:10 there is a similar variation, but it is quite clear that there was originally no article. It is also probable that the addition Ἰσκαριώτης has been added from there.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 311

NA28 Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ **ὄχλος** μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

BYZ Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθέως, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἷς ὢν τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ αὐτοῦ **ὄχλος πολὺς** μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, C, D, W, X, Δ, f1, 124, 346(=f13), 22, 700, 892, 1424, Maj,
Lat(c, d, k, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Trg^{mg}

txt 01, B, L, Θ, Ψ, 083, f13, 565, 1342, pc,
it(a, aur, f, ff^{2}, q), Sy-H, Co, arm, goth

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:47 Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ.

There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 312

NA28 Mark 14:45 καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐθὺς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει· ῥαββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν·

BYZ Mark 14:45 καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐθέως προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει αὐτῷ Ῥαββί Ῥαββί καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν·

Byz A, X, 0116, 700, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Gre
αὐτῷ Ῥαββί Ῥαββί E, G, H, S, Y, Ω, 2, 157

txt 01, B, C*, D, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 579, 1342, pc,
Lat(d, f, ff^2, l, q, r^1, vg), Sy-S, bo

χαῖρε ῥαββί C^c, W, f1, f13, 565, 892, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc,
it(a, aur, c), Sy-H^{mg}, sa, geo^2

χαῖρε ῥαββί ῥαββί 22, pc

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1300 B, line 30) λέγει· ῥαββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:49 καὶ εὐθέως προσελθὼν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπεν· χαῖρε, ῥαββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. (safe!)

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 23:7 καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί.

BYZ καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων Ῥαββί Ῥαββί,

Byz D, W, 0107, f13, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H

The addition of χαῖρε is clearly a harmonization to Mt 26:49.
The second ῥαββί could have been omitted as a supposed error. On the other hand it could have been added for emphasis. Note Mt 23:7.
The support for the double reading is not very good.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 313

135. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:51 καὶ νεανίσκος τις συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ, καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν·

BYZ Mark 14:51 καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν· οἱ νεανίσκοι·

T&T #176

Byz A, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Sy-H, geo, goth

txt 01, B, C, L, Ψ, 892, 1342, pc, a, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo, arm

νεανίσκος δὲ τις D, 79, Lat, sa

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 14:47 εἷς δέ [τις] τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον.

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 22:50 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
NA28 John 11:49 εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας

The construction εἷς τις with nominative is singular in the Greek Bible. On the other hand the construction nominative plus τις appears only in Luke, but here 16 times. It is therefore possible that scribes changed the singular εἷς τις plus nom. into the more common nom. plus τις.

Zahn and Weiss think that the Byzantine reading is a harmonization to verse 47. This appears quite probable. The young man then would be one of the disciples.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 314

136. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:51 καὶ νεανίσκος τις συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ, **καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν·**

BYZ Mark 14:51 Καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ **καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν οἱ νεανίσκοι·**

καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν	01, B, C*, D, L, Δ, Ψ, 892, Lat, Sy-P, sa^{mss}, bo, Gre^{old}
καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν νεανίσκοι	1342
καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν οἱ νεανίσκοι	A, C^{c}, P, X, 28, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj, q, Sy-H, goth, Gre^{new}
οἱ δὲ νεανίσκοι κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν	W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, 2542, pc, sa^{mss}
"and many people went and seized him"	Sy-S

omit ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ: W, f1, c, k, Sy, sa^{mss}

Greeven changed his view in his TC book on Mk (TC Mark, 2005, p. 674).
Lacuna: 33
B: umlaut! (p. 1300 C, line 13) κρατοῦ**σιν αὐτόν· 52 ὁ δὲ κατα**λιπὼν

No parallel. Difficult.
The Byzantine reading is the more difficult one: "The young men caught the young man." It is possible that the omission of οἱ νεανίσκοι is an attempt to overcome the difficulty.
The different word order variants indicate a secondary cause though. It could have been arisen to give the verb a subject, but it is awkward. τινες αὐτῶν would have been more suitable (note Sy-S). Perhaps οἱ νεανίσκοι should indicate that it was the young ones (who could run fast), who caught him?

The whole paragraph is strange:
50 All of them deserted him and fled. 51 A certain young man was following him, wearing nothing but a linen cloth. They caught hold of him, 52 but he left the linen cloth and ran off naked.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit this episode, possibly as incomprehensible? It has often been noted that this lifelike episode makes the strong impression of an authentic observation by an eye-witness. Note the vivid dramatic present κρατοῦσιν (they seize him). It has been suggested that the fleeing young man was Mark.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 315

137. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν **καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·** σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

ἐκ δευτέρου λέγων· W, Θ, f13, 565, 700, 2542^{s}, pc, Sy-S, Or

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 14:60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδὲν τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;

and also:

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς **ἐκ δευτέρου** ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:63 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα. καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

No parallel for this addition.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 316

138. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδὲν τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;
NA28 Mark 14:61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. **πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·** σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;
NA28 Mark 14:62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς **εἶπεν·** ἐγώ εἰμι,

Only incomplete in NA, full in SQE and Tis!

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεύς,	D, (a), d, q
ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ·	D, it
ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·	G, W, f1
εἶπεν, σὺ εἶπας ὅτι	700
ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, σὺ εἶπας ὅτι	f13, 1071, 2542^{s}
ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ, σὺ εἶπας ὅτι	Θ, 565, pc, arm, geo, Or

B: no umlaut

Parallel for verse 61:

NA28 Matthew 26:63 καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
BYZ Matthew 26:63 καὶ ἀποκριθείς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ

Byz	A, C, D, W, 22, 157, 565, 579, 700, Maj, it(a, b, c, d, f, ff^{2}, h, n, q, r^{1}), Sy, mae-2
txt	01, B, G, L, Z, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 517, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, pc, Lat(aur, ff^{1}, g^{1}, l, vg), Co

Parallels for verse 62:

NA28 Matthew 26:64 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ εἶπας . ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Δ
NA28 Luke 22:70 ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη· ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

NA28 John 18:37 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος· οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι.

Compare also context:

NA28 Mark 15:2 Καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλᾶτος· σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ λέγει· σὺ λέγεις.

a) the variant in verse 61:
The D reading is probably an attempt to remove the redundancy and/or to improve the style.

b) the reading ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει/εἶπεν αὐτῷ in verse 62:
ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει/εἶπεν αὐτῷ is not in the parallels or in the immediate context. It appears only once in Lk 13:8 and once in the Byzantine text of Mk 10:51. λέγει could be a conformation to the previous λέγει in verse 61. ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει appears only 3 times in the Gospels, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν appears 33 times. λέγει could be an assimilation to Mt or it has been used to avoid the double εἶπεν - εἶπας.
Weiss (Mk Com.) also thinks that the D reading is a reminiscence of Mt.

c) the reading σὺ εἶπας ὅτι in verse 62:
σὺ εἶπας ὅτι seems to be a mixture of Mt and Lk. On the other hand it could be original and would explain (on the two-source theory) the readings of Mt and Lk.
Note the interesting addition by Δ in the parallel Mt 26:64: σὺ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. Where is this from?
Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 322) on the Θ reading: "But here again, the obscurity of the expression, or the apparent hesitancy it might seem to imply in our Lord's acceptance of the title Christ, would favor its omission."

Compare:
R. Kempthorne "The Marcan text of Jesus' answer to the high priest (Mk 14:62)" NovT 19 (1977) 197-208

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 317

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:64 ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας __· τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται; οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου.

αὐτοῦ	D, G, N, f1, 1071, 2542^{s}, pc, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, goth
τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ	W, Θ, f13, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}
αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ	124, 565

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 22:71 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν; αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

A natural addition, probably inspired from Lk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 318

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν
αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν

τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ
D, a, Sy-S, bo^{mss}

αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
Θ, 565, 700, Sy-P

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:67 Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐράπισαν

NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, 64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;

The Caesarean addition is probably a harmonization either to immediate context (same verse) or to Mt.

The Western omission is also probably a harmonization to Mt, who omits the part, too (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 319

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· προφήτευσον__, καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον.

ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;

N, U, W, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1243, 1424, pc, gat, Sy-H, bo, sa^{mss}, arm

ἡμῖν, χριστέ·	aur, vg^{ms}
νῦν	G, f1
ἡμῖν	Ψ, c, f, k

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:68 λέγοντες· προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;

NA28 Luke 22:64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;

Very probably a harmonization. There is no reason for an omission.

These words are normally considered the most difficult Minor Agreement of Mt/Lk against Mk. The addition here in Mk is clearly secondary.

Note Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 326):

"It then becomes apparent that the addition in Mk is influentially supported in each of three main streams of textual tradition: by the later Egyptian (Δ, X, 33, 579, sa^{mss}, bo); ca. AD 400 by the African father Augustine (expressly, in a discussion of "The Agreements of the Evangelists"); by the Caesarean (Θ, W, f13, 565, 700, N, U, also arm, Sy-H). In the face of this evidence only two conclusions are open to us. Either the reading is correct and the words have accidentally dropped out of the text of Mk both in 01, B, L and D, k, or the passage is one which has specially invited assimilation, and this to such an extent that it has taken place independently along three different lines of transmission. The second alternative I believe to be correct."

[...]

"The view that τίς ἐστιν κτλ. is an interpolation into Matthew from Luke was originally suggested to me by Prof. C. H. Turner, and at first I demurred to the view. But a consideration of the evidence that in Mark assimilation has been at work both in B, 01 and *fam.* Θ has removed my previous hesitation to believe

that these manuscripts. have suffered interpolation into Matthew also. […] If, then, we accept the shorter text in Mark and reject τίς ἐστιν κτλ. in Matthew, we shall find that Matthew as usual is substantially reproducing Mark, but that Luke has an entirely different representation. […] I will conclude with a quotation from Hort (vol. i. p. 150) - the italics are mine. 'It must not of course be assumed to follow that B has remained unaffected by *sporadic* corruption . . . in the *Gospel of Matthew*, for instance, it has occasionally admitted widely spread readings of very doubtful genuineness.' I suggest that the insertion of τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε is one of these."

Compare: F. Neirynck, "τίς ἐστιν…", Evangelica II, p. 95-137

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 320

NA28 Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· προφήτευσον, καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν **ἔλαβον.**

BYZ Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτευσον καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν **ἔβαλλον.**

T&T #178

ἔβαλλον	H, 28, 1071, Maj-part[920]
ἔβαλον	E, M, U, X, Σ, 33, 118, 124, 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj-part[607]
ἐλάμβανον	D, G, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, Sy-H
ἔλαβον	01, A, B, C, K, L, N, S, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Π, Ψ, Ω, 067, 1342, 2766, al[76]
κατέλαβον	579

B: no umlaut

No parallel.
ἔλαβον is equivocal and unusual. Swete suggests "They caught him with blows."
BDAG (3rd ed.) notes:
οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον Mk 14:65 does not mean "the servants took him into custody with blows" (BWeiss, al.), but is a colloquialism (s. B-D-F §198, 3, w. citation of AcJo 90 [Aa II 196, 1] τί εἰ ῥαπίσμασίν μοι ἔλαβες; "what if you had laid blows on me?") the servants treated him to blows (Moffatt: "treated him to cuffs and slaps"), or even "got" him w. blows, "worked him over" (perh. a Latinism; Cicero, Tusc. 2, 14, 34 verberibus accipere. B-D-F §5, 3b; s. Rob. 530f); the v.l. ἔβαλον is the result of failure to recognize this rare usage.
Blass (Grammar) calls ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον "vulgar" and notes a 1st CE papyrus which has αὐτὸν κονδύλοις ἔλαβον (Argumentum to Demosth. Midiana).

Note the unusual ἐλάμβανον = imperfect. It appears only once in the NT: Acts 8:17. Aspect?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 321

139. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

The omission of the double cock-crowing.

NA28 Mark 14:68 + 14:72 + 14:30

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν].

BYZ Mark 14:68

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν

T&T #179

omit: 01, B, L, W, Ψ*, 222, 579, 892, c, Sy-S, sa^{mss}, bo,
WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Bal

txt A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ^{c}, 067, f1, f13, 33, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, bo^{ms}, goth, Eus
καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc^{11}

Ψ: The words have been added in the margin in a different ink.

B: no umlaut

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

omit ἐκ δευτέρου 01, C*, L, 579, pc, c, vg^{ms}

[...] ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δὶς τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ·

omit δὶς 01, C*, W, Δ, 579, it(all, except aur, k!), vg^{ms}

omit ὅτι ... ἀπαρνήσῃ D, a, d

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:30 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

omit δὶς 01, C*, D, W, 579, pc, it(except aur, f, l, q), vg^{mss}

These readings (verse 30, 68 and 72) must be considered together.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:74 τότε ἤρξατο καταθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. <u>καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.</u>
NA28 Matthew 26:71 ἐξελθόντα δὲ εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα
NA28 Luke 22:60 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις. καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ <u>ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ.</u>
NA28 John 18:27 πάλιν οὖν ἠρνήσατο Πέτρος, <u>καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.</u>

Faijum-fragment, P.Vindob G 2325 (3rd CE):
πρὶν ἀλεκτρύων <u>δὶς</u> κοκ[κύξει

The support for the omission is quite good.
The sentence seems to be required to fulfill Jesus' prophesy in verse 30 ("before the cock crows twice"). The second crowing is again mentioned in verse 72.
It is therefore possible that scribes added the sentence to harmonize the story better with the verses 30 and 72. Possibly Mk did originally not mention it explicitly, but implied it by only mentioning the second crowing.

It is possible that the sentence has been omitted as a harmonization to the parallel accounts, which have only one crowing. This is supported by omissions at the other verses 30 and 72. Strangely the support for the omission is much better at verse 68 than at 30 and 72. It would be much more effective to remove the δὶς in verse 30 and the δευτέρου in verse 72 as have done 01, C* et al., who also omitted then consequently the sentence in verse 68. But why did B, Ψ and 892 omit the sentence, too? It is possible although improbable that it is due to parablepsis (καὶ ἀλέκτωρ - 69 καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη …).

Since in verse 68 there is no good reason for an intentional or accidental omission by B et al. of καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν, it is slightly more probable that the words been added later. The description given by WH (Intro §323) is consistent. The correct text is:

verse 30 ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι
verse 68 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον
(omit καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν)
verse 72 ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ
φωνῆσαι δὶς

Changes:

	group 1 (01, 579)	group 2
verse 30:	omit δὶς as a harmonization to the parallels.	leave as is
verse 68:	no addition	add καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν to harmonize with verse 72 (two crowings are required)
verse 72:	omit ἐκ δευτέρου omit δὶς	leave as is

Not all manuscripts follow this line consistently. 01 and 579 are the only ones which remove the second crowing completely. A, Θ, f1, f13, Maj have the double crowing complete with the explicit mentioning of the first crowing in verse 68. It is in principle possible that this reading is correct, but it can not explain why B, Ψ, 892 and Sy-S omit the crowing in verse 68.

It is interesting that both Mt and Lk have only one cock crowing (Minor Agreement?).
Why? Because only one crowing is explicitly recorded by Mk, that in verse 72. The words καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν have been added later in Mark to have two crowings recorded.

It is also interesting to consider what the Diatessaron is doing here. The verses are not commented upon in Ephrem's commentary, but they are as follows in the Arabic Diatessaron:

In ch. 45:	**Mk** 14:30b	quia tu hodie in nocte hac, priusquam gallus **bis** cantaverit,
	Lk 22:34b	ter abnegabis nosse me.
In ch. 48:	**Lk** 22:57	Et negavit dicens: Mulier, nescio illum,
	Mk 14:68	neque etiam scio, quid dicas. _____
In ch. 49:	**Mk** 14:71	Tunc Simon coepit anathematizare, et iurare: Quia non cognosco hominem istum, cuius meministis.
	Lk 22:60b	Et continuo adhuc illo loquente, **bis** cantavit gallus.
	Lk 22:61a	Et illa hora conversus est Iesus, qui foris erat, et intuitus est Cepham. Et recordatus est Simon verbi Domini nostri, quod ei dixerat:
	Mk 14:30	Quia prius quam gallus **bis** cantaverit, ter me es negaturus.

The Diatessaron has the double cock crowing. It is omitting the first crowing mentioned in Mk 14:68 though, and is putting the two crowings together into Lk 22:60.

Rating: 1? or – (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
(omit bracketed clause)

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 322

140. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:69 καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν τοῖς παρεστῶσιν ὅτι οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν.

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν εἶπεν	B, Co, WH^{mg}, Weiss, Trg^{mg}
καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο	M, N, W, 579
καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν	01, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1424, WH, **NA^{25}** = txt
καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν πάλιν ἤρξατο	A, X, f1, f13, 33, Maj, goth, Trg = Byz
καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα πάλιν αὐτὸν ἤρξατο	157, a
και ἤρξατο πάλιν ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν	1342
πάλιν δὲ ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη ἤρξατο	D, Θ, 565, 700, 2542^{s}, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Eus

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:71 ἐξελθόντα δὲ εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἐκεῖ· οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου.

NA28 Luke 22:58 καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ ἕτερος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔφη· καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη· ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:66-67 Καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως 67 καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον θερμαινόμενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει· καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

It is interesting to note that B, M, N, W, 579 omit πάλιν and that the others have it at various positions. This is often an indication for a secondary cause. There is no reason for an omission of the word. To the contrary, it is only natural to add it. It is not influenced from the parallel accounts, because Mt and Lk use quite a different wording here.

The ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν points back to verse 66-67 (Weiss). Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the simple B reading is original ("inconceivable as a secondary emendation").

Both Mt and Lk report that someone else is seeing him here (ἄλλη and ἕτερος), whereas Mk has the same παιδίσκη speaking πάλιν (Minor Agreement?).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 323

141. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:70 ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ,
καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ.

BYZ Mark 14:70 ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶ τες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ
καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει.

Byz A, K, Π, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj,
q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, SBL
add καὶ σὺ: M
Lk 22:59 + καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει Diatess^{Arabic}
nam loquela eius similis est (Ciasca)
Und sein Wort gleicht ihm (Preuschen)

txt 01, B, C, D, L, Ψ, 0276, f1, 565, 700, 1342, pc, Lat, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, Eus

omit: W, 543(=f13), pc, a (h.t.?)

καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ. 579 (Mt)
καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ὁμοιάζει. 33
καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου δηλοῖ N, Σ (acc. to Legg, Tis)

B: umlaut! (p. 1301 B, line 21) Γαλιλαῖος εἶ. 71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:73 μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προσελθόντες οἱ ἑστῶτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἀληθῶς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ,
καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ.
D, it, Sy-S: ὁμοιάζει

NA28 Luke 22:59 καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς ἄλλος τις διϊσχυρίζετο λέγων· ἐπ' ἀληθείας καὶ οὗτος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν. (no significant variants)

What is interesting and makes an assessment difficult is that the Byzantine text uses the word ὁμοιάζει (which appears also in "Western-Mt").
It is basically possible that the shorter text is an omission due to h.t. ει - ει. But the diverse support for the short text makes this rather improbable. It should be noted though that W omits also καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ due to such an ει - ει h.t. We have three ει in this verse with almost equidistant separation.

The following textual developments are possible:

1. Western Mt original
   txt Mt result of a διορθωτής (so Nestle)
   txt Mk original
   Byz Mk copied from Mt

2. txt Mt original
   Western Mt copied from Mk
   Byz Mk original
   txt Mk due to h.t.

3a. txt Mt original
   Western Mt early idiosyncrasy
   txt Mk original
   Byz Mk copied from Western Mt

3b. txt Mt original
   Western Mt from Byz Mk
   txt Mk original
   Byz Mk from txt Mt plus early correction

4. independent alteration

All of these possibilities have problems:

1. The problem of 1 is that the explanation for the origin of the δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ reading (by a διορθωτής) is not very convincing.

2. The problem of 2 is that the support for txt in Mk is very good and diverse. In such a case a h.t. error based on two letters is not very probable. Also, why do D, it, Sy-S have txt in Mk and not the Byzantine reading? If they copied (in Mt) from Mk, one should assume that they read Byz in Mk.

3a. The problem in 3a is that it is difficult to explain why Byz Mk copied from a Western Mt and not from txt. This is very unusual.

3b. A reading that has support from D, it, Sy-S is normally considered "old", therefore the Byzantine change in Mk must have happened very early. Also the assumed text change by Byz is rather unmotivated.

4. The wording is similar to the Matthean parallel. That the words change is not influenced by Mt is rather improbable.

Nestle argues for 1. Michael Holmes (JBL 109, 1990, 651-664) argues for number 2. B. Weiss argues for 3b.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 689) suggests that the change in D is possibly a translation variant. Perhaps ὁμοιάζει in D is a back-translation from the Latin?

It is well known that D et al. harmonize to Mk at certain points in Mt (compare e.g. Mt 26:70, add οὐδέ ἐπίσταμαι by D, it, Sy-S). This is a characteristic that goes against the scribal tendency. Thus it is quite probable that in Mt 26:73 the Western text also harmonized to Mk. Note especially that D, Θ, f1, pc, Sy-S also omitted καὶ σὺ in Mt 26:73, probably also a harmonization to Mk. If we accept that the Western text in Mt is a harmonization to Mk, then it must be a harmonization to Byz Mk. In that case we are left with number 2 or 3b. Both possibilities have problems. Very difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 324

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.
καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δὶς τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ·
καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν.

omit ἐκ δευτέρου	01, C*, L, 579, pc, c, vg^{ms}
omit δὶς	01, C*, W, Δ, 579, it, vg^{ms}

καὶ εὐθὺς δὶς ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. 1342

omit ὅτι ... ἀπαρνήσῃ D, a

txt	φωνῆσαι δὶς τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ	C^c, L, Ψ, 892, aur, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Bois, Gre, Tis
	δὶς φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ	B, k, NA^{25}, WH, Weiss, Trg, Bal
	δὶς φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με	1342
	φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ	01, C*, W, Δ, it, vg^{ms}
	φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με	579 (Mt)
Byz	φωνῆσαι δὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς	A, X, f1, f13, 33, 1424, Maj, Sy-H, Co, goth
	δὶς φωνῆσαι ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς	Θ, 565, 700

Swanson has C^c for Byz. The manuscript is difficult to read here. K. Witte from Muenster notes that R.W. Lyon reads against Tis here. It is not in the NTS article but his dissertation. Lyon writes (p. 340-41) in his notes on the first corrector:

"και εκ δευτερου for και ευθεως (or ευθυς). Tischendorf noted that και was at the end of line 37 and εκ δευτερου at the beginning of line 38. In the margin a modern hand (perhaps Wetstein) has verified this by writing και εκ δευτερου. There can be no doubt, however, that this represents a correction by the first corrector. The vertical stroke of a large original κ (presumably) is seen at the beginning of the line. Otherwise none of the original writing can be seen; but the following items conclusively verify our text: (1) και at the end of line 37 is by B rather than A; (2) at the beginning of line 38 εκ is clearly far out in the margin; (3) the ε's and υ's of δευτερου indicate that it also is by B. The text of A, therefore, must have fitted in the place occupied by δευτερου (without the marginal εκ. Hence και ευθεως (or ευθυς). Codex C, then, unites with Codd. 01, L in writing και ευθεως (or ευθυς) αλεκτωρ."

Lyon notes on the δις:
"[first corrector] added, probably, δις after φωνησαι. This is the solution proposed by Tischendorf. Something has been added to the text. I consider it less likely that αρνηση was changed to απαρνηση."

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:74-75 καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. 75 καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με· καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

NA28 Luke 22:60-61 καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ. 61 καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς.

For a general discussion of the double cock crowing, see above 14:68!
The omission by D is strange. There is no reason for it. Is it another, more radical attempt to omit the δὶς?

Note the diversity of variants here: The reading of 579 is harmonized to Mt, the Byzantine reading to Lk.
The txt reading best explains the origin of the others. The δὶς τρίς is a stumbling block and has been changed in several ways.

The omission of ἐκ δευτέρου in both Mt and Lk could be seen as one of the so called Minor Agreements.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 325

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δὶς τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ· καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν.

καὶ ἔρξατο ἔκλαιεν	D, Θ, 565, Latt, Sy-S, sa^{mss}, goth
καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἔκλαυσεν	bo
καὶ ἔβαλεν τὴν χεῖρα κλαίειν	sa
καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς	579

Baljon has ἐπιβαλὼν in brackets with a question-mark.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:75 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

NA28 Luke 22:62 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν according to Friberg has two possible meanings:
(a) put one's mind on, think seriously about; thus and when he thought seriously about the matter, he wept;
(b) set oneself to, begin to; thus and he began to weep.

The term is difficult to understand: Idiom. Some scribes felt the difficulty, too and changed it therefore. Scrivener: It "looks more like an explanatory scholium than a various reading".

This is one of the major so called Minor Agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 176f.) noted the Coptic rendering above. He notes that most often ἐπιβάλλω is used with "hands" in the NT and it is possible that we have here an ellipsis. He further notes that ἐπιβαλὼν is sometimes the equivalent for ἐπικαλυψάμενος with the meaning "having covered his head".

BDAG:

The mng. of καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν *Mk* 14:72 is in doubt. Theophylact. offers a choice betw. ἐπικαλυψάμενος τ. κεφαλήν (so ASchlatter, Zürcher Bibel '31; Field, Notes 41-43; but in that case τὸ ἱμάτιον could scarcely be omitted) and ἀρξάμενος, which latter sense is supported by the v.l. ἤρξατο κλαίειν and can mean *begin* (PTebt 50,

12 [112/111 BC] ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν=‘he set to and dammed up’ [Mlt. 131f]; Diogen. Cyn. in Diog. L. 6, 27 ἐπέβαλε τερετίζειν). The transl. would then be *and he began to weep* (EKlostermann; OHoltzmann; JSchniewind; CCD; s. also B-D-F §308). Others (BWeiss; HHoltzmann; 20th Cent.; Weymouth; L-S-J-M) proceed fr. the expressions ἐ. τὸν νοῦν or τὴν διάνοιαν (Diod. S. 20, 43, 6) and fr. the fact that ἐ. by itself, used w. the dat., can mean *think of* (M. Ant. 10, 30; Plut., Cic. 862 [4, 4]; Ath. , 1 ‘deal with a problem’), to the mng. *and he thought of it,* or *when he reflected on it.,* viz. Jesus’ prophecy. Wlh. ad loc. has urged against this view that it is made unnecessary by the preceding ἀνεμνήσθη κτλ. Least probable of all is the equation of ἐπιβαλών with ἀποκριθείς (HEwald) on the basis of Polyb. 1, 80, 1; 22, 3, 8; Diod. S. 13, 28, 5 ἐπιβαλὼν ἔφη. Both REB (‘he burst into tears’) and NRSV (‘he broke down and wept’) capture the sense. Prob. Mk intends the reader to understand a wild gesture connected with lamentation (s. EdeMartino, Morte e pianto rituale nel mondo antico, ’58, esp. -235).

A. Pallin (Notes, 1932) suggests: "I incline to think that ἐπιβαλὼν means ἐπιβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον or ἐπίβλημα *having drawn on his cloak;* that is, having drawn it over his head and face. In great grief it was usual with the Jews to cover their heads and faces. ... I have come across Field's note on the same theme. He examines ἐπιβαλὼν from all points with admirable learning and reaches the same conclusion as I am urging."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 326

142. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:1 Καὶ εὐθὺς πρωὶ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον, δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

ἑτοιμάσαντες	01, C, L, 892, 1342, pc, NA[25], WH[mg], Weiss
ποιήσαντες	A, B, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 579, 700, Maj, l, vg, WH
ἐποίησαν and καὶ	D, Θ, 565, 2542[s], pc, it, Or

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:1 Πρωΐας δὲ γενομένης συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὥστε θανατῶ σαι αὐτόν· γενομένης συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν D

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:6 καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἡρῳ διανῶν συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

συμβούλιον ἐποίουν	A, (D, W), f1, 33, 579, 1424, Maj
συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν	01, C, Δ, Θ, 892[mg], 1071, pc
txt ἐδίδουν	B, L, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892*, pc

NA28 Matthew 12:14 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ
συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν L

NA28Matthew 22:15 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον
NA28 Matthew 27:7 συμβούλιον δὲ λαβόντες
NA28 Matthew 28:12 μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συμβούλιόν τε λαβόντες
συμβούλιόν τε ἐποίησαν 01

συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες is equivocal here, meaning either "convene a council" or "make a plan". 14:55 ff. makes clear that the council had already been convened and therefore the second meaning is intended. This can be clarified by using ἑτοιμάσαντες instead. Weiss (Mk Com.) finds ἑτοιμάσαντες the more difficult reading. συμβούλιον ἑτοιμάσαντες is singular here in the Greek Bible

(and in the other early Christian literature, acc. to Greeven). It is therefore quite probable that this unique phrase has been changed into the more common form.
A similar variation occurred at Mk 3:6 and 3 times (singular) in Mt. Always a form of ποιέω is used instead.
The Western/Caesarean reading is a stylistic improvement which replaced the finite verb for the participle.
The support is quite good for ἑτοιμάσαντες.

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)

TVU 327

143. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:1 Καὶ εὐθὺς πρωὶ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον, δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν **ἀπήνεγκαν** καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

ἀπήγαγον εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν D, it, Or

it = "in atrium"

k = "in praetorium"

Lat(aur, l, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:2 καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι.

NA28 Luke 23:1 Καὶ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλᾶτον.

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 14:54 καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θερμαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς.

NA28 Mark 14:66 Καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως

NA28 Mark 15:16 Οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον

Compare also:

Mt 26:3, 58, 69; 27:27

Lk 11:21; 22:55

Jo 10:1, 16; 18:15, 28, 33; 19:9

The ἀπήγαγον probably comes from Mt.

Note that both Mt and Lk use a form of ἄγω against Mk, who uses ἀποφέρω (Minor Agreement).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 328

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:3 καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά __.

NA28 Mark 15:4 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; ἴδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν.

αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο

ipse autem nihil respondebat.

N, U, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1071, 1424, 2542^{s}, al,
a, c, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-H, sa^{ms}

Lacuna: L

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:12 καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο.

NA28 Luke 23:9 ἐπηρώτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν.

There is no reason for an omission. Clearly a harmonization to the parallel accounts.

The Aorist ἀπεκρίνατο is rare. Mt and Lk possibly took it over from Mk 14:61. Note that both avoid the double negation (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 329

144. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 15:8 καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 15:8 καὶ ἀναβοήσας ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἀεί ἐποίει αὐτοῖς

Byz 01^{C2}, A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 700, 1342, Maj, Sy, bo^{ms}, arm, Trg^{mg}

txt 01*, B, (D), 892, Latt, Co
ἀναβὰς ὅλος D

omit: k
ἀναβὰς καὶ ἀναβοήσας aeth

Lacuna: L
B: umlaut! (p. 1301 C, line 20) πεποιήκεισαν. 8 καὶ ἀναβὰς

ἀναβαίνω "go up"
ἀναβοάω "cry out"

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:13 οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν· σταύρωσον αὐτόν.

This variant is probably caused by the similar looking words. Even though ἀναβὰς makes sense (they have to go up to Pilate's residence), it is quite irrelevant in context.
Weiss (Mk Com.): ἀναβὰς was not understood. And ἀναβοήσας already prepares for verse 13.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 330
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:8
καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.

καθὼς ἔθος ἦν ἵνα τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς
Θ, 565, 700 (adds αὐτοῖς after ἦν)

καθὼς ἀεί ἐποίει αὐτοῖς
A, C, D, X, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, Trg

txt 01, B, W, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, 1424, 2542, pc, Co

Lacuna: L
B: no umlaut

ἀεί Adverb "always, constantly"

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. omit μᾶλλον: Θ, 565

NA28 Matthew 27:15 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν **εἰώθει** ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον ὃν ἤθελον. "to maintain a custom or tradition, be accustomed"

καθὼς ἔθος: Jo 19:40, Heb 10:25

The short καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς has always been considered as rather incomprehensible. The Θ reading is probably an expansion of the condensed style, basically from Mt.
ἀεί appears only here in the Gospels (once in Acts and 6 times in the epistles). It is un-Markan and there is no reason for its omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for Θ reading
- (indecisive) for the ἀεί reading

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
for the ἀεί reading

TVU 331
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:10
ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.**

omit: B, f1, 579, pc, Sy-S, bo
WH have the term in brackets.

Lacuna: L
B: no umlaut

Note next verse:
NA28 Mark 15:11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.
οἵτινες καὶ Θ, 565, 700, arm
οὗτοι δὲ 118, 209, geo

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:18 ᾔδει γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν ____.
NA28 Matthew 27:20 Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν.

The last mentioned subject (besides Pilate) was ὁ ὄχλος in verse 8. On the one hand it is possible that the subject has been added to make it clear that not the crowd was jealous, but the priests.
On the other hand the term could have been omitted to improve style. Several witnesses left the term in verse 10, but changed the one in verse 11._
Possibly the omission might be a harmonization to Mt 27:18. It is also quite probable that the omission is just accidental: οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς - οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς (so Weiss).

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) accepts the short reading:

> "The above reading, παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν without οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς to follow, is that of B 1 k and the Sinai Syriac, and is supported by Matt. 27:18 ᾔδει γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν: and since it was certainly not the multitude who had handed Jesus over to the governor, we must take παραδεδώκεισαν as impersonal plural, and translate' it was for envy's sake that Jesus had been brought before him'. The alternative reading supplies a nominative to παραδεδώκεισαν: but it would be awkward even for Mark to end one sentence with οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς and begin the next sentence with οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς, and I incline to think that the first οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς is just an early scribal insertion, or more

probably gloss, intended to make the sense of παραδεδώκεισαν clear to the reader."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 332

145. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:12 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω [ὃν λέγετε] τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

omit: 01, B, C, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, pc, Co
NA[25], WH, Gre, Weiss, Bal

txt A, D, X, Θ, 0250, 124, 346(=f13), 700, Maj, Latt, Sy, arm, Tis, Bois, [Trg]

Lacuna: L

B: no umlaut

Compare verse 9:

NA28 Mark 15:9 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων· θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

and also:

NA28 Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί θέλετέ [με] ποιήσω ὑμῖν;

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 20:32 τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν;
NA28 Matthew 27:17 τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν,
NA28 Matthew 27:21 τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν;
NA28 Matthew 27:22 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν; λέγουσιν πάντες· σταυρωθήτω.

NA28 Luke 23:20 πάλιν δὲ ὁ Πιλᾶτος προσεφώνησεν αὐτοῖς θέλων ἀπολῦσαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

First it should be noted that no variation occurs in Mt 27:22, the exact parallel to Mk and that Mt omits θέλετε.
It is very difficult to decide, either it is an omission to harmonize the text to Mt, or it is an addition to harmonize to immediate context, verse 9 (so Weiss) or to conform to common usage.
The external support is also relatively evenly divided, although the shorter text comes out slightly better.
An omission of θέλετε in the above parallels is not recorded.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)
prefer shorter reading.

TVU 333

146. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:12 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω **[ὃν λέγετε]** τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

T&T #182

omit: A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, pc[4], Latt, Sy-S, sa, Trg
pc = 79, 474, 1542, 1654

txt 01, B, C, X, Δ, Ψ, 0250, 124, 346(=f13), 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Trg[mg]

λέγετε B, Weiss
WH, **NA[25]** both have [ὃν] λέγετε

Lacuna: L

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:17 Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν;

NA28 Matthew 27:22 τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν;

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 14:71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε.

NA28 Mark 15:9 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων· θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

In 15:9 Mk does not use a "so called" in contrast to Mt, so there is no strong reason to insert it here. On the other hand the omission might be a harmonization to verse 9.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 136) notes that the ὃν cannot be original, because only when it is missing the text is difficult. It has been changed either by deleting λέγετε or by adding ὃν.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 334

147. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 15:20 καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν **τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ.** Καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 15:20 καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν **τὰ ἱμάτια τὰ ἴδια.** καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν

T&T #183

Byz A, P, X, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, goth, Gre, Trg, SBL
τὰ ἴδια ἱμάτια Θ, 892, pc[4] (= 115, 282, 591, 2411)

τὰ ἱμάτια D, 732, 2610, L547 (h.t.) (not d ! d has "suis")
τὰ ἴδια 2786* (h.t.)

τὰ ἴδια ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ 01, 472, 1009, Tis
τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ τὰ ἴδια pc[28]

txt B, C, Δ, Ψ, 1342, pc[7]
pc = 382, 580, 720*, 1408, 1495, 1539*, 2708

059: noted in T&T as "unleserlich" (unreadable).
S. Porter in his "NT Papyri and Parchments" (Vienna, 2008) has a transcription though: ΑΝΑΥΤΟΝΤΑΙΔΙ]ΑΙΜΑ[ΤΙΑ
ΚΑΙΕΞΑΓΟΥΣΙΝΑ]ΥΤΟΝΙΝΑ
Since it is the first preserved line of the papyrus, one cannot know what comes before ἱμάτια. The only conclusion one can draw is that no further word comes after it. This leaves either the Θ or the D reading.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Lacuna: L, W
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:31 καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ _πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. _ἰδίᾳ 01^{c}, A, L

There is no variation in Mt.
The txt reading in Mk could be a harmonization to Mt. Note the support by 7 Byzantine minuscules.
On the other hand the insertion of ἴδια could be a clarification, that the purple cloak was not his own.
It is possible that for the D reading h.t. is involved (ια – ια).
Mt follows Mark quite closely here, so it is possible that he took the αὐτοῦ from Mk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 335

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:21 καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν παράγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου **καὶ Ῥούφου**, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

τοῦ Ῥούφου pc, Tis: 47. (et cod ap Erasm)
omit: ff^2

omit: ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ M*, pc (Tis)

k reads: "Et adpraehendunt transeuntem quendam Cyrinaeum, cui fuit nomen Simon, venientem de villa sua, fuit autem nomen Alexandri et Rufi, et factione eum cruce ambulare."

B: umlaut! (p. 1302 A, line 37) Ἀλεξάν**δρου καὶ Ῥούφου, ἵνα**

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:32 Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖον ὀνόματι Σίμωνα, τοῦτον ἠγγάρευσαν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Luke 23:26 Καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνά τινα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

Both Mt and Lk omit the τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ῥούφου against Mk (Minor Agreement).
The k reading is curious.

Trivia: There was an early Doketic tradition that Simon was crucified instead of Jesus (Irenaeus Contra Haereses 1:24,4).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 336

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:22 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Κρανίου Τόπος.

μεθερμηνευόμενος

A, B, N, 892, L844, pc, k, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Trg[mg]

txt 01, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, WH[mg]

B: no umlaut

μεθερμηνευόμενον	participle present passive nominative neuter	singular
μεθερμηνευόμενος	participle present passive nominative masculine	singular

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:33 Καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ, ὅ ἐστιν Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος,

λεγόμενον	W, 69, 1071, pc
μεθερμηνευόμενος	M, N, pc

NA28 Luke 23:33 Καὶ ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον,

NA28 John 19:17 καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον, ὃ λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθα,

Compare:

NA28 Mark 5:41 ταλιθα κουμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.

NA28 Mark 15:34 ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι; ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;

Both other occurrences in Mk of μεθερμηνευόμενον are safe.
μεθερμηνευόμενος does not appear in the Greek Bible.

Tischendorf suggests that this is a harmonization to the Matthean λεγόμενος.

Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 713) thinks that it is a conformation to the nominative Τόπος.

Weiss thinks that μεθερμηνευόμενον is a conformation to Mk 15:34 and notes that the opposite meaning comes out:

neuter: "Golgotha, which is translated as 'place of a skull'."
masculine: "Golgotha, which is the translation of 'place of a skull'."

The support is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 337

NA28 Mark 15:23 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ _____ ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὃς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν.

BYZ Mark 15:23 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ **πιεῖν** ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν

Byz A, C^c, D, P, X, Θ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa^{pt}, goth
txt 01, B, C*, L, Δ, Ψ, 700, 1342, pc, n, Sy-S, sa^{pt}, bo

Lacuna: W

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:34 ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον· καὶ γευσάμενος οὐκ ἠθέλησεν πιεῖν.

Probably a harmonization to Mt and/or a clarification. There is no reason for an omission.

On the "wine mixed with myrrh" compare:

E. Koskenniemi, K. Nisulab, J. Topparic "Wine Mixed with Myrrh (Mark 15.23) and Crurifragium (John 19.31-32): Two Details of the Passion Narratives" JSNT 27 (2005) 379-391

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 338
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:25 ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.

ἕκτη Θ, 479**, pc, Sy-H^{mg}, aeth

Lacuna: W
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 19:14 ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη. καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν.

τρίτη 01^{C2}, D^{s}, L, X, Δ, Ψ, 053, pc, Eus

Harmonization to John. See discussion in Jo 19:14.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 339
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:25 ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.

ἐφύλασσον D, it(d, ff^2, k, n, r^1), sa^{mss}
custodiebant

et crucifixerunt eum et custodiebant eum vg^{ms} (book of Kells)

Lacuna: W
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:36 καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ.
et sedentes servabant eum

NA28 Matthew 27:54 καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν
et qui cum eo erant custodientes Iesum

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:24 Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρῃ.
NA28 Mark 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λῃστάς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ.

ἐτήρουν/ἐφύλασσον:
Both words mean "protect", both are imperfect active 3rd person plural.

Interesting variation.
Tischendorf: "quae lectio egregie commendatur conlato Mt 27:36".
Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk 1910) accepts it.

Perhaps a harmonization to Mt. But why did they not use ἐτήρουν/servabant then?

WH: "Probably introduced to avoid the seeming anticipation of v. 27 (σταυροῦσιν), the Hebraistic use of ἦν ... καὶ not being understood.

The most probable explanation is that the variant has been introduced to avoid repetition from Mk 15:24, where the crucifixion has already been mentioned:
24 And they crucified him,
25 But it was the third hour, and they crucified him;

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 340

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λῃστάς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν [1] καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων [2] αὐτοῦ.

[1] nomine Zoathan c
[2] nomine Chammatha c
B: no umlaut

Codex Colbertinus, c (12th CE) reads in full:
"Et crucifixerunt cum eo duos latrones, unum a dextris nomine Zoathan et alium a sinistris nomine Chammatha."

The same addition occurs in Mt 27:38 by the same manuscript.
NA28 Matthew 27:38 Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λῃσταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν [1] καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων [2].

[1] nomine Zoatham c
[2] nomine Camma c

Another tradition appears in Luke:
NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ [1] ἀναιρεθῆναι [2].

[1] Ioathas et Maggatras l
[2] … et Capnatas r^1 (having a lacuna before)

According to the Acta Pilati 9.10 the names were Δυσμᾶς and Γέστας, with Δυσμᾶς being the one who repented.

Compare:
B. Metzger "Names for the Nameless in the NT", in: "New Testament Studies", Leiden 1980

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 341
NA28 Mark 15:28

BYZ Mark 15:28 καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα, Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.

Byz K, Π, L, P, Y^{mg}, Δ, Θ, 083, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, goth, Eus, [Trg]

omit = txt 01, A, B, C, D, X, Y*, Ψ, 047, 059, 157, pm^{173}, d, k, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}

Eusebius: Deduced from his canon tables, which assign this verse to canon VIII, Lk/Mk agreements. (for other canon table cases compare Mt 17:21, Lk 5:39, Lk 22:43-44 and Lk 23:34)
Lacuna: W
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.

NA28 Matthew 13:14 καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἠσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα· ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε, …

NA28 John 19:24 ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]· διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.
omit ἡ λέγουσα: 01, B, L844, it, sa, ac^{2}, pbo

Source:
LXX Isaiah 53:12 διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη …

Eusebius of Emesa († ca. 359 CE), i.a. a pupil of Eusebius of Caesarea, wrote in his "Homily on the sufferings and death of our Lord":

> Peter drew his sword, which the Lord bade him take with him in order to fulfill every particular dispensation connected with His humanity; according to what S. Luke declares, that this saying should be fulfilled, "He was reckoned among the transgressors", a saying which the other Evangelists [i.e. Mk] apply to Christ on the Cross.
> (taken from: http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/eusebius_of_emesa_sermon_on_passion_02_trans.htm)

Severus of Antioch (first half of the 6th CE) writes in a letter to Eupraxius the Chamberlain:

> "So also he is said to have become sin, because he endured the death that was the due of sinners; for, while he is himself the pure justice of the Father, he is crucified between two robbers; but these on account of their offences, and in accordance with the passage in the Gospel of Mark who says, And with him they crucified two robbers, one on the right hand and one on the left, and the Scripture was fulfilled which says, 'He was numbered with the unjust'."
>
> [compare E.W. Brooks, Patrologia Orientalis 14, p. 32]

Only the second part of the verse is identical with Lk.
It is very interesting to note that this quote fits perfectly here, but is very strange in Lk:

Luke 22:35-38 He said to them, "When I sent you out without a purse, bag, or sandals, did you lack anything?" They said, "No, not a thing." 36 He said to them, "But now, the one who has a purse must take it, and likewise a bag. And the one who has no sword must sell his cloak and buy one. 37 For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me, **'And he was counted among the lawless'**; and indeed what is written about me is being fulfilled." 38 They said, "Lord, look, here are two swords." He replied, "It is enough."

Labeled LXX quotes are very rare in Mk. The phrase ἡ λέγουσα appears only two times in the Gospels (Mt 13:14 and Jo 19:24, the last one is not certain).

There is no reason for an omission, because the words fit perfectly. The only possible reason would be a harmonization to Mt:

Mt 27:38 Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λῃσταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων.	Mk 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λῃστάς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ. **28 Καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα, Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.**
39 Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν 40 καὶ λέγοντες· ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν,	29 Καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες· οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις,

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 717) notes the interesting fact that the words have been handed down very uniformly. Almost no variants are recorded, which is quite unusual for such a long passage of text. He notes a similar secondary addition after Mt 27:35 (compare TCG Mt commentary).
Interestingly this Matthean variant seems to come from Jo 19:24, which also has a ἡ λέγουσα reading.

The external support for the omission is extremely strong (01, B + D + A + 059 + k + Sy-S). Against this we have P, L, 083, (892, 1342). P and 083 are of the 6th CE. It is interesting that D omits against Lat.
Eusebius' canon table (early 4th CE) is the earliest witness for the verse.

Jim Snapp found the following interesting reference:
In "The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels," p. 77-78, John Burgon wrote, "If the reader will take the trouble to inquire at the Bibliotheque at Paris for a Greek Codex numbered '71', an Evangelium will be put into his hands which differs from any that I ever met with in giving singularly minute and full rubrical directions. At the end of St. Mark xv. 27, he will read as follows - 'When thou readest **the sixth Gospel of the Passion**, - also when thou readest **the second Gospel of the Vigil of Good Friday**, - stop here: skip verse 28: then go on at verse 29.' The inference from this is so obvious, that it would be to abuse the reader's patience if I were to enlarge upon it, or even to draw it out in detail. Very ancient indeed must the Lectionary practice in this particular have been that it should leave so fatal a trace of its operation in our four oldest Codexes: but it has left it."

It is possible that lectionary usage has to do with the omission, at least in part (compare the many Byzantine minuscules which omit).
The Synaxarion notes for the sixth Gospel of the Passion:
Mk 15:20, 22, 25, 33-41
and for the Good Friday Vigil simply: Mk 15:1-41.

On 059 compare:

- Dirk Jongkind, "Short Note: 059 (0215) and Mark 15:28" online in TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism
- Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter "New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments. New Editions: Texts" (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek XXX; Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2008)

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 342

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:34 καὶ τῇ ἑνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι; ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;

	λαμα	B, D, N, Θ, 059, f1, 565, 2542^{s}, L844, pc, vg, TR!, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Trg, Bal
txt	λεμα	01, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 083, 892, 1342, pc, c, l, vg-mss, Eus
	λιμα	A, P, f13, 28, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:46 ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι;

λαμα	D, Θ, f1, 22, TR
λεμα	01, B, L, 33, 700, 892, pc, Lat, Co, WH, **NA^{25}**, Weiss, Gre, Trg, Bal
λιμα	A, (W), f13, 2, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj W: ηλι ηλι μα (h.t.? λι -λι)

The Hebrew hM'l' (Ps 21:1), represents λαμα, and the Aram. am'l., represents λεμα and λιμα, both "for what?, why?".
Difficult to judge on internal grounds.
Externally λεμα clearly has to be preferred in Mk.
Metzger notes that the committee decided to present the entire saying in what represents an Aramaic original.

Compare:
M. Patella "The death of Jesus: The diabolic force and the ministering angel", dissertation, Paris, 1999, p. 84ff.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 343
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:34 ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;

ὁ θεός μου	A, K, P, Y, Γ, Δ, Θ, 059, 083, f1, f13, Maj-part, vg^{mss}, sa^{mss}, Eus
ὁ θεός	Justin (Dial. 99:1)
μου	B, 565, bo^{ms}

Lacuna: W
B: umlaut (p. 1302 C, line 5) μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου εἰς τί

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:46 Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἱνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες;

Compare:
Compare also:
LXX Psalm 21:2 ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με

Probably omitted either accidentally (so Weiss) or to improve style.
It is also possible that the A et al. reading is a conformation to Psalm 21:2.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 344

148. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:34 ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;
"My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

ὠνείδισας με D (not d!), c, i, k, Porphyrius (3rd CE)
(older ed. of UBS cite Sy-H for this reading, probably in error.)
c: exprobrasti
i: in opprobrium dedisti
k*: maledixisti

Lat(aur, d, ff^2, k^c, l, n, vg): dereliquisti
k has been corrected by the late *m. 3.*

Lacuna: W

B: no umlaut

ὀνειδίζω "reproach, denounce, insult"
"My God, my God, why have you reproached/reviled me?"

From the "Apocriticus" by Macarius Magnes, representing the thoughts of the Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyrius (3rd CE, who attacks passages from the New Testament):

> CHAPTER XII. Objection based on the discrepancy of the Gospels about the Crucifixion.
> *The Philosopher.*
> For if one says "Into your hands I will commend my spirit," and another "It is finished," and another "My God, my God, **why have you forsaken me**?" and another "My God, my God, **why did you reproach me**?"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:46 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων· ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι; τοῦτ' ἔστιν· Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἱνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες;

The quote is from:

LXX Psalm 21:2 ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παραπτωμάτων μου

Gospel of Peter (5/19):

ἡ δύναμίς μου, ἡ δύναμις κατέλειψάς με.

The exclamation is very hard. The variant reading was possibly intended to soften it down. It might have been inspired from verse 32:

NA28 Mark 15:32 καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ <u>ὠνείδιζον</u> αὐτόν.

It is also possible that the D-reading is an early corruption against the Gnostics, who thought that Christ the God left Jesus the man at the cross. (See Ehrman, "Orthodox Corruption" p. 144-45.)

On the other hand the parallel in Mt is invariant. It is possible that ἐγκατέλιπές is an early harmonization to Mt (or to the LXX). ὠνείδισας makes good sense in Mk, where everyone else mocks Jesus as well.

Harnack: ὠνείδισας is not a translation of the Aramaic σαβαχθανι (forsaken). It is possible that it was Mk already who changed the word. Since Mk knew the LXX, the change must have been deliberate.
The phrase ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ was a terminus technicus in earliest Christianity (Mt 5:11, Lk 6:22, Act 5:41, 1Pe 4:14, Heb 11:26, 13:13). In this term are combined all sufferings of Christ. So probably we have with ὠνείδισας the earliest and probably correct interpretation of Christ's exclamation on the cross. If it is originally Markan or a later change is difficult to decide. The external support is Western only.
Burkitt notes that a, b, e, f, q and r are all defective at this position so that the only Latin attestation for the ordinary text is by aur, d, ff^2, l, n, vg. He suggests that "the evidence of n makes it probable that a also would have read *dereliquisti*." He adds: "It may be pointed out that *maledicere* is a well attested 'African' rendering for ὀνειδίζειν, for which *exprobrare* or *improperart* is generally substituted in the Vulgate and the 'European' texts (e.g. Mt 11:20, Lk 6:22)."

Weiss (Mk Com.): "For the strange ὠνείδισας με in D an explanation is still missing".

Ehrman argued (Orthodox corruption, p. 143-44) that the change from ἐγκατέλιπές to ὠνείδισας was intended to refute the Gnostic view of Jesus and Christ being separate and Christ having left Jesus on the Cross.

Swete notes (comm. Mk): "It is remarkable that in Macarius Magnes the objector knew both ὠνείδισας and ἐγκατέλιπές and regarded them as distinct utterances." Macarius Magnes wrote an apology against a Neo-Platonic philosopher of the early part of the fourth century, whose arguments probably have been derived from Porphyry (3rd CE).

Compare:

- F.C. Burkitt "On St. Mark XV 34 in Cod. Bobiensis" JTS 2 (1900) 278-9 [notes that k has maledixisti prima manu and dereliquisti secunda manu]
- J. Gnilka "Mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen?" BZ 3 (1959) 294-97

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 345

149. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:36 δραμὼν δέ τις [καὶ] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν λέγων· ἄφετε ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἠλίας καθελεῖν αὐτόν.

τις ___	B, L, Ψ, pc, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss
τις καὶ	01, Δ, 083, 579, 892, [Trg]
εἷς καὶ	A, C, (f1), 33, 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Gre[new]
εἷς	Gre[old] (Error? No support!)

καὶ δραμὼν εἷς καὶ γεμίσας	f1
καὶ δραμὼν εἷς καὶ πλήσας	D, Θ, 565, 700 (Mt)
καὶ δραμὼντες ___ἐγέμισαν	f13, 2542, L844

NA has no notation for τις/εις, but notes everything with καὶ under txt. This is an oversimplification, resulting in "Maj" reading txt.

Greeven in his Synopsis reads εἷς without καὶ, but he changes his view in his commentary (TC Mark, 2005, p. 720-22).

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:48 καὶ εὐθέως δραμὼν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὄξους καὶ περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν.

NA28 Luke 23:36 ἐνέπαιξαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται προσερχόμενοι, ὄξος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ

NA28 John 19:29 σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς τις εἷς D, W
NA28 Mark 9:17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς
NA28 Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς
NA28 Mark 13:1 λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς

NA28 Mark 14:47 εἷς δέ [τις] τῶν παρεστηκότων

NA28 Mark 14:51 καὶ νεανίσκος τις
BYZ Καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος

Here clearly harmonization to Mt took place. The only question is to what extent. The εἷς probably comes from Mt (so Tischendorf), where it is safe, there is no reason for a secondary change into τις.
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 721) notes that the normal Markan usage is the use of εἷς (see examples above). Both occurrences of τις have variants (as here).

So the question remains if καὶ is original. καὶ could have been omitted to tighten the narrative or added to improve fluency (so Weiss). "The accumulation of the unconnected participles is typically Markan" (Weiss).

Compare:
M. Patella "The death of Jesus: The diabolic force and the ministering angel", dissertation, Paris, 1999, p. 90-91

[Rating: 2? (= NA probably correct) for τις]

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 346

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:39 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς <u>ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ</u> ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.

<u>αὐτῷ</u> W, f1, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P

<u>ἐκεῖ</u> D, Θ, 565, d, i, n, q ("ibi")

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:54 Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες· ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος.

NA28 Luke 23:47 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων· ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν.

The construction ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ for "who stood facing him" is awkward. It is only natural that certain Western and Caesarean witnesses changed the words here.

Note also that both Mt and Lk omit this wording (<u>Minor Agreement</u>).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 347

150. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 15:39 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι **οὕτως** ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.

BYZ Mark 15:39 Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι **οὕτως κράξας** ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν Ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ

T&T #186

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth, Gre, [Trg]

οὕτως κράξας ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα εἶπεν·	1424 (Mt 27:50)
οὕτως αὐτὸν κράξαντα καὶ ἐξέπνευσεν· ἀληθῶς	D

κράξας	W, Θ, 565, 2542, pc^2, L844 pc = 763, 1542
txt	01, B, L, Ψ, 083^{vid}, 892, pc^2, Co pc = 297, 2430

083: Harris, in "Studia Sinaitica I", 1890, p. 104 reads (or suggests, in cursive letters): οὕτως ἔκραξεν εἶπεν. But this 1. would be a singular reading and 2. does not fit the space very good (too short). In his improved transcription, JBL 12 (1893) 96-103 he gives for 083 the text reading.
083 is not noted in NA and SQE. In T&T 083 is noted as having a lacuna. This is not correct. From the Plate in Studia Sinaitica, several letters are barely visible, at least the last three. The plate is not very good, so one cannot base any certain judgments on it (it's the last line of the left column). It appears to me that the last two letters are ϹЄ̅ . There is a bar visible, probably Nu ephelkustikon. Note that the same word (ЄϨЄΠΝЄΥϹЄ̅) appears at the same position 8 lines above. This should definitely be checked at the original.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

X: the text is in part within a lacuna.
It reads ὅτι οὕ[τως κρά]ξας ἐξέπνευσεν.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:54 Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα <u>ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα,</u> <u>λέγοντες·</u> ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος.
NA28 Luke 23:47 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον <u>ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων·</u> ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν.

The words refer back to verse 37:
NA28 Mark 15:37 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς <u>ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην</u> ἐξέπνευσεν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 27:50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν <u>κράξας</u> φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.

There is no direct parallel for this word. It could have been derived from Mt 27:50 (so Weiss) or is simply a natural addition. It is also possible that it is original, but there is no obvious reason for an omission.
Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 724) suggests that οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν appeared awkward and stimulated variation. What was special of this cry to refer to it with οὕτως?

Both Mt and Lk avoid this wording in different ways. Perhaps they wanted to avoid such an extreme word ("scream") in connection with Jesus dying.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 348

151. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:40 Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς καὶ **Μαρία** ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆτος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη,

Μαριάμ B, C, W, Θ, 0184, f1, Sy-H, WH

txt 01, A, D, L, Δ, Ψ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA[25], Weiss

Μαριάμ ἡ Ἰακώβου Θ, f1

B: no umlaut

Compare extensive discussion at Mt 28:2.

Parallel:

Matthew 27:56-1	Μαρία	01, A, B, D, W, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
	Μαριὰμ	C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, pc, sa-mss
	Μαριὰμ²	C, Δ, Θ

Compare:

Matthew 27:61-1	Μαριὰμ	01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, L844, pc, mae, bo-ms
	Μαρία	A, D, W, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
	Μαριὰμ²	Δ, 700
Matthew 28:1-1	Μαριὰμ	01, C, L, Δ, Θ, 1582, L844, L2211, pc, mae
	Μαρία	A, B, D, W, 1, 33, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
	Μαριὰμ²	L, Δ, Θ
Mark 15:47-1	Μαρία	01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
	Μαριὰμ	Θ, f1, 33, Sy-H
	Μαριάμ ἡ Ἰακώβου	Θ, f1
Mark 16:1-1	Μαρία	01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
	Μαριὰμ	Θ, f1, 33 (not in NA and SQE!)
	Μαριάμ ἡ Ἰακώβου	f1

Θ and f1 strongly prefer Μαριάμ always.
No clear-cut rules can be found. Probably in part accidental or to avoid a hiatus.
Difficult!

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 349

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:43 ἐλθὼν Ἰωσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας εὐσχήμων βουλευτής, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλᾶτον καὶ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

omit B^{c}?, D, W^{c}, 083, 13, 69, 28, 579, pc, bo^{pt}, WH

txt 01, A, C, L, W*, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj,
NA^{25}, Weiss, WH^{mg}

Ἰωσῆ ὁ ἀπο B*?
Ἰωσῆς ὁ ἀπο W* (there is a dot above the o, indicating its deletion)

B p. 1303 A 1: Swanson conjectures that B* originally read:

B*: ⲓⲱⲥⲏ ⲟ ⲁⲡⲟ ⲁ̀ⲣⲉⲓⲙⲁⲑⲁⲓⲁⲥ
B^{c}: ⲓⲱⲥⲏ ⲫ ⲁⲡⲟ ⲁ̀ⲣⲉⲓⲙⲁⲑⲁⲓⲁⲥ

This is of course difficult to decide, because it is not determinable whether the vertical bar is original or not. But the shape of the ⲟ-circle is quite different from the normal Phi. The ⲟ after ⲓⲱⲥⲏ is a perfect circular shape, whereas the circle of B's Phi is always ovate: ⲫ. Since this difference is pretty distinct, Swanson's conjecture is quite probable.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

579 is not noted in NA, but it is in Schmidtke and Swanson!

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:57 Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας, τοὔνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ·

NA28 Luke 23:51 - οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν - ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ,

NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησεν τὸν Πιλᾶτον Ἰωσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας,

omit ὁ P66^{vid}, A, B, D^{s}, L, Ψ, 579, pc, WH, NA^{25}
txt 01, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 700, Maj

Interestingly the same variation occurs in John.

Difficult to decide internally. It is possible that the ὁ has been inserted to indicate clearly which Joseph is meant, that it's not e.g. Jesus' father:
"Came Joseph from Arimathea"
"Came Joseph, the one from Arimathea"

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 727) notes that ἐλθὼν Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, without the article, could mean that Arimathea was the starting point of his journey, not his provenance.

Externally the reading <u>with</u> the article has to be preferred in Mk, especially since the B reading is suspect.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 350

152. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:44 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν·

T&T #188

εἰ ἤδη ἀπέθανεν	B, D, W, Θ, Σ, 205, 372, 2737, pc[14], Lat, WH, Trg
εἰ ἤδη τεθνηκεν	1342
εἰ ἀπέθανεν	544, pc, Sy-S
καὶ εἶπεν ἀπέθανεν	Δ
txt	01, A, C, K, Π, L, X[vid], Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, WH[mg], Trg[mg]

X: in part within a lacuna: ἐπηρώτησεν αὐ[τὸν εἰ πάλα]ι ἀπέθανεν·

Coptic not clear. Horner: bo "... probably ἤδη ..."

P. Williams comments on Sy-S:

> "In Mark 15:44b NA27 cites *S* along with ms 544 and *pauci* for the reading εἰ as opposed to *txt's* εἰ πάλαι or the variant εἰ ἤδη. UBS4 is similar. However, according to the preceding discussion *S*'s text could easily have been produced from the variant εἰ ἤδη, which is much more widely attested than the variant for which it is actually quoted. Moreover, we should not rule out the possibility, given the use of ܡܢ ܚܕܐ in *S* earlier in the verse to represent ἤδη, that *S* is, as usual, avoiding repetition. At any rate the citations in NA27 and UBS4 are highly uncertain."
>
> P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", *Gorgias Press*, 2004, p. 167.

B: no umlaut

πάλαι adv. "long ago, formerly"

No parallel.

On the one hand πάλαι could have been changed to ἤδη because it was felt to be inappropriate in the meaning "long ago". Perhaps some idiom? Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 730) thinks that there is no difference in meaning. Weiss thinks that ἤδη is a mechanical repetition of the first ἤδη.

On the other hand ἤδη could have been changed to πάλαι to avoid repetition.

πάλαι appears only here in Mk, ἤδη appears 8 times.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 351

153. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:46 καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν **μνημείῳ** ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.

	μνήματι	01, B, 1342, pc, WH, **NA**[25], Weiss, Tis, Bal
txt	**μνημείῳ**	A, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj

B: no umlaut

Harmonizations to Mt:

λαβὼν for καθελὼν	D
ἐν σινδόνι	f13
ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ	D
ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ	f13
προσκυλίσας	D, f1
μέγαν after λίθον	01
(καὶ) ἀπῆλθεν after μνημείου	D, G, f1, 157, pc

μνήματι	μνῆμα
μνημείῳ	μνημεῖον

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 16:2 καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου.

μνῆμα 01*, C*, W, Θ, 565

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:60 καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπῆλθεν. safe!

NA28 Luke 23:53 καὶ καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω κείμενος.

μνημείῳ D, 579

NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ, ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, μνῆμα D

NA28 John 19:42 ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ <u>μνημεῖον</u>, ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. safe!

μνημεῖον is clearly the more common word (Mk: 8 : 2).
Either the 01, B reading is a harmonization to Lk or the txt reading is a harmonization to Mt or a conformation to the immediately following second μνημείου (so Weiss). The immediately preceeding words are identical in Lk, so a harmonization to Lk is not improbable. On the other hand there are at least 7 other harmonizations recorded and all to Mt (see above).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 352

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 16:1 Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

πορευθεῖσαι D, d, (k), n

et sabbato exacto abierunt et adtulerunt aromata k

et abeuntes emerunt aromata d

et abeuntes emerunt unguenta n (unguenta: cp. Lk 23:56)

διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη πορευθεῖσαι Θ, 565

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 15:47:

NA28 Mark 15:47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται.

Two of the women have already been mentioned in the previous verse. The repetition is not needed.

On the other hand it is possible that the names have been added for some lectionary usage.

The support is slim.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 353

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 16:1 Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ____ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

ἡ Μαρία

01^{C2}, B*, L, [WH], [NA^{25}], Weiss

ἡ δὲ Μαρία

01* (from 15:47)

txt A, B^{C2}, C, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

B, p. 1303 A 31: The H is unenhanced or erased. There is a spot above the H that looks like the Spiritus. Possibly the enhancer first enhanced the letter and added the spiritus, but then recognized his error and erased the letter. This seems to be the view of Tischendorf, who writes: "H erasum, a B3" (B3 = enhancer). It is also possible, but more improbable, that the spot above the H is some other sign, possibly for a deletion? In that case it is possible that the corrector was already C1.

Swanson lists 579 for ἡ Μαρία, Schmidtke and NA have it for txt.

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Mark 15:46 καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.

NA28 Mark 15:47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 28:1 Ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων ἦλθεν Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον.

ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαριὰ 157

NA28 John 20:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρωῒ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.

It is possible that the addition of the article is inspired from immediate context, verse 15:47, where the article is set to allow for the δὲ.
Weiss thinks that the article is original and anaphorically (indicative) "refers probably back to 15:47."
Nowhere else Mary Magdalene appears with the article.
The support is quite slim.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 354
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 16:3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;__
NA28 Mark 16:4 καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

Subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebrae diei factae sunt per totum orbem terrae, et descenderunt de caelis angeli et surgent [surgentes? surgente eo? surgit?] in claritate vivi Dei; simul ascenderunt cum eo et continuo lux facta est. Tunc illae accesserunt ad monimentum ... k
B: no umlaut

"But suddenly at the third hour of the day there was a darkness over the whole circle of the earth, and angles descended from the heavens, and as he [the Lord] was rising in the glory of the living God, at the same time they ascended with him; and immediately it was light. Then the women went to the tomb ..."

Codex Bobiensis reports here the actual resurrection of Jesus.
Palmer suggests that this is a misplaced bit. Actually meant is that this happened at the crucifixion: "The interpolation seems to be an account of the assumption of Jesus from the cross, which was transposed to its present position at the time of the Latin translation of Mk, in order to give the impression of a visible resurrection from the tomb."
Palmer gives various references in his article (Gospel of Bartholomew, Gospel of Peter, 2. Enoch). Interesting!
Gospel of Peter 5, 19: και ο κυριος ανεβοησε λεγων, Η δυναμις μου η δυναμις, κατελειψας με, και ειπων **ανεληφθη.**
2. Enoch: "... the Lord sent darkness over the earth, and there was darkness, and the darkness covered the men who were standing with Enoch. And the angels hastened and took hold of Enoch and led him away to the upper heaven, and the Lord received him and placed him before his face for ever. And the darkness withdrew from the earth and there was light."

Compare:
D.W. Palmer "The origin, form and purpose of Mk 16:4 in Codex Bobbiensis" JTS 27 (1976) 113-122

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 355

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 16:4 καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα καὶ ἔρχονται
καὶ εὑρίσκουσιν ἀποκεκυλισμένον τὸν λίθον

D, Θ, 565, it(aur, c, d, ff^2, n), Sy-S, Eus

Lat(k, l, q, vg) read txt

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 24:2 εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου,

Probably re-ordered to improve style, possibly with the Lukan parallel in mind.

As C.H. Turner points out (Marcan Usage), the first part must be seen as a parenthesis:

3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; 4 καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 356

154. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 16:4 καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι **ἀποκεκύλισται** ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

ἀνακεκύλισται

(01), B, L, WH, Tis, **NA[25]**, Weiss, Trg

ἀνακεκυλισμένον 01

txt A, C, (D), W, Δ, (Θ), Ψ, f1, f13, 33, (565), 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

ἀποκεκυλισμένον D, Θ, 565

B: no umlaut

Compare context, verse 3:

NA28 Mark 16:3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; safe!

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 28:2 καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 24:2 εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου,

The occurences in parallels are safe.

It is possible that ἀποκεκύλισται has been inspired from the parallels or the previous verse 3 (so Weiss).

On the other hand it is possible that ἀνακεκύλισται is a conformation to ἀναβλέψασαι in the same verse. The meaning of ἀνακεκύλισται, which appears nowhere else in the Greek Bible, should be "roll up", which is not immediately clear. It has been suggested that the stone has been rolled back up the hill from which it was rolled down in front of the door.

The dictionary entry in Liddell-Scott is: "ἀνακύλιω, roll up, λίθους Luc.*Luct.*8, cf. D.H.*Comp.*20; overturn, ἁμάξας Plu.2.304f: metaph., χιλιοταλάντους ἀνακυλῖον οὐσίας Alex.116.7 ; roll away or back, ἀνακεκύλισται ὁ λίθος Ev.Marc.16.4 ."

H.B. Swete in his "The Gospel According to Mark" (3rd Ed. 1920, p. 396) writes:

"... The change from ἀποκυλίειν to the rarer and more difficult ἀνακυλίειν is evidence for Mark's care for accuracy in detail; the stone was not rolled right away, but rolled back so as to leave the opening free; cf Ev. Petr. [Gospel of Peter] 9 ο δε λιθος ... αφ εαυτου κυλισθεις επεχωρησε παρα μερος, και ο ταφος ηνοιγη. The Perf., as in 15:44, 47, adds to the vividness of the narrative: we hear the women exclaim 'ἀνακεκύλισται -- their τίς ἀποκυλίσει? has been answered, and their wish, idle as it had seemed, is realized."

Rating: - (indecisive)

The endings of Mk:

These are covered in an extra file: TC-Mark-Ends.pdf