Textual variants
in the
Gospel of Mark

Results from the variant evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:15-26</td>
<td>7:3-15</td>
<td>9:18-31</td>
<td>12:24-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:38-6:3</td>
<td>7:25-8:1</td>
<td>11:27-12:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:16-25</td>
<td>8:10-26</td>
<td>12:5-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C lacuna:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**L lacuna:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:16-30</td>
<td>15:2-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**W lacuna:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:13-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ψ lacuna:**

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1-9:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**083 extant:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:12-14</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>14:29-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>15:27-16:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0274 extant:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:56-7:4</td>
<td>7:19-23</td>
<td>8:3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6-9</td>
<td>7:28-29</td>
<td>8:8-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**33 lacuna:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:31-11:11</td>
<td>13:11-14:60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**579 lacuna:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:28-4:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sy-S lacuna:**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;2&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Sonder&quot;</th>
<th>Comparable to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1241 11% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2737</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1071 12% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2786</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1424 14% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2766</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 'Αρχή τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [νίκεθεο]

BYZ Mark 1:1 'Αρχή τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ νίκος τοῦ θεοῦ

T&T #1

**omit:**

01*, Θ, 28c, pc9, L2211, sa**ms**, arm, geo1, Sy-Pal
Or, Serapion, WH, NA**28**, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, SBL

pc = 28% of 530, 582*, 820*, 1021, 1436, 1555* and 1692, 2430, 2533

(%) = Byz readings. Those without have more than 90% Byz, from T&T)

υίος τοῦ θεοῦ

A, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj

υίος θεοῦ

01c, B, D, L, W, 732, 1602, WH**ms**, Weiss

one of the longer endings: Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, arm**ms**, geo2, goth,
Ir, Ambrose, Jerome, Aug, Cyr

tοῦ θεοῦ

055, pc4

νίκος τοῦ κυρίου

1241

eὐαγγελίου τοῦ Κύριου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Sy-Pal**ms**

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. Hieze. 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:

- Contra Celsum 2.4: written ca. 246-48 in Caesarea.
  2.4. Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, ὁ Μάρκος φησίν: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἑσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ. Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, δακτασκευάσει τὴν ὄδον σου ἐμπροσθεὶν σου, δεικνύς ὅτι ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀρχὴ τῶν ιουδαϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἦρτηται.

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 ὄνομαζεται παρατηρητέον, παρατηρητέον δὲ καὶ τὰς προστιθεμένας αὐτῷ λέξεις, οἱ τὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ εὐαγγελίου αἰώνιοι, ἡ εὐαγγελίου τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν Ἐφεσίων, ἡ ἀπλὸς εὐαγγελίου, ὡσπερ ὅταν λέγῃ περὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ ὁ Παῦλος οὗ ὁ ἑπαύνος 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): ᾿Ε β' Μάρκος λέγει: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ, ῾Ο ἐν Ματθαίος: Βιβλίος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑιοῦ Δαυὶδ ... The words in Serapion are (PG 40 c. 921 "Against the Manichees"): Διὰ τοῦτο οὗτε ἐπιστήμην τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἔχουσιν, τὴν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων ἀρχὴν μὴ παραλαβόντες: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ
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 αὐτοῦς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθείς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ κριστός.  

01, L, 157, pc, b, r

W, f13, pc, Sy-P, sa

(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:

\[\text{ἱγχγγιογεγ} \text{ or } \text{iγχγγγγγεγ}\]

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 \(\text{ou}\) 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 'Αρχή 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 Καθως γέγραται 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 καθως 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 Baptist, who, in the desert, was proclaiming a baptism of repentance ..."

Note also:
NA28 Philippians 4:15 οἶδατε δὲ καὶ ὡμεῖς, Φιλιππησίοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἔξηλθον 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]
- 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]
- 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 Καθώς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαία τῷ προφήτῃ:

Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,

ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὠδόν σου.

NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνή βοώντος ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὠδὸν κυρίου,

εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Mark 1:2 Ὑς 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 ng, sa, bo pt, arm, geo, goth, Ir Gr, Ir lat 1/3, Or 5 times, 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 ng ms, Catena

Legg notes the following catena (Cat oxon, item scholia cdd. 253, 255, 256, al.):

τοῦτο δὲ τὸ προφητικὸν μαλαχίου εἶτιν, οὐχ Ἡσαία. οφαλμά (=error) δὲ εστὶ γραφεώς. οὐς φησιν Ευσεβίος ὁ καυσαρείας ἐν τῷ πρὸς μαρίνῳ περὶ τῆς δοκουσης ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τῆς αναστάσεως διαφωνίας.

Origen (3rd CE): οτι ο Μαρκος δυο προφητειας εν διαφοροις ειρημενιας τοπος 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 testimoniiis scripturarum suum corpus effectum."

Lacuna: C, Sy-S

B: umlaut! p. 1277 C 3 R γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαία τῷ
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:3 οὗτος γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥήτεις διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· φωνὴ βοώντος ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 3:4 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου· φωνὴ βοώντος ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

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

NA28 Luke 7:27 οὗτος ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

Compare LXX:
LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψωται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου
LXX Exodus 23:20 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ὕπαν φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ὡς εἴσαγάγῃ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἥτοιμασά σοι
LXX Isaiah 40:3 φωνὴ βοώντος ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε 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 ὁδὸν 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:

οὗτος 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 Ἰσαία υἱοῦ προφητή του D, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, sa^ms^, Ir^Lat^-^mg
- Mt 2:6 Ἰσαία 01^mg^, f13, 33, pc
- Mt 13:35 διὰ Ἰσαία υἱοῦ προφητή του 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 Baptist, 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
προφήτας, someone else added verse 3 from Mt 3:3/Lk 3:4 with the intro ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ 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 Ἡσαΐου 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 Minority 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 Minority 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]

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 3
NA28 Mark 1:2 Καθώς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ: ἴδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὡς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου.

BYZ Mark 1:2 Ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ὡς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

T&T #3

Byz A, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 1342, 892, Maj,
Sy-H, f, ff², l, vgα, saπτ, boπτ, goth, Or, Eus
txt 01, B, D, K, Π, L, P, W, Θ, Φ, 700*, 2766, al40, L2211,
Lat, Sy-P, saπτ, boπτ, IrLat

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 ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὡς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

Byz: ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω
D, it: omit ἐμπροσθέν σου

LXX parallel:
LXX Malachi 3:1 ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου
01*, B omit ἐγὼ

Compare also:
LXX Genesis 24:7 αὐτῶς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἐμπροσθέν σου
LXX Genesis 24:40 αὐτῶς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ μετὰ σοῦ καὶ εὐδοκάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου
LXX Exodus 23:20 καὶ ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ἵνα φυλάξῃ σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
It is possible that ἐμπροσθέν σου fell out due to h.t. (σου - σου). Also ἐμπροσθέν 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 ἐγώ 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] βαπτιζόν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν.

omit: B, 33, 892, pc, bo-mss, WH, NA28, Weiss, Bois, Trg, 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 Ἔν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔκειναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστῆς κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
NA28 Luke 3:3 καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς πάσαν [τὴν] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν,

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:14 καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιζόν ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν
NA28 Mark 6:24 καὶ ἔξελθοῦσα εἶπεν τῷ μητρὶ αὐτῆς· τί αἰτήσωμαι; ἢ 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 βαπτιζόν 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 uncialss 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 O1, 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 βαπτιστής, probably a demotic form in Hellenistic times."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
3. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:6 καὶ ἢν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὁσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσθιον ἄκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

dérriv D, a ("pellem"), geo²A, Bois
not d ("pilos")!

omit: D, it(a, b, d, ff², r¹, t), vgⁿˢ, Bois
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg) have the words

Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

dérrivς "leather clothing"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 3:4 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχεν τὸ ἐνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὁσφὺν αὐτοῦ, ἡ δὲ τροφὴ ἢν αὐτοῦ ἄκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

Compare:

LXX Zechariah 13:4 καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνη κατασκυνθήσονται οἱ προφήται ἐκκατά τὴς ὀράσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ προφητεύειν αὐτόν καὶ ἐνδύσονται dérriv τριχίνην ἀνθ’ ὄν ἐψεύσατο

“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 dérrivς - 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. dérrivς assert that in the 'Western text' here dérrivς has been transferred from Zech. 13:4 ἐνδύσονται dérriv τριχίνην ἀνθ’ ὄν ἐψεύσατο - which is surely very improbable - and quote Hesychius dérrereiς τὸ παχὺ ὑφασμα, ὃ εἰς παραπέτασμα [= hanging] ἐχρώντο. It is a not unlikely word for Mark, and I suspect that it is genuine.
Add. καὶ ζῴην 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 ζώην δερματίνην [περιεξωσμένος] 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. ζώην has a proper construction (ἐίχεν), and so too in Apoc. 1:13 (περιεξώσμενον).

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. (.ὀυ - .ὀυ or καὶ - καὶ), so von Soden.
Swete (Comm. Mk) suggests that δέρμαν 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 ὑδάτι,
αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματi ἀγίῳ.

T&T #7:

**add ἐν before ὑδάτι:** A, (D), L, P, W, f1, f13, 579, 892\(\text{mg}\), Maj, [Trg]

txt  01, B, H, Δ, 33, 892*, 1342, al60, L2211, pc

T&T #8

**omit ἐν before πνεύματi:**  B, L, WH, NA25, 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 ἀγίῳ  D (=Mt/Lk)

αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματi ἀγίῳ  f13, 28, 565

αὐτὸς δὲ ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματi ἀγίῳ  Θ

αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματi ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί  P

**Taken together:**

ὑδάτι, πνεύματi:  B

ἐν ὑδάτι, πνεύματi:  L

ὑδάτι, ἐν πνεύματi:  01, Δ, 33, 892, 1342, pc  (txt, = Lk)

ἐν ὑδάτι, ἐν πνεύματi:  A, D, W, f1, f13, 579, Maj  (= Mt)

**Note also (:: Mt):**

ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς (ἐν) ὑδάτi

A, P, W, Δ, (Θ), f1, f13, 28, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj

ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὑδάτi  Θ

To count Θ as supporting ἐν before ὑδάτi (in brackets) is misleading in NA.

NA28 has 892* for the omission of ἐν before πνεύματi. This is wrong. NA27 had this correctly. 892 omits ἐν before ὑδάτi. 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 ὑπίσχο μου ἐρχόμενος ἱσχυροτέρος μοῦ ἔστιν, σὺ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἴκανὸς τὰ υποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὕτως ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί:
NA28 Luke 3:16 ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πάσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἵσχυροτέρος μου, οὐ δὲ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἴκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἴμαντα τῶν υποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὕτως ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί:
NA28 John 1:33 κἀγώ οὐκ ἤδειν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ’ ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ὑδατι ἐκείνος μοι εἶπεν· ἐφ’ ὅν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαινον καὶ μένου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, οὕτως ἔστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.
NA28 Acts 1:5 ὁτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβαπτίσειν ὑδατι, ὡμεὶς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἀγίῳ

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 φωνῆ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· σὺ εἶ ὁ νιὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

T&T #9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν</th>
<th>01*, D, S, L84, pc⁴, d, ff², t, <strong>Tis, Bal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(01* corrected by 01C²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pc = 807, 900, 1128, 1263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ίκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ήκουσθη</th>
<th>Θ, 28, 565, geo¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγένετο λέγουσα</th>
<th>1342</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα</td>
<td>pc⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**NA²⁵, WH** have ἐγένετο in brackets.

add ἰδοὺ before φωνῆ: 565, pc

Lacuna: C, Sy-S

B: no umlaut

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

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοώντως ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ·
NA28 Mark 1:4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης
NA28 Mark 1:9 Ἐγένετο ἐν ἑκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνῆ 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 φωνῆ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης·

NA28 John 12:28 ἤλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·
NA28 Acts 10:15 καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτούν·
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 ἐγείρω 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 ἡρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ύπό τοῦ σατανᾶ, καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἀγγέλοι διηκόνοντο αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 1:13 καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἡρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ύπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων καὶ οἱ ἀγγέλοι διηκόνοντο αὐτῷ

Byz W, Δ, Π², 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 nost, 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 ὀρεί τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας

LXX Exodus 34:28 καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ Μωυσῆς ἐναντίου κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας ἅρτου οὐκ ἔφαγεν καὶ ύδωρ οὐκ ἔπιεν καὶ ἔγραψεν τὰ ρήματα 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 ἡρήμον was mentioned. It is possible that scribes replaced therefore ἐν τῇ ἡρήμῳ 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 ἡρήμῳ).
Weiß (Comm.) argues that ἐκκεῖ was originally meant as a replacement for the clumsy ἐν τῷ ἑρτήμῳ 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)
4. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:14 Ἔτερον δὲ τὸ παραδόθημα τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ

T&T 10

**Καὶ μετὰ** B, D, 771, a, ff², Sy-S, bo-mss, WH, NA₂⁵, Weiss, Trg, SBL

txt 01, A, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, sa-mss, bo²⁰, Or

**Metá kal** 38

**Metá** pc⁴ (971, 1291, 1302, 1534)

**Τ-Λ**

B (p. 1278 A 19) reads: ΚΛΗΜΕΤΩ

B* omitted Τ-Λ. Tischendorf assigns the addition of the Τ-Λ to B²³ (= enhancer).

Lacuna: C

**B**: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 4:12 Ἄκοι, γὰρ δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Context:
1:12 Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν 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 Metá δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆμα τὸν Ἰωάννην
or: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆμα τὸν Ἰωάννην

Καὶ μετὰ appears four more times in Mk (Mk 8:31, 9:2, 10:34, 14:70 always safe), μετά 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 ἤν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου
BYZ Mark 1:6 ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου

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 καὶ μετὰ.

Note that D changes δὲ into καὶ in verse 9, too.

The correction in B might be interesting:

ΜΕΤΑΔΕΤΟ
ΚΑΙ ΜΕΤΟ

ΛΛ could be misread as Μ. But this of course explains not everything. Perhaps it is just an accidental error.

Rating: - (indecisive)
"good news of God" appears only here in the Gospels.

NA28 Matthew 4:17 'Απὸ τότε ἡράτω 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

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)
ΤVU 11
NA28 Mark 1:16 Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἦσαν γὰρ ἄλλες.

BYZ Mark 1:16 Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα Καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σίμωνος βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἦσαν γὰρ ἄλλες.

T&T #13

βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον
ἀμφίβληστρον βάλλοντας
ἀμφίβληστρον βάλλοντας
ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον

Ee, Pe, 579, 892, 1241, Maj
700, 872, 1342, 2193, pc95
f1, pc14
A, W, Δ, (all Byz Majuscules15), 0133, 22, 565*, 2766, pc150

ἀμφιβάλλοντας τὰ δίκτυα

D, Θ, f13, 28, 565c

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 ἄδελφοὺς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ἄλλες.

Compare next verses 18-19:
NA28 Mark 1:18 καὶ εὕθης ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῶ. 19 Καὶ προβὰς ὅλιγου εἶδεν Ἰάκωβου τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον 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 προβάς ὁλίγον εἶδεν Ιάκωβον
BYZ Mark 1:19 Καὶ προβάς ἐκείθεν ὁλίγον εἶδεν Ιάκωβον

Not in NA but in SQE and Tis!

ἐκείθεν ὁλίγον A, C, Δ, f13ᵃ, 700, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy-H, arm, goth

ὁλίγον ἐκείθεν 01ᶜ², 33

ἐκείθεν 01*

ὁλίγον B, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 124, 788(=f13ᵇ), 28, 565, 579, 892, 1424,
it(a, b, d, ff², r¹, t), Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 4:21 καὶ προβάς ἐκείθεν εἶδεν ἄλλους ὄνο ἀδελφοῦς,

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 Καφαρναοὺμ· 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 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
ἐις 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 Καφαρναοὺμ· 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 κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν· ... 33 καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἀνθρώπος ... 

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 συναγωγήν. This makes an accidental change unlikely.

Metzger on the other hand notes that possibly "the word was inserted 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 συναγωγήν 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 συναγωγήν.

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 Ιησοῦς λέγων· φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

T&T #16

ὁ Ιησοῦς

01*, A*?, pc⁴, Tis
corrected by 01c¹ and A°²
pc = 59, 136, 949, 1325

λέγων D, pc, vg
ms, Bois, Gre
2005

καὶ εἶπεν W, b

ὁ Ιησοῦς 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 λύτωσις appear to have been deleted and added again, with λέγων 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.

NA²⁵, WH have λέγων in brackets.
The omission of ὁ Ιησοῦς is not in NA, but in SQE.

B: no umlaut

φιμώθητι φιμώ "silence, pass. be silenced"
imperative aorist passive 2nd person singular

Parallel:

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἃ ἑκατὸν μηδενὶ λέγοντι περὶ αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 8:33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς ... ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει...
NA28 Mark 9:25 ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ λέγον ἀυτῷ·
NA28 Matthew 16:22 ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῶ 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 ἀπαντεῖς ὡστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· τί ἦστιν τούτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ’ έξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμαι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

T&T 18

omit 01, B, pc² (290*, 1532) , WH, NA²⁸, Weiss, Tis, Bal
txt A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565*, 1342, Maj, Lat, WH²⁴

πρὸς αὐτοὺς  G, L, S, Φ, Ω, 2, 372, 892, al³⁷, L2211, al, TR
πρὸς αὐτὸν  565²⁴
B: no umlaut

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

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:11 Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαίοι καὶ ἱρέαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ, σὺν αὐτῷ  D

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

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

NA28 Mark 9:16 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς· 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

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
tí ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καὶ κατ’ ἐξουσίαν· καὶ
toῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ύπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 1:27
Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καὶ κατ’ αὐτή; ὅτι κατ’ ἐξουσίαν καὶ
toῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>διδαχὴ</th>
<th>κατ’</th>
<th>ἐξουσίαν</th>
<th>01, B, L, 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>κατ’</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
<td>f1, 28*, 565, 579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατ’</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
<td>700, (bo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>κατ’</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
<td>Θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἡ κατ’</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>κατ’</td>
<td>διδαχὴ, ἡ</td>
<td>1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἡ κατ’</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἡ κατ’</td>
<td>ἐξουσίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἡ ἐξουσία</td>
<td>ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς ἡ</td>
<td>διδαχὴ</td>
<td>ἡ ἐξουσία</td>
<td>ἡ ἐξουσιαστικὴ αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lat = aur, f, l, vg
it = b, c, d, ff, q, rι
The Sahidic has a lacuna in Horner (1910).
The versional evidence is doubtful.

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 7:29 ἢν 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
ἤν 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 τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδασκῶν αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὖχ 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 αὐτή could be an adjustment to the Lukan οὗτος.
There is no reasonable explanation for an omission of these words.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant

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

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

eὐθὺς
A, D, Δ, Maj, Lat(aur, d, f, l, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

eὐθὺς πανταχοῦ
01c2, B, C, L, f13, 892, 1342, pc, sa

omit:
01*, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc, c, ff2, r1, Sy-S, bo

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: ἄλλαχοῦ = 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 ἔξελθοντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἄνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

T&T #19

txt ἔξελθοντες ἦλθον 01, A, C, L, 33, 892, Maj, I, vg, (Sy-P), Sy-H, Sy-Pal, boπt, geo1, goth, WH, NA25, Trgπw, Tis

έξελθοντες εἰσῆλθον F, Δ, al40

έξελθών ἦλθεν B, f1, f13, 22, 565, 579, 700, 1342, al120, f, vgπss, geo2, WHπw, Weiss, Bal

έξελθών ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἦλθεν D, W, Θ, Σ, 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc8, it, boπt, arm

Tis has arm for the B reading, UBS4 for the D reading.
The Sahidic has a lacuna in Horner (1910).
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:14 Καὶ ἔλθων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου εἶδεν τὴν πενθεράν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν.
NA28 Luke 4:38 Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος Τ.

Τ καὶ Ἄνδρέου D, it, vgπss

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 αὐτῶ 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 Ἄνδρέου 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:32 Ὅψιας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, ἐφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἐχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους.

ἔδυσεν B, D, 28, 1424, pc, WH, NA28, 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 Ὅψιας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς· καὶ ἔξεβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγω καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἐχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν,

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: Δύναντος δὲ τοῦ ἥλιου

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 20

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:34 καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας πονίκλαις νόσοις καὶ δαιμόνια πολλά ἐξέβαλεν καὶ οὐκ ἦφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν.

T&T #20

αὐτὸν Ἐρυστὸν εἶναι

αὐτὸν τὸν Ἐρυστὸν εἶναι

αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Ἐρυστὸν

txt αὐτὸν

(D repeats accidentally verse 34a: καὶ ... ἐξέβαλεν after ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν, 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 αὐτὸν [ ... ] Καὶ πρῶτον ... The lacuna is large enough to fit one of the longer readings.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 1:24 λέγων τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνεῖ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἴδας σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἄγιος 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 ἐννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κάκει προσηχεῖτο.

T&T #21

ἐξῆλθεν B, 28*, 565, pc20, sa\textsuperscript{ms}x, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, Bal
ἀπῆλθεν W, pc\textsuperscript{3}, it(aur, b, d, e, ff\textsuperscript{2}, q, r) Sy-P

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

W reads: Καὶ ἐννυχα 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 ἐκείθεν eἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
BYZ John 4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκείθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν eἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Byz A, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, 33, Maj, aur, c, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H\textsuperscript{mg}, Vogels
txt P66, P75, 01, B, C, D, W\textsuperscript{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: ἀγωμεν ἄλλαχοῡ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἔξηλθον.

BYZ Mark 1:38 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: ἀγωμεν εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἔξεληλυθα.

Not cited in NA, but SQE!

Byz  A, C<sup>3</sup>, 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 ἄλλαχοῡ additionally in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

ἄλλαχοῡ = elsewhere

Parallel:


A rare word. Only here in the Bible. Possibly omitted for this reason?

Compare with the 1:28 variant: πανταχοῡ = 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 ἡλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναχώγας αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

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

T&T #22 (ἡλθεν only)

Byz A, C, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth
ἡν ... εἰς A, C, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1342, Maj-part, Trg
ἡν ... 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 περιήγησεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων

From the grammar ἡλθεν ... 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 συναχώγαις αὐτῶν: Luke retains εἰς on the first occasion, but by combining the two phrases into εἰς τὰς συναχώγας τῆς Γαλιλαίας [Ἰουδαίας] avoids the second. With regard to the verb, Matthew changes to περιήγησεν 'went about', Luke has ἦν. It is much more likely that Luke repeated ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς from Mark than that he altered ἡλθεν εἰς into ἦν εἰς."
It is further much more likely that scribes or editors of Mark should have substituted ἐλθεὶν εἰς for ἔνεις 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 ἔνεις εἰς is a harmonization to Lk.

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

The support for txt is incoherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

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

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

T&T #23
gονυπετέω "kneel"

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

καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν 69*, Weiss

καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ 01, L, Θ, f1, 517, 565, 579, 892, 954, 1241, 1675, 2542, 2766, 2786, pc⁹⁰, Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo¹

καὶ γονυπετῶν 01*, NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, WHms, Gre, SBL

[WH have καὶ γονυπετῶν in brackets]

καὶ D, Θ, W, Γ, 124 (=f13b), pc⁶⁰, it, vgms

οmit: B, sa

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

Parallels:

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 8:5-6 Εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν 6 καὶ λέγων· κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος.

NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἔλθοντων πρὸς τὸν ὥρκον προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος γονυπετῶν αὐτόν καὶ λέγων·

NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅπων προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτόν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν·

Compare Egerton 2, line 35-36: καὶ ἱδοὺ λεπρὸς προσέλθων αὐτῷ λέγει·

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 γονυπετῶν αὐτόν
omit αὐτόν: 28, 579, e, f, ff1, l, r1, Sy-S, Sy-P, mae-1+2

NA28 Matthew 27:29 καὶ γονυπετήσαντες ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ

NA28 Mark 10:17 προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτόν
omit αὐτὸν: W, pc, c, ff², q, Cl

Rating: - (indecisive)

brackets ok, slight tendency to omit the brackets
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπετῶν] καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔαν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.

Not in NA but in SQE!

Κύριε ὅτι B, Co?

ὁτι ἔαν θέλης Κύριε Φ, 090, 124, 28, 565, 1071

Κύριε C, L, W, Θ, Σ, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Lat(c, e, ff², vg₃₄), Co?, Sy-Pal

omit: D, pc, Lat(a, aur, b, d, f, l, r, 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 ἵδον λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων· κύριε, ἔἀν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.
NA28 Luke 5:12 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἵδον ἄνηρ πλήρης λέπρας· ἵδον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων· κύριε, ἔἀν θέλης δύνασαι 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)
12. **Difficult variant:**  
Minority variant:  
NA28 Mark 1:41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἰψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: θέλω, καθαρίσθητι:  

T&T #24

καὶ ὄργισθεὶς D, a, d, ff², rⁱ*, Diatess Ephrem, Bois, SBL  
kαλ  

καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς pc⁴ byz, b, gⁱ  

pc = 169, 505, 508, L866

° O δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτείνας 169, 505, 508, 1358, L866

° O δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς A, C, K, (Lʲ), W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 783, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, Copt

txt καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς 01, B, 892, e, Copt

Et iratus a, d, ff², rⁱ*

Iesus autem misertus aur, c, f, l, (q), (r¹c), vg

Et misericordia actus e (k lac.)

1358: This is noted for ὄργισθεὶς 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* (SPLAGXNISQES 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 (...γχνισθεῖς)  
B: no umlaut

σπλαγχνιζομαι "be moved with pity or compassion"  
ὄργιζομαι "be angry, be furious"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:3 καὶ ________ ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα ἡψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·
NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ _______ ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα ἡψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:43 καὶ ἐμβρμισάμενος αὐτῶ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν ἐμβρμιμᾶομαι speak harshly to; criticize harshly
W omits the verse!

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

NA28 Mark 10:14 ἤδην δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤγανάκτησεν καὶ ἔπινεν αὐτοῖς· ἠγανάκτεω be indignant or angry
add ἐπιτιμήσας: W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 1342, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-Hmg, arm, geo

NA28 Matthew 9:30 καὶ ἐνεβρμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων·
NA28 Matthew 9:36 ἤδην δὲ τούς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν,
NA28 Matthew 14:14 εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς
NA28 Matthew 15:32 Ἰησοῦς ... ἔπινεν· σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Matthew 20:34 σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 6:34 εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς,
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Mark 9:22 βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθείς ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς.

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς ἔπινεν αὐτῶν ἔπινεν αὐτῶν
add ἐπ’ ὀργῇ D, Χ, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 22, 157, 1071, al21 :: Mk 3:5

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

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

NA28 Matthew 18:27 σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ δοῦλου ἐκείνου ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ.

NA28 Matthew 18:34 καὶ ὄργισθεὶς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς ἕως ὅτι ἀποδῆκεν πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.

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

Note also "Secret Mark":
καὶ ὄργισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπῆλθεν μετ᾿ αὐτῆς εἰς τὸν κήπον ὅπου ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον

σπλαγχνίζομαι:

Swete (comm. Mk): In the N.T. σπλαγχνίζεσθαι is limited to the Synoptists: in the LXX, Prov. 17:5 ὁ δὲ ἐπισπλαγχνιζόμενος (Ἀ, 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 ὕργισθεὶς is very slim. On the other hand it is possible that scribes changed the hard word. ὄργισθεὶς 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 ὄργισθεὶς 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 r¹, which has been corrected from iratus to the Vulgate text. The Greek ὄργισθεὶς 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 ὄργισθεὶς 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 σπλαγχνα (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."

όργισθεὶς 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. Οργισθεὶς seems to be a conformation to ἐμβρυμησάμενος.

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

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

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

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

Rating: - (indecisive)
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, al¹, L2211, it(a, b, c, d, ff², r¹), 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.*


*ἀπῆλθεν ἡ λέπρα ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.*  f13, 157

*ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.*  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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 1:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἢ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.
NA28 Mark 1:43 καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν
NA28 Mark 1:44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὥρα μηδενὶ μηδεν ἐίπης,

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 χείρα ἦψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἢ λέπρα. 4 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὥρα Ἡσαύης· ὥρα μηδενὶ εἴπης,
NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα ἦψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἢ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. 14 καὶ αὐτὸς παράγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἴπειν,

parable command, order

For the B umlaut:
No variant is known here, but one can easily imagine something similar to that of verse 41: ὀργισθείς/σπλαγχνισθείς. 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 σπλαγχνισθείς/ὀργισθεῖς.
A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) suggests: "I presume therefore that καὶ ἐμβρ. ... ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν was at one time an alternative marginal reading to ν. 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)
14. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῶ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν σέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον ὧν οἱ παραλυτικοὶ κατέκειτο.

BYZ Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι αὐτῶ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν σέγην ὅπου ἦν καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσιν τὸν κράβαττον ἐφ᾽ ὧν οἱ παραλυτικοὶ κατέκειτο.

**Byz** A, C, D, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, it? , Gre, Bois, Trg

προσήλθεν W, it?

accedere it = a, b, c, d, e, ff², q, r¹, vg

**txt** P88(4th CE), 01, B, L, Θ, (33), 892, pc,

Lat(“offere” aur, f, l, vg), Sy-H, Co, Trg

προσενέγκειν 33

P88 reads προσενεγκαί

αὐτῶν instead of αὐτῶ: f13, 892, pc

Lacuna: Sy-S

**B**: no umlaut

προσενέ·γκαι προσφέρω infinitive aorist active

"bring"

προσεγγίσαι προςεγγίζω infinitive aorist active

"come or get near"

Parallel: NA28 Luke 5:19

καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτῶν διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,

eισφέρω

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 9:2 καὶ ἰδοὺ προςέφερον αὐτῶ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον.

Compare immediate context:

NA28 Mark 2:3 καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτῶν παραλυτικὸν αἱρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.
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 bring (HIM) to Jesus because of the crowd..."
"And when they could not get near 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 προσήλθειν 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 εἴρενέγκωσαν.
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 ἔστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἶπεὶν τῷ παραλυτικῷ ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν: ἐγείρε καὶ ἀρὸν τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;

No txt in NA but in SQE!

ἐγείρευ B, L, Θ, 28, 372, pc, Trg, WH


ἐγείραι 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

ἐγείρε imperactive present active 2nd person singular
ἐγείρου imperative present middle 2nd person singular
ἐγείραi imperative aorist middle 2nd person singular

Context:
NA28 Mark 2:11 σοὶ λέγω, ἐγείρε ἀρὸν τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. (not in NA and SQE!)

ἀρὸν τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;  safe!

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:5 τί γὰρ ἔστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἶπεὶν ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν: ἐγείρε καὶ περιπάτει;  safe!
NA28 Luke 5:23 τί ἔστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἀμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν: ἐγείρε καὶ περιπάτει;  safe!
Compare:
NA28 Mark 10:49 θάρσει, ἐγείρε, φωνεῖ σε.
    ἐγείρου f1, f13, 28

    ἐγείρου D

NA28 Luke 8:54 αὐτῶς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἔφωνησεν λέγων· ἢ παῖς, ἐγείρε.
    ἐγείρου A, W, f13, 28, 565, 700, Maj

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

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


Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 31

16. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 2:10 ἵνα δὲ εἶδητε ὅτι ἐξουσιάν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίνει αἵματίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς - λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ:

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίνει αἵματίας (= Mt, Lk)

P88<sup>4<sup>th</sup> CE</sup>, 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

ἀφίνει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀἵματίας

A, K, Π, Γ, f1, f13, 28, 565, pm, Sy-H, Robinson, Gre<sup>2005</sup>

ἀφίνει αἵματίας

W, pc, b, q, Bois

ἀφίνει αἵματίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

B, Θ, Φ, 157, pc, Trg<sup>ma</sup>

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 εἶδητε ὅτι ἐξουσιάν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίνει αἵματίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίνει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀἵματίας W

NA28 Luke 5:24 ἵνα δὲ εἶδητε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσιάν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίνει αἵματίας safe

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 2:7 τίς δύναται ἀφίνει αἵματίας 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 ἀμαρτίας 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 2:14 Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν Λευίν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἥκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.

T&T #29

Τάκωβον D, Θ, f13ab, 565, pc4, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff2, r1), vgms, 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 Λευί (against Λευίν in the old text).
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Origen (2nd CE, Fr. Matt, 194, s. GCS, Or 12.3:93)
ἐν τισὶ δὲ τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκου εὐαγγελίου εὑρίσκεται Τάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, ἀντὶ τοῦ Λευίν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου. κατ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Μάρκον μετὰ τὴν θεραπείαν τοῦ παραλυτοῦ παράγων εἶδε Δευί τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον. ἔοικεν οὖν διωύςμος εἶναι. ἐσμειώσατο δὲ ἐπιτηδείως τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματα, ἵνα μηδενὶ πεσθώμεν ἐτέρῳ 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)
"Εςτῳ δὲ καὶ ὁ Δευίς τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἄλλῳ οὕτω γε τοῦ ἄριθμοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἦν εἰ μὴ κατὰ τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκου 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 ἐκείθεν εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, Μαθθαίου λεγόμενον.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:18 καὶ Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαίον καὶ Μαθθαίον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαίον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναίον

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 Θαδδαίος to Λεββαίος, so that possibly Lebbaios could be an equivalent to Levi.

It is only Mark who has here τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, 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 Ἀλφαίου 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 Μαθθαίον λεγόμενον, where the λεγόμενον may indicate that he originally had another name (and perhaps Jesus called him Μαθθαίον?

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
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. 16. καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν
Φαρισαίων ἔδωκαν ἰδόντες

T&T #30

καὶ. P88(4th CE), 01, D, L, 047, 0130[4th], 33, 2786, pc, bo[5th], Trg
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Punctuation 1 with καὶ:
01, L, 33, 151, b, bo[5th],
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἰδόντες τῶν
Φαρισαίων. καὶ ἰδόντες
Δ, 0130[4th], bo[5th]:
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἰδόντες τῶν
Φαρισαίων καὶ ἰδόντες
P88(4th CE):
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἰδόντες

Punctuation 2 without καὶ:
txt: B, (W), 28, 124, L547, pc
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ
Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες
A, C, K, Π, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, bo[5th]:
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ
Φαρισαίοι ἰδόντες
Θ, 565:
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ οἱ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ
Φαρισαίοι ἰδόντες
Σ, 700:
ήσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ οἱ δὲ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ
Φαρισαίοι ἰδόντες

W omits from ἰδόντες ... τελωνῶν probably due to h.t. ὄν - ὅν.
Summary:
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. 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 καί ἕκολοθον αὐτῶ 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 ἕδοντες.
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 ὑρα τρίτη καὶ (=ότε) ἔσταυρωσαν αὐτὸν. It is a paratactic popular form of speech. Pernot, La Langue des Evangiles p. 196: 'καὶ n’a pas d’autre valeur que οὐ; meme construction en grec moderne’ "

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 34
NA28 Mark 2:15-16 καὶ πολλοὶ τελώναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἥκολοῦθουν αὐτῷ. 16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἴδοντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν

BYZ Mark 2:15-16 καὶ πολλοὶ τελώναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἥκολοῦθουν αὐτῷ. 16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἴδοντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν

T&T #30

Byz     A, C, D, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj,
        Lat, Sy, bopt, sa, gotth

txt     P88(4th CE), 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0130, 124(=f13b), 28, 33, 151, b, bopt

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:11 καὶ ἴδοντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον

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

Compare for the term:
NA28 Acts 23:9 ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀνάσταντες τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων 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 ἴδόντες ὅτι ἔσθει μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔσθειε; 

BYZ Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἴδόντες αὐτὸν ἔσθιοντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· τί ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔσθει καὶ πίνει; 

T&T #33

ὀτὶ B, C\textsuperscript{vid}, L, 33, 1342, 1424, pc\textsuperscript{23}, bo\textsuperscript{pt}

τὶ ὅτι A, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj, L2211

τὶ Θ, pc\textsuperscript{1}

diα τὶ O1, D, W, pc\textsuperscript{5}

one of these: Latt("quare"), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, arm, geo

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

τὶ ὅτι = "why"

diα τὶ = "why"

ὅτι = "that"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:11 καὶ ἴδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τὶ μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔσθειε ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;

NA28 Luke 5:30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· διὰ τὶ μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔσθειε καὶ πίνετε;

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:11 Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἦλλαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; τὶ οὖν W, Θ (:: Mt)

πῶς οὖν f13
NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ’ ίδιαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν· ὅτι ἤμεις οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτὸ;

διὰ τὶ A, D, K, Π, 33, 1071, 1424, al (=: Mt)

NA28 Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ἦδετε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεί εἶναι με;

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

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

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 ἢτί. But note one case where two witnesses replaced ἢτί 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 ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἐλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;

BYZ Mark 2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίόντα μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: τι ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει;

T&T #34

ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει: P88(4th CE), A, f1, f13ac, 28, 33, 157, 892, Maj, c, l, q, Sy, sa ms, goth, WH ms, 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 ὑμῶν 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, vg ms, (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) ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει; 17 καὶ ἀκούσας

Parallels:

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

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

NA28 Luke 5:30

diὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;

omit καὶ πίνετε: K

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 11:19 ἠλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔσθιον 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 ἔσθιει is mentioned. Compare:
καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἴδοντες ὅτι ἔσθιει 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. (εἰκαί - εἰκαί).
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 ἵσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἄλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἠλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς.

BYZ Mark 2:17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἵσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἄλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἠλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.

Not cited in NA, but SQE and Tis!

Byz C, Γ, f13, 2, 33, 1071, Maj, a, c, r1, vgms, 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, ff2, i, l, q, vg), Sy, Co, arm, goth

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 5:32
οὐκ ἔληλυθα 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 Φαρισαίοι νηστεύοντες, καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οί δὲ σοὶ μαθηταί 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 οί δὲ σοὶ μαθηταί 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\textsuperscript{ms}, Sy-H\textsuperscript{mg}, sa\textsuperscript{ms}, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, goth
txt  P88(4\textsuperscript{th} CE), 01, A, B, C, D, K, M, Θ, Π, f13, 517, 565, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc\textsuperscript{87}, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa\textsuperscript{ms}, bo\textsuperscript{pt}

καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων  W, sa\textsuperscript{ms}

b) Byz  C\textsuperscript{c}, D, (W, Δ), f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, bo\textsuperscript{pt}
txt  P88, 01, B, C\textsuperscript{*}, L, 33, 565, 892, pc, e, Sy-H\textsuperscript{mg}, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}

καὶ οἱ Φαρισαίοι  Θ, 1424, pc (= Mt)

omit:  A  (= Lk)

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:14 Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου λέγουν· διὰ τί ἤμειν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύουμεν [πολλά], οἱ δὲ μαθηταί σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν;
NA28 Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἰπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὠμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἔσθιον καὶ πίνουσιν.
In the first case a) the support is not good. It 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 νεότατοι τοῦ νυμφώνος ἐν ἐκείνη τῇ ημέρᾳ ἐστιν νηστεύειν; ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ’ αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν.
2:20 ἔλευσονται 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, al50, it, vg

"No!" Sy-P

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 νεότατοι τοῦ νυμφώνος πενθεῖν ἐφ’ ὅσον μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ νυμφίος; ἔλευσονται δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν.

NA28 Luke 5:34 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς νεότατους τοῦ νυμφώνος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ημέρᾳ ἐστιν νηστεύειν; 35 ἔλευσονται 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 αὐτοὺς· μὴ δύνανται οἱ νεότατοι τοῦ νυμφώνος ἐφ’ ὅσον εχουσίν τον νυμφίον μεθ’ αὐτῶν νηστεύειν.
The omission is most probably due to parablepsis: ηστεύελν ... ηστεύελν Lat: ieunare.
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 Weiβ). Such somewhat clumsy doublings are typical for Mk.
Note how D is harmonizing in Lk!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
NA28 Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μή, ρήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μή ρήσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχείται, καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπόλούνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

Byz A, 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, ρήγνυται οἱ ἁσκοὶ ...

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ρήγνυται οἱ ἁσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχείται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπόλλυται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ρήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολούνται· 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

Probably a harmonization to Lk. On the other hand it could have been omitted because of the similarity of the words: ΟΟΙΝΟΣΟΝΕΟΣ.
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 ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς·
εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος
ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοί· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς·
εἰ δὲ μὴ ῥήσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται,
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπόλουνται. ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς
βλητέοι.

Byz 01, A, C, (W, Θ), Δ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy, sa, goth, Gre, Trg
ἐκχειται, καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθησεται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολουνται 579

txt P88, B, (D), 892, (it), bo
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολουνται D, it(a, b, d, e, ff, i, r, 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 ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς· εἰ
δὲ μὴ γε, ῥήγυνναί οἱ ἁσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ
ἀπόλουνται·
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλουνται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ  D, a, k

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς·
εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθησεται
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολουνται.

The support for the txt reading is very slim. Nevertheless it best explains the
origin of the others. The καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ 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 ἁσκοὶ).
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 ἔκχεω, which constitutes one of the so called Minor Agreements.

Note that D omits ἔκχειται 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 οὐδὲς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήζει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοὺς ∟.

BYZ Mark 2:22 καὶ οὐδὲς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπόλούνται.
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοὺς βλητέον.

T&T #37

Byz P88, 01\textsuperscript{1}, 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, px

pc = 1041, 1282, 2528*

D, 976, it(a, b, d, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, r\textsuperscript{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 ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἁσκοὶ καὶ οἱ οἶνοι ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδὲς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ῥήζει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς 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:

καὶ σὺνες βάλλει ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς: 

εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήξει ὁ ὁἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς 

καὶ ὁ ὁἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοῖ.

ἀλλὰ ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοὺς.

The words are slightly awkward without βλητέον:

καὶ σὺνες βάλλει ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς παλαιοὺς:

ἀλλὰ ὁἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοὺς.

"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 ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς:
εἰ δὲ μὴ, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται,
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ: ἄλλα οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς.

**omit:** D, 976, it(a, b, d, ff, i, r), bo*, *Tis, Bal

*WH, NA, 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 ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς:
εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ρήγνυται οἱ ἁσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχείται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ
ἀπόλλυται: ἄλλα βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς,
καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Luke 5:37-38 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς:
εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ρήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται: 38 ἄλλα οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς 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 ἁσκοὺς παλαιοὺς:
εἰ δὲ μὴ, ρήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁσκοὺς
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ:

ἄλλα οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς.

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 βαλλαλω 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 ἦρξαντο ὅδον ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας.

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

πορεύεσθαι W, f13

txt Ρ88⁴ᵗʰ.ἐ., 01, A, L, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 700, 892, L2211, Maj. NA25, Weiss, WH⁴ᵗʰ.ἐ. παραπορεύομαι 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,

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 ἔρημου).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
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, t, Weiss, Bal

WH, NA₂₅, 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


**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 εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Αβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοὺς ἁρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὕς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἐδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν;

T&T #39

ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως

01, B, G, K, Y, 118, 157, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg)

ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως

A, C, Θ, Π, Σ, Φ, 064, f1, f13, 22, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, al<sup>250</sup>, Co, Trg<sup>mg</sup>

ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ τοῦ ἱερέως

Δ

omit D, W, pc<sup>5</sup>, it(a, b, d, e, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, r<sup>1</sup>, 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) Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 12:4 πῶς εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἁρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἄτῳ φαγεῖν σοῦ τοῖς μετ’ ἄτῳ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεύσιν μόνους;

Compare:
1 Samuel 21:1 David came to Nob to the priest Ahimelech (Ἀβιμελήχ). 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 Ἀβιαθάρ 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 βιβλίῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου
"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 Ἀβιαθάρ 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
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 γὰρ ἔστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

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

For κτίζω compare:
NA28 Matthew 19:4 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἔρωσεν καὶ θῇλε ἐποίησεν αὐτούς;
BYZ Matthew 19:4 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἔρωσεν καὶ θῇλε 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 ἐκτίσεν ἄνθρωπον appear several times in the LXX also.

It remains interesting that both Mt and Lk omit the verse, which thus constitutes a Minor Agreement 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

καὶ εὐγένετο πάλιν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν σάββατον διαπορευθεὶς διὰ τῶν σπορίμων καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἤρχαντο τιλλεῖν τοὺς σταχίους.

24 οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι εἶλεγον

ἰδὼ τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου τοῖς σαββάσιν οὐκ ἐξέστιν αὐτοῖς.

25 καὶ ἀποκρίθεις εἶπεν αὐτοῖς

οὕτως ανέγνωσε τις ἐποιησαν Δαυὶδ ὡτε χριαζαν εἰσήγαγαν καὶ εἰπίσαν αὐτοὺς καὶ οἱ μετὰ αὐτοῦ ἄντες

26 εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἴκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσβέσεως εφαγαν καὶ ἐδώκεν τοῖς μετὰ αὐτοῦ οὐσίν.

οὕς οὐκ ἐξέστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῖσιν.

27 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν

καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσβέσεως λαβὼν ἐφαγεν καὶ ἐδώκεν τοῖς μετὰ αὐτοῦ.

οὕς οὐκ ἐξέστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνοις τοὺς ἱερεῖς:

28 κύριός εστιν ο ὕιος τοῦ ανθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου

κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

[v. 5 in D post v. 10]

Luke 6:1

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύσασθαι αὐτοῦ διὰ σπορίμων, καὶ ἐτίλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρθον τοὺς στάχιος ψάχχοντες ταῖς χερεῖς. 2 τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπαν: τί ποιεῖτε ὦ οὐκ ἐξετίν τοῖς σαββάσιν;

3 καὶ ἀποκρίθης πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐδὲ τούτῳ ἀνέγνωσεν τὸ ἐποιήσαν Δαυὶδ ὡτε ἐπείσαν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἄντες 4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἴκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσβέσεως λαβὼν ἐφαγεν καὶ ἐδώκεν τοῖς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

Matthew 12:1

Εἰν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς σαββάσιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείσαν καὶ ἤρχαντο τιλλεῖν στάχιος καὶ ἐσθίειν.

2 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπαν αὐτῷ: ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ὦ οὐκ ἐξετίν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.

3 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἀνέγνωσε τί ἐποίησαν Δαυὶδ ὡτε ἐπείσαν καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, 4 τῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἴκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσβέσεως ἐφαγεν, ὦ οὐκ ἐξοδοὺς τοῖς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῖσιν μόνοις;

5 ὁ δὲ ἂν ἀνέγνωσεν τὸν νόμῳ ὡτε τοῖς σαββᾶσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ θερῷ τὸ σαββάτον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοι εἰσιν; 6 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὁδὲ. 7 εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἔστιν ἔλεος· θέλω καὶ οὐ θοιάν, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναίτιους.

8 κύριος γὰρ 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 ἕκει ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

**omit** 01, B, WH, NA²⁸, 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.

**Compare:**
NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ· 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
eἰ 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 ἔηράν. καὶ
ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες: εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσατε;
ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Luke 6:7 παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει, ἵνα εὑρωσιν 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 ἐηράν χείρα ἔχοντι· ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον.

BYZ Mark 3:3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χείρα ἔγειρα εἰς τὸ μέσον

T&T #41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</th>
<th>01, C*, Δ, Θ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>33vid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>372, 435, 1342, 1675, 2737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>B, (L), 072, 565, 892, 2786, a, NA25, WH, Weiss, Trg, SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>W, Lat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐχοντι τὴν χειρα ἐχοντι</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 has a partial lacuna:

καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ἐηράν ἔχον[τι χειρα ἐγ]ει[πε ...]

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 ἀνθρωπὸς ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χειρά.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 12:10 καὶ ἴδοι ἀνθρωπὸς χεὶρα ἔχων ἐηράν. 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 O1 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 ξηράν 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 σώσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.

BYZ Mark 3:4 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; Ψυχὴν σώσαι, 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, NA²⁵, Weiss

D, b, e

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

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

NA28 Luke 6:9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπερωτῶ ὡμαζόμενος ἐξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιήσαι ἢ κακοποιήσαι, ψυχὴν σώσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι; ἀγαθὸν ποιήσαι 892, L1094

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 19:16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν διδάσκαλε τί ἀγαθὴν ποιῆσον ὃν σχόλον αἰώναν; τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσας  01, L, 28, 33, 157, 892, L2211, pc

NA28 Mark 2:23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπομπός διὰ τῶν σπορίμων καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὅδον ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυσας.

όδοποιεῖν  B, G, H, f1, 565*, 892

όδοποιοῦντες  f13, 565c


NA28 Luke 6:35 πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δαινίζετε 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 κακοπολιησι (so Weiss). Note that also in Mk 2:23 a number of witnesses (including B) contracted ὀδὸν πολέιν.

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 χεῖρ 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 χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

txt B, Maj-part[Ε, Μ, Σ, Υ, Β, Γ, Π, Ω, 0135], NA28, Weiss, WHmg

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 χεῖρα σου for L. Belsheim has ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα σου for 565.

Lacuna: 33
**B:** umlaut! (1280 C 10 L) ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ. 6 καὶ ἔξελθοντες

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 12:13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἔκτεινον σου τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

σου τὴν χεῖρα 01*, B, L, N, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1424, al
tὴν χεῖρα σου 01ε2, C, D, W, 579, Maj

no omission!

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἔκτεινον τὴν χειρά σου, ὃ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ 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 χειρα σοῦ is nevertheless better. In the parallels no omission of σοῦ 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 αὐτοῦς μετ’ ὀργής, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ παρώσει τῆς καρδιάς αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκτεινοῦ τὴν χείρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χείρ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ’ ὀργής συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ παρώσει τῆς καρδιάς αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ Ἐκτεινοῦ τὴν χείρα σου. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χείρ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡ ἀλλή.

Variant not in NA, but in SQE.

Byz  C<sup>c</sup>, L, Θ<sup>cn</sup>, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, a, b, c, Sy-S, (Sy-Pal)
omit ύγιής 346, a, b, c, Sy-S

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

ἐθέως  D, it("statim" d, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, r<sup>1</sup>)

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

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 12:13 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὡς ἡ ἀλλή.
omit ύγιής 01, C<sup>2</sup>, 892


Byz  A, D, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 892, 1071, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H
ὑγιῆς  W, 579

txt  P4(200 CE), P75<sup>vid</sup>, 01, B, L, 33, pc, Lat(a, aur, e, ff<sup>2</sup>, l, vg), Co

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
24. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἁνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλήθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἡκολούθησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρων καὶ Σιδῶνα πλήθος πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὡσα ἐποίει ἢλθουν πρὸς αὐτὸν.

BYZ Mark 3:7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς ἁνεχώρησεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πολὺ πλήθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας

T&T #44

| ἡκολούθησεν | Β, L, Θ, 565, pc |
| ἡκολούθησαν | Ο1, C, 728 |

(01, C: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἡκολούθησαν)

| ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ | Α, P, Σ, f1, 579, 700, 892, Maj-part705, Lat(aur, f, vg) |
| ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ | (W), (Δ), All Byz Majuscules, 0133, f13ac, 22, 33, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj-part836, l, Sy-H, sa, bopt, goth |

(= Mt)

W, b, c have ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ in verse 8.

Δ: ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῶν

omit:

D, 124, 788(=f13b), (28), 2542, 2786, pc, it, Sy-S, bopt

28, 2533 omit ἡκολούθησεν ... Ἰουδαίας (h.t.?)

1342 has it after Ἰουδαίας.

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῶν ὁχλοὶ πολλοὶ

NA28 Luke 6:17-18 καὶ ὁχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλήθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας ... 18 οἱ ἢλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ
Verse 7b and verse 8 have been rearranged and changed in several ways to improve Mark's insertion of ἠκολούθησαν 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 ἀκολουθεῖω is invariably followed by αὐτῶ or some other personal pronoun. For the ratio ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῶ / ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῶ (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 ἤλθον (3rd person plural). Perhaps ἠκολούθησαν is conformation to ἤλθον (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:

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 55

25. **Difficult variant:**

**Minority reading:**

NA28 Mark 3:8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδούμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρων καὶ Σιδώνα πλήθος πολὺ ἰκουόντες ὡσα ἐποίει, ἠλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν.

**ποιεῖ** B, L, 892, sa, bopt, WH, NA28, Weiss, Trg

txt 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, L2211,
Lat, Sy-H, bopt, WHmg, Trgmg

B: no umlaut

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

**Compare:**

NA28 Mark 5:20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὡσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἔθαμαζον.

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

NA28 Acts 9:39 ... καὶ ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ ἱμάτια ὡσα ἐποίης μετ’ αὐτῶν οὕσα ἡ Δορκάς.

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

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

Both tenses, imperfect and present are rare with ὧσα. Of all 116 occurrences (ὁσα 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 ἰκουόντες.

Note that ἰκουόντες is masculine plural, whereas πλήθος is neuter singular. ἰκουόντες has been changed into ἰκουόσαντες, too.
Rating: - (indecisive)
26. **Difficult variant:**

NA28 Mark 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεῦματα τὰ ἁκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἔθεσαν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκράζον ὁ λέγοντες ὁτί σὺ εἰ ὁ νιώς τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:11 Καὶ τὰ πνεῦματα τὰ ἁκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἔθεσαν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκράζεν, λέγοντα ὁτί Σὺ εἰ ὁ νιώς τοῦ θεοῦ.

*Byz* λέγοντα A, B, C, L, P, Δ, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, L2211, WH, NA28, Weiss, Gre, Trg, Bal, SBL

*txt* λέγοντες 01, D, K, W, 69, 28, 579, pc, L48, L260, WHμ, Tis

*omit ὁτί:* D, W

καὶ πνεῦματα ἁκάθαρτα D, Θ, f13, 28, pc

**B:** no umlaut

λέγοντα present active nominative neuter plural

λέγοντες present active nominative masculine plural

Parallel:


-safe!

*Compare:*

NA28 Matthew 8:29 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκραζάν λέγοντες:

NA28 Matthew 15:22 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελθοῦσα ἐκραζέν λέγουσα:

NA28 Matthew 20:30 καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν ἀκούσαντες ὁτί Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἐκραζάν λέγοντες:

NA28 Matthew 21:9 καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐκραζόν λέγοντες:

NA28 Matthew 27:23 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐκραζόν λέγοντες:

NA28 John 18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν λέγοντες:

NA28 John 19:6 καὶ οἱ υπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες:

NA28 John 19:12 οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαίοι ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες:

-safe!

But compare also:
NA28 Matthew 11:16 Τίνι δὲ ὡμοιῶσώ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὡμοία ἐστὶν παιδίους καθημένους ἐν ταῖς ἁγοραῖς ἀ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἐτέροις 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 ἔξελθοντα τὰ πνεῦματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους 579

NA28 Luke 11:26 ...έτερα πνεῦματα ... καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκείνην εἰσελθὼν G

λέγουσις could have been changed into λέγουσι to fit to the neuter τὰ πνεῦματα. It could also be a harmonization to Lk. On the other hand λέγουσις is the much more common word and it could have been used accidentally. The support for λέγουσις is rather bad and incoherent.
Of the occurrences of λέγουσις 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 πνεῦματα 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, προσεπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ ἐι ὸς ὑίος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Not in NA but in SQE.

ὁ θεός ὑίος τοῦ θεοῦ
ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

69
C, M, P, Φ, 517, 1424, pc, Sy-H**, sa

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ ἐι ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος.
NA28 Matthew 26:63 ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος ἵνα ἴμιν εἰπης σὺ ἐι ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἑπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ ἐι ὁ χριστὸς.
NA28 Mark 14:61 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ ἐι ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;
NA28 John 1:49 ραββί, σὺ ἐι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
NA28 John 10:24 εἰ σὺ ἐι ὁ χριστὸς, εἰπὲ ἴμιν παρρησία.
NA28 John 11:27 λέγει αὐτῷ· καὶ κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ ἐι 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)
27. **Difficult variant:**

NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν]

インド ὡσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰνα ἀποστέλλη αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν

BYZ Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα

インド ὡσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰνα ἀποστέλλη 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, \(\Delta\)), Θ, f13, 28, pc\(^{20}\), Sy-H\(^{mg}\), Co, geo\(^{2A}\), aeth, WH

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

καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα μαθητὰς ἵνα ὡσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὡς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν

\(W\)

καὶ ἐποίησεν ἵνα ὡσιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ δώδεκα ὡς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν

\(Δ\)

καὶ ἐποίησεν ἵνα ὡσιν δώδεκα μετ’ αὐτοῦ

\(D, \text{Lat}\)

**B: no umlaut**

**Compare verse 16:**

NA28 Mark 3:16 καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ,

**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 ἠρέσατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἔδιδο ἀυτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθόρτων,

NA28 Mark 6:30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὡς ἐποίησαν καὶ ὡς ἐδίδαξαν.
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὄνοματά ἐστιν ταῦτα:
BYZ Luke 6:13 ... προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπὸ αὐτῶν δώδεκα οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν

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 ἀποστέλλη αὐτοὺς later in the verse. One the one hand this phrase could have lead to the addition. On the other hand οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν could be original and makes a good counterpart:
οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν - 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 οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν
6:7 ... καὶ ἦρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο
6:30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἄποστολοι 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 ἄποστολοι is safe in 6:30!
Lührmann (Comm. Mt) thinks that the words are original, because in Mk 6:30 the name οἱ ἄποστολοι 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 οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν 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 text type 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:

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 59

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὤνόμασεν] ἵνα ὠς ἤκουσαν τῆς καθιστήσεως τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλην αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὰ δαίμονια.

3:15 καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαίμονια.

tὸ εὐαγγέλιον· 15 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

D, W, it, vg

praedicare evangelium. Et dedit illis ... b, d, f, ff², i, r¹, t, vg
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 ὡστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλάκιαν.

NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰσσων ὁ διατάσσων τοὺς δώδεκα μαθηταίς αὐτοῦ, μετέβη ἐκείθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.

NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαίμονια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν

NA28 Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστείλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἱάσθαι [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, D, P, W, (Θ), f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj.
Latt, Sy, arm, goth, Trg
Θ has θεραπεύειν νόσους καὶ

txt 01, B, C*, L, Δ, 565, 892, pc, Co, geo, WH, NA

**B**: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ ... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὡστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσου 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 νόσου 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, 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, pc¹, saₘss, WH, NA₂₈, Weiss, Tis, Bal

πρῶτον Σίμωνα  f13, pc, saₘss

καὶ περιάγοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον  W, a, c, e, vgₘss

(this fits better at the end of verse 15!)

NA²⁷: 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 NA²₈). Hoskier notes (Codex B, i, p. 81) that there is a space between δαμίνα 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 [ὁς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν]  

txt  01, B, C*, (W, Δ), Θ, f13, 28, pc²₀, Sy-H²⁰, Co, geo²₄

omit:  A, 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 ὄνοματά ἐστιν ταύτα: πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος
Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὁτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,

omit: 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 ἐπέθεκαν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα[τα] βοανηργεῖς, ὃ ἐστιν νῦι ὑπονήτης:

κοινως δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσεν βοανηργεῖς, ὃ ἐστιν νῦι ὑπονήτης· ἢςαν δὲ οὗτοι Σίμων καὶ Ἄνδρεας, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης, …

communiter autem vocavit eos Boanerges, quod est interpraetatum fili tonitrui …
W, e, (b, c, q)

omit ὃ ἐστιν νῦι ὑπονήτης 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)
W reads curiously for verse 16-18:
3:16 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον,
3:17 κοινῷ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσεν Βοανηργῆ, ὃ ἐστιν νισῆ βροντῆς·
3:18 ἦσαν δὲ οὕτωι 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,

\[\text{ὁνόματα} \quad \Theta, 33, 1071\]

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὄνομα· τὰ ὄνομα 579

Regarding Boanerges:
Aramaic nickname given by Jesus to James and John, the sons of Zebedee; translated "sons of thunder" (hebr. שְׁפַרְתֵּי בֵית בֶּן). 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 = שְׁפַרְתֵּי; Kautzsch points to גַּר wrath, which would make the word mean the hot-tempered. Wih.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 ὄνοματα is a conformation to the following plurals Βοανηργές and Υἰοὶ Βροντῆς. On the other hand ὄνομα appears the more natural usage. ὄνομα 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 ὄνομα is a conformation to the previous verse 16 or accidental (compare Mt 10:2).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
30. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 3:20 Καὶ ἐγράφεται εἰς οἶκον· καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν οἶχλος, ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν.

BYZ Mark 3:20 Καὶ ἐγράφονται εἰς οἶκον Καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὦχλος ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν.

Byz 01\textsuperscript{c2}, A, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H  

εἰςερχόμεναι  

veniunt  

Lat(aur, d, f, l, q, vg)


txt 01*, B, W, Γ, 1241, 1342, pc, b, Sy-S, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}  

introivit  

it(e, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, r\textsuperscript{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 ὦχλου  
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)
Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 3:21 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ᾿ αὐτοῦ ἔξηλθον κρατήσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ότι ἔξεστη.

D: καὶ ὁτὲ ἦκουσαν περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἔξηλθον κρατήσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ότι ἔξεσται αὐτοῦς.

T&T #50+51

περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ
deo scribae et ceteri

D, W, it(a, b, c, d, e, f, ff2, g12, i, q, r1), vgms

ἔξεσται αὐτοῦς ("he is amazing/bewitching them")
quoniam exsentiat eos
D, it(a, b, d, ff2, i, q, r1) [c, e omit]

ἔξηρτηνται αὐτοῦ ("they are adherents of him", from ἔξερταω, cp. BDAG)
W

aur, g12, 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 καλούντες αὐτόν.

The change is probably the result of the embarrassment to which the text lent itself, the perception that Jesus was mad. (If ἔξεστη 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 ἔαν οἰκία ἐφ’ έαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὔ δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη σταθήναι.

**στηναι** B, K, Π, L, 579, 892, pc, WH, NA28, Weiss, Gre, Trg

**txt σταθησεται** 01, A, C, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, a, Sy-H

**εσταναι** D

**σταθησεται** 1241 (and omit δυνήσεται ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη σταθήναι)

= from Mt.

**B: no umlaut**

σταθήναι infinitive aorist passive
στήναι infinitive aorist active
ἐστάναι infinitive perfect active
σταθήσεται indicative future passive 3rd person singular

**Parallels:**

NA28 Matthew 12:25 εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθείσα καθ’ ἑαυτής ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἡ οἰκία μερισθείσα καθ’ ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.


**Compare previous verse 24:**

NA28 Mark 3:24 καὶ ἔαν βασιλεία ἐφ’ ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὔ δυναται σταθήναι ἡ βασιλεία ἐκείνη·

στήναι 579, 892, pc

and next verse 26:

NA28 Mark 3:26 καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὔ δυναται στήναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἐχει.

στηναι 01, B, C, L, Θ, 892, pc

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

579 omits due to h.t. (prob. στήναι ... στήναι).
The Byzantine text has in all three verses $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$.

3:24 $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ almost safe (=txt)
$\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ 579, 892, pc

3:25 $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ 01, A, C, W, $\Delta$, $\Theta$, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1424, Maj (=txt)
$\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ B, K, $\Pi$, L, 579, 892, pc

3:26 $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ A, D, W, $\Delta$, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 1424, Maj
$\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ 01, B, C, L, $\Theta$, 892, pc (=txt)

The first of the three verses reads (basically safe) $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu$. In verse 26 then, the urge to change $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ 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 $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ is original? But he answers in the negative that there was no exquisitely strong motive to change $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ there. To the contrary he suggests that $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ in verse 24 could be a conformation to the two following $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ in verse 25 and 26. This means that only (579?), 892 have the original text in all three verses.

The support for $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ reading is not coherent (K, $\Pi$).

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 ἀφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἄλλα ἕνοχος ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος.

omit: D, W, Θ, 1, 1582*, 788(=f13), 22, 28, 565, 700, pc, it(a, b, d, e, ff², q, r¹), vgms, Cyp
Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg) have the words.

omit ἄλλα ἕνοχος ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος bo⁷⁶, sa⁷⁶

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 ἅγιου, οὐκ ἀφεθῆσαι αὐτῷ οὐτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

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

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
**TVU 68**

NA28 Mark 3:29 ὃς δ' ἄν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰώνα, ἀλλὰ ἐνοχὸς ἔστιν αἰῶνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

BYZ Mark 3:29 ὃς δ' ἄν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰώνα ἀλλ’ ἐνοχὸς ἔστιν αἰῶνίου κρίσεως.

**T&T #52**

Byz A, C², f1, 124, 700, 892c, 1342, (1424), Maj, f, r¹, vgms, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt

txt 01, B, L, Δ, Θ, 28, 33, 372, 565, 892*, 2737

ἁμαρτήματος or ἁμαρτίας Lat, Sy-S, bopt, goth

ἁμαρτίας C*, D, W, f13

κρίσεως καὶ ἁμαρτίας 826, 828(=f13)

κρίματος 517, 954, 1424

κολάσεως pc¹⁷

892: κρίσεως in the margin (triplet sign).
The Sahidic omits ἀλλὰ ... ἁμαρτήματος.

Lacuna: 579

B: umlaut! (p. 1281 B, line 37) αἰῶνίου ἁμαρτήματος. 30 ὅτι ἔλεγον.

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 3:28 πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἁνθρώπων ἃς ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἔαν βλασφημήσωσιν.

NA28 Matthew 12:32 ... ὃς δ' ἄν εὕπη κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰώνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

NA28 Luke 12:10 ... τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ Ἁγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσωντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 5:21-22 ἐνοχὸς ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.

ἐνοχὸς ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.
ἐνοχὸς ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ.
ἐνοχὸς ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

NA28 Matthew 26:66 ἐνοχὸς θανάτου ἔστιν.

NA28 Mark 14:64 ἐνοχὸν εἶναι θανάτου.
τὰ ἀμαρτήματα 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, ἀμαρτίας, κολάσεως).

Note the addition of τὰ ἀμαρτήματα by Byz in Mk 4:12!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
32. Difficult variant

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

BYZ Mark 3:31 Ὁ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω ἔστωτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, φωνοῦντες αὐτὸν.

**Καὶ ἔρχεται**

01, D, G, W, Θ, f1, 565, 892, pc, it(a, b, d, e, f, ff2, q, r1), vg

**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, NA28, Weiss, Gre, Trg, SBL

**Ἐρχονται οὖν**

A, 33, 157, Maj, Sy-H

**Ἐρχονται οὖν**

346

**Ἐρχεται 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 Ἡτὶ ἀυτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὁχλοῖς ἱδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν 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 οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἔξηλθον κρατήσας αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἔξοςθη.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 3:20 καὶ ἐρχέται εἰς οἶκον.
BYZ Mark 3:20 καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς οἴκον

NA28 Mark 5:38 καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου,
BYZ Mark 5:38 καὶ ἐρχέται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου

NA28 Mark 8:22 καὶ ἐρχόμενος εἰς Βηθσαϊδᾶν.
BYZ Mark 8:22 καὶ ἐρχέται εἰς Βηθσαϊδᾶν

NA28 Mark 10:46 καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ.

NA28 Mark 11:15 καὶ ἐρχόμενος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.

NA28 Mark 11:27 καὶ ἐρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα.

NA28 Mark 14:32 καὶ ἐρχόμενος εἰς χωρίον ὦ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανί.

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 ὀἱ 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.

ὁὖν 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 ὀἱ 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 ἔξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτόν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες,

NA28 Mark 1:36 καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ ὁ μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

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

Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔχρηται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στῆκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 3:31 ἔχρηται οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω ἔστώτες 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 βλασφημήσα τῷ τὴν γῆν τῷ καλῆν.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 12:46 Ἔτει αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὀχλοῖς ἵδον ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι.

Compare:
NA28 John 10:3 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἱδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ’ ὄνομα καὶ ἔξαγει 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)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:

BYZ Mark 3:32 ἴδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί 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, 1324, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2766, 2786, [G, Y] Maj-part\textsuperscript{450}, Lat(aur, e, f\textsuperscript{c}, l, r\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{1150}, it(a, b, c, d, f\textsuperscript{c}, ff\textsuperscript{2}, q), vg\textsuperscript{mss}, Sy-H\textsuperscript{mg}, goth, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Trg\textsuperscript{25}, Tis

Lacuna: 579
B: probably umlaut (p. 1281 C, line 6L!) καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ 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 Luke 8:21 ὡς ἂν ἄποκριθεῖς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· μήτηρ µου καὶ ἀδελφοὶ µου οὗτοι εἰσίν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ
NA28 Mark 3:33 καὶ ἀποκριθεῖς αὐτοῖς λέγει· τίς ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ µου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [µου];
NA28 Mark 3:34 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτῶν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει· ἢ ἡ μήτηρ µου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ µου.
NA28 Mark 3:35 ὃς [γὰρ] ἄν ποιήθη τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφὸς μου καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

NA28 Matthew 13:56 καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσίν;
NA28 Mark 6:3 καὶ οὐκ εἰσιν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὡδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 18:29 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὀφείλεις ἐστίν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαι ἤ γυναῖκα ἡ ἀδελφοῦς ἡ γονεῖς ἡ τέκνα ἐνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,

The term could have been omitted by oversight:
καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου
καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ 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)
35. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 3:33 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοὶς λέγει·
tίς ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [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 ἀν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτὸς μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.
NA28 Luke 8:21 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὕτωι εἰσίν οἱ τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

**Compare:**
NA28 Matthew 20:21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· τί θέλεις; λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ ᾧνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο νίοι μου εἰς ἑκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἰς ἑς 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 ΧΥ 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·
tίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου];

BYZ Mark 3:33 Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων,
tίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου ἡ 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: ἡ ἀδελφοί;
       700 has ἡ 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·
tίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ τίνες εἰσίν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 3:32 καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτῶν ὁχλός, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·
       ἵδον ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου [καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου] ἔξω
       ζητοῦσίν σε.
NA28 Mark 3:34 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτῶν 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 ἡ 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 εἰσίν
οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; Even here some witnesses changed καὶ into ἡ.
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
36. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 3:35 ὁς [γὰρ] ἄν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός
μου καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

T&T #56

*omit* B, pc³ (590, 1188, 1310), b, e, bo, WH, NA²⁸, 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, WHma, [Trg]

καὶ ὁς ποιή | W
B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:50 ὅστις γὰρ ἄν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου
tοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

| ὅστις γὰρ | D
| ὁς γὰρ ἄν | L

NA28 Luke 8:21 μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὕτως εἰσίν οἱ τῶν λόγων
tοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:41 Ὁς γὰρ ἄν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ύδατος ἐν ὅνωματι
ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μή ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν
αὐτοῦ.

καὶ ὁς ἄν | Θ, 565, 700 (harmonization to Mt)

اختلاف γὰρ | Ψ

ὁς ἄν is the normal form, ὁς γὰρ ἄν 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 ὁποὺ οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.

**καὶ ὁποὺ**  B, 1071, [Trg], [WH]

**καὶ ὁτί**  D, W

**txt**  01, A, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA25, Weiss

**B: no umlaut**

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:5 ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη ὁποὺ οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.


*Compare previous verse 4:*

NA28 Mark 4:4 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὄδόν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

NA28 Mark 4:7 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκανθαὶ καὶ συνεπνεύσαν 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 ὁτί is a misreading of ὁποὺ.

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)
38. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:8 καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἶς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα καὶ ἔφερεν εὖ τριάκοντα καὶ ἔν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἔν ἕκατὸν.

εἶς B, L, (1071), WH, NA28, Weiss
1071 omits 2nd ἐν
B^c2 accents: εἶς ἐν ἐν ἐν
L accents: εἶς ἐν ἐν ἐν

txt A, C^c2, D, Θ, (W), f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, Sy-P, Trg
3 times τὸ ἐν W

εἶς ... εἶς ... εἶς 01, C*vid, Δ, 28, 700, pc, WH, Trg, Tis, Bal
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:8 ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν, ὦ μὲν ἐκατὸν, ὦ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὦ δὲ τριάκοντα.
NA28 Matthew 13:23 ὦ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρεῖς, οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ τῶν λόγων ἄκουσων καὶ συμμεῖς, ὃς δὴ καρποφορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὦ μὲν ἐκατὸν, ὦ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὦ δὲ τριάκοντα.
NA28 Luke 8:8 καὶ ἔτερον ἔπεσεν εἶς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἄγαθὴν καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίαν.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοĩ εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἕκατὸν.
basically safe, no εἶς.

The accents are not certain, it could be either the number "one" (so NA) or the preposition "in" (so B, L).

**BDAG notes:** —ἐν 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 ἐν is the probability that underlying the variants was the Aramaic sign of multiplication ('-times' or '-fold'), פפ, 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 ἐν 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 εἰς 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, εἰς ἐν. 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 ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δὲ ... ὁ δὲ: he would therefore seem to have read ἐν, 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. εἰς in verse 8 would be ungrammatical after ἀλλα, and if we translate with Matthew 'one ... another ... another' we must read the neuter ἐν 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 ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν is the true text, we can the better understand why 01 should have εἰς ... εἰς ... εἰς and A Δ ἐν ... ἐν ... ἐν."

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 77
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ος ἔχει ὁτα ἀκούειν ἀκούέτω ___.

καί ὁ συνίων συνίετω D, it(a, b, d, ff, r), vgms, Sy-Hmg, 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 ἱδὼσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἑπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 7:14 ἀκούσατε μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε.
NA28 Mark 8:17 οὐπω νοεῖτε οὔδε συνίετε;
NA28 Mark 8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὐπω συνίετε;
NA28 Matthew 13:14 ἀκοὴ ἀκούσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε,
NA28 Matthew 13:23 οὗτος ἐστίν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνίεις,
NA28 Luke 8:10 ἵνα βλέπωντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

Some form of ὁ ἔχων ὁτα ἀκούέτω 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. ἔτω - ἔτω (Bois).
συνίεις and συνίων are both participle present active nominative masculine singular!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 78

NA28 Mark 4:11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·

υμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·

BYZ Mark 4:11 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,

υμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·

Not in NA, but in SQE.

τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται 01, B, C*, L, 892, pc, bo

dέδοται τὸ μυστήριον A, K, Π, W, pc, Sy-S, sa

tὸ μυστήριον δέδοται γνῶναι 1342

dέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον C², D, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, geo, bo

dέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια G, Σ, Φ, f1, 1424, pc, Sy-H, arm

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:11 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

ὁτι υμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν,

NA28 Luke 8:10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·

ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,

gνῶναι is safe in Mt and Lk. This wording appears therefore to be unproblematic for the scribes.

gνῶναι 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. (αἰ - 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 Minor Agreement.

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, ff², Sy-S, Sy-C, Cl, Ir."

γνω̂ναί 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 ἄμαρτήματα.

Byz  A, D, K, Π, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Trg

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 βλέπετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε 10 ... καὶ τοῖς ὀσίν αὐτῶν ἐκάμμουσαν καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν ἑκάμμουσαν καὶ τῷ καρδίᾳ συνιῶσαν καὶ ἐπιστρέψασιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτοῖς

NA28 Matthew 13:13-14 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνιῶσιν, 14 καὶ ἀναπληρώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἡ λέγουσα: then follows the exact Isa quote as above

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:28 Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς νίοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἄμαρτήματα

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 ἄμαρτήματα 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 δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 4:15 οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.

Byz ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Θ, Δ, Θ, 124, 346 (= f13), 33, 700, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, bopt, arm, goth, Trgm
ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν A, l (= 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-Hmg, sa, bopt, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:19 παντὸς ἀκούσων τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος ἔρχεται ὁ ποιητὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρέις.

NA28 Luke 8:12 οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν 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 οὕτωι εἶσιν oἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι, οἱ ὃταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν,

BYZ Mark 4:16 καὶ οὕτωι εἴσιν ὁμοίως oἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι οἱ ὃταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθ윌 μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν

T&T #58

εἴσιν ὁμοίως A, B, K, Π, 124, 346 (=f13), 157, 1424, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, l, vg), Sy-H, goth, NA25, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, SBL

ὁμοίως εἴσιν 01, C, L, Δ, 33, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 2766, 2786, pc16,
bo?, Trgαι, 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, pc13,
it(b, c, d, ff2, i, q, r1), 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 ὃ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρεῖς, οὕτως ἔστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτὸν,

NA28 Luke 8:13 οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας οἱ ὃταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὕτωι ρίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν,

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 4:15 οὕτωι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν·

and:
NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἀλλοι εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι·

οὕτω εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοι 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 ο´μοιως has been inserted.

Metzger: "there is no question that ο´μοιως makes the text smoother." Why?

Weiss notes (Textkritik, p. 211), that the order ε´ιςιν ο´μοιως 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)

ο´μοιως ε´ιςιν οι very probably right
TVU 82
NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσίν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

BYZ Mark 4:18 καὶ οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες

Caes reading: καὶ οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες.

Byz A, C⁵, 33, 1342, Maj, f, q, Sy-H, goth
txt 01, B, C*, D, L, Δ, pc, Lat, saⁿˢ, bo
Caes (W), Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1424, 2542, pc, Sy-P, saⁿˢ
W has οἱ δὲ εἰς τὰς …

Sy-S is missing from here to 4:41.
B: no umlaut

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 4:5 καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρὸδες
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 δὲ εἰσίν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν· ὅπου ...
NA28 Mark 4:16 καὶ οὕτω Εἰσίν ... οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον
NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσίν ... οὕτω Εἰσίν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες
NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἑκεῖνοι εἰσίν οἱ ... οἵτινες ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:19 ... οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς.
NA28 Matthew 13:20 ο̣ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη σπαρεῖς, οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν,
NA28 Matthew 13:22 ο̣ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς, οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων,
NA28 Matthew 13:23 ο̣ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρεῖς, οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων

NA28 Luke 8:12 ο̣ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐίσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
NA28 Luke 8:13 ο̣ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας ο̣ οί οί οί ἀκούσωσιν
NA28 Luke 8:14 ο̣ τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες,
NA28 Luke 8:15 ο̣ τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οίτινες

The αὐλοὶ could be a harmonization to the previous context (καὶ αὐλο ἐπεσεν). Or, more probably, the οὗτοί looks like a harmonization to the immediate context of verses 15, 16, and 20.
Possibly the redundant, double αὐλοί/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 ... οὗτος ἐστιν
13:20 ο̣ δὲ οὗτος ἐστιν
13:22 ο̣ δὲ οὗτος ἐστιν
13:23 ο̣ δὲ οὗτος ἐστιν
Lk has:
8:12 ο̣ δὲ εἰσιν
8:13 ο̣ δὲ ο̣ ο̣
8:14 ο̣ τὸ δὲ οὗτοί εἰσιν
8:15 ο̣ τὸ δὲ οὗτοί εἰσιν

Note that both Mt and Lk never have αὐλοί.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 83
NA28 Mark 4:19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος

BYZ Mark 4:19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον.

toû toû not cited in NA and SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, f13, 22, 33, 157, 579, 892c, 1071, 1342, Maj, f, Sy, Co, arm, geo, goth
txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, f1, 28, 892*, pc, aur, l, vg

tou/biov D, W, Θ, 517, 565, 700, 1424, pc
vitae/victus it(b, c, d, e, ff2, i, q, r1)

892: toû toû 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 τοῦτον
Byz 01c1, C, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa/ms, mae-1+2, bo, Or
txt 01*, B, D, it, sa/ms

NA28 Luke 8:14 καὶ ύπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ήδονῶν τοῦ βίου

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 13:40 οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος·
BYZ Matthew 13:40 οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον.
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 ὃτι οἱ οἱ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοῦς οὐοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἔκαστον εἰσιν.
omit: pc

NA28 Luke 20:34 οἱ οἱ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο χαμοῦσιν καὶ χαμίσκονται,
The term τοῦ αἰώνος 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 αἰώνος = τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου. τοῦ βίου is probably a harmonization to Lk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
**TVU 84**

**40. Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 4:20 καὶ ἐκεῖνοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες,

BYZ Mark 4:20 καὶ οὖτοι 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, bopt, arm, goth, Trg

omit: Θ, 28, 565

Lacuna: Sy-S

**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 οὖτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὁποὺ ... 

NA28 Mark 4:16 καὶ οὖτοι εἰσιν ... οἱ άταν ἀκούσασιν τὸν λόγον 

NA28 Mark 4:18 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσίν ... οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες 

BYZ καὶ οὖτοι εἰσίν ...

**Compare variant 4:18 above.**

Either οὖτοι is a harmonization to verses 15, 16 and 18 (Byz), or ἐκεῖνοι 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 ἐκεῖνοι or οὖτοι (Minor Agreement).

**Rating:** - (indecisive)

**External Rating:** 2? (NA probably original) 
(after weighting the witnesses)
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς μήτε ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν στόμιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην: οὕτω ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

T&T #59

ότι μήτε B, L, 892, WH, NA28, Weiss, Bal

μή οτι 1074, 1487

οτι μή 1317

ἰδέτε μήτε 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 καίοσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πάσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οίκῳ.

Normally Mk uses καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς without οτι. The words appear 59 times in Mk, but only 5 times with οτι. In 4 cases οτι is omitted by some witnesses. In only one of the 59 cases some witnesses added a οτι (Mk 2:27, W, 28). This seems to indicate that a secondary addition of οτι is rather improbable.
This argumentation is in strong contrast to Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 242) who writes: "οτι 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: μὴτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

υπὸ 01, B*, Y, f13, 33, 1071, pc, WH

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. υπὸ makes no sense.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 4:24 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. ἐν ὧν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται υμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται υμῖν.

BYZ Mark 4:24 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε ἐν ὧν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται υμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται υμῖν τοῖς ἁκούονσιν.

T&T #60

Byz A, Θ, 0107, 0167, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj, (f), q, Sy, sa, bopt, arm, geo, goth, Gre
f13 omits ἐν ὧν ...

τοῖς ἁκούονσιν G, 205, pc100 (h.t.?)

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, 700, 892, pc², Lat(aur, c, f, ff², i, q, r², vg), bopt
pc = 122*, 161*

omit: D, W, 565, 579, pc², b, d, e, l, vgms, sau (h.t.)
pc = 873, 1534, 2206, 2207, 2474, 2808

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 7:2 ἐν ὧν γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,
καὶ ἐν ὧν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται υμῖν.

both safe!

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:27 Ἀλλὰ υμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἁκούονσιν: ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἑχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν υμᾶς,
It is interesting to note the many occurrences of h.t. at this variation unit. It is possible that the words τοῖς ἀκούοσιν fell out due to h.t., too: ..Ly - ..Ly. 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 Criticism in Mk 4:24" JTS 65 (2014) 425 - 32

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

(after weighting the witnesses)
43. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 4:28 αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον **ἐίτη** στάχυν **ἐίτη** πλήρη[ς] σῖτον ἐν τῷ στάχυї.

---

**ἐίτεν** 01*, B*, L, Δ, WH, NA25, Weiss, Gre, Bal

txt 01ci, A, Bce, C, D, W, Θ, 0107, 0167, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, Maj

01* omits **ἐίτεν** στάχυν due to parablepsis. A corrector (01ce) adds **ἐίτα** στάχυν in the top margin and some scribble above the τ of **ἐίτεν**, which NA interprets as a separator: **ἐίτ’ ἐν** πλήρη σῖτον.

B, p. 1282 C 20/21: The **ΕΝ** is left unenhanced and an **Α** is written above the line.

**B:** no umlaut

**ἐίτα/ἐίτεν** adv. "then, and then; moreover"

According to BDAG **ἐίτεν** is the "Ionic-Hellenistic form".

---

No parallels.

**Compare context:**

NA28 Mark 4:17 καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, **ἐίτα** γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθύς σκανδαλίζονται. safe!

**Compare also:**

NA28 Mark 8:25 **ἐίτα** πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, safe!

NA28 Luke 8:12 **ἐίτα** ἐρχεται ὁ διάβολος safe!

NA28 John 13:5 **ἐίτα** βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτήρα safe!

NA28 John 19:27 **ἐίτα** λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ safe!

NA28 John 20:27 **ἐίτα** λέγει τῷ Θωμᾶ safe!

All other occurrences of the word are safe. **ἐίτεν** appears nowhere else in the Greek Bible.

Note that **ἐίτα** in Mk 4:17 is safe. Possibly the word has been changed to create a better sounding word flow?

πρῶτον χόρτον **ἐίτεν** στάχυν **ἐίτεν** πλήρη σῖτον
On the other hand it is possible that εἰς τέν is original and had been changed because it was considered unusual? Perhaps εἰς τέν 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, πρώτων χόρτων εἴτε στάχυν εἴτε πλήρης σίτον ἐν τῷ στάχυι.

BYZ Mark 4:28 αὐτοµάτη γὰρ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ πρώτων χόρτων εἴτε στάχυν εἴτε πλήρη σίτον ἐν τῷ στάχυι

"... then the full grain in the head."

πλήρης σίτον 01, A, C, L, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, Maj, WH, Gre, Bois, Bal
πλήρης τὸν σίτον Θ, 565, 700, 1424
πλήροι τὸν σίτον 892
πλήροι σίτον 983 (= f13c), pc
πλήρης σιτον Σ, 13*, 28, 2542c, pc, some Lect = txt!
πλήρες σίτον C*vid
πλήρης ὁ σίτος D, W
πλήρης σῖτος pc, NA25, 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)
πλήρες nominative/accusative neuter singular 8
πλήρει dative feminine singular 7
πλήρη accusative masculine/feminine singular 18/1
πλήρης accusative masculine singular 2/1
πλήρως nominative feminine singular 24/1
πλήρης nominative masculine singular 32/6
πλήρους genitive masculine singular 2
πλήρες nominative/accusative masculine/feminine plural 28/5
πλήρη nominative neuter plural 16
σίτου accusative masculine singular

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:19 πόσους κοφίνους κλασμάτων πληρείς ἔρατε; πλήρης A, F, G, M, al

NA28 Luke 4:1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πληρής πνεύματος ἁγίου
no variation

NA28 Luke 5:12 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἁνήρ πληρής λέπρας;
no variation

NA28 John 1:14 πληρής χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.
πλήρης χάριτος D

NA28 Acts 6:5 ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως ἄνδρα πλήρης πίστεως B, C°, 1739, pc

Acts 6:8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; 13:10
no variation

πληρεὶς = neuter, from B seems to be an error, because σίτως 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 πληρής σίτου is the most normal term, it was probably not the original.

Most probably the original was πληρής σίτου. To get rid of the problematic πληρής, some changed it to πληρή and some changed σίτου to σίτος.

Some other occurrences of πληρής (see above) where less problematic and no variation is extant.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 28) sees πληρής σίτου as an emphatic exclamation ("Full grain in the head!"), which was not understood and has been changed therefore into a complete sentence (πληρής ὁ σίτος...) or into the accusative.

πλήρης is sometimes used as an indeclinable adjective. A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) writes: "As WH remark, the variant πληρής σίτου, 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. πλήρης). 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 παραδοθῇ ὁ καρπὸς, εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὦτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

καρπὸς  

NA28 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 ἐπιδίδωμι, was corrupted. Cf. Philo, Opif M. 12 (opificio mundi) συναυξάται [ὁ καρπος] εἰς οἰκον ἐπιδίδουσι τελειοτατον. Acts Andr. 12 σπερματων α ουκ ἐπιδώσει 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 ὁ θεός; Isocr. 5, 118 ὁ καρπος; Polyb. 22, 24, 9 τῆς ὀρας παραδοσύστης) ὅταν παραδοθῇ ὁ καρπὸς 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.
45. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἐλεγεν· πώς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολὴ θώμεν;

BYZ Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἐλεγεν τίνι ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν πολα παραβολὴ 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<sup>ma</sup>
- **πῶς** txt: 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 33, 579, 892, pc, b

2. θώμεν/παραβάλωμεν

- Byz: A, C<sup>c</sup>, D, Θ, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, Trg<sup>ma</sup>
- txt: 01, B, C<sup>*</sup>, L, (W), Δ, 788(-f13), 28, 579, 892, 1342, pc, b, Co, Or
- W: ἐν τίνι τὴν παραβολὴν δᾶμεν

ἐν τίνι ὁμοιώματι; παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν f1

ὁμοιώματι ὁμοίωμα noun dative neuter singular common

ἐν τίνι παραβολὴ αὐτὴν θώμεν; παραβάλωμεν αὐτὴν f13

Lacuna: Sy-S

B: no umlaut

θώμεν τίθημι subjunctive aorist active 1st person plural

παραβάλωμεν subjunctive aorist active 1st person plural

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:31 "Ἀλλήν παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοία ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκω συνάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐσπειρεῖν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Luke 13:18 "Ελεγεν οὖν· τίνι ὁμοία ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνι ὁμοιόως αὐτὴν;
Regarding the pronouns τίνι and ποία it should be noted that the beginning of the question is similarly divided. We have basically:

τίνι/ ποία   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 παραβολὴ 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 αὐτῆν παραβάλωμεν. Then the object παραβολὴ or ὁμοιώματι(f1) has been added and the place of αὐτῆν changed.

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that the difficult θῶμεν has been changed into the explanatory παραβάλωμεν αὐτῆν.

Bartsch notes that especially the f1 reading looks like a reference to Isa 40:18.

LXX Isaiah 40:18

τίνι ὁμοιώσατε κύριον καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώματι ὁμοιώσατε αὐτὸν

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 τοιαύτας παραβολαίς πολλαῖς ἐλάληε αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἦδύνατο 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 αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαίς πολλαῖς
W, 28, b, c, e: παραβολαῖς
D: παραβολαίς πολλαῖς
(not in NA)

Verse 13:
NA28 Mark 4:13 καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 13:3 Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλαῖς ἐν παραβολαίς 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)
The term ἰδίος 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 ἰδιός:
κατ’ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλευεν πάντα.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 4:36 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὀχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοϊῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

πλοῖα πολλὰ ἦσαν

D, it(b, d, ff², i, q, r')
Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg) has txt

πλοῖα πολλὰ ἦν

33

πολλοὶ ἦσαν

W

tὰ ἄλλα τὰ ὄντα πλοῖα

Θ, 565

tὰ ἄλλα δὲ τὰ ὄντα πλοῖα

700

tὰ ἄλλα τὰ ὄντα μετ’ αὐτοῦ πλοῖα

f1, 28

Byz δὲ πλοιάρια ἦν

L, U, 124, 2, Maj-part, TR

dὲ πλοῖα ἦν

A, 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

ὦντα εἰμί participles 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 δειλοὶ ἐστε; οὐπω ἔχετε πίστιν;

BYZ Mark 4:40 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
τί δειλοὶ ἐστε οὕτως; πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν

T&T #61

ἐστε οὕτως πῶς οὐκ  A, C, 33, Maj, f, (Sy-P), Sy-H, goth, NA²⁸, Weiss, Tis

ἐστε οὕτως  W, e, q

ἐστε; οὐπω  01, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, 565, 700, 892*, 1342, 2737, pc⁴,
Lat, Co
pc = 722, 858, 1416, 2808

οὕτως δειλοὶ ἐστε; οὐπω  P45vid. 0167, f1, f13, 28, 2542, pc
ἐστε οὕτως; οὐπω  892c, Gre (he separated the two var. units)

( :: Mt)

ἐστε ὀλιγόπιστοι οὕτως πῶς οὐκ  508, 1424
ἐσται ὀλιγόπιστοι οὐπω  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]ύτοις· τί οὐ[τως, with the next line missing.
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:26 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι;
NA28 Luke 8:25 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 2:7 τί οὕτως οὕτως λαλεῖ;
omit οὕτως: 346, 565
NA28 Luke 12:56 τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τούτον πώς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

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 f13

NA28 Matthew 16:11 πώς οὐ νοεῖτε Θ, 1424
πώς 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
πώς οὐ νοεῖτε B, 2
πώς οὔσι συνίετε 28, 157, 579, 700, 2542, Maj-part, Robinson
πώς οὔπω συνίετε A, D*, W, Θ, 1582, (f13), 33, 565, Maj-part
πώς οὔπω νοεῖτε D

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 οὕτος 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 δείλοι is a clear stylistic smoothing of the A et al. reading.
It has been suggested that οὐτως is an error of οὐπω. ουπω has been accidentally written as ουτω, which then has been taken with the antecedent. Compare W! To complete the following, πῶς οὐκ has been added.

b) οὐπω or πῶς οὐκ:
It is possible that this variation is also at least in part accidental (so Weiss):
ουτωςπωςουκ ---> ουπωςπωςουκ ---> ουπω
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 οὐπω in Mt 16:11, probably as a conformation to verse 9.
An οὐπω/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 ουπω.

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 ἡλθοὺν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἡλθοῦν 01\textsuperscript{1-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, W, f1, 33, 157, 565, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, sa, goth

01: NA notes this correction, which is not in Tischendorf. The 0 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 o 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\textsuperscript{2})


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 ἁρα οὗτος ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἅνεμος 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 ἡλθοῦν 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 ἡλθεν 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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἠλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.

BYZ Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἠλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν.

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)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:6 καὶ ἴδων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ

αὐτόν  A, B, C, L, Δ, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, pc, WH, NA25, Weiss, Gre, Trg, SBL

txt  01, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj

ιδων δε for και ιδων: A, D, W, 33, 157, 565, 1071, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallel:


Compare:

NA28 Matthew 2:2 προσκυνήσαει αὐτῷ.  αὐτόν  Γ, Δ, 157
NA28 Matthew 2:8 προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ.  safe!
NA28 Matthew 2:11 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  safe!
NA28 Matthew 4:9 προσκυνήσης μοι.  με  157, 565
NA28 Matthew 8:2 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  αὐτόν  33
NA28 Matthew 9:18 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  αὐτόν  1424
NA28 Matthew 14:33 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  safe!
NA28 Matthew 15:25 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  αὐτόν  Δ
NA28 Matthew 18:26 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  safe!
NA28 Matthew 28:9 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ  safe!
NA28 Mark 15:19 προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.  safe!
NA28 Luke 24:52 προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν  safe!  (700 omits αὐτόν)
NA28 John 4:21 προσκυνήσασθε τῷ πατρί.  safe!
NA28 John 4:23a προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρί  safe!
NA28 John 4:23b προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.  αὐτῷ  P66*, 01*, pc
NA28 John 4:24 προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν  safe!  (01, D* omit αὐτόν)
NA28 John 9:38 προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ.  αὐτόν  Δ, 157, pc
LXX quote:
NA28 Matthew 4:10 τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις safe!
NA28 Luke 4:8 κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις safe!

NA28 Matthew 28:17 καὶ ἱδόντες αὐτὸν προσέκύνησαν
προσέκυνησαν 01, B, D, 33, L844, L2211, Lat
προσέκυνησαν αὐτῷ A, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj
προσέκυνησαν αὐτόν Γ, 346, 28, 157, 700*, 1241, al

Compare also Josephus:
Ant 6:154 ὁ Σαμουήλ ἀσεβῆσαι μὲν ἐλεγεν ἀγένητα δὲ ποιήσαι τὰ πεπραγμένα μὴ δύνασθαι τιμῆσαι γε μὴν αὐτὸν παρεκάλει τοῦ πλήθους ὁρώντος σὺν αὐτῷ παραγενόμενον τὸν θεὸν προσκυνήσαι δίδωσι δὲ τούτῳ Σαμουήλος αὐτῷ καὶ συνεκληθὼν προσκυνεῖ τῷ θεῷ

The normal case following προσκυνεῖω 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 ἱδὼν 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: πέμψοι τὴν ημᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.

BYZ Mark 5:12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ δαίμονες λέγοντες πέμψοι την ημᾶς 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 δαίμονια εἶπόντα Θ, 565, a
πάντα τὰ δαίμονια λέγοντα D
πάντα τὰ δαίμονια λέγοντα ὅτι 700

λέγοντες 01, B, C, L, Δ, f1, 22, 892, 1342, Co, geo
εἴπαν W
εἴπον 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 ὤρει
3 ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη
4 βοσκομένη 12 καὶ παρε
5 κάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγον
6 τες· πέμψοι την ημᾶς εἰς
dαιμονες δαιμων noun nominative masculine plural
dαιμονια δαιμονιον noun accusative neuter plural

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:31 οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων.

NA28 Luke 8:32 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὤρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσέλθειν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς.

Θ: καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες

Compare:
NA28 Luke 8:29 ... ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονίου εἰς τὰς ἔρημους.
BYZ Luke 8:29 ... ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος εἰς τὰς ἔρημους
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 δαμόνιον is much more common (52 times in the Gospels). Interestingly Byz replaces δαμόνιον with δαίμων in Lk 8:29.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 100

50. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 5:13 καὶ ἔπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς

BYZ Mark 5:13 καὶ ἔπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Byz  A, f13, 33, 892, 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

ἐπεμψεν αὐτοῖς  Θ
ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπεμψεν αὐτοῖς  565, 700
ἐπεμψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς  H, U, al

eὐθέως κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐπεμψεν αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους
Statim Dominus Iesus misit eos in porcos
D, pc, it(c, d, ff, i, r)

892: words added in the margin by a later hand (triplet insertion sign).
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 8:32 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑπάγετε.

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 5:12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.

εὐθέως 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 εὐθέως itself appears to be late, it is very probable that Mk originally wrote εὐθὺς always.

ἐπεμψεν 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 ἐπεμψεν αὐτοῦς 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 ἔξουσίαν 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 εὐθέως.

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 101
Minority reading:

BYZ Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὃχλος πολὺς ἐπ’ αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν

T&T #65

omit: P45vid, D, Θ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc30, it(b, c, d, ff², i, q, r¹), 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, saₘₛₛ, goth

ἐν πλοίῳ Β, pc¹⁰

εἰς Γεννησαρέτ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ 1342 (Mt 14:34 + Mk 6:53)
ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ W, saₘₛₛ

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν πάλιν.
NA28 Luke 8:40 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὥχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκώντες αὐτὸν.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 4:36 παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ,
NA28 Mark 4:37 καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοίον,
NA28 Mark 5:2 καὶ ἓξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοίον
NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἐρημοῦ τόπον κατ’ ἱδίαν.
NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοίον
NA28 Mark 6:54 καὶ ἓξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοίον
NA28 Mark 8:14
καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.

NA28 Mark 6:53 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ

NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν

NA28 Matthew 14:34
Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἤλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.
add εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον: 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, vg), (Sy-S), sa, bo, arm, geo, [Trg]
txt = omit: 01, B, C, L, Δ, 2144, bo, Lat(aur, ff, 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 again 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 ὁ χόλος πολὺς ἐπ’ αὐτόν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν 01*, D, 565, 700, it, Sy-P
eἰς τὸ πέραν P45, c, f, ff²
πάλιν Θ, pc, Sy-S, bo

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 ἦνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβήμανει 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 διέλθομεν εἰς τὸ πέραν safe!
NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης safe!
NA28 Mark 6:45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβήμανει εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, omit εἰς τὸ πέραν: P45 vid, W, f1, Sy-S
NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. safe!
NA28 Luke 8:22 διέλθομεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης safe!

Metzger notes that Lk 8:40 presupposes the Markan πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν:
NA28 Luke 8:40 Ἔν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τον Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ χόλος: ὑποστρέφω "return, turn back"

The connection of πάλιν with συνήχθη ὁ χόλος πολὺς refers back to 4:1
NA28 Mark 4:1 καὶ πᾶς ὁ χόλος 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 εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, ὄνοματι Ἰάιρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

omit: D, it(a, d, e, ff², i, r¹)

Lat(aur, b, c, f, l, q, vg) have the words.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἴδος ἄρχων εἰς ἑλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἑλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπ’ αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.

NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἴδον ἤλθεν ἀνήρ ὁ ὄνομα Ἰάιρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπήρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθείν 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 θυγατριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἐχεῖ, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς ἵνα σωθῆ καὶ ζήσῃ.

καὶ θέλω ἵνα ἐλθὼν 157
ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν 225 (Legg, from Lk)
ἵνα 1342

ἐλθε ἵππῃ αὐτῆς ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.

Veni, tange eam de manibus tuis
D, it(b, d, e, ff², i, q, r¹), 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 εἰς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνη τοῦ λέγων ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἀρτί ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὴν χείρα σου ἐπ’ αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.
NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἤλθεν ἄνηρ ὁ ὄνομα Ἰάιρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπήρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ὦκον 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 ἐπιθῆς τὰς χείρας αὐτῆς, NA27 cites (SP) in support of D's reading ἐλθέ ἄψαι 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 ἐπιθῆς 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 ἀπομαί 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.

51. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 5:27 ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ἄχλῳ ὁπισθεὶς ἦπατο τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ.

T&T 68

**tὰ περὶ** 01*, B, C*, Δ, pc6 (811, 1006, 1214, 1540, 1546, 1630), L33

*WH, NA28, Weiss, Gre, [Trg]**, *Tis, Bal*

**txt** 01C2, A, C*, D, L, W, Θ, 0132(nd), 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 ἀτρών καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφελθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χείρον ἐλθοῦσα,

**Compare:**

NA28 Mark 7:25 ἀλλ᾽ εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀκούσασα γυνὴ τίς περὶ αὐτοῦ, 700


**Compare also:**

NA28 Mark 2:2 καὶ συνῆχθησαν πολλοὶ ὡστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν

NA28 Matthew 24:17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δόματος μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, 71 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 ὅχλῳ ὄπισθεν ἦψατο τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ.

Not in NA, but in SQE.

Τὸ 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 ἦψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ.

omit: 1689, it(a, b, c, g², k), vg


omit: D, it(a, d, ff², l, r¹), Marcion

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:36 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 6:56 ... καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται.

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 φοβηθείσα καὶ τρέμουσα ὁ ἐίδον ὅ γέγονεν αὐτῇ, ἤλθεν καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

T&T #69

D, Θ, 28, 124, 565, 2680, pc15, it(a, d, ff, i, r1)

pc = 20, 50, 176, 184, 207, 215, 348, 495, 537, 709c, 718, 773, 829, 1510*

700, 1071

quod fecerat occulto ff2, i
quod fecerit occulto r1
quod fecerat occultum d
quod fecerat absconse a
Lat(aur, b, c, e, f, l, q, vg) read txt.

πεποίηκεν (Pluperfect): D, (28 -η), 124, 565, 700
Swanson notes for 124: δι' ὅ πεποίηκεν λάθρα
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

λάθρα adv. "secretly, quietly"

Parallels:
NA28 Luke 8:47 ἰδοὺς δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὥτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα ἤλθεν καὶ προσπεσοῦσα αὐτῷ δι' ἤν αἰτίαν ἔπαθε τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἐστι παραχρήμα.

Compare LXX:
LXX Leviticus 15:27 πᾶς ὁ ἀπτόμενος αὐτῆς ἀκάθαρτος ἦσται καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἰμάτια καὶ λουσται τὸ σῶμα ὦδατι καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἦσται ἔως ἐσπέρας

"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 λαλοῦμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.

BYZ Mark 5:36 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εὐθέως ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλοῦμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ Μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πίστευε

eυθέως ἀκούσας  A, C, (İ, N, 828, 983), 0132, f13, 33, 579, L2211, Maj, a, Sy-H, goth

ἀκούσας  01c, D, Θ, 0126, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 892c, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2542, al, Lat, Co, Trg

παρακούσας  01*c, B, L, W, Δ, 892*, pc

01: Tischendorf writes: "παρα punctis notatum (a C?) 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.

eυθέως generally is a later word, Mk uses εὐθὺς. εὐθέως fits only to ἀκούσας and therefore the two are connected.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
52. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 5:38 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωτεὶ θάρυσον καὶ κλαῖοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά,

BYZ Mark 5:38 Καὶ έρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωτεὶ θάρυσον, κλαῖοντας 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, ff², Sy-H, boₘsₛ, 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 ἔλθων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ...  
NA28 Luke 8:51 ἔλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ...

Context:
NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὖν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν: ...  

Possibly the plural has been changed to the singular, because of the following singular θεωτεὶ.

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 ἐκβάλων πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὡς εἰς ἡν τὸ παιδίον.

BYZ Mark 5:40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ ὁ δὲ ἐκβάλων πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὡς εἰς ἡν τὸ παιδίον ἀνακείμενον.

---

**ἀνακείμενον**


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, Λ, 0153, 983, 1689 (=f13 c), 892, pc,

it (a, b, d, e, ff, i, r), 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 ἢ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκελτο πυρέσσουσα,  
NA28 Mark 2:4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον ὧποι ἀ παραλυτικὸς κατέκελτο.

BYZ John 5:6 τοῦτον ἱδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺς ἡδι χρόνον ἐχει λέγει αὐτῷ Θέλεις ὑγιῆς 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 ὁπού ἡμι is safe. Note that later in the verse ὁπού ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο appears.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 111
NA28 Mark 5:42 καὶ εὕθυς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιπάτει· ἢν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἐξέστησαν [εὕθυς] ἐκστάσει μεγάλη.

BYZ Mark 5:42 καὶ εὐθεὼς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιπάτει· ἢν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ ἐξέστησαν ______ ἐκστάσει μεγάλη

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 ms, 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, i, q), vg ms, sa pt, bo ms

οἱ γονεῖς al 46, vg ms (Lk)

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
BYZ Luke 8:56 καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρῆγγελεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἴπειν τὸ γεγονός

It is possible that εὕθυς 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 εὕθυς has been added to separate the two similar words ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει.

Weiss (Mk Com.): "The second εὕθυς, with the emphatical position in front of the dative, which should be emphasized, has been omitted due to its unusual position."

Other examples of εὕθυς 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 ἦρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες:

οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες B, 28\textsuperscript{c}, 892, pc, sa\textsuperscript{ms}, bo\textsuperscript{ms}, NA\textsuperscript{28}, 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\textsuperscript{st}
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 ἔθαυμαζον
NA28 Luke 4:28 καὶ ἐπλήθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 24:12 καὶ διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἄνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἄγαπη τῶν πολλῶν.

NA28 Mark 9:26 καὶ κράζας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας ἐξῆλθεν· καὶ ἐγένετο ὥσεi νεκρός, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὃτι ἀπέθανεν.
omit τοὺς: C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj
omt 01, A, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 0274, 33, 579, 892, 1071, pc

NA28 Mark 12:37 αὐτὸς Δαυίδ λέγει αὐτῶν κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστιν υἱός; Καὶ [ὁ] πολλὸς ὄχλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.
omit ὃ: 01, D, W, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc
omt 01, A, B, L, Ψ, f1, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj
In all three cases in Mk of a form of ὂι 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 ὂι 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 ὂι in brackets
TVU 113
Minority reading
NA28 Mark 6:2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες: πόθεν τούτῳ ταύτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαύται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνομεναι;

ἵνα (καὶ) δυνάμεις τοιαύται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται;
C*, D, K, Π, Y, Θ, 124, 346, 700, al28, UBS12

ὁτι (καὶ) δυνάμεις τοιαύται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται;
U, pc, TR(!), Kilpatrick, Elliott(!)

One of the above: b(et ut), d, ff²(ut et), f(quod), i, q, r¹ (ut), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, saṃs Lat(a, aur, c, e, l, vg) read txt.
If (and which) minuscules support ὁτι is not clear. The info we currently have comes from UBS⁴, 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 ὁτι only. Tischendorf marks it as "cum minusculis ut videtur vix multis".
Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

γινώμεναι 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?"

ὁτι: "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 αὐτή 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 per labia 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 ἴνα reading!"
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 114

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 6:3 οὖχ οὖτός ἐστιν οἱ τέκτων, ὁ ὑιὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήτου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος;

txt 01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 124, 788(=f13b), 28, 157, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(d, f, ff², l, q, vg), Sy, Co, goth

P45vid, f13, 33vid, 565, 579, 700, 2542,
it(a, aur, b, c, e, i, r²), vgms, bo ms, Or:

tοῦ τέκτωνος, ὁ ὑιὸς καὶ τῆς  P45vid, f13a, 33vid
τοῦ τέκτωνος, ὁ ὑιὸς τῆς  346(f13), vgms
τοῦ τέκτωνος, ὁ ὑιὸς καὶ  69(f13), 700
τοῦ τέκτωνος ὑιὸς, ἀδελφὸς  579
τοῦ τέκτωνος, ὑιὸς  Σvid, 565, 2542
_____________ ὑιὸς τῆς Sy-Pal

P45 clearly reads τέκτωνος. It is uncertain whether it reads τῆς or καὶ τῆς.
Swanson has: ... τεκτωνοὶς ὁ υἱὸς ...
NA notes it as “vid for ... τεκτωνὸς ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ...
Comfort and Barrett also agree with this, but note additionally that ὑιὸς is abbreviated as a nomen sacrum as Υ[arshal. This is correct. Actually the C is quite visible, too. Also part of the Ν of τέκτωνος.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.
33 has a partial lacuna:

οὐχ οὖτος ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτωνος [ ... Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήτος
579 omits Μαρίας.

Origen (Contra Celsus 6:36):
οὐ βλέπων στὶ σουδαμίῳ τῶν εν ταῖς εκκλησίαις φερομένων ευαγγέλιων τεκτῶν αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἀναγεγράφαται
"in none of the gospels current in the churches is Jesus himself ever described as being a carpenter."

Justin (dial. 88,8)

μν’ νομιζομένου ἱωσήφ τοῦ τεκτόνος υἱοῦ υπαρχεῖν καὶ τεκτόνος νομιζομένου ταῦτα γαρ τα τεκτονικὰ ἐργα ευργαζότει εν ανθρώποις ὦν, ἀροτρα καὶ 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 οὐχὶ 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 υἱὸς ἐστίν 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 Ἰωσήφος 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'), 22, 28, 157, 892, 1342, 1424, 2542, Maj, Sy, sa*ss*, goth

**Ἰωσήφ**  B, D, L, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, pc², a, d, sa*ss*, bo pc = 428, 693c

**Ἰωάννης**  01, pc, Lat (aur, b, f, l, q, r', vg)

*omit:*  953, c, ff², i

Lacuna: Sy-S

**B:** no umlaut

**Compare Mt 13:55:**
NA28 Matthew 13:55 καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβος καὶ Ἰωσῆφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας;
BYZ Matthew 13:55 καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβος καὶ Ἰωσῆ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδα

Byz **Ἰωσῆς**  K, L, W, Δ, Π, f13, 565, 1241, Maj-part, k
txt **Ἰωσῆφ**  01c, 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 Ἰωσῆφ μήτηρ
BYZ Matthew 27:56 καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ μήτηρ

Byz  **Ἰωσῆς**  A, B, C, Dc, f1, f13, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt **Ἰωσῆφ**  01, D*, L, W, Θ, pc, Lat, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 15:40 καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήφος μήτηρ
BYZ Mark 15:40 καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆ μήτηρ
NA28 Mark 15:47 καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτως ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθεται.
BYZ Mark 15:47 καὶ Μαρία Ἰωσῆ ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τίθεται

NA28 Acts 4:36 Ἰωσῆς δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς
BYZ Acts 4:36 Ἰωσῆς δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρναβᾶς

Byz has in all Gospels Ἰωσῆς.
txt has Ἰωσήτως in Mk and Ἰωσῆς in Mt/Acts.
urtles Ἰωσήτως is the Genitive form of Ἰωσῆς.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant: Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἔθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιήγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

έθαύμαζεν 01, B, 565, pc, WH, NA28, Weiss, Tis, Bal

txt ἐθαύμαζεν A, C, D, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Sy-H, WH

Δ (spatio relictō) omits καὶ ἔθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν
b, e, omit καὶ ἔθαύμαζεν
B: no umlaut

ἐθαύμαζεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular
ἐθαύμασεν indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
περιήγεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 6:5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδώνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγους ἀρρώστους ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρετο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὡς ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες έθαύμαζον.

NA28 Mark 15:44 ο δὲ Πιλάτος ἔθαύμασεν εἰ ἦδη τέθηκεν

NA28 John 4:27 Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἠλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει· οὐδεὶς μεντοῦ εἶπεν· τί ζητεῖς ἢ τί λαλεῖς μετ’ αὐτῆς;

The words do not appear in the parallels.

The words do not appear in the parallels. 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").
On the other hand compare Mk 15:44, where the Aorist was changed to the Imperfect.
Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that ἐθαυμᾷζεν is a conformation to the following imperfect περιήγετον.
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 χιτώνας.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἐνδύσασθαι B\(^{c2}\), S, Π*, Ω, 124, 892, pc, Gre, Trg\(^{ma}\), 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\(^{ma}\)

ἐνδύσησθαι A, D, W, Δ, 28, 579, pc

ἐνδεδύσθαι L, Ν, Σ, 1424, al

B p. 1285 A 42: the Ε is canceled by a slash. Both the Ε and the slash are not enhanced and are faded. The ΛΙ 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
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 σκεῦς ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ γυναικὶ οὐδὲ μὴ ἐνδύσῃσθαι (subjunctive aorist middle 3rd person singular) ἀνὴρ στολὴν γυναικεῖαν ὃτι βδέλυγμα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σοῦ ἐστὶν πάς ποιῶν ταῦτα

Extremely difficult to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)
NA28 Mark 6:11 καὶ ὁς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται, ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 6:11 καὶ ὁσοὶ ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

Byz A, C, D, Θ, 983 (=f13c), 33, 157, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Trgmg (Lk)
txt 01, B, (C, vid), L, W, Δ, (f1), f13, 28, 579, pc, Sy-S, Co

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:14 καὶ ὁς ἂν μὴ δέξηται, ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούση τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

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)
NA28 Mark 6:11 καὶ ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δεξηται ὕμας μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὕμων, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὕμων εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 6:11 καὶ ὃςοι ἂν μὴ δέξωται ὕμας μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὕμων ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκείθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὕμων εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς ἁμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἑκείνη.

Byz A, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892², Maj, a, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, goth

txt 01, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, 28*, 565, 892*, 1342, 2542, pc,
     Lat, Sy-S, sa, bopt

B: umlaut! (p. 1285 B, line 12) μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 12 Καὶ ἐξελθόντες

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:14-10:15 καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὕμας μηδὲ ἀκούση τοὺς λόγους ὕμων, ἐξερχόμενοι ἐξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἑκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοινοτόν τῶν ποδῶν ὕμων. ἁμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ τῇ πόλει ἑκείνη.

NA28 Luke 9:5 καὶ ὃςοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὕμας, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἑκείνης τὸν κοινοτόν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὕμων ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς. - does not have the words

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 11:24 πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι γῇ Σοδόμων ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἢ σοὶ.

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 ἠκουσεν οἱ βασιλεὺς Ἰρωνίδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὦτι Ἰωάννης οἱ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἠκουσεν οἱ βασιλεὺς Ἰρωνίδης φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὦτι Ἰωάννης οἱ βαπτίζων ἐκ νεκρῶν ἡγέρθη, 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, r¹, vg), Sy, Co, goth, WH³, Gre, Trg

txt B, (D), Nμ, W, 0133, pc⁸, a, b, d, ff², vg₃, WH, NA²⁸, Trg₃⁴

εἴπεν τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ  Φ (Mt 14:2)

εἴπεν 766

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:2 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἡκουσεν δὲ Ἰρώνιδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὦτι Ἰωάννης ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

Context:
NA28 Mark 6:15 ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ...
NA28 Mark 6:16 ἄκοψας δὲ ὦ Ἰρώνιδης ἔλεγεν· ὦν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἡγέρθη.
It is possible that scribes changed ἐλεγον to ἐλέγεν to conform it to the preceding ἤκουσεν (so Weiss). Also the missing subject for ἐλεγον could have been a problem.

On the other hand it is possible that ἐλέγεν has been replaced by ἐλεγον to conform it to the following two ἐλεγον 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'."

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.]
"whom I beheaded, John, he has been raised."
"whom I beheaded, John, he is it; he was raised out of the dead."

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
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 ἡγέρθη 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 ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρῴδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν.

T&T #79

καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς φυλακὴν D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, pc,
et misit in carcerem it(a, b, d, f, ff², i, q, r³)

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 ο ὅ δὲ οὐκ ἦθελεν ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακὴν ἐως ἀποδῷ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.

A natural expansion (possibly from Mt 18:30) of the slightly condensed form.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
Now 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 ὁ γὰρ ἡπόρευ ἔ παντοδύναμος σου χείρ καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου υλῆς ἐπιπέμψαι αὐτοῖς πλῆθος ἀρκῶν ἔθρασεσές λέοντας
"For your all-powerful hand, which created the world out of formless matter, did not lack the means to send upon them a multitude of bears, or bold lions."

ἡπόρευ 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. ἐποίει is often written with a very small loop only. In this case a transition from ἐποίει to ἠπόρευ 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 διηπόρευ, also the wording is completely different.

Bonner notes that it is also possible to translate ἠπόρευ as "raise a question". In this case the passage would become:
"and having heard him, he was want to raise many questions, 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 ἠπόρευ (v.l. ἐποίει). Mark’s order is definitely in favor of taking πολλὰ with ἀκούσας. This, however, enables us to decide in favor of ἠπόρευ against ἐποίει, because, while ἠπόρευ 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."

ἡπορεύτο, 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 ἡπόρευ 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

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
59. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθοῦσας τὴς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰηρωδιάδος καὶ ὄρχησμένης ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἰηρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ ἂντησόν με δὲ εὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δῶσω σοι.

BYZ Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθοῦσας τὴς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἰηρωδιάδος καὶ ὄρχησμένης καὶ ἄρεσας, τῷ Ἰηρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ ἂντησόν με δὲ εὰν θέλῃς καὶ δῶσω 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, NA28, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, 565, (arm)

τὴς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς Ἰηρωδιάδος W, pc, L253, L1043
"And when her daughter, Herodias, came in ..."

τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς Ἰηρωδιάδος f1, 22, pc, 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 τῷ Ἰηρώδου ὄρχησατο ἡ θυγατὴ τῆς Ἰηρωδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἰηρώδῃ,
Compare previous verse 21:
NA28 Mark 6:21 Καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δείπνου ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρῶτοις 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 αὕτης τῆς Ἡρώδιαδος 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 αὕτης τῆς into αὐτοῦ. He suggests that possibly originally no pronoun was present at all and conjectures: τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἡρώδιαδος.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:22 καὶ εἰσελθοῦσας τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης καὶ ὀρχησαμένης ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις.

εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ: αἰτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλης, καὶ δώσω σοι.

οἱ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν
P45, 01, B, C*, L, Δ, 33, 1342, L1043, sa, WH, NA, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt C3, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, Maj, it, Sy-H, bo-mss

εἶπεν ὁ Ἰωάννης P45*

εἶπεν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Α

更多的证据
P45, A, 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 ὃθεν μεθ’ ὄρκου ὑμολόγησεν 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 δὲ 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O1, B</th>
<th>txt</th>
<th>Byz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kai. εἰσελθούσης</td>
<td>ἦρεσεν</td>
<td>εἶπεν</td>
<td>Kai. ἄρεσασθης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai. ἄρεσασθης</td>
<td>ἦρεσεν</td>
<td>εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This observation makes it probable that these two variants are connected. Note that the support for ἦρεσεν - εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς (= txt) is zero! If we assume that ἄρεσασθης is a conformation to the preceding participles, then also εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς must be secondary.

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
61. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


BYZ Mark 6:23 καὶ ὄμοσεν αὐτῇ ὦ τι ὅτι ὁ ἑαν με αἰτήσης δῶσω σοι ἐως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου

αὐτῇ πολλὰ P45?, D, Θ, 565, 700, it(a, b, d, ff, i, q), vg<sup>ms</sup>, arm, Bois

— πολλὰ P45?, 28

αὐτῇ O1, A, B, C<sup>2</sup>, Δ, (f1), f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, L1043, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth, NA<sup>28</sup>, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

**omit:** L, sa<sup>ms</sup>, bo<sup>ms</sup>

**C<sup>vid</sup>** W, Γ, 22, pc omit due to h.t. (22 δῶσω σοι - 23 δῶσω σοι).

P45: NA notes P45<sup>vid</sup> for πολλὰ without αὐτῇ. Greeven and Comfort have P45 for txt. P45 starts from a lacuna with πολλὰ, 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 ὄμοσεν, probably ὄμοσεν. A letter has been erased and an /octet 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 reduplicicated αὐτῇ. The first letter does not look like a Π, but like a Λ.

f1 reads the verse: ἐως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου καὶ ὄμοσεν αὐτῇ.

Possibly the words have been omitted (in an ancestor of f1, note 22l!) 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 f1l)

579: Acc. to Schmidtke, the text of Mk 16-28a has been taken from a different (Byz) Vorlage.

B: no umlaut
ψωμοσεν ὑπὸ ὦμοιός "swear, vow, make an oath"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:7 θεὸν μεθ’ ορκου ὲμολογησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὡ εἶν αἰτήσεται.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:45 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, W, Latt
NA28 Mark 3:12 καὶ πολλὰ ἐπέτιμα 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 ὀχλὸν παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοία ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.
omit πολλὰ: D, 33, it(b, d, ff², i, q, r¹)
NA28 Mark 5:10 καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: L, 892, pc, e, g¹, Sy-S
NA28 Mark 5:23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, pc, it, Sy-S
NA28 Mark 5:43 καὶ διεστειλάτο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ
omit πολλὰ: D, 1424, pc, it
NA28 Mark 6:34 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ.
omit πολλὰ: Θ, Sy-S

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 6:20 καὶ ἀκοῦσας 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:

---

**αἰτήσῃς**
01, H, L, f13, 892, 1071, 1424, al, Lat(aur, b, c, l, q, vg), Sy-P, bo, WH<sup>172</sup>, NA<sup>25</sup>

**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<sup>2</sup>, i), Sy-H, sa, goth, WH

**με αἰτήσῃ**
Δ

C<sup>a</sup> vid, W, Γ, pc *omit due to h.t.* (22 δῶσω σοι - 23 δῶσω σοι).

f<sub>1</sub> has: 6:22 αἰτήσον με ὦ ἐὰν θέλης, καὶ δῶσω σοι 23 ἐως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου. καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ.

Sy-S omits ὦ τι ἐὰν με αἰτήσῃς δῶσω 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. Greven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 323) notes it for the 01 reading, but Comfort and Barrett for the B reading. Comfort gives it as:

> ἀγίτησῃς πολλὰ ὦ τι ἐὰν μ[ε]

without any indication that the M is doubtful. Kenyon’s ed. pr. has a dot under the Mu. The remaining ink is not completely clear, but most likely a M.

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 ὤθεν μεθ’ ὀρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὁ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται.

Compare previous verse 22:
NA28 Mark 6:22 εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ· αἰτησόν με ὁ ἐὰν θέλης, καὶ δώσω σοι.

The omission of μὲ 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 μὲ, too.
f1 rearranged the sentence to omit the second rather redundant ὁ τι ἐὰν μὲ αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι.

Rating: - (indecisive)
He said to them, "Come away to a deserted place all by yourselves …
And they/he went away in the boat to a deserted place …
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.
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.
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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεί καὶ προήλθον αὐτούς.

No txt in NA and SQE!

**ἐγνωσαν** B*, D, f1, Trg, WH

**ἐπέγνωσαν** 01, A, Bć, L, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA25, Weiss, WHmg

0187: lacuna, but space considerations strongly suggest txt.
B p. 1286 A 38: The ἐπι 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: "B3 demum ut vdtr", but assigns it in his NT 8th edition to B2.
Lacuna: C

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:13 Ἄκοισας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκείθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ’ ἰδίαν καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὀχλοὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

**ἐπιγνόντες** Ψ

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 11:27 Πάντα μοί παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγνώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μή ὁ πατήρ

**γνώσκει** C

Variation in both ways occurs. The meaning is the same, but γνώσκω 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 αὐτοὺς.

BYZ Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν πολλοί καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς καὶ συνήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν.

**Byz**  P84<sup>vid</sup>, A, K, Π, f13, (33), 157, 1071, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H
______ συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτὸν.  A
______ συνεισήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν.  f13

συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ συνήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν  33

καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς  01, B, 0187, 892, 1342, pc, Lat, Co
καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοὺς  L, f13, 579, 713, 1241, 1675, 2766
καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοῖς  Δ, Θ, 1424, pc

καὶ συνήλθον αὐτοῦ  D (not d)
καὶ συνήλθον αὐτῷ  28, 700, pc
καὶ συνεισήλθον αὐτῷ  788
καὶ ἠλθον αὐτοῦ  565
καὶ ἠλθον ἐκεῖ  f1 (omitting first ἐκεῖ)

**omitted:**  W, c, Sy-S

P84 (6<sup>th</sup> 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 ὁ ὀχλος ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῆ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>4Gospels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>προερχόμαι</td>
<td>go ahead, go on before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσερχόμαι</td>
<td>come or go to, approach;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67(Mt 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνέρχόμαι</td>
<td>come together, gather; meet;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνευερχόμαι</td>
<td>go in with, enter with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 αὐτοὺς 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 συνήλθον αὐτοῦ? If we accept the long reading as original, then the short readings are quite easy to understand: συνήλθον αὐτοῦ was omitted [accidentally] and D et al. omitted [deliberately] the difficult προῆλθον αὐτοὺς. - If finally συνήλθον αὐτοῦ or συνήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν was original, is difficult to decide."

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) thinks that the words have been added to prepare for the abrupt ἔξελθον 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 αὐτοὺς is bad Greek for ἔφθασαν αὐτοὺς.

Note that in this verse there is also one of the so called Minor Agreements: οἱ ὀχλοι ἡκολούθησαν 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 αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλω ἄγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν.

Not in NA and only incomplete in SQE!

ἐγγιστα D, 700, Latt
proximas

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἐγγιστα superlative of ἐγγύς "near, close to; on the verge of"
kύκλω as an adjective with the article: "around, nearby"

Context:
NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιήγησαν τὰς κώμας κύκλω διδάσκων

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:15 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.

It is possible that κύκλω is a harmonization to Lk, but the support is just too bad. In the Gospels only ἐγγύς appears elsewhere. ἐγγιστα appears 11 times in the LXX. Probably ἐγγιστα 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 κύκλω.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 132
NA28 Mark 6:36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλω ἁγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἁγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν.

BYZ Mark 6:36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλω ἁγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἁγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτοις τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

Not cited in NA, but in SQE!

Byz P84(6th CE), A, K, III, f13, 33, 700, 1342, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H

omit ἄρτοις 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 κύκλω κώμας καὶ ἁγροὺς καταλύσωσιν from Lk for εἰς τοὺς κύκλω ἁγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἁγοράσωσιν 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 ἁγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτοις. There appears to be very little space after ἑαυτοῖς, so that even τί φάγωσιν appears to be too long. They suggested ἄρτοις 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 ἁγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.
NA28 Luke 9:12 ... ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλω κώμας καὶ ἁγροὺς καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπιστημόν, ὅτι ὥδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἔσμεν.

NA28 Matthew 15:32 ὁτι ἠδη ἠμέραν τρεῖς προσμένουσιν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν.

NA28 John 6:5 Ἐπάρας οὖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος ὁτι πολὺς ὀχλὸς ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγει πρὸς Φίλιππον· πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὕτως;

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὀχλὸν, ὅτι ἠδη ἠμέραν τρεῖς προσμένουσιν 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)
64. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

Feeding of the 5,000:

NA28 Mark 6:38 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς: πόσους ἡρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἵδετε. καὶ γνώμενς λέγουσιν: πέντε, καὶ δύο ἵχθυας.

**ἔχετε ἡρτους:**

B, L, Δ, Θ, 0187, 1342, 2542, WH, NA, Weiss, Trg, SBL

**txt** P45, 01, A, D, W, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj

0187: πό

[σους ἔχ]ετε

[ἠρτους:] ὑπά

[γετε ἵδε]ετε

**Lacuna:** C

**B:** no umlaut

Parallel: Feeding of the 4,000:

NA28 Matthew 15:34 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: πόσους ἡρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἴπαν: ἐπτά καὶ ὀλίγα ἱχθύδια.  

NA28 Mark 8:5 καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτοῖς: πόσους ἔχετε ἡρτους; οἱ δὲ εἴπαν: ἐπτά.

**ἔχετε ἡρτους** A, B, L, Δ, f1, 346, 788, 157, 1071, Maj

**ἡρτους 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 ἡρτους, 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:39 καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλίναι πάντας συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ.

T&T #85

ἀνακλίθηναι 01, B*, G, Θ, Φ, 047, 055, 0187, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, L2211, al, Sy-S, Or

WH, NA25, Weiss, Bois

ἀνακλήθηναι 13, 346, 2, 565

txt ἀνακλίναι A, B, D, L, W, Δ, 33, 579, 892*, 1424, Maj, f, I, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, Or

0187: αὐτοῖς ἀνακλήθηναι 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

ἀνακλίναι  infinitive aorist active
ἀνακλήθηναι  infinitive aorist passive

Parallels: Feeding of the 5.000
NA28 Matthew 14:19 καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὀχλοὺς ἀνακληθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου,


Feeding of the 4.000
NA28 Mark 8:6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὀχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
NA28 Matthew 15:35 καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὀχλῳ 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 ἀνακλίναι to the parallel reading (ἀνακληθῆναι) 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 ἀνακλίναι 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:

*omit* 01, B, L, Δ, 0187vid, 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc, d, sa-mss, bo, *WH, NA²⁸, 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 ἔγενετο αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπομποῦσθαι 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 ἡπιάτο;

*omit αὐτοῦ:* W

NA28 Mark 6:35 Καὶ ἦδη ὤρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσέλθοντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἦδη ὤρα πολλῆς·

*omit αὐτοῦ:* W, f1, 28
NA28 Mark 7:17 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσήλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ὁ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολὴν.

omit αὐτοῦ: Δ

NA28 Mark 8:1 Ἔν ἑκείναις ταῖς ὁμέραις πάλιν πολλοὶ ὕλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἔχοντων 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 ὁ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεται τις ὁδε ἠρείμασι λέγει αὐτοὶ:

omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 Mark 8:6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὕλῳ ἀναπησείν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἐδίδον τοὺς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατίθεσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὕλῳ.

omit αὐτοῦ: 33, 579, 1424

NA28 Mark 8:27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ὁ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κόμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι εἶναι;

omit 2nd αὐτοῦ: A

NA28 Mark 8:33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἴδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὑπαγε ὑπίσω μοι, σατανᾷ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἁνθρώπων.

omit αὐτοῦ: 579

NA28 Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἔλθοντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὕλου πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

ADD αὐτοῦ: Θ, f13, 1424, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 9:28 Καὶ ἐςελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον ὁ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ ἴδιαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβάλειν αὐτὸ;

omit αὐτοῦ: W
NA28 Mark 10:10 Καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν.

omit αὐτοῦ: 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 28, 579, 1424
add αὐτοῦ: A, D, W, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj (not in NA but in SQE!)

NA28 Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἠψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς.

ADD αὐτοῦ: D, Θ, 565, 700, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 10:24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἔθαμβούντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὦ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκρίθης λέγει αὐτοῖς· τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολον ἔστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·

ADD αὐτοῦ: D, Θ, 565, 700, Sy-S

NA28 Mark 10:46 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὠχλον ἱκανοῦ ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαίους, τυφλὸς προσαίτης, ἐκάθεντο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν.

omit αὐτοῦ: Θ

NA28 Mark 12:43 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὐτή ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν τῶν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον·

omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 Mark 14:12 Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν αζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουν, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἓνα φάγης τὸ πάσχα;

omit αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 Mark 14:16 καὶ ἔξηλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἤλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἤτοιμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

omit αὐτοῦ: 01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, f1, 28, 579, 892, 1424, pc
add αὐτοῦ: A, C, D, W, Θ, f13, 565, 700, 1342, Maj

NA28 Mark 14:32 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανὶ καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· καθίσατε ὧδε ἐώς προσεύξωμαι.

omit αὐτοῦ: A
At the following verses the pronoun is safe:

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:
(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 ἔδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατίθωσιν αὑτοῖς,

omit 01, B, L, Δ, 33, 359, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, pc, d, sa-mss, bo, WH
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.
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 ἑκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὀχλοῦ ὑποτασσόμενος τῶν μαθητῶν βασιλείας. 

**txt**  
*omit* 01, D, L, N, Δ, 0131, f1, 28, 892, L2211, pc, NA28, 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:


BYZ Mark 6:44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἀρτους πεντακισχίλιοι ἀνδρείς

T&T #86 (partial, unfortunately it does not list the ωσ(ε)ι variants)
cp. ECM-Parallels also!

**Western-non-interpolation?**

**omit:** P45, D, W, 788(=f13), 79, 2193, Lat, sa

ως 01, Θ, 565, 700, 2542

ωσεῖ f1, 28, 372, 2737

τοὺς ἀρτους

τοὺς πέντε ἀρτους

τοὺς ἀρτους ως

τοὺς ἀρτους ωσεῖ

τοὺς ἀρτους καὶ ἰχθύας

αὐτοὺς

A, B, L, Δ, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, f, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo

M, pc⁴ (= 162, 174, 1220, 2661)

176, 2680

pc
c

Sy-S ("that ate of them ", acc. to Burkitt)

**Lacuna:** C

**B:** no umlaut

**Parallels:**

NA28 Matthew 14:21 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἀνδρείς ωσεῖ πεντακισχίλιοι

D, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 700, pc: ως

NA28 Matthew 15:38 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι

B, Θ, f13, 33, 892, 1582: ἦσαν ως

01, 579, pc: ἦσαν ωσεῖ

NA28 Luke 9:14 ἦσαν γὰρ ωσεῖ ἀνδρείς πεντακισχίλιοι

D, it: ως
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 \( \omega`j / \omega`jei \) is a natural addition.

The omission of \( \tau`ouj`a\;\rho`touj`\) could be simply a harmonization to the parallel accounts. Both Mt and Lk don’t have it (Minor Agreement). The quite strong support is strange nevertheless. There should be no problem with \( \tau`ouj`a\;\rho`touj`\) 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 ἦνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβήμαται εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν</th>
<th>πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P45vid, W, Sy-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q (&quot;a&quot; = &quot;from&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν</th>
<th>εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b, i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D, N, Σ, Φ, f13ab, Lat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Θ, 28, 565, 700, Or, sapt, bo, Sy-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f13c (Mt?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33: has a lacuna, but from space considerations probably reads txt.

**Parallels:**
NA28 Matthew 14:22 Καὶ εὐθέως ἦνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβήμαται εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους.

NA28 Matthew 14:34 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἠλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ.


BYZ Luke 9:10 ... εἰς τόπουν ἐρημοῦν πόλεως καλομένης Βηθσαϊδάν.

NA28 John 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἦρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναοῦμι. καὶ σκοτία ἦδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὕτω ἔληλυθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:1 Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασημῶν.
NA28 Mark 5:21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἱησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὁ χλὸς πολὺς ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ ἤν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.
NA28 Mark 6:1 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ,
NA28 Mark 6:6 Καὶ περιήγησαν τὰς κόμας κύκλω διδάσκων.
NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπήλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἑρμοῦ τόπον κατ’ ἱδίαν.
NA28 Mark 6:53 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρῆτ καὶ προσωμισθήσαν.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:22 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδᾶν.
NA28 Mark 14:28 προάξω ὕμας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
NA28 Mark 16:7 ὅτι προάγει ὕμας 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 Βηθσαϊδᾶν (f13°)

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 ἕναντίας or something like that. εἰς and πρὸς appear to have the same meaning here. Also πρὸς B 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 αὐτός δὲ ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον. D, Θ, 565, b
This could be read as:
"But he dismissed the crowd to Bethsaida."

Regarding αὐτόν: 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, αὐτόν 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 αὐτόν though.]

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 138

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 6:47 καὶ ὁμιάς γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοίον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔπι τῆς γῆς.

T&T #87

ην πάλαι P45, D, f1, 22, 28, 2542, pc8
iam erat it(a, b, d, ff2, i), vg mss, geo mss, Gre, Bois
pc = 251, 660*, 697, 791, 1192, 1210, 1365, 2372
omit: Δ

τ1 ην A, U, 124
τ2 ην M

Δ: The scribe, who is unaccustomed to Greek, is probably confused here. He takes γενομένη for one word and ης for ην, since he writes erat above ης.

Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, r1, vg) read txt.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

πάλαι "already"
ηδη "now, already"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοίον ἤδη σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
BYZ Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοίον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης

NA28 John 6:16 Ὡς δὲ ὅμιλα ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θαλάσσην 17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ σκοτία ἦδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὕτω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

Compare next verse:
NA28 Mark 6:48 ... περὶ τετάρτην φυλακῆν τῆς νυκτὸς ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἦθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτοὺς.
Compare also:

NA28 Mark 15:44 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἔθαμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθηκεν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν. εἰ 1st ἤδη: safe

 отмет: ἤδη for πάλαι: B, D, W, Θ, pc
 καὶ εἰπεν 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, ἢν 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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>01, A, 1342, 1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος</td>
<td>f1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος σφόδρα</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς σφόδρα</td>
<td>P45vid, W, Θ, f13, 28, 700, pc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lacuna: C

**B:** no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 14:24 τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἦδη σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχεν βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων, ἢν 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 φάντασμα ἐστίν, καὶ ἄνεκραξαν· 50 πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον καὶ ἐταράχθησαν.

T&T #88
Western non-interpolation?

καὶ ἄνεκραξαν 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 ἄνεκραξαν· 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 φάντασμα ἐστίν, 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)
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 ἑθαύμαζον.

T&T #89

λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ  A, X, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, NA28, Bois, Weiss

λίαν  01, B, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc⁵, Co, WH, Gre
pc = 49, 294, 759, 1032, 2533

περισσός  D, (Θ), 700
ἐκ περισσοῦ  W, 1582, 2193*(=f1), 28, 72, 1313
ἐκ περισσός  1, 2542(=f1)

περισσός ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἑθαύμαζον 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 ἑθαύμαζον.
(checked at the film)
Swanson and Gregory also agree in περιέσωσεν, but probably περιέσωσεν αὐτοὺς is just a scribal error for περισσός ἐν ἑαυτοῖς 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 περισσός
Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:37 καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσουσα λέγοντες: 
ὑπερεκπερισσῶς D, U, f1, 700

NA28 Mark 10:26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσουσα 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 ἐκραξαν·
περισσοτέρως P, 28, 1071, Maj-part(E, S, U, Γ, Ω)

Note also:
NA28 Mark 1:35 Καὶ πρωὶ ἑννυχὰ λίαν ἀναστὰς ἔξηλθεν
omit: W

NA28 Mark 9:3 καὶ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλβοῦντα λευκὰ λίαν
omit: Δ, 1424

NA28 Mark 16:2 καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἐρχονται
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 ἀνεμος, καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο.

BYZ Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἀνεμος καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἑθαύμαζον.

T&T #90

Byz A, D, W, X, Θ, f13, 33, (565), 700, Maj, it (a, aur, b, d, f, q, r¹), vg², Sy-P, Sy-H, Trg²
ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἑθαύμαζον λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς 565
ἔθαύμαζον καὶ ἐξίσταντο 517, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc⁹
pc = 261, 695, 723, 780, 950, 1076, 1396, 1534, 1557

txt 01, B, l, Δ, (f1), 28, 892, 1342, pc⁸, Lat (c, ff, i, l, vg), Sy-S, Co, WH, NA²⁵
f1: ἑξεπλήσσοντο (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 ἑθαύμαζον.
NA28 Mark 6:6 καὶ ἑθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 12:23 καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι
NA28 Luke 2:47 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἄκουόντες αὐτοῦ
NA28 Acts 2:7 ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἑθαύμαζον 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 ἑθαύμαζον.
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 ἀγροὺς, ἐν ταῖς ἄγοραις ἔτιθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτοῦ ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται.

Not in NA but in SQE!

**πλατείας**    D, 565, 700, 2542, Lat("plateis" a, b, d, f, i, l, q, r, vg)

**ἄγορας**    conj. A. Pallis (1932)
"street, highway"

Acc. to Lewis Sy-S reads: "in the cities, villages or fields and streets".

aur, c, ff² omit the words ἐν ταῖς ἄγοραις.

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

**πλατεῖα** "broad way, open street, wide road"

**ἄγορα** "market place, especially as the center of public life forum, public square"

**ἄγυια** "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,

πλατεία appears nowhere in Mk, but 3 times in Mt and 3 times in Lk.
ἄγορα appears 3 times in Mk.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 27) sees πλατείας as a correction, because "there are no market-places in the ἄγορα".
The conjecture by A. Pallis (Notes, 1932) is noteworthy.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 144
NA28 Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοινάς χειρὶν, τούτ’ ἐστιν ἀνίπτως, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους.

BYZ Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κοινὰς χειρὶν τούτ’ ἐστιν ἀνίπτως ἐσθίοντας ἄρτους ἐμέψαντο.

Byz (D), W, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 579, 788, Maj-part, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa

ἄρτους ἐμέψαντο f1, 22, Maj-part, a, f, i, vg

ἄρτον ἐμέψαντο 2c, pc, it, Sy

tοὺς ἄρτους ἐμέψαντο W, Θ, f13, 33, 579, 700
tοὺς ἄρτους κατέγνωσαν D

txt 01, A, B, L, X, Γ, Δ, 0274, 157, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj-part,
b, Sy-S, Co, goth

ἀρτοῦς A, X, Γ, 157, 1424, Maj-part

ἀρτον 01, 2*, 1342, b

τοὺς ἄρτους B, L, Δ, 0274, 892

αὐτοῦς 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 μαθηταὶ σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοινὰς χειρὶν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;


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 ἐμέψαντο 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:

τοῦς καιρός

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 Φαρισαίοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἔδω μὴ πυγμη γινόμεναι τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίονσιν,

πυγμη 01, W, (aur), b, f, l, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, Tis
omit: Δ, Sy-S, sa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;momento&quot;</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;subinde&quot;</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;primo&quot;</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;crebro&quot;</td>
<td>f, l, vg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;crebro pugillo&quot;</td>
<td>aur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pugillo&quot;</td>
<td>c, ff, i, q, r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"for a moment?" (στιγμή?)
"repeatedly"
"first"
"repeatedly"
"repeatedly, fist"
"fist"

Arabic Diatessaron: "mit guter Waschung" (Preuschen)
"thoroughly" (Hill, Hogg)
"crebro" (Ciasca)

Note also:
πυκμη D

πυγμη conj. A. Pallis (1932)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

πυγμη πυγμη "fist", dative feminine singular
πυκνα πυκνός "frequent, often"

Compare:
NA28 Luke 5:33 οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνά καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὀμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίονσιν 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 with the dry hand.

πυγμή is certainly the harder reading.

An old crux interpretum:
J. Wellhausen (1909): "What πυγμή means, we don’t know."
R. McL. Wilson (1962): "No satisfactory explanation has yet been offered."

Epiphanius (4th CE): πυγμή μεν τας χειρας νυπτομενοι, πυγμή δε και μολυσμους τινας δι’ υδατων και λοιτρων αποσημηχομενοι.
This seems to require the understanding of πυγμή as "frequent".

Theophylact (11th CE): Ου γαρ εν τω νομω γεγραπται νυπτεσθαι 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 πυγμή is an ellipsis for πυγμή ύδατος = "a handful of water". Against this interpretation must be noted that in our sources πυγμή 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 πυγμή 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 πυγμή. 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. πηγή. ... The correction πηγή 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 πυγμη is a meaningful reading and if Mark really wrote it."

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) supports Theophylact's understanding:

"Now πυγμη 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 Lausiaca of Palladius, to the phrase in chapter lv, p. 148, 1. 21, ἡ ψαλαθή τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῆ ὑδατί ψυχροτάτω. 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 πυγμη 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
- 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
- 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’ ἀγοράς ἔλαβε μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίονσιν,

Τὸ ὅταν ἔλθωσιν D, W, pc, it(all!), vg\textsuperscript{mss}, arm

cum venerint

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (p. 1287 B, line 6) καὶ ἀπ’ ἀγοράς ἔλαβε 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’ ἁγιοῦ ἔδω μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ ἐστιν ἡ παρέλαβουν κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοῦς ποτηρίων καὶ ἕστων καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινών].

T&T #92

βαπτίσωνται 01, Β, pc, sa, WH, NA, Weiss, Bal

**WH** have βαπτίσωνται in the margin. Tis reads txt.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

ῥαντίζωνω "sprinkle"; middle "wash oneself"

Compare:

"The Pharisee was amazed to see that he did not first wash before dinner."

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφεύντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

BYZ Mark 7:8 ἀφεύντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βαπτισμοὺς ἕστων 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.

ΠΑΝΤΓΙ
ΒΑΠΤΓΙ

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 49) thinks that βαπτίσωνται is a conformation to the following βαπτισμοῦς.

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 ραντίςω, which fits perfectly, into βαπτίζω. Perhaps scribes changed βαπτίσωνται to avoid a possible tautology with νύψωνται, 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 ἕαν μή βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἔσθιουσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἔστιν ἐν παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστών καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλίνων]

BYZ Mark 7:4 καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς ἕαν μή βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἔσθιουσιν καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ὥπερ ἐπιλαβον κρατεῖν βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστών καὶ χαλκίων καὶ κλίνων

T&T #93

**omit:** P45<sup>vid</sup>, 01, B, L, Δ, 28*, 1342, pc<sup>3</sup>, (Sy-S), sa<sup>ms</sup>, bo, WH, NA<sup>25</sup>

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 πυγμῆ 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:

Rating: - (indecisive)
ΤVU 149
NA28 Mark 7:5 καὶ ἔπερωτώσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς: διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναῖς χερσίν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

BYZ Mark 7:5
ἐπείτα ἔπερωτώσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου οὐ περιπατοῦσιν κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀλλὰ ἀνίπποις χερσίν ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον

Byz 01ε, A, L, X, Δ, 892, Maj, it(aur, b, c, f, ff, l), Sy, goth

txt 01*, B, (D, W), Θ, f1, 33, (565), 579, 700, 1342, 2542, pc, Lat(d, i, q, r1, vg), Co
koιναῖς ταῖς χερσίν  D, W, 565

koιναῖς χερσίν καὶ ἀνίπποις  P45, f13(omit καὶ)

immundis ("dirty")  a

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:2 καὶ ἰδιόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὧτι κοιναῖς χερσίν, τούτι ἐστὶν ἀνίπποις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους

NA28 Matthew 15:2 διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; ὦ γὰρ νίπτοται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.
NA28 Matthew 15:20 ταύτα ἐστὶν τὰ κοινοῦντα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, τὸ δὲ ἀνίπποις χερσίν φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

The reading of P45, f13 is clearly a conflation. κοιναῖς χερσίν 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 χείλεσιν με τιμᾶ, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.

ἀγαπᾷ D, W, a, b, c, Cl?, Tert?
diliget

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Quote from Isaiah:
LXX Isaiah 29:13 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδασκοντες 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)
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 ἐπίσημον ξεστών καὶ ποτηρίων καὶ ἄλλα παράμοια τοιαῦτα πολλά 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 ἄλλα.

**add before ἀφέντες:** D, Θ, 0131\(^{\text{vind}}\), 28, 565, 1071, it

Θ, 565: ... ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν ...

βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων 1342 (:: 7:4)

omitting καὶ ἄλλα ... ποιεῖτε.

**sine add:** P45, 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 22, pc\(^{14}\), Co, arm, geo, Diatess\(^{\text{Arab}}\)

pc = 17*, 26, 29, 34, 251, 660*, 697, 791, 924, 1005, 1210, 1278, 1365, 2372

**omit verse 8:** Sy-S (probably h.t. ἀνθρωπῶν - 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 ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ὁ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμοῦς ποτηρίων καὶ ἔστων καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινών]
NA28 Mark 7:13 ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαύτα 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 βαπτισμοῦς 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, NA25, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
tηρήσητε B, pc² (= 294, 519, 571, 1432)
txt D, W, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 2542, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Cyp, Bois

κρατήσητε 0211, pc³ (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
tηρήτε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
tηρέω "keep"

στήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural
ἵστημι "establish"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 15:3 οἶδὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· διὰ τί καὶ ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε (break, disobey) τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν;

NA28 Matthew 15:6 καὶ ἡκυρώσατε (cancel, disregard) τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν.

NA28 Matthew 19:17 τηρήσου τὰς ἐντολὰς.

NA28 John 15:10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ 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 θεοὺ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ 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 άλλα νόμον ἰστάνομεν.
NA28 Romans 10:3 ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν [δικαιοσύνην] ζητοῦντες στήσατε.

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 τηρεῖν is the normal word that is used with ἐντολή (13 times in the NT). But here τηρεῖν refers to παράδοσιν and not to ἐντολή. Greeven thinks that it is possible that τηρεῖν 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 ἀκουοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδώσει ύμῶν τῇ παρεδώκατε καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

T&T #96

τῇ μωρᾷ D, it, vgmas, Sy-Hmg
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 ἢ παρεδώκατε: καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

*omit:* W

*omit τοιαὐτά:* Δ, 983, 1689 (=f13°)

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 ἰδιωτῆς τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. 7 ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαίας λέγων:

Compare verse 8:

NA28 Mark 7:8 ἀφείνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

BYZ Mark 7:8 ἀφείνετε γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βαπτισμοῦ ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων; καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

txt P45, 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 22, pc

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)
NA28 Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἀκούσατε μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε.

BYZ Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάντα τὸν ὄχλον ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀκούσατε μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε.

Swanson has wrongly 579 for Byz against NA and Schmidtkel 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 ἄγροις, ἐν ταῖς ἁγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἄσθενοὺς καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ὕψαντα καὶ τὸ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἐπιθυμοῖς καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο αὐτοῦ ἔσωζοντο.

"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:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mt} & 17 = 1.6\% \text{ (relative, per verse)} \\
\text{Mk} & 28 = 4.1\% \\
\text{Lk} & 3 = 0.2\% \\
\text{Jo} & 45 = 5.1\%
\end{array}\]

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
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 Θε), 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  ο̣ έχων ώτα ἀκούετω.
NA28 Matthew 13:9  ο̣ έχων ώτα ἀκούετω.
NA28 Matthew 13:43  ο̣ έχων ώτα ἀκούετω.
NA28 Mark 4:9  καὶ ἔλεγεν: ὅς ἔχει ώτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.
NA28 Mark 4:23  εἴ τις ἔχει ώτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.
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
οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον.

NA28 Mark 7:15-17
οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐξωθὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς δύναται κοινώσαι αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενα ἐστὶν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἀνθρώπον.

12 Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαίοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν;

16 Ἐί τις εἴει ὅταν ἀκούειν, ἀκοῦέων—
17 Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἄπο τοῦ ὀχλοῦ, ἐπηρコピー τινῶν αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολὴν.

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 ἐισπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα;

BYZ Mark 7:19 ὅτι οὐκ ἐισπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζουν πάντα τὰ βρώματα

Byz 33, 157, 700, 1582°, 2542, Maj-part(K, Π, Μ, U, Υ, 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', arm, geo = et purgat)
καθαρίζεται 1047, Sy-S

Note also: ... πάντα τὰ σῶματα 0274° (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
καθαρίζουν 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 ἀφεδρώνα ἐκβάλλεται;

Compare:
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: Ο 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 ἀφεδρώνα: "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 ANQRWPOS, 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 καθαρίζων is even more difficult. It is not clear to what it refers, the only grammatical possibility is πῶν τὸ ἐξέβαλεν εἰσφορεύμονα, 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 καθαρίζων 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, ἐκεῖνο κοινοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

"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 καθαρίζεται supports the present passive καθαρίζεται, the waw is obligatory to coordinate the participle with the previous action. It cannot therefore be used to support καὶ. Manuscript 1047, from the twelfth or thirteenth century, lacks καὶ. 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."


The intended meaning of the Sy-S (and D) reading is thus about the same as that of καθαρίζων.
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, κοινώσα, οὔκ 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 0274C (5th CE) καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ σώματα:

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 C of σωματα 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 [καθαρίζων] 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 embedded discourse from οὕτως to ἐκπορεύεται)."
καθαρίζων 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 Ἕκείθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὀρια Τύρου.

BYZ Mark 7:24 καὶ Ἕκείθεν ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ μεθόρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνως.

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 ὀρια 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, ff₂, i, n, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Or, WHms, NA₂₅, Tis

Tregelles has καὶ Σιδώνως 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 ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδώνως εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως

BYZ Mark 7:31 Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνως ἦλθεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως

T&T #98

Byz P45, A, W, 0131, 0211, f1, f13, 28, Maj, q, Sy, sa₉₉₉, goth,

txt 01, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1342,

Lat, sa₉₉₉, bo, WH, NA₂₅, Trg, Tis, Bal

Τύρου ἦλθεν εἰς 579

B: no umlaut
Compare:
NA28 Matthew 11:21 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι
NA28 Matthew 15:21 εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνος.
NA28 Mark 3:8 καὶ περὶ Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνα
NA28 Luke 6:17 καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνος,
NA28 Luke 10:13 ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι
NA28 Luke 10:14 πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι

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.
tὸ 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 ὄριον 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 Σιδώνος, which is smooth and straightforward.

7:24
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

7:31
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 159
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:24 Ἑκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν οὐδένα ἦθελεν γνώναι, καὶ οὐκ ἡδυνάσθη λαθεῖν:

ἡδυνάσθη 01, B, WH, NA28, Gre, Tis, Bal

txt ἡδυνάσθη A, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, Weiss

ἡδύνατο 565, pc (Mk 6:19)

Lacuna: C, 33
B: no umlaut

ἡδυνάσθη indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular
ἡδυνάσθη indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular
ἡδύνατο indicative imperfect middle 3rd person singular

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:19 ἢ δὲ Ἦρωδιάς ἐνείχεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἦθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείναι, καὶ οὐκ ἡδύνατο:

The words are not in the parallel.
Both forms are possible and both appear only here in the NT. In the LXX ἡδυνάσθη appears 3 times and ἡδυνάσθη 5 times.
Weiss notes that ἡδυνάσθη is the more rare Ionic form.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 160

73. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 7:28 ἥ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: κύριε· καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων.

BYZ Mark 7:28 ἥ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ναὶ, κύριε καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων.

**NA28**

κύριε καὶ γὰρ

A, K, P, L, X, f1, 124, 346 (=f13), 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(a, aur, f, l, n, q, vg), Sy-H, goth

01, B, H, Δ, 0274?, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Sy-P, Co, WH, NA28, 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, ff², i), WH

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 ἥ δὲ εἶπεν· Ναὶ κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων 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 ὀχλοῦ κατ’ ἰδίαν ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀτρα αὐτοῦ καὶ πτύσας ἤψατο 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"
ᾎπτω "touch"

0131 (old = Wd, 9th CE), Diatess\textsuperscript{Arab}:
εἴπτυεν εἰς τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὰ ὁτρα τοῦ κωφοῦ καὶ ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ μυγιλάλου
"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 ὀτρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ.
Ο, 565 have:
ἔβαλεν πτύσας ...
"and spitting he put his fingers into his ears and touched his tongue."

(W), f13, 28, 2542, pc\textsuperscript{3}, Sy-S:
ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὀτρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ.
"and he put his fingers, spitting into his ears and touched his tongue."

124:
ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀτρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ πτύσας

... ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς/\textit{manus} αὐτοῦ ...
\(\Delta\) (from Mt 8:15)

omit first αὐτοῦ: 01, L, W, 892

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (p. 1288 B, line 26) for the words: δακτύλος 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 μογιλάλον

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:23 καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐξηνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐκ τῆς κώμης καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὅμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν· εἰ 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 ἐπυνθανομένως 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 [ἐὐθέως] ἤνοιγμαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἄκοιαὶ, καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλάληε ὁρθῶς.

**omit 1:** 01, B, D, L, Δ, 0131, 0274, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, it(a, b, d, ff², i, q, r'), saₘss, bo,
WH, NA₂₅, 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,
Мaj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy, saₘss, arm, geo, goth, Trg₉₂ (all read ἐὐθέως, no ἐὐθὺς appears !)

T&T #100 (add 2)

**add 2:**
...καὶ ἐὐθὺς ἐλύθη ... 01, Δ, 69, 2786, NA₂₅, Bois, Weiss, Tis
...καὶ ἐὐθέως 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 ἐὐθὺς/ἐὐθέως at pos. 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T&amp;T</th>
<th>Gre</th>
<th>Swanson</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐὐθὺς</td>
<td>01, L, Δ, 69, 2786</td>
<td>01, Δ, 1342</td>
<td>01, Δ</td>
<td>01, Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐὐθέως</td>
<td>0274, 892, 1342</td>
<td>L, 0274, 892</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L, 0274, 892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1342 reads ἐὐθέως, Swanson is in error (checked from the film).
L also reads ἐὐθέως (checked at the BnF image).

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut
Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:31 καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.  

NA28 Mark 2:12 καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἃρας τὸν κράβαττον  

omit: W, Θ, 1342

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ ἐζήτειν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.  

safe:
NA28 Mark 1:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα,  

NA28 Mark 5:29 καὶ εὐθὺς ἔξηράνθη ἡ πηγή τοῦ ἀίματος 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 ἔλυθη.

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.
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 7:37 καὶ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἔξεπλήσσοντο 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, NA25, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

tοὺς 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 ύγιεῖς καὶ χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας:

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 11:5 τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούομεν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.
NA28 Matthew 12:22 Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαίμονις ὅμοιος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐδεράπευσεν αὐτὸν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν.


NA28 Mark 7:32 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφόν καὶ μογιλάλον καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χείρα.
NA28 Mark 9:17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἑκ τοῦ ὀχλου· διδασκαλε, ἢνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον. 

omit ἄλαλον: Sy-S

NA28 Mark 9:25 ἴδων ... λέγων αὐτῷ· τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, ...

LXX Isaiah 35:5 τότε ἀνοιχθῆσονται ὀφθαλμοί τυφλῶν καὶ ὡτα 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, ἄλαλος 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 τοῦς, 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 τοῦς
(after weighting the witnesses)
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\textsuperscript{mass}, bo\textsuperscript{mass}

παμπόλλου  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 ἔξελθοιν εἰδεν πολὺν ὄχλον

παμπόλλος "vast, very great"

The word παμπόλλος 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 ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὠχλοῦ ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς:

BYZ Mark 8:1 Ἐν ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου ὠχλοῦ 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, NA25, 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 αὐτούς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ οὐ̄δῷ καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἡκασιν.

BYZ Mark 8:3 καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτούς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ οὐ̄δῷ τινὲς γὰρ αὐτῶν μακρόθεν ἡκουσιν

Byz ἡκουσιν K, Π, X, 0131, f13, 157, Maj

txt ἡκασιν 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)
elίσιν B, L, Δ, 0274, 892, sa msd, bo, WH, NA28, Weiss, Bal

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

ἡκω "have come, be present; come"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:32 καὶ ἀπολύσαι αὐτούς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ οὐ̄δῷ.

Compare:
1 Clement 12:2 ἐκπεμφθέντων γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ τοῦ Ναυή κατασκόπων εἰς τὴν Ἰεριχώ, ἔγγυο ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἡκασιν κατασκοπεῦσαι τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξεπεμψει ἀνδρὰς τοὺς συλληψισμένους αὐτούς, ὅπως συλληψισμένες 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.

ἡκουσιν and ἡκασιν are both derived from ἡκω. 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 εἰσὶν from B, L et al. has been inserted to avoid the rare form ἢκασιν. But the word appears 20 times in the LXX, always as ἢκασιν. No ἢκουσιν is found. ἢκουσιν is here clearly a secondary grammatical correction.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 47) thinks that ἢκασιν is a more precise term which replaced the colorless εἰσὶν. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 396), too, notes the colorless εἰσὶν as one of the peculiarities of Mark (cf. 6:3, 10:43, 14:67). To the contrary C.H. Turner considers εἰσὶν a correction by Alexandrian grammarians ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Mt omits the complete phrase καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἢκασιν.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
Difficult variant
NA28 Mark 8:7 καὶ εἶχον ἵχθυδια ὀλίγα·
kai eu logh σας ἀυτὰ εἶπεν kai taúta paratíde naı.

BYZ Mark 8:7 καὶ εἶχον ἵχθυδια ὀλίγα·
kai eu logh σας ___ εἶπεν paratheinai kai auta

cp. ECM-Parallels!

paratheinai καὶ αὐτὰ A, X, f13, Maj, goth
paratheinai αὐτὰ V, 22, 157, 346, 1071, pc, Sy-H, arm
paratheinai καὶ ταῦτα F
paratidēnai αὐτά αὐτοῖς sa_
paratidēnai τῷ ὅχλῳ Μ, 713

paratheinai W, Θ, 0131, f1, 28, 565, 2542, pc, Sy-P, Gre
paratheinai αὐτοῖς N, Σ, vgms, Sy-S
paratidēnai 124, Lat (et iussit adponi)
paretheken 01* (and omit εἶπεν)

καὶ ταῦτα paratidēnai 01ci, B, L, Δ, 372, 892, 2786, pc,
καὶ αὐτὰ paratheinai q, bo(adds αὐτοῖς), Sy-Pal
καὶ ταῦτα paráthe te 700 (checked at the film)
καὶ αὐτὰ paráthe te C, 1342, pc, bomss
καὶ ταῦτα paráthe te 33, 579, pc

καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐκέλευσεν paratidēnai 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

paratheinai infinitive aorist active
paratidēnai infinitive present active
paráthe te 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 λαβῶν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἐδίδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατίθωσιν, καὶ παρέθηκεν τῷ ὄχλῳ.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 15:36 ἠλάβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἐδίδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταί τοῖς ὀχλοῖς.
NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἀρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατίθωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.
NA28 Luke 9:16 ... καὶ ἐδίδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθέτεται τῷ ὄχλῳ.
NA28 John 6:11 ἠλάβεν οὓς τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Παρθένος καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ψαρίων ὥσον ἦθελον.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 5:43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδένς γνῷ τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθήσαι αὐτὴ 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)αὐτὰ (= "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 παρατίθεναι 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 __________ ως τετρακισχίλιοι.

BYZ Mark 8:9 ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ως τετρακισχίλιοι.

Byz  A, C, D, W, X, Θ, 0131, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Latt, Sy, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, goth, [Trg]  
add ἀνδρες after τετρακ.  G, Δ, 1071, pc, it

txt  01, B, L, Δ, 0274?, 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc,  
sa\textsuperscript{mt}, bo\textsuperscript{pt} 
omit ως: 01

0274: has a lacuna, but space considerations allow for the short reading only.  
B: no umlaut

Compare:  
oἱ φαγόντες ως 01, Θ, f1, 28, 565, 700

Probably added from 6:44 (so Weiss). Some manuscripts harmonize further by  
adding ἀνδρες. Note that in return in 6:44 several witnesses added the ως 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)
79. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἤλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθᾶ.

**Καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη**  D
**Et ipse ascendens**  b, d, i, k, r

**Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβας αὐτὸς**  B, WH  Weiss
**Καὶ εὐθέως ἐμβας αὐτὸς**  372, 2737

**Et statim ascendens**  a, aur, f, l, q, vg
**Iesus autem ascendens**  c, ff
**B: no umlaut**

**Context:**
NA28 Mark 8:13 καὶ ἁφεὶς αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἐμβας ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 8:23 Καὶ ἐμβάντα αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβας εἰς πλοῖον ...

NA28 Mark 4:1 ὡστε αὐτῶν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα
NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Luke 5:3 ἐμβας δὲ εἰς ἐν τῶν πλοίων,

**Εὐβας δὲ**  D

NA28 John 6:24 ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια

**Ανέβησαν**  01*, pc

**Quite a strong support for αὐτοῦ.**

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 ἐμβας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἕλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθᾶ.

T&T #103+104

tὰ ὄρια Δαλμανουθᾶ N, Σ, 124, 517, 1071, 1241, 1424, 1675, 2766, pc17

tὸ ὄρος Δαλμόουναi W

tὰ μέρη Μαγδαλά Θ, f1, f13, 2542, 2680, pc7, Sy-Pal, geo2, goth
pc = 4, 191, 271, 273, 537, 1502, 2394

tὰ μέρη Μαγεδά 565, it(“Magedam” b, ff2, i, r)

tὰ ὄρια Μαγεδά aur, c, k

tὸ ὄρος Μαγεδά 28, Sy-S (Sy-S: MGDN), Eus?

tὰ ὄρια Μελεγαδά D* P45 (conj.)

tὰ ὄρια Μαγαιδά D2, d(Magidan)

tὰ μέρη 118
txt 01, A, B, C, L, Χ, Δ, 0131, 0274, 1582c, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, f, l, q, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, arm, geo1

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 Δαλμανουθᾶ 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 Δαλμανουθᾶ 11 Καὶ ἔξηθον
B reads Δαλμανουπῆθα

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 Μ.
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 ἠλθεν εἰς τὰ ὀριαὶ Μαγδαλάν.

- Magdala
  - L, X, Δ^6^, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 892, Maj, Sy-H

- Magdalan
  - C, N, W, 33, 565, 579, al, q, mae-1, bo

- Magadan
  - 01*, B, D, d

- Magean
  - 01^c^2, 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 "λαμανουθά". 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 Μαγεδα or Μελεγαδα has dropped out? Dalman objects to this.

Thielscher notes that the δαλ appears in Μαγδαλά. He speculates that some scribal error occurred: ΛΛΛ ΜΑΓXXXΑ out of which then was formed: ΛΛΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ

This is of course highly speculative and rather improbable.

tὰ ὀρια 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 ΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ which is a step nearer to the hypothetical ΜΑΓΔΑΛΝΟΥΘΑ, or Μαγδαλούνα, 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 Βηθσαϊδάν 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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἰς } & \text{TAMEΡΗΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ} \\
\text{may be a corruption of } & \text{εἰς TIBΕΡΙΑΔΑΛΜΑΘΟΥΣ}
\end{align*}
\]

(or some such form). Probably St Mark wrote εἰς Ἀμαθοῦς, 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)
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει· τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημείον;
ἀμὴν λέγω ύμῖν, εἰ δοθῆσαι τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημείον.

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, NA28, Weiss, WH

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 ποιηρᾶ καὶ μοιχαλίς σημείον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημείον οὐ δοθῆσαι αὕτη εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.
NA28 Matthew 16:4 γενεὰ ποιηρᾶ καὶ μοιχαλίς σημείον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημείον οὐ δοθῆσαι αὕτη εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.
NA28 Luke 11:29 Τῶν δὲ χάλων ἐπαθροιζομένων ἢξετο λέγειν· ή γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ ποιηρᾶ ἐστιν· σημείον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημείον οὐ δοθῆσαι αὕτη εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.

Robertson ("Wordpictures") writes:
"Mt 16:4 has simply οὐ δοθῆσαι, 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 ύμῖν appears 86 times in the Gospels (12 times in Mk)! It would be only natural to complete it.
On the other hand the phrase ἀμήν 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 ἀφεῖς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβας ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

BYZ Mark 8:13 καὶ ἀφεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐμβας πάλιν εἰς πλοῖον ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν

T&T #106

ἐμβας πάλιν εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον  
πάλιν ἐμβας εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον

A, X, 0131, f1, 124, Maj, Sy-H, sa, goth
P45, D, W, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 2542, pc,
it(a, b, c, d, f, i, l, q, r¹, vg²), (Sy-S), bo-pt, arm, geo, [Trg]

ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον πάλιν  
ἐἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἀπήλθεν πάλιν  

1424  
1241 (UBS3c omits πάλιν)

πάλιν ἐμβας  
01, B, C, L, Δ, 2144, aur, ff², vg, bo-pt

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 16:4 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπήλθεν.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:18 Καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Mark 6:45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ... ἐμβήκαῖ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Mark 6:51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Mark 8:10 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

NA28 Matthew 8:23 Καὶ ἐμβάντες αὐτῶ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβας εἰς πλοῖον
BYZ Matthew 9:1 Καὶ ἐμβας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
NA28 Matthew 14:22 Καὶ εὐθέως ... ἐμβήκαῖ 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’ αὐτὸν καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

omit: P45\textsuperscript{nd}, D, Θ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 2542, pc\textsuperscript{30}, it, Sy-S
(here too the position of πάλιν is variable!)

The main parallel is verse 10.
It is possible that εἰς τὸ πλοίον accidentally fell out or has been added as superfluous after ἐμβάς. 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 πλοίον, 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 ἐμβάς, to make clear that πάλιν refers to ἐμβάς and not to ἀφεῖς αὐτοῦς. The same reason holds for the addition of εἰς πλοίον.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 173

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:15 καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων: ὀρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ὅρωδου.

T&T #107

txt ὀρᾶτε, βλέπετε  01, A, B, L, W, X; 33, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, goth
羟ate καὶ βλέπετε  P45, C, Φ, 0131, f13, 28, 1424, pc60
one of these  Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

羟ate  Δ, 700, pc4 (= 176, 577, 1138, 2806)
羟ate καὶ προσέχετε  D, Θ, f1, 565, pc3 (= 2*, 939, 1699)
one of these  Sy-S, geo, arm

羟ate φυλάσσεσθε  1342 (:: Lk)
羟ate καὶ προσέχετε  79, 208 (:: Mt)

Lat: "Videte"  b, d, ff2, i, q, r1
"Cavete" (beware)  a, k, vg
"Videte et cavete"  aur, c, f, l, vg

Δ: In the Latin a later hand added + cavete above videte, but not in the Greek.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:38 Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἐλεγεν· βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς
NA28 Matthew 9:30 ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ὀρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω.
= "Beware, let no one know."

NA28 Matthew 18:10 Ὄρατε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἐνὸς 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 ὀρᾶτε 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 ὡτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὕπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε: ἐτὶ πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;

BYZ Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς ὁ ᾨσοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὡτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε οὕπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε ἐτὶ πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν

Byz A, K, Π, X, 157, 700, 892c, 1071, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt P45vid, 01, B, C, D, L, N, W, Δ, (Θ), 0143vid, f1, f13, 28, 33, (565), 579, 892*, 1241, 1342, pc, it, Co

συνίετε ἐτι πεπωρωμένην 047, 1424, pc

892: ἐτι is written above the line by a later hand. Also ὁ ᾨσοῦς is added after γνοὺς.

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:18 ὃθεαλμοῦς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὃτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε.

It is possible that the ἐτι has been omitted accidentally: συνίετε ἐτι (so Hoskier).

On the other hand it is possible that the word has been added as a conformation to immediate context: οὐπω - ἐτι. "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 ἐρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀψηται.

BYZ Mark 8:22 Καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀψηται.

Not in NA but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz 01*, A, N, X, f1, 22, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy

txt 01ab, 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 ἐρχονται 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(Q, 1, 565)

Compare context:
8:21 καὶ ἐλέησεν αὐτοῖς
8:22 Καὶ ἐρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.
8:27 Καὶ ἔξηλθεν 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 ἐλέησεν). 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 Βηθσαΐδαν.

T&T #112

**Βηθανίαν** D, 199, 566, 1118, 1187, 1424<sup>mg</sup>, pc, it(a, b*, d, f, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l, q, r*), "unreadable" (T&T): 262*, 1060*

aur, b<sup>c</sup>, c, k, vg read Bethsaida.

1424 (cp. CSNTM image 0068a): There is a wavy line with two dots above Βηθσαΐδαν 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 κατασκεύασας ὄνομαζε Καισάρειαν, κἂν γὰρ δὲ Βηθσαΐδα πρὸς λίμνη τῇ Γεννησαρίτιδι πόλεως παρασχῶν ἀξίωμα πλῆθει τε οἰκητόρων καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει Ἰουλία θυγατρὶ τῇ Καίσαρος ὀμώνυμον 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 ὠματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν· ἐὰν τί βλέπεις:

BYZ Mark 8:23 καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὠματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν ἐὰν τί βλέπει.

T&T #114

Byz 01, A, Dc, L, W, X, f1, f13, 700, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, geo28, WHma, Trg, Tis, Bal

ἐὰν τί βλέπεις 13, 732, 2106
ἐὰν βλέπει W
txt B, C, D*, Δ, Θ, 565, 579, 1342, 2737, pc3, Sy-S, Co, geo1,2A, DiatessArab, WH, NA28, Trgma 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 αὐτὸν· τί ὁνομά σου;
NA28 Mark 10:17 καὶ ... ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν· διδάσκαλε ἁγαθέ, ...
NA28 Mark 13:3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ’ ἰδίαν ... 4 εἶπον ἡμῖν, ...
NA28 Mark 14:61 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εὐλογητός;
NA28 Mark 15:4 Πιλάτος ... ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνησθαι οὐδέν;

In Mk all appearances of ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν are followed by direct speech.
The txt reading is not normal (classical) Greek usage of εἰ τί. 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 εἰ seemed superfluous in direct speech."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χειρὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἄπαντα.

T&T #115
No txt in NA and SQE!

ēθηκεν B, L, 892, pc³ (222, 1093, 2517), Trg, WH

txt ἐπέθηκεν 01, A, C, W, Δ, f1, f13, 28, 579, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA28, Weiss, Trg

ἐπιθεῖς D, Θ, 565, 700, pc⁹, a

33: omits due to parablepsis vs. 23 τὰς χειρὰς ... vs. 25 τὰς χειρὰς.

B: no umlaut

ἐπέθηκεν ἐπιτίθημι indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
ἐθηκεν τίθημι indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
ἐπιθεῖς ἐπιτίθημι participle aorist active nominative masculine singular

No parallel.

Context, verse 23:
NA28 Mark 8:23 ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χειρὰς αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν· εἶ τι βλέπεις; safe!

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 9:18 ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθεσε τὴν χειρὰ σού ἐπὶ αὐτήν,
NA28 Matthew 19:13 ἦνα τὰς χειρὰς ἐπιθῆ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύχεται·
NA28 Matthew 19:15 καὶ ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χειρὰς αὐτοῖς ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν.
NA28 Mark 5:23 ἦνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χειρὰς αὐτὴ ἦνα σωθῆ καὶ ζήσῃ.
NA28 Mark 6:5 εἶ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χειρὰς ἔθεράπευσεν.

NA28 Mark 10:16
καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ αὐτᾶ.
ἐπιτίθεις W, 565, 700

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 21:7 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια
NA28 Matthew 23:4 καὶ ἐπιτίθεασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὠμοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
NA28 Matthew 27:29 ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ
ἐθηκαν ἐπὶ W, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 1071, 1424, al[K, Π, N, Y]
NA28 Luke 15:5 καὶ εὐφῶν ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὠμοὺς αὐτοῦ χαίρων
τίθησιν ἐπὶ 28
NA28 John 9:15 πηλόν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

On the one hand it is possible that the prefixed ἐπὶ has been omitted because
the preposition follows later: ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ 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 ἐπιτίθησι + 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 ἐπιθεῖς is safe, but no preposition is following.

ἐπιθεῖς is a conformation to the previous verse 23.

Rating: - (indecisive)
NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τούς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγώς ἀπαντα.

BYZ Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τούς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψῃ καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγώς ἀπαντας.

Not in NA, but in SQE (in part)!

καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψῃ

A, X, 33, 124, Maj, α, f, q, Sy-H, goth

ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψῃ

565, 700

ἐποίησεν ἀναβλέψῃ

Θ

καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψῃ καὶ διέβλεψεν

f13

καὶ ἠρέστα ἀναβλέψῃ

D, Lat ("et coepit videre")

καὶ διέβλεψεν

P45, 01, B, C, L, W, Δ, f1, 788(=f13), 28, 579,

k, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

καὶ ἀναβλέψῃ

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 ἀναβλέψῃς ἔλεγεν· βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι ώς δένδρα ὡς ἑρμοῦντες.
NA28 Mark 10:51 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τί σοι παρακαλεῖς ποιήσω; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ῥαββουνί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψῃ
NA28 Mark 10:52 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὑπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέασωκέν σε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέβλεψῃ

The txt reading is redundant with what follows.

It is not really clear what ἀναβλέψῃ means here. It could either mean "look up" or "see clearly". The second meaning is probably intended by the D reading, ἀναβλέψῃς 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 εἰσέλθης.

BYZ Mark 8:26 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ λέγων μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἶπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ.

T&T #116

Byz A, C, K, Π, X, Δε, 33vid, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo9, goth, Trg

txt 01#, B, L, W, Δ*, f1, 900, Sy-S, sa, bo9, geo

μὴ for μηδὲ: 01*, W, Tis

μηδὲν εἶπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ

pc8, c, k

ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου καὶ μηδὲν εἶπης εἰς τὴν κώμην D, d, q

ὑπαγε εἰς [τὸν] οἶκον σου καὶ εἶαν εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἶπης (μηδὲ) ἐν τῇ κώμῃ

Θ, Φ, f13, 28, 565, 1071, 2542, 2680, pc30, Lat, (Sy-Hmg)

cp = 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 (implicitly 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 εἰσέλθης μηδὲν εἰπὲ τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ.

Tregelles has additionally μηδὲ εἶπης τ. ἐ. τ. κώμη 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· ὥρα μηδὲν μηδὲν εἰπῆς, ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεὶ ...
NA28 Mark 2:11 σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἰκόν σου.
The reading of k et al. is possibly an omission due to parablepsis (μηδὲ εἶπεν - μηδὲ εἶπεν).

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 ὑπαγε ἐίς τὸν οίκον 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 ... μηδὲ ("neither . . . nor") case. Normally μηδὲ follows another negation like: μὴ, μηκέτι, μὴπω 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 εἶπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κωμῇ presents the true intention of Jesus' order μηδὲ εἶς 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 (01cai, 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 εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἶπης τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ lie two earlier readings, (1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης, and (2) μηδὲ εἶπης 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\textsuperscript{sin}. But what if we repeat the process of analysis, and ask whether both (1) and (2) cannot be explained as developments 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 μηδὲν ἐἶπης 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 μηδὲ[ν] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἶπης as the original source of the different developments: 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: 27 (NA probably original)
TVU 181

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

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς·
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. - r1 omits "Iesus" and "vivi").

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 182

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:31 Καὶ ἦρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἁρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι.
NA28 Mark 8:32 καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλησ.

λαλεῖν or εἶπεῖν Sy-S, k, DiatessArabic?

"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 ἐλάλησ, 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 ΕΚΛΑΛΕΙΝ (with the final N perhaps only indicated by a horizontal stroke) is nearer to ΕΛΑΛΕΙ than either λαλεῖν or ἐκλαλήσαι 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· εἰ τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαριθμήσω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι.

έλθεῖν 01, A, B, 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, 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, i, n, q, vg) Sy, sa, goth, Or, *Tis

έλθεῖν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν Δ, sa

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:38 καὶ ὁς οὖν λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὁπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι ἄξιος. safe!


ἀκολουθεῖ K, Π, pc II (:: Mt 10:38)

NA28 Matthew 16:24 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· εἰ τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαριθμήσω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. **safe**

NA28 Luke 9:23 Ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἰ τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνηθείσῳ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν και ἀκολουθεῖτω 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

έλθεῖν 01C1, C53, Ψ, Maj (:: Mt 16:24)
Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:20 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαίου ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν ἀπῆλθον ὑπίσω αὐτοῦ.  

ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ  D, W, 1424, Latt  
ἡλθον ὑπίσω αὐτοῦ  Θ

Weiss (Mk Com.) thinks that ἀκολουθεῖν is either a conformation to Mt 10:38 or to the immediately following ἀκολουθεῖτω.  
Note a similar change in Mk 1:20!  
Both Mt and Lk have a form of ἐρχομαί against Mk (Minor Agreement). It is not clear why both should have changed an ἀκολουθεῖν independently into a form of ἐρχομαί.  

On the other hand ἐλθεῖν could be a harmonization to Mt 16:24.  

Interestingly both readings in Mt are safe:  
10:38 ἀκολουθεῖ ὑπίσω μου  
16:24 ὑπίσω 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 θέλη ἡ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν. ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

T&T #117
No txt in NA and SQE!


tὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν
B, 28, pc3 (344, 2206, 2317), Or, WH

txt P45vid, 01, A, C, D*, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA25, Weiss, WHmog
(tὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν) C53, W, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 700, Maj, Tre, Gre

tὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν
c
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 34:
NA28 Mark 8:34 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐὰν τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ 01

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:39 ὁ εὕρων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτὴν.
NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν. ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἑνεκεν ἐμοὶ εὑρήσει αὐτὴν. τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ - τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν 28

It is possible, that the ἑαυτοῦ has been used from the previous verse. Note that 01 wrote in 34: τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ.

Interestingly the Byzantine text has τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆν 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 Minor Agreement between Mt and Lk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
85. **Difficult variant**

**Minority reading:**
NA28 Mark 8:35

ος γαρ εαν θελη την ψυχην αυτου σωσαι απολεσει αυτην
ος δ' αν απολεσει την ψυχην αυτου ένεκεν έμου και του ευαγγελιου σωσει αυτην.

**του ευαγγελιου**

P45, D, 28, 700, it(a, b, d, i, k, n, r'), Sy-S, arm, Or, Bois

WH have the words in brackets.

Lat(aur, c, f, ff2, l, q, vg) reads txt.

έμου ευρήσει 33, 579, ff2 (:: Mt)

έμου η του ευαγγελιου 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 ος γαρ εαν θελη την ψυχην αυτου σωσαι απολεσει αυτην

NA28 Luke 9:24 ος γαρ αν θελη την ψυχην αυτου σωσαι απολεσει αυτην

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 10:29 έφη ο Ιησους αμην λεγω υμιν ουδεις εστιν ας αφηκεν οικιαι ή αδελφους ή αδελφας ή μητερα ή πατερα ή τεκνα ή άγροις ένεκεν έμου και ένεκεν του ευαγγελιου

Ένεκεν έμου και του ευαγγελιου A, B*, 700, 1424, pc

Ένεκεν έμου η ένεκεν του ευαγγελιου D, Θ, f1, 565

Ένεκεν του ευαγγελιου 01*

The omission by 33, 579 is clearly a harmonization to Mt. The Byzantine text adds ουτος from Lk (see next variant).

The omission of έμου και is difficult to explain except as scribal oversight.
It is possible that ἐμοὶ καὶ has been added as a harmonization to Mt/Lk, but in that case one would have expected either εὐρήσει (Mt) or οὕτως (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 Minor Agreements 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 ἐμοὶ 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 ἔδω θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δὲ ἀν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

BYZ Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἔδω θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δὲ ἀν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz C\textsuperscript{2}, X, f13, 157, 700, 1342, Maj

txt P45, 01, A, B, C\textsuperscript{*}, 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 δὲ ἀν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν.


Clearly a harmonization to Luke.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 187

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 8:38 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἑπαναχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωλῷ,

"whoever is ashamed of me and the mine (my followers)"
"whoever is ashamed of me and of my words"

omit: P45⁴ᵈᵈ, W, k, sa

D has the word
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 9:26 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἑπαναχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τούτων ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἑπαναχυνθήσεται,  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. (ὉΥC - ὈΥC). 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:

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 188

86. Difficult variant:
NA28 Mark 9:2 Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἐξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβου καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὦρας ύψηλὸν κατ’ ίδιαν μόνον. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐξεροθεῖνεν αὐτῶν,

BYZ Mark 9:2 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἐξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβου καὶ Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὦρας ύψηλὸν κατ’ ίδιαν μόνον καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐξεροθεῖνεν αὐτῶν·


txt P45, 01, C, D, L, W, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 1342, 1424, Maj-part [K, Π, U, X, Y], TR, WHm

καὶ Ἰάκωβου καὶ Ἰωάννην
καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην

Γ, Δ, Θ, Ω, 0131, 118, 157, 700, pc (:: Mt)

Χ, 983, 1689 (=f13c)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:1 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἐξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὦρας ύψηλον κατ’ ίδιαν.

τὸν Ἰάκωβου 01, Δ, Θ, 33, 157, 892, L844, pc

τὸν Ἰωάννην D*, 892


Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ’ αὐτοῦ συνακολούθησα εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἄδελφον Ἰακώβου.

safe!
NA28 Mark 10:41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.  
περὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.  

NA28 Mark 14:33 καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰάκωβον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν

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.

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 ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλβοῦτα λευκὰ λίαν, οἶα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

BYZ Mark 9:3 καὶ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλβοῦτα λευκὰ λίαν ὡς χιῶν, οἶα 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, Maj1173, Lat, Sy, bo, goth

ωσεὶ χιῶν Y, K, Π, 28, 1071, 1241, pm401

Ὃς W

οἶτι λίαν: 1424, al55

وغς τὸ φῶς 1577, Or!

txt P45, 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, 892, 1342, 2713, d, k, sa

οἵτι λίαν: Δ, 544

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 12:39 τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ λευκὰ καὶ στιλβοῦτα ὡς τὸ φῶς οἶα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 28:3 ἦν δὲ ἡ εἴδεα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπῆ καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιῶν.

A harmonization to Mt 28:3.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 190
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκειάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ῥ, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

\(\text{Τ} \quad \text{δὲν ἔξελεξαν} \quad 0131\)
\(\text{Τ} \quad \text{ἐν θ. εὐδόκησα} \quad 01\alpha, \Delta, 983\)

Note that some Latins read for ὁ ἀγαπητός:
"dilectus" ur*, 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 υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν θ. εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλειάζομένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. ("electus")
BYZ Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 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 ἔξαπταν περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἄλλα 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, WHmg, Tis

εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν
01, D, N, Σ, Ψ, 517, 892, 954, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, ps50, Lat(b, d, ff2, n, q, r1, vg), Sy-H, NA28, Weiss

μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
B, 33, 579, aur, c, f, WH

εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
0131, pc17, a, k, l, Sy-S, Bal(l) (::Mt)

In Syriac and Coptic ἄλλα 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 τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον


Compare οὐκέτι - ἄλλα:
NA28 Matthew 19:6 ὡς τε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἄλλα σάρξ μία.
NA28 Mark 10:8 ὡς τε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἄλλα μία σάρξ.

NA28 John 11:54 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι παρρησία περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἄλλα ἀπήλθεν ἐκεῖθεν
NA28 John 16:25 ἔρχεται ὡρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ύμιν, ἄλλα παρρησία περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ύμιν.
Compare οὐδείς - εἰ μη:
NA28 Mark 5:37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ’ αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβου ... 
NA28 Mark 6:5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἑκεί ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἑθεράπευσεν. 
NA28 Mark 9:29 τούτῳ τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ. 
NA28 Mark 10:18 οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός. 
NA28 Mark 11:13 καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν οὐδὲν εὑρεν εἰ μὴ 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

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 446) notes that the B reading is probably a smoothing, by bringing together εἰδοὺ and μεθ’ ἐαυτῶν.

The 0131 reading is clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Note that both Mt and Lk omit μεθ’ ἐαυτῶν (Minor Agreement).

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 192

88. Difficult variant
NA28 Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὁχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτούς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητούντας πρὸς αὐτούς.

BYZ Mark 9:14 Καὶ ἠλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδεν ὁχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτούς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητούντας αὐτούς.

Byz A, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Gre, Bois, Trgims
txt 01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1342, pc, k, sa, arm, geo²⁴, goth

ἐλθὼν ... εἶδον Sy-S, geo²⁴? 
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὁχλον προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπος ἐλθὼν D, pc

NA28 Luke 9:37 Ἑγένετο δὲ τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀροὺς συνήτησαν αὐτῶ ὁχλός πολύς. safe!

Compare next verse 15:
NA28 Mark 9:15 καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς ὁ ὁχλὸς ἠδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβηθησάν καὶ προστρέχοντες ἰσπάζοντο αὐτῶν.

τὸν Ἰησοῦν D, Lat, DiatessArabic

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 gudio 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 ἱδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν καὶ προστρέχοντες ἤσπάζοντο αὐτὸν.

προστρέχοντες = προσχαίροντες
"gaudentes" = "rejoice"
D, it (b, c, d, ff², i, k), Diatess"Arabic

The Arabic Diatessaron has:
Ciasca: et praes 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 ἠλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἀνθρωπὸς 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 ἡμὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ ἁρμόζουσα ἐγὼ ἡμὴν ἢ προσέχαιρεν καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ εὐφραίνομην 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 ... ὠρέαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὃν εἶδον δυνάμεων,
Perhaps this was an influence?
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
NA28 Mark 9:23 ὅ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ: τὸ εἰ δύνη,
pάντα δύνατά τῷ πιστεύοντι.

BYZ Mark 9:23 ὅ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ: τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεύσαι,
pάντα δύνατά τῷ πιστεύοντι

* ἐν δύνη P45
  τὸ εἰ δύνη 01*, B, Δ, f1, 892, pc, WH, NA²⁵
  si potes k
  τότῳ εἰ δύνη W
  τὸ εἰ δύνασαι 01²², 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

* ἐν δύνασαι πιστεύσαι D, K, U, Y, Θ, Π, f13, 28, 565, 1071, pc, Sy, Lat
  τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεύσαι A, C²³, X, Ψ, 33, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, goth

ἐν δύνη Wohlenberg (conj.)
"with grief"

Tregelles reads txt, but has δύνη [πιστεύσαι] in the margin.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 9:22 ἀλλ’ εἰ τι δύνη,
BYZ Mark 9:22 ἀλλ’ εἰ 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 πιστεύω, to get back some sense. In the Byzantine reading they left the article τὸ which is quite awkward now.
To take τὸ εἶ δύνη 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 εἶ δύνη or τί ἐστιν τὸ εἶ δύνη.

Wohlenberg (Comm. Mk) calls τὸ εἶ δύνη 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 εὐθεῖας κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου μετὰ δακρύων ἔλεγεν· Πιστεύω· Κύριε βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ.

T&T #121

Byz A⁺, C⁺, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bopt, goth
eἰπεν: f13, pc
λέγει: D, Θ, 565

txt P45, 01, A*, B, C*, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 28, 700, 2542, pc⁵, k, Sy-S, sa, bopt
pc = 267, 1093, 1651, 1654*, 2555
eἰπεν: P45, W
λέγει: 700

W has:
καὶ εὐθεῖας κράξας τὸ πνεῦμα (sic!) τοῦ παιδαρίου εἶπεν· Πιστεύω.
B: no uumlaut

No parallels.
Compare:
NA28 Acts 20:31 διὸ γρηγορεῖτε μημονεύοντες ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην μετὰ δακρύων νουθετῶν ἑνα ἑκαστὸν.
NA28 Hebrews 12:17 ἵστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον ὧν εὑρεῖν καὶ περὶ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 27 (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 196

NA28 Mark 9:24 ἐθύμως κράζας ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παιδίου ἔλεγεν: πιστεύω ὁπεθεὶ μου τῇ ἀπίστῃ.

BYZ Mark 9:24 καὶ ἐθύμως κράζας ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παιδίου μετὰ δακρύων ἔλεγεν Πιστεύω: ΚΥΡΙΕ ὁπεθεὶ μου τῇ ἀπίστῃ.

Not in NA and SQE!

Byz C, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 700, 1342, Maj, a, aur, b, c, f, q, vg

txt P45, 01, A, B, C*, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 565*, 579, 892, d, i, k, l, r, vg, Sy-P, Sy-Pmss

βοήθησον W, Ψ (from verse 22)
B: no umlaut

βοήθει imperitive present active 2nd person singular
βοήθησον imperative aorist active 2nd person singular

Compare verse 22:
NA28 Mark 9:22 ἀλλ’ ἐὰν τῇ δύνῃ, βοήθησον ἡμῖν ἑπε’ ἑμᾶς.

Τ ΚΥΡΙΕ D, G, Θ, 067, 565, it(a, b, d, ff², 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 ἐπεν ἐς ἑνεταῦθα ἐβοήθησεν ἡμῖν κύριος
LXX Psalm 36:40 καὶ βοήθησεὶ αὐτοῖς κύριος
LXX Psalm 40:4 κύριος βοηθήσαι αὐτῷ ἐπὶ κλίνης ὃ δύνῃ αὐτοῦ
LXX Psalm 43:27 ἀνάστα κύριε βοηθήσου ἡμῖν
LXX Psalm 85:17 ὅτι σὺ κύριε ἐβοήθησάς μοί καὶ παρεκάλεσάς με
LXX Psalm 93:17 εἶ μὴ ὅτι κύριος ἐβοήθησάν μοι
LXX Psalm 93:18 ὅ ποὺς μου τὸ ἔλεος σου κύριε βοηθεῖ μοι
LXX Psalm 108:26 βοηθήσον μοι κύριε ὁ θεός μου σώσον με
LXX Isaiah 50:9 ἵδοι 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 ἵππων δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισωτρέχει ὁ χλός, ἐπέτιμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ λέγων αὐτῷ: τὸ ἀλάλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, ἑγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι, ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθης εἰς αὐτὸν.

T&T #122

omit: P45, W, f1, pc³, Sy-S
pc = 1139, 1571, 2454
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:18 καὶ ἐπέτιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὄρας ἑκείνης.

Compare verse 20:
NA28 Mark 9:20 καὶ ἵππων αὐτῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίστη ἀφρίζων.

Compare verse 17:
NA28 Mark 9:17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τοῦ χλοῦ διδάσκαλε, ἢνεγκα τὸν υἱὸν μου πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἀλάλον.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 10:1 ἔξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων
NA28 Mark 1:23 ἀνθρώπως ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἀνέκραξεν
NA28 Mark 1:26 καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκαθάρτων
NA28 Mark 1:27 καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει
NA28 Mark 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτῶν ἐθεώρουν
NA28 Mark 3:30 ὅτι ἐλεγον: πνεῦμα ἀκαθάρτου ἔχει.
NA28 Mark 5:2 ἀνθρώπως ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ.
NA28 Mark 5:8 ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώ
NA28 Mark 5:13 καὶ ἔξελθοντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα
NA28 Mark 6:7 ἐδίδον αὐτοῖς ἔξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,
NA28 Mark 7:25 τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκαθάρτου.
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)
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 θαύμασθαι.

T&T #123

Byz  P45vid, Ο1, C, D, L, W, X, Δc, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co, goth, Gre, Trg καὶ τὴ θαύμασθαι Δc
νηστεία καὶ προσευχὴ Sy-S, Sy-P, bo۰

txt  O1*, B, Δ*, 0274, k, geo۰

Note further:

οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται ... 33, 579, 1391, 1574, L7, L184 (= yScr), arm (from Mt)
ἐν οὐδενὶ ἐξέρχεται 1342, pc

Δ: (p. 167) wrongly listed in NA (implicitly 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 θαύμασθαι 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 θαύμασθαι.

Byz  Ο1, C, D, L, W, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, (Sy-P, Sy-H)
... ἐξέρχεται... 118, 205, 209, al

txt  O1*, 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, with 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?


Mk 9:29 Denn dieses Geschlecht kann man durch nichts austreiben, außer durch Fasten und Gebet.

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 ὃς ἂν περιποιήσεται χρώματος …
BYZ Mark 9:30 καὶ ἐκείθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο …

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 2:37 καὶ αὕτη χήρα ἔως ἐτῶν ὀγδοϊκοῦντα τεσσάρων, ἢ ὁ κύριος ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ νηστείας καὶ δεήσεως λατρεύοντα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν.

"then as a widow to the age of eighty-four. She never left the temple but worshiped there with fasting and prayer night and day."

NA28 Luke 5:33 οἱ μάθηται Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνά καὶ δεήσεις πολούντεις
John’s disciples, like the disciples of the Pharisees, frequently fast and pray.

NA28 Acts 10:30 καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος ἔφη· ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι τεύχης τῆς ὥρας ἦμην τὴν ἐνάτην προσευχόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἐστή ἐνώπιον μου ἐν ἐσθήτῃ λαμπρᾷ

πηστεύων, καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος

P50, А*, 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 μὴ τί ἔκ συμφώνου πρὸς καὶ ᾧ ἃν σχολάσῃ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἢτε, ἵνα μὴ πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς διὰ τῆν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν.

υποστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ 01\textsuperscript{c2}, Maj, Sy

txt P11, P46, 01\textsuperscript{c}, A, B, C, D, 33, 81, 1739, al, Latt, Co, Cl

NA28 Romans 14:17 οὖ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις ἄλλα δικαιοσύνης καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίων καὶ ἁσκησίας 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 υποστείᾳ. 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 υποστείᾳ, 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:30 Κάκειθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνώι.

No txt in NA and SQE!

παρεπορεύοντο
B*, D, pc, a, aur, c, f, Trg, WH

txt P45, 01, Bε, C, L, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 1424, Maj, d(!), NA28, Weiss, WHm, Trgm

B, p. 1291 B 11: ΠΠΑ Π is written above the line, according to Tischendorf by the enhancer. This is probably correct.

Ψ: Swanson notes a correction, Ψε for παρεπορεύοντο (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 περιπέτεια ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, οὗ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαίοι 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)
No parallel.

Context, previous verses:
NA28 Mark 9:30 Κάκειθεν ἔξελθοντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Ιαλμαίας, ΝΑ28 Mark 9:32 οί δὲ ἤγνωσιν τὸ ρήμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἔπερωτήσαν.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰςπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμι: εἰςπορεύεται f1

NA28 John 4:46 Ἡλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Ιαλμαίας, Ἡλθαν 01

NA28 Matthew 15:39 καὶ Ἡλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν. Ἡλθου C, 118

NA28 Luke 2:51 καὶ κατέβη μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ Ἡλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέθ Ἡλθου 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 ἤλθεν: Καὶ ἤλθεν ... 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)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:34 oí de ἐσιώπων· πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ τίς μείζων.

T&T #124

omit: A, D, Δ, Π, pc\textsuperscript{16}, it(a, aur, b, d, f, i, l, q, r\textsuperscript{1}), Sy-S, goth
pc = 19, 64*, 149*, 264\textsuperscript{a}, 265, 274, 692, 766, 1079, 1128, 1500, 1546, 1602, 1664, 2290, 2411

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ in brackets in the margin.
c, ff\textsuperscript{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 Καφαρναοῦμ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· τί ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ διελογίζεσθε;

Compare also:

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)
92. Difficult variant

 Minority reading:
 NA28 Mark 9:35 καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: εἰς τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἐσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος.

 NA28 Luke 9:46-48 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἢν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶδὼς τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ’ ἑαυτῷ 48 καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτοῖς· διὸ ἐάν δέξηται τούτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ διὸ ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστειλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτος ἔστιν μέγας.

T&T #125

omit: D, d, k

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·
εἰς τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων διάκονος
f1, pc22 (h.t.?)

txt, but: ... πάντων δοῦλος M*, pc39 (:: Mt/Mk!)

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallels: both omit this word!
NA28Matthew 18:1-3 Ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσήλθο ὦτι μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες· τίς ἁρμα μείζων ἔστιν ἐν τῷ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; 2 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν 3 καὶ ἔστησεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἢν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὕτως εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28Luke 9:46-48 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἢν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶδὼς τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ’ ἑαυτῷ 48 καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτοῖς· διὸ ἐάν δέξηται τούτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ διὸ ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστειλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτος ἔστιν μέγας.
Compare:
NA28 Mark 10:31
πολλοὶ δὲ ἐσονται πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ καὶ [οί] ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι.
NA28 Matthew 19:30
πολλοὶ δὲ ἐσονται πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ καὶ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι.
NA28 Matthew 20:16 οὕτως ἐσονται οἱ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἐσχατοὶ.
NA28 Mark 10:43-44 οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
44 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δούλος.
NA28 Matthew 20:26-27 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
27 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δούλος.

Mt and Lk use a different wording and omit this sentence (Minor Agreement?).
Perhaps the omission is due to parablepsis?
9:35 καὶ λέγει ... 36 καὶ λαβὼν
et ait illis ... et accepit

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 Ἡφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης· διδάσκαλε, εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἥκολοῦθει ἡμῖν.

BYZ Mark 9:38 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων, Διδάσκαλε εἶδομέν τινα τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια οὐκ ἁκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἁκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν.

T&T #126

Byz A, K, Π, N, 157, Maj, Sy-H, goth, (NA25, Weiss), Tis, [Trg]

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0274, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, pc11, aur, f, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, WH, Trg

add pos. 1 omit pos. 2:
D, W, X, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc60, Lat(a, b, c, d, ff2, i, k, l, q, r1, vg), arm, geo, Gre, Bois

omit: (due to h.t.) καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἁκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν· 124, 472, pc120 !

μεθ’ ἡμῶν instead of ἡμῖν: D, L, Φ, pc11, a, d, k (: Lk)

Swanson, Legg have L, but it’s not in T&T.

NA25 and Weiss have basically Byz, but with ἐκωλύσαμεν and ἥκολοῦθει 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:
"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: 
\[\delta\varsigma\ οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ \; \muεθ’ \; \etaμῶν\]
He thinks that the ο[τι clause has been taken over from Lk. His argumentation for μεθ’ ημῶν is inconclusive. He thinks that Lk took the present ἀκολουθεῖ, the imperfect ἐκωλύομεν and μεθ’ ημῶν 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:

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)  
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 204

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:39 ὸ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὸν.
oúdeîcς γὰρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου
καὶ δυνηθεῖται ταχὺ κακολογησάι 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 κακολογησάι W, f1, 28, 565,
it(a, b, c, d, ff², i, k, r²), Sy-S, arm, geo
_____ κακολογησάι με F*
_____ ταχύ κακολογησάι 1582c

Θ, f13, 700, aur, f, l, q, vg have ταχύ.
1582: There is a space between δυνηθεῖται με and κακολογησάι and ταχύ
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"): 
tὸ δὲ ταχύ πρόσκειται διὰ τοὺς εἰς αὐρεσιν ἐκπεσόντας.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 205

NA28 Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν.

BYZ Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν

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<sup>10</sup>, Co, goth

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

BYZ Luke 9:50 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν

Byz  01<sup>2</sup>, f1, f13, Maj

txt  01<sup>1</sup>, B, C, D, K, L, W, Ε, Ψ, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, pc, Latt, Sy, Co

The Byz/txt readings are exactly opposite in Mk and Lk.

Compare next verse 41:
NA28 Mark 9:38 Ἑφι οὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης· διδάσκαλε, εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὄνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαίμονα καὶ ἐκκλώσαικεν αὐτόν, ὦτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν.

NA28 Mark 9:41 Ὁς γὰρ ἀν ποτίση ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὑδατός ἐν ὄνοματι ὦτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὦτι 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 ὑδατος ἐν ὄνοματι ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 9:41 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὑδατος ἐν ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

T&T #127 (partial)

txt ἐν ὄνοματι ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε B, C*, K, L, N, Π*, Ψ, f1, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, Sy, sa, WH, NA25

ἐν ὄνοματι ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐσται 01C2, A, 579, 1424

Byz ἐν ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε C3, Πc, X, 2c, Maj,

ἐν ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐσται
ἐν ὄνοματι μου ὅτι ἐμὸν ἐσται

ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε M, Θ, 565, 700, 2542
ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐσται D, Δ, 28
ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου, ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε f13 (:: 9:37,39)

Byz ὅτι (01*), C, W, Maj, Latt, bo
Byz + τῷ D, H, M, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 372, 565, 700, 2542, 2737

txt 01C2, A, B, C*, K, L, N, Π*, Σ, Φ, Ψ, 0211, f1, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 2766, al60, Sy, sa

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 10:42 καὶ ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἐνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτηρίων ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.
Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 9:37 ὃς ἂν ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέχηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται.
NA28 Mark 9:38 εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκκλύσαμεν αὐτὸν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν.
NA28 Mark 9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύσετε αὐτὸν. οὐδὲς γὰρ ἔστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματί μου καὶ δυνηστεί ταχὺ κακολογήσαί με.

The meaning of the Greek idiom ἐν ὄνοματι ὃτι 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 ὄνοματι 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)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 9:42 Καὶ οὐκ ἦν σκανδαλίσθη ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστεύοντων [eἰς ἐμὲ]. καλὸν ἔστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικός περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν.

BYZ Mark 9:42 Καὶ ὁ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσθη ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστεύοντων εἰς ἐμὲ καλὸν ἔστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται λίθος μύλικος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

omit eἰς ἐμὲ: 01, C*, D, Δ, it(a, b, d, ff², k)

πιστεύοντων 01, C*, Ν, Δ, it, NA28, WH, Weiss, Gre, Tis, Bal

πίστιν εὐχόντων C*, D, a, Bois

txt A, B, C², L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, l, q, vg), Sy, Sa, bo², Goth

According to Tischendorf two readings are possible for C*. He prefers the second.

πιστεύοντων
πιστινευόντων

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [eἰς ἐμὲ] in brackets in the margin.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 18:6 Ὅτι δὲ ἦν σκανδαλίσθη ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστεύοντων εἰς ἐμὲ.

Compare for absolute πιστεῦω:
NA28 Mark 5:36 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλοῦμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγωγῷ μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.
NA28 Mark 9:24 εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου ἔλεγεν πιστεῦω.
NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη ἵδε ὄδε ὁ χριστός, ἵδε ἔκει, μὴ πιστεύετε.
NA28 Mark 15:32 ὁ χριστός ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καταβάτων νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν 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 times in Mk.

The story 9:38 ff. deals with an exorcist, who "does not follow us". Therefore possibly the phrase τούτων τῶν πιστεύόντων εἰς ἐμὲ appeared somewhat inappropriate and lead to the omission of εἰς ἐμὲ, leaving a more general τούτων τῶν πιστεύοντων.

Rating: - (indecisive)  
(brackets ok)
TVU 208

95. **Difficult variant:**

*Minority reading:*
NA28 Mark 9:43 Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλὸν ἔστιν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἐχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γένναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ άσβεστον.

**σκανδαλίζῃ** 01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, (579), 892, 1342, pc, WH, NA28, Bois, Tis, Bal

**σκανδαλήσῃ** 579

txt **σκανδαλίζη** A, C, D, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, Weiss, WH

txt **σκανδαλίζει** E, X, Θ, 28, 565, 1424, pc

**B:** no umlaut

σκανδαλίζῃ subjunctive present active 3rd person singular
σκανδαλίζη subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
σκανδαλίζει indicative present 3rd person singular

**Parallels:**
NA28 Matthew 5:29 εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν 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 δεξιὰ σου χείρ σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτὴν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθη.

safe!

NA28 Matthew 18:6 Ὁς δὲ ἐν σκανδαλίζῃ ἐνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἔμε, συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλας ὁνυκός 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· καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν κυλλὸν ἢ χωλὸν ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἐχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ άσβεστον.

**σκανδαλίζη** F, L, V, X, 579, pc
NA28 Matthew 18:9 καὶ εἶ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν μοινόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς.

NA28 Luke 17:2 λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἶ λίθος μυλικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα.

σκανδαλίζει 579

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 9:42 Καὶ ὁς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων [εἰς ἐμέ], καλὸν ἔστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

σκανδαλίζη b
σκανδαλίζει H, 1071, pc
σκανδαλίζει Θ
σκανδαλίζει 2, 28, 579
σκανδαλίζη txt all others, W

NA28 Mark 9:45 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ποὺς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτὸν· καλὸν ἔστιν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.

σκανδαλίζει 01, Θ, 2, 28, 565, 1342, 1424
σκανδαλίζει L
σκανδαλίς txt W

NA28 Mark 9:47 καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτὸν· καλὸν σε ἔστιν μοινόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν,

σκανδαλίζει D, Θ, 2, 28, 565, 700, 1424
σκανδαλίζη W, 579

Mt uses the present active σκανδαλίζει, except for 18:6 σκανδαλίζη, subjunctive aorist, but here the subjunctive is required because of the ὁς ὁ δὲ ἂν. The same is true for Mk 9:42 (ὁς ἂν σκανδαλίζη). In Mk 9:45 and 47 subjunctive present σκανδαλίζῃ is basically safe.

It could thus be argued that σκανδαλίζη in verse 43 is a conformation to the immediately preceding 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)
NA28 Mark 9:43 Καὶ ἔαν σκανδαλίζῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτὴν· καλὸν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεὶν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἡ τάς δύο χειρὰς ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἀσβέστου.

T&T #128 (verse 47)

9:43 Minority reading

txt 01(C) 01(C) 01(C), A, B, C, (D), X, Θ, f13, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy-H, Co, goth
D, k: βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν ...

ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν 01(C), L, Δ, Ψ, 0274, 700, 892, pc, Sy-P
ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἀσβέστου 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 ἀσβέστου.

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 ἀσβέστου A, D, Θ, Ξ, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, goth
βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἀσβέστου 700
B: no umlaut
NA28 Mark 9:47 ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.
BYZ Mark 9:47 ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς.

T&T #128

ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν

01, B, L, (W), Δ, Ψ, 0274, 28, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc³, it (a, b, c, d, ff², k, r'), Co
D, f1, Sy-S
pc = 1312, 1668, 2144

ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς

A, C, Χ, Θ, f13, Maj,
Lat (aur, f, i, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Trg

The omission of the article is discussed as an extra variant. See below.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 18:8 ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰῶνιον.
(Mt puts foot and hand in one saying.)
NA28 Matthew 18:9 ἐπελθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 5:22
ὅς δ᾿ ἂν εἶπῃ μωρέ, ἐνοχὸς ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς.
safe!
NA28 Matthew 5:29 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἑνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῷν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ σῶμα σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.
safe!
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 homoiarcton (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 ἁβεβεθὸν 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 ἁβεβεθὸν 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 γέννησα τοῦ πυρὸς. 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 ἔδω ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτὸν ἰλαλό τον καλὸν σὲ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσέλθειν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθήναι εἰς τὴν γένναν,

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, NA25, Weiss, WH25

εἰς τὴν γένναν 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, ἐνοχὸς ἦσται εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρὸς.  

-safe!

NA28 Matthew 5:29 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γένναν.  

eἰς τὴν γένναν  W, L

NA28 Matthew 5:30 συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γένναν ἀπέλθη.  

eἰς τὴν γένναν  L

NA28 Matthew 18:9 καλὸν σοί ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσέλθειν ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθήναι εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρὸς.  

-safe!

NA28 Luke 12:5 ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλείν εἰς τὴν γένναν.  

eἰς γένναν  D, ψ, 157, 700
Context:
NA28 Mark 9:43 καλὸν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἡ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἁσβεστὸν. safe!

NA28 Mark 9:45 καλὸν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἡ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.

εἰς γέενναν 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 σκώλης αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.

Of course the addition of the article could be a conformation to the immediately preceding 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
οποιον ο σκώλης αυτών ου 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
οποιον ο σκώλης αυτών ου τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.

derived from:
LXX Isaiah 66:24 καὶ ἐξελεύσονται καὶ ὄψονται τὰ κώλα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν παραβεβηκότων ἐν ἔμοι ὁ γὰρ σκώλης 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 UBS⁴ 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.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 212

97. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 9:49 Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθῆσεται.

BYZ Mark 9:49 Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθῆσεται καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλὰ ἀλισθῆσεται.

T&T #129

Byz A, C, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 28c, 579, 892, Maj, Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, goth, Weiss, Vogels, [Trg] ... ἐν πυρὶ ... C

Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ δοκιμασθῆσεται ... 46, 52, 2614, g1 (= "will be tested") from Theophylact Comm.
Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀναλωθῆσεται ... Θ, pc3 (= "will be consumed")
καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀναλωθῆσεται Ψ

txt 01, B, L, W, Δ, 0274, f1, 788, 826(=f13), 28*, 565, 700, 1342, pc100, Sy-S, sa, bopt, arm, geo, Did

ἐν πυρὶ 01, 1342 ἀλισθῆσεται W (= "will be polluted")

καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλὰ ἀλισθῆσεται 1364*, 2173, 2426, 2465 (h.t.)
pᾶσα γὰρ θυσία ἀλλὰ ἀλισθῆσεται D, Ambrose, Chromatius
Omne enim sacrificium sali salietur d
Omnis enim victim sale salietur b, ff2, 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 δοκιμασθῆσεται clearly comes from Theophylact’s commentary to the passage who writes: "ἀλισθῆσεται, τούτῳ δοκιμασθῆσεται". 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 υμεῖς ἔστε τὸ ἁλας τῆς γῆς.
NA28 Luke 14:34 Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἁλας· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἁλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται;

LXX Leviticus 2:13 καὶ πᾶν δῶρον θυσίας υμῶν ἀλλὰ ἀλισθῆσεται
"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 σοβεύνυται 49 Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθῆσεται. καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλὰ ἀλισθῆσεται
(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 ἁγίω 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 ωὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν 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 ἀλλὰ 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 ἀλλὰ 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 ἁλισθήσεται and ἀναλωθήσεται must be regarded as later alterations of ἁλισθήσεται.
It should be noticed that Θ, Ψ and k appear to have arrived at ἀναλωθῆσεται independently. Θ and Ψ are both supporters of the conflate Constantinopolitan text, but whereas Θ has 'for every one shall be consumed (ἀναλωθῆσεται) 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 γάρ οὐσία ἐλισθῆσεται 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 ἄγνισθῆσεται (purified) for ἐλισθῆσεται (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 ἀλας." 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 ἐκείθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας [καὶ] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς.

BYZ Mark 10:1 Ἡκαί. ὅπαν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου Καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς.

T&T #130

**πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου** C\(^{22}\), 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

**καὶ 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"

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 19:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, μετήριεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἤλθεν 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 ... ἤλθον πρὸς αὐτοῦ.
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 and 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 ὄρια τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας πέραν τοῦ ᾿Ιορδάνου 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 his 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 Φαρίσαιοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.

T&T #131

omit: D, 1661, 2615c, it(a, b, d, k, r'), Sy-S, geoδ, saκε, Bois, SBL

WH have the term in brackets

Lat(aur, c, ff², l, q, vg) have the words.

D*: καὶ πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν

D$: καὶ ______________________ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Compare previous verse 1:
NA28 Mark 10:1 καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὁχλοὶ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

D: καὶ πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:3 Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρίσαιοι πειράζοντες αὐτόν καὶ λέγουντες: εἰ ἔξεστιν ἄνθρωπῳ ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναίκα 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 (ΚΑΙ P.. - ΚΑΙ 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 προσήλθον 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 ἀρχής κτίσεως ἀρσεν καὶ θὴλυ ἔποιησαν αὐτοὺς:

BYZ Mark 10:6
ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχὴς κτίσεως ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἔποιησαν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός.

αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός  
A, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, Maj, Lat(a, aur, l, q, vg), Sy, Gre, Trg

ὁ θεός  
D, W, pc, it(b, d, f, ff², k, r¹), goth, Bois

 txt  
01, B, C, L, Δ, 872 (=f1), 579, 1342, pc, c, Co

WH have txt with αὐτοὺς in brackets.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:4 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ’ ἀρχής ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἔποιησαν αὐτοὺς;

omit: a, ff¹, Sy-S
add ὁ θεός: pc

LXX parallel:
LXX Genesis 1:27 καὶ ἐποίησαν ὁ θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἔποιησαν αὐτὸν ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησαν αὐτοὺς

Compare LXX:
LXX Genesis 1:1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός 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 φωστήρας ... 
LXX Genesis 1:21 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ κῆτη 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 θεὸς has probably been added to provide the subject for ἐποίησεν (so Weiss). In verse 4 and 5 Moses was the subject.
Possibly αὐτοὺς 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 ἐνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα [καὶ προσκολλήθησεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ].
8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰσίν δύο ἄλλα μία σάρξ.

BYZ Mark 10:7 ἐνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολλήθησεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.
8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰσίν δύο ἄλλα μία σάρξ.

omit: 01, B, Ψ, 892*, Sy-S, goth, WH, NA25, Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal

καὶ προσκολλήθησεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ
A, C, L, N, Δ, Σ, f1, 579, 1342, al

txt D, Κ, Π, W, Χ, Θ, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700c, 892c, 1071, 1424, Maj.
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

700*: μητέρα for γυναῖκα

μητέρα αὐτοῦ 01, (D), M, 579, 1241, pc, it, vgmas

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)"
kολλάομαι "unite oneself with"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:5 καὶ εἶπεν· ἐνεκα 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 ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλαίψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

NA28 Ephesians 5:31 ἀντὶ τούτου καταλαίψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ 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. (ΚΑΙ ... ΚΑΙ). 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·
δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
cαὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται ἐπ’ αὐτήν·
NA28 Mark 10:12
cαὶ εὰν αὕτη ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὕτης
gαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχάται.

T&T #132

δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ ἄνηρ τὴν γυναῖκα
cαὶ γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ
f13, 28

δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
cαὶ γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ
D, Θ, 565, 700, arm, geo²
it(a, aur, b, c, d, ff², k, q)

ἐὰν ἀπολύσῃ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς
cαὶ ἐὰν ἄνηρ ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα μ.
W, f1, pc, Sy-S, geo¹

δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
cαὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ
A, K, Π, X, 157, 1071,
Maj, Lat(f, l, vg), goth, Gre

δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
cαὶ ἐὰν αὕτη ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὕτης
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*, X, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
("is married to another", better Greek)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 5:31 Ἐρρέθη δὲ·
δὲς δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὕτη ἀποστάσιον.
NA28 Matthew 5:32 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνεῖας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχεύσῃ, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχάται.

NA28 Matthew 19:9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἀν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται.


Compare context:
NA28 Mark 10:2 Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ἐξέστην ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτὸν.

There are two things involved:

1. W+f1 and f13+28 give direct subjects/objects in verse 11.
   f13+28 have: ἀνήρ τὴν γυναίκα
   W+f1 have: γυνὴ τοῦ ἀνδρᾶ (change of order)

2. Δ, Θ, 565, 700, it and f13+28 change ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἀνδρα 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 ἁψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπέτιμησαν αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα ἁψηται· αὐτῶν οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπέτιμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν

Byz A, D, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1071, Maj.
Lat, Sy, sa, goth, Gre, Tis, Trg, Bal
tοῖς φέρουσιν Θ, f1, f13, 1424

txt 01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, pc, c, k, sa, bo, Trg

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:13 Τότε προσνέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπέτιμησαν αὐτοῖς. ἐπέτιμων αὐτοῖς


txt 01, B, D, L, T, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, al

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 ἵδων δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξετηρεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς: ἀφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

ἐπετιμήσει καὶ ἐπετιμήσας
W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-H\mp, arm, geo, [von Soden]

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

ἐπετιμάω "command, order; rebuke; scold"

Compare previous verse 13:
NA28 Mark 10:13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετιμήσαν 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 diletantastic.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 220

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὄδὸν προσδραμὼν εἰς καὶ γονυπητήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωῆν αἰῶνιον κληρονομήσω;

ἀδελφὸς μεγαλότερος προσδραμὼν ἄδεν

Clement (Swanson): ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὄδὸν προσελθὼν τις εγονυπέτει λέγων ...

Lacuna: L, 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωῆν αἰῶνιον;
NA28 Matthew 19:22 ... ἢν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.
NA28 Matthew 19:23 ... πλούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.
NA28 Luke 18:18 Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἀρχῶν λέγων· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ποιήσας ζωῆν αἰῶνιον κληρονομήσω;
NA28 Luke 18:23 ... ἢν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερον ἑστιν κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλίας τῆς ραφίδος 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 ἡ τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

T&T # 135

"you shall not defraud"

*omit: B*, K, Π, W, Δ⁽¹⁾, Σ, Ψ, f1, f1₃ᵇ, 28, 579, 700, 2542, pm²⁴₀, vgᵐˢ, Sy-S, arm, Cl

txt 01, A, Bᶜ, C, D, X, Θ, 0274, f1₃ᵃ, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

omitt μὴ φονεύσης f1
omitt μὴ μοιχεύσης 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 ὁ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, _______ 19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

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 ἀνθρώπος αἰμάτων
"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 ἄδικεῖτε 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. (.ρήσης - .ρήσης), compare the similar omissions by 01* and f1.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 222

NA28 Mark 10:21 ὁ δὲ Ἱησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐν σε ὦστερεῖ· ὑπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πῶλησον καὶ ὅσα [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

 Byz Mark 10:21 ὁ δὲ Ἱησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐν σοί ὦστερεῖ· ὑπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πῶλησον καὶ ὅσα πτωχοῖς καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι ἀρας τὸν σταυρόν.

T&T #138

Byz    T2   A, X, 700, 1424, Maj, q, Sy, sa, bo, goth, Gre
       T1   G, N, W, 0257, f1, f13, 28, 2542, pc8, a, geo, (W, f13 add sou)

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, pc11, Lat, sa, bo, geo, Cl, Hil

pc = 16, 79, 92, 136, 406, 417, 766, 830, 1187, 1416, 2633

Lacuna: L, 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1292 C, line 30)
καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι. 22 ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:21
καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ⌠ καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

 niên τὸν σταυρὸν sou Sy-C, Aphraates

NA28 Luke 18:22
καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:34 εἰ τίς θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι.

NA28 Matthew 16:24 εἰ τίς θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω 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 ἔθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὡ δὲ Ὕσσος πάλιν ἀποκριθεῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολον ἦστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·

BYZ Mark 10:24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἔθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ ὡ δὲ Ὕσσος πάλιν ἀποκριθεῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τέκνα πῶς δύσκολον ἦστιν τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ χρήματιν, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν·

T&T #139

"those trusting on the riches"

Byz A, C, D, X, Θ, Ψc, f1, f13, 579, 892, 1342, Maj.
Lat, Sy, bopt, goth, Cl, Diatess, Gre, Trg

**οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἐχοντες** 1241, pc5 (= 588, 973, 1090, 2791, 2812) (verse 23) εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν πλοῦσιν W εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ. τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν 2786

txt 01, B, Δ, Ψ*, 146394% Byz, k, sa, bopt, WH, NA25

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:

Compare next verse 25:

"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
Ο ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πλούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελέγεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Mark 10:23-25
Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: πῶς δυσκόλως ὁ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελέγουσιν.

24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς: τέκνα, πῶς δυσκόλων ἦστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.


NA28 Luke 18:24-25
καὶ ἐναπόκρισιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [περίλυπον γενόμενον] εἶπεν: πῶς δυσκόλως ὁ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

25 εὐκοπώτερον γὰρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλίας 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:

κάμηλον  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 ἐνδύμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου τριχῶν καμίλου 28, 565

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπῶτερον ἦστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ραφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλοῦσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
καμίλου  579, 1424, pc (10 minuscules), Or

NA28 Matthew 23:24 ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, οἱ διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες.
κάμηλον  M, Θ, Π*, 579

NA28 Mark 1:6 καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσθιων ἄκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.
καμίλου  G5, 2, 28

καμίλου  S, 124, 579, 788, 1424

579  4 times
28  3 times
124, 1424  2 times

In the early christian centuriesEta, η, was sometimes pronounced like "e" and sometimes like "i". In the second case κάμηλον and καμίλον 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:

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 F, Γ, 28, 157, 565, al
omit τῆς G
τρυμάτως βελόνης f13, pc
τρυμάτως ῥαφίδος 01* (corrected by 01C2)

txt B, Maj-part[E, H, S, V, X], Cl, Robinson, NA28, Weiss, WHma

Lacuna: L
B: no umlaut

Compare also the discussion for τρυμαλίας ῥαφίδος, next page!

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερον ἐστιν κἄμηλον διὰ τρυμάτως ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλοῦσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

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:

τρυμαλιὰς τῆς βελόνης f13, pc
τρήματος ῥαφίδος 01* (corrected by 01c2)
τρυμαλιὰς τῆς βελόνης Cl

Lacuna: L, 33

B: no umlaut

(meaning is the same for all.)

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερον ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθείν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

διὰ τρυπήματος 01c2, D, L, W, Z, Γ, Δ, f1, f13, 2, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1010, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part (Robinson)
διὰ τρυμαλιὰς C, K, M, U, Θ, 124(f13), 157, 565, 700, Maj-part
διὰ τρήματος 01*, B, WH, NA25


Byz τρυμαλιὰς ῥαφίδος A, W, Ψ, 1071, 1424, Maj
τρυμαλιὰς 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 ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

T&T #140

πρὸς αὐτὸν 01, B, C, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1555, 2586, Co, WH, Trg
πρὸς ἑαυτὸν 788
omit: 569, pc13, boms, Cl

txt A, D, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, goth, NA25, 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 ἁρὰ δύναται σωθῆναι;
NA28 Luke 18:26 εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:27 καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἀπαντῶς ὡστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01, B</th>
<th>G, L, 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αὐτοὺς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρὸς αὐτοὺς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
<td>565c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA28 Mark 9:10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους Θ, 565
πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς 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 ἑαυτοὺς in Mk is not recorded.

Metzger: "The reading πρὸς αὐτὸν 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, οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν
ἥ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφᾶς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα __________ ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

BYZ Mark 10:29 ἀποκρίθεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ἁμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν
ἡ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφᾶς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ καὶ ἔνεκεν 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

txt 01, B, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 565, 700, 892, 1241, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Co
pc = 16, 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 ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις

Note also the minority reading:
omit 2. ἔνεκεν A, B*, S*, 2, 700, 1424, pc, aur, c, k
B* corrected probably by B cl (added in small uncial script).

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:29
οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφᾶς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα __________ ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις
BYZ Matthew 19:29
οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφᾶς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις
omitted by: B, (D, f1), pc, Sy-S

NA28 Luke 18:29 οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γυναικές ἢ τέκνα
BYZ Luke 18:29 οἰκίαν ἢ γυναικές ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ τέκνα

ἡ 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 ἦ 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)
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, 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.

Qui autem reliquerit... cum persecutionibus... vitam aeternam accipiet.

But who has left houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions, in the age to come will get eternal life.

"with persecutions all is affliction and anxiety" Diatess Pers (cp. Petersen p. 81)

Possibly the following meaning is intended (with a period after ἐκατονταπλασίων): "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 δἰωγμῶν. Both Mt and Lk omit it together with the repetition of the "houses ... fields" (Minor Agreement) 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’ ὀπού and must be some kind of colloquial equivalent of in aequo 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 ὰφηκεν οἰκίας (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 ἦ and in the second with καὶ.

Compare:

Mt 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.

Mk 10:29 Jesus said, "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."

Lk 18:29 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."

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 ἐκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

οἶκιάς καὶ ἁδελφοὺς καὶ ἁδελφᾶς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγέρους

μετὰ διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωῆν αἰώνιον.

**omit οἶκιάς … διωγμῶν**

01*, c

**omit οἶκιάς … ἀγεροῦς**

k

**add καὶ πατέρα**

01C2, K, Π, N, M, X, f1, 346(f13), 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, pc, l, bo

**add καὶ γυναίκα**

ψε, 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

οἶκιαν ἢ ἁδελφοὺς ἢ ἁδελφᾶς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγέρους

Byz: A, C, ψ, f13, 1342, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H

οἶκιαν ἢ ἁδελφοὺς ἢ ἁδελφᾶς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ γυναίκα, ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγέρους

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 ἐκατονταπλασίονα 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 ζωῆν αἰώνιον.

The sentence looks like an intrusion. It has been omitted by Mt and Lk!

ἡ πατέρα καὶ ἡ γυναίκα are omitted, although some added it later. ἡ
gυναίκα 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)
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 μελεί μετὰ τὸ ησαν δε εν τη οδῷ αναβαίνοντες εις ιεροσολύμα και τα εξής εως μετὰ τρεῖς ημερας αναστήσεται ωδε επιθετει κατα λεξιν

καὶ ερχονται εἰς βηθανιαν καὶ ἦν εκει μια γυνη ὡς ο ἁδελφὸς αὐτης απεθανεν καὶ ἐλθοῦσα προσεκυνησε τὸν ησουν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ υπὲρ δαβιδ ελεησον με ὠς μαθηταπ επετιμησαν αὐτὴ καὶ ὀργίσθηκεν ο ησους απηλθεν μετὰ αὐτης εἰς τὸν κηπον ὅπου ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ευθὺς ἡκουσθη εκ τοῦ μνημειον φωνὴ μεγάλη καὶ προσέλθων ο ησους ἀπεκύλλη τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θυράς του μνημειου καὶ εἰσέλθων εὐθὺς ὅπου ἦν ο νεανισκὸς ἐξετεινεν τὴν χειρα καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτον κρατήσας τῆς χειρος ο δε νεανισκὸς εμβλεψας αὐτῷ ἤγαπησεν αὐτον καὶ ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ὅσα μετὰ αὐτον ἦ καὶ ἔξελθοντες εκ τοῦ μνημειοῦ ἠλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν του νεανισκοῦ την γαρ πλοῦσιος καὶ μεθ ἡμέρας εξ επεταξεν αὐτῷ ο ησους καὶ ὄψις γενομενης ερχεται ο νεανισκος προς αὐτου περιβεβλημενος συνὸν επὶ γυμνον καὶ ἔμεινε συν αὐτῷ τὴν νυκτα ἐκεινην ἐδίδασκε γαρ αὐτὸν ο ησους το μοστηριον τῆς βασιλείας του θεου ἐκεῖθεν δε αναστας επεστρεφεν εἰς τὸ περαν του ἱορδανου

ἐπὶ μὲν τούτους επετας καὶ προσπορευονται αὐτῳ λακώβος καὶ ἰωάννης και πᾶσα η περικοπη το τε γυμνος γυμνω καὶ ταλλα περὶ ὧν εγραφας οὐκ 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 ὄνει. Ζεβεδαίοι λέγουτες αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, θέλωμεν ἵνα ὁ ἐὰν
αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν.

T&T #143

οἱ δύο ύιοι

B, C, 579, 1342, Co, DiatessArab, Weiss
NA25, WH have δῦο in brackets.

οἱ ὄνει

01, D, G, L, W, Γ, Δ, Φ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, 1424,
Maj-part1100, Or

_____ ύιοι

A, K, M, N, U, Χ, Θ, Π, Σ, 0233, 828 (= f13), 28, 157, 517,
565, 700, 954, 1071, 1675, 2766, Maj-part520

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 προβάς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο
ἀδελφοὺς, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν
αὐτοῦ, ε

NA28 Matthew 20:20 Τότε προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ὑιῶν
Ζεβεδαίου

NA28 Matthew 20:21 εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὐτοὶ οἱ δύο ύιοί μου εἰς ἕκ
δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἰς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

NA28 Matthew 20:24 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν.

NA28 Matthew 26:37 καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο ύιοὺς
Ζεβεδαίου ἦρετο 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: ΟΙΑΥΟΙΙΟΙΟΙΟΙΟΙ

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)
107. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: τί θέλετε [με] ποιήσω ὑμῖν;
BYZ Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: τί θέλετε ποιήσαι με ὑμῖν

T&T #144

tί θέλετε με ποιήσω 01\textsuperscript{CI}, B, Ψ, 0233, 954, 2766, WH\textsuperscript{ma}, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Tis

tί θέλετε ποιήσω ζ, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 1424, 1675, pc\textsuperscript{30}, WH, Trg, Bal, SBL

tί θέλετε ἵνα ποιήσω 1241, pc

tί θέλετε με ποιήσαι 01\textsuperscript{C2}, L, W\textsuperscript{C}, 579, 892, 1342, 2542, 2786, pc\textsuperscript{7}, W*, Δ, pc\textsuperscript{40}

tί θέλετε ποιήσαι 01\textsuperscript{C2}, L, W\textsuperscript{c}, 579, 892, 1342, 2542, 2786, pc\textsuperscript{7}, W*, Δ, pc\textsuperscript{40}

tί θέλετε ποιήσαι με A, X, 28, 124, 157, 372, 517, 700, 2737, Maj, Gre

01\textsuperscript{*} 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\textsuperscript{C}, L, 565, 579 τί θέλετε ἵνα ποιήσω ὑμῖν;

NA28 Matthew 26:15 τί θέλετε 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 ποιήσω 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 O1c2 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 θέλεις. 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 ἕξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἄλλοις ἴση ἂτοίμασται.

ἄλλοις 225, it("aliis" a, b, d, ff², k), sa
ἄλλοις δὲ Sy-S

ἄλλ' οἶς B², C², Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, i, l, q, r¹, 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"
ἄλλ' οἶς: "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 λλλοίς without any accents or spaces.

ἄλλοις is clearly a misinterpretation of the scriptio continua. With ἄλλοις the sons of Zebedee are excluded, with ἄλλ' οἶς the question is open.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 235

108. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 10:46 Ἐρχομαι εἰς Ιεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ιεριχώ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁχλοῦ ἴκανον ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαίου, τυφλὸς προσαίτης, ἐκάθετο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν.

omit: B*, 63 Legg, sa

(added by B Cl in the right margin, p. 1293, C 34)

(not in NA and not in SQE, but in Tis:)

Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Ιεριχώ

D, 0211, 2, 788, pc3,

it(a, b, d, ff2, i, r1), Sy-S, Or2 times, Sec. Mark(ab), Lachmann, Tregelles

pc = 740, 1337, 1347 (ECM-Parallels)

61, 258, 481 (Tis and Legg)

Origen: Com. Matth. tom. 16, 12 line 8f.
...
Kaὶ ἔρχομαι εἰς Ιεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁχλοῦ ἴκανον ἴδον ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτιμαίου, τυφλὸς" καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἔως 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.
ο ὁ δεὶ Μάρκος: "Καὶ ἔρχομαι εἰς Ιεριχώ. Καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖθεν"
same in Latin: "et venit in Hiericho. et exeunte eo inde"

ἐκεῖθεν instead of ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ: D, Θ, (565), 700, it(a, b, f, ff, i, q, r1), Or

565 reads both!

ἔδω after ἴκανον: 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:

\[\text{μετά δὲ τοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Ἰεριχώ επαγεῖ μονὸν: καὶ Ἰακύβ ἦκεὶ ἡ ἁδελφὴ τοῦ μενάσκου δυν ἡγάπα αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἡ μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ Σαλώμη καὶ οὐκ ἀπεδέχετο αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰ δὲ ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ τὰ εὐγαμματὰ καὶ φαινεται καὶ εστὶν ἡ μὲν οὖν αλήθεια καὶ κατὰ τὴν αλήθη φιλοσοφιαν εξηγησις}\]

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 Ἰεριχώ ἡκολουθοῦσεν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς.

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 έρ... - Καὶ έκ...).

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: ΚΑΙΕ ... ΚΑΙΕ.
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 Ἰεριχώ ... καὶ ὁχλοῦ ἴκανοῦ.

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)
NA28 Mark 11:3 καὶ εἶπε· τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἶπατε· ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὅτε.

BYZ Mark 11:3 καὶ εἶπε· τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; ὃ ποιεῖτε τοῦτο εἴπατε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει ὅτε

αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν
ἀποστέλλει πάλιν αὐτὸν
ἀποστέλλει πάλιν
πάλιν αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει
πάλιν ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν
one of these:

αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει
ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν

ἀποστελεῖ τὸν πάλον
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 εἴπη τι, ἔρειτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῦς.
NA28 Luke 19:31 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ· διὰ τί λύετε; οὕτως ἔρειτε· 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 ὦδε.

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 Ίησοῦς, καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 11:6 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ίησοῦς καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοῖς

Not in NA but in SQE!

αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν 01, B, C, L, Δ, 892, 1342, WH, NA²⁵

αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς W, Ψ, f1, 124, 28, Sy-S, sa, bo

καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς D, it(b, c, ff², 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 indicatīve 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 01², Β, Δ, Θ, 073, f1, 124, 788(=f13-part), 579, 700, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co(+ mae-2), Or

Parallels:
NA28 Luke 19:32-34 ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοὶς. 33 λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτοὺς· 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 αὐτοὶς 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)
NA28 Mark 11:8 καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἴματα αὐτῶν ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὄδον, ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἄγρψων.

NA28 Mark 11:8 πολλοὶ δὲ τὰ ἴματα αὐτῶν ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὄδον ἄλλοι δὲ στοιβάδας ἐκοπτοῦν ἐκ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώνυμον εἰς τὴν ὄδον.

T&T #149

Byz  A, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo⁸⁸, goth

... ἐς τὴν ὄδον... A, (D), G, X, Φ, f1, f13, 28, 1342, Maj

... ἐν τῇ ὄδῷ... K, M, N, Y, Θ, Π, Σ, 69*, 565, 579, 700, pm

ἄγρψων ... ἐν τῇ ὄδῷ: 579
ἄγρψων ... ἐς τὴν ὄδον: 892ε, 1342

dένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώνυμον: k

txt  01, B, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 892*, Sy-H⁷⁷, sa, Or
B: no umlaut

omit ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἐς τὴν ὄδον: W, 2*, pc¹⁸, i, Sy-S (h.t.)

892: After ἄγρψων 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 οὐ δὲ πλείστος ὁ λαὸς ἐστρωσαν έαυτῶν τὰ ἴματα ἐν τῇ ὄδῷ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκοπτοῦν κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἐστρώνυμον ἐν τῇ ὄδῳ.

There is no reason for an omission. Very probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).
Note the mixed version of 579, 892ε and 1342 where ἄγρψων 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 ὄδον - εἰς τὴν ὄδον).

Note that both Mt and Lk have ἐν τῇ ὄδῷ against εἰς τὴν ὄδον in Byz Mk. If the short text of Mk is original, then we have here a significant Minor Agreement 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: ὦσαννά ἐν τοῖς υψίστοις.

BYZ Mark 11:10 Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία ἐν ὅνοματι Κυρίου, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ: ὦσαννά ἐν τοῖς υψίστοις.

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:


Compare previous verse:

NA28 Mark 11:9 καὶ οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐκραζοῦν· ὦσαννά: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὅνοματι κυρίου.

LXX:

LXX Psalm 117:26 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὅνοματι κυρίου εὐλογηκαμέν ὑμᾶς εἷς οἶκου κυρίου

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context. In verse 9 we have ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὅνοματι κυρίου

In verse 10 again ἡ ἐρχομένη appears and some scribe added ἐν ὅνοματι 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 εἰσήλθεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὀψίας ἤδη οὕσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

**ὅψη** 01, C, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc, Or, WH, NA₂₅, Gre, Trg₆ₓ, Tis, Bal, SBL

**ὅψη δὲ** Δ (perhaps just a misreading: Δ C for Δ C)

**txt** A, B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 069, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Weiss, WH₆ₓ

**omit τῆς ὥρας:** B, 1424, pc

**ὅψίνης** 565

Lacuna: 33

**B: no umlaut**

**ὄψίας** noun genitive feminine singular

**ὅψη** adverb

the meaning is the same: "late, late in the day, evening"

**Compare context:**

NA28 Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὅταν ὀψή ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἐξω τῆς πόλεως. safe!

**Compare also:**

NA28 Mark 1:32 ὄψιας δὲ γενομένης, safe!

NA28 Mark 4:35 ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὄψιας γενομένης. safe!

NA28 Mark 6:47 καὶ ὄψιας γενομένης safe!

NA28 Mark 13:35 ἢ ὀψή ἢ μεσονύκτιον safe!

NA28 Mark 14:17 Καὶ ὄψιας γενομένης safe!

NA28 Mark 15:42 Καὶ ἤδη ὄψιας γενομένης, safe!

NA28 John 20:19 Οὕσης οὖν ὄψιας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνῃ τῇ μίᾳ σαββάτων

ὀψία is clearly the more common word (15 times in the Gospels against 3 times for ὀψή). Mark uses both forms. Interestingly all other occurrences of the words are safe.
This is the first occurrence of ὄψε, and it would be only natural to change it into ὄψία. That ὄψε is a conformation to the following ὄψε in verse 19 is rather improbable.
Weiss argues (Comm. Mk) that ὄψίας has to be taken as an adjective here. Misunderstanding this, it was changed into ὄψε, or, as in B, τῆς ὥρας was omitted. Already Hort has noted that τῆς ὥρας has to be included into the analysis. ὄψίας ἦδη οὖσης 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 ὄψε ἦδη οὖσης as possible original text. He thinks it is possible that scribes found the genitivus absolutus difficult and inserted the common phrase. ὄψε ἦδη οὖσης 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, ὡσιάς ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

ἡδη οὔσης ὥρας B, 1424, pc, sa
οὔσης τῆς ὥρας D, 565
οὔσης τῆς ἡμέρας W

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 ἔξῆλθεν ἐξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ἠνήλισθη ἐκεῖ.
NA28 Luke 21:37 Ἡν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἠνήλιστο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαίων· 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 ὡσιάς always occurs in the form: ὧσιάς (δὲ) γενομένης 12 times
It is only here that we have ὡσιάς ἤδη οὔσης.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 129) notes that ὡσιάς 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 ὡσιάς 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Mt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Jerusalem</td>
<td>Entering Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig tree 1</td>
<td>Cleansing the temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleansing the temple</td>
<td>fig tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig tree 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 21:12 Καὶ εἰσήλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλεν πάντας ...
NA28 Matthew 21:17 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτούς ἐξήλθεν ἐξ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ηὐλίσθη ἐκεῖ. 18 Πρῶτο δὲ ἐπαινάγων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπείνασεν.

NA28 Mark 11:11 Καὶ εἰσήλθεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὦρας ἡ ὡρα ὡρας, ἐξήλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.
NA28 Mark 11:15 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰς ἑσελθὼν 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 ότι ὁ οἰκός μου οἰκός προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὡμεῖς δὲ πεποίηκατε αὐτὸν σπῆλαιον ληστῶν.

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, NA25, Weiss, WHᵐ<br>

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:13 καὶ λέγει **αὐτοῖς:** γέγραπται· ὁ οἰκός μου οἰκός προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὡμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπῆλαιον ληστῶν. NA28 Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἠρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας 19:46 λέγων **αὐτοῖς:** γέγραπται· καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἰκός μου οἰκός προσευχῆς, ὡμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐστιν σπῆλαιον ληστῶν.

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 ὡτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.
add αὐτοῖς: Mᵐ, 2, pc

NA28 Mark 4:11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται
omit αὐτοῖς: 33

NA28 Mark 4:26 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
add αὐτοῖς: 124, 1071

NA28 Mark 4:30 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
add αὐτοῖς: 01ᵃ, 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 οἶκον
omit αὐτοῖς: W

NA28 Mark 7:9 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· καλῶς ἁθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ,
omit αὐτοῖς: 579

NA28 Mark 7:27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ· ἀφές πρῶτον χορτασθήμαι τὰ τέκαν
omit αὐτῇ: f1, 28

NA28 Mark 8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὕπω συνίετε;
omit αὐτοῖς: Ν

NA28 Mark 9:31 ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἄνθρωπων
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 ἁγοραῖς
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 κακὸν
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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὃταν ὤψε ἐγένετο, ἔξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.

BYZ Mark 11:19 Καὶ ὃτε ὤψε ἐγένετο, ἔξεπορεύετο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως

Byz 01, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
Lat(a, b, f, ff², i, k, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-H, Co, goth, WH₅₉, Gre

txt A, B, K, M, W, Δ, Π, Ψ, 28, 124, 565, 700, 1071, al,
aur, c, d(!), r¹, vg₄₉, Sy-P, WH, NA₂₅

L omits the verb, probably due to h.t. (ETO - ETO) or h.a. (EX - EX).

Ὀτε: 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 Ἡν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκειν, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἔξερχόμενος ἡπιλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἑλαιών·

Context:
NA28 Mark 11:18-20 πάς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ. 19 Καὶ ὃταν ὤψε ἐγένετο, ἔξσπορεύουντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως. 20 Καὶ παραπορεύομενοι πρὸς εἶδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ριζῶν.

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 ἔξεπορεύουντο with the previously mentioned subject ὁ ὄχλος which took the singular. Note that some manuscripts have in verse 18 the plural ἔξεπλήσσετο: 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)
112. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 11:23 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἶπη τῷ ὀρει τούτῳ ἀρθητὶ καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὁ λαλεῖ γίνεται, ἔσται αὐτῷ ὅ ἂν εἶπη

BYZ Mark 11:23 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἶπη τῷ ὀρει τούτῳ ἀρθητὶ καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὁ λέγει γίνεται ἔσται αὐτῷ ὃ ἂν εἶπη

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
   ὁ σα ἂν εἶπη  Θ, 565, 700, pc

txt  01, B, C, D, K*, L, W, Δ, f1, 28, 892, 2786, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Co
   pc = 130, 1542, 1654

ὁ:  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 ὀρει τούτῳ εἶπητε· ἀρθητί καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, γενήσεται· 22 καὶ πάντα ὁ σα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψησθε.

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 ὁ λαλεῖ (txt) and ὁ 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, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.*

**Byz** A, C, D, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, 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, vgme, Sy-S, sa, bopt

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 *(Εὰν γὰρ ἀφίητε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος: 15 εὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδὲ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.)*

**Compare previous verse:**

NA28 Mark 11:25 *Καὶ ὅταν στήκете προσευχόμενοι, ἀφίετε εἰ τι ἔχετε κατὰ τινος, ὃν καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῆ 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**

| εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε, | εὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφήσει 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 ἀφητε).

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; ἥ τίς σοι ἐδωκέν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιήσῃ.

Not in NA (only the omission by D is noted) but in SQE!

omit: W, Θ, 28, 565, pc, it(a, aur, b, ff², i, r¹), Sy-S
omit ἥ τίς . . . ποιήσῃ: 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 ἐδωκέν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;
NA28 Luke 20:2 καὶ εἶπαν λέγοντες πρὸς αὐτόν· εἰπὼν ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἥ τίς ἐστιν ὁ δοῦσι σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

The omission by D could be due to h.t. (ταῦτα ποιεῖς - ταῦτα ποιήσῃ).
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;
ἡ τίς σοι ἐδωκέν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 11:31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν’ εἷς οὐρανοῦ, ἐρέι· διὰ τί [οὖν] οὐκ ἐπιστεῦσατε αὐτῷ;

Τὸ τι εἴπωμεν: D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, pc, it(a, b, c, d, ff, i, r)
[von Soden], Bover, Kilpatrick, SBL

aur, f, l, q, vg omit the words.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:25 οί δὲ διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν’ εἷς οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· ἡμῖν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεῦσατε αὐτῷ;
NA28 Luke 20:5 οί δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν’ εἷς οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεῦσατε αὐτῷ;

Compare:
NA28 Luke 12:17 καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποτὶ συμβῇ τοὺς καρποὺς 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 Τὸ τι εἴπωμεν’ εἷς 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 εἶπομεν· εξ ἀνθρώπων· ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον· ἀπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην οὕτως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν.

ἡδελσαν D, W, Θ, 565, 2542, it("sciebant"), arm, geo
οἶδασιν 700

I, vg have εἶχον ("habebant")
B: no umlaut

ἐχω here as: "regard, consider, think"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:26 ἔαν δὲ εἰπομεν· εξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 14:5 καὶ θέλων αὐτῶν ἀποκτείναι ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.
NA28 Matthew 21:46 καὶ ζητούντες αὐτῶν κρατήσας ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἔπει εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

ἐχω 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)
And again he sent another slave to them; this one (they threw stones at) they beat over the head and insulted.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:35 καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ ὅν μὲν ἐδειράν, ὅν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὅν δὲ ἔλθοβόλησαν.

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 ἐκεφαλίσαν.

An interesting conjecture has been proposed by Linwood for ἐκεφαλίσαν, 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 ἐκεφαλίσαν, the two words could be easily mixed up. Cp. also Mk 14:65.


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 δούλον· κάκεινον ἐκεφαλίσαν καὶ ________ ἦτίμασαν.

BYZ Mark 12:4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δούλον· κάκεινον λιθοβολῆσαν ἐκεφαλάζαν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἦτίμωμένον.

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^ς, bo

k omits καὶ ... ἦτίμασαν.
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 ἄτερον πέμψαν δούλον· οἱ δὲ κάκεινον 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 ἦτίμωμένον.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 251

114. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

**omit** B, L, 892*, 1342, pc, k, Sy-S, sa-mss, bo, WH, NA28, Weiss, Bois, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt 01, A, C, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 892c, 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 ὡταν οὖν ἔλθη ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος, τί ποιήσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἔκείνους;
NA28 Luke 20:15 καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος ἀπέκτειναν. τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος;

**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 ἔπηράτων αὐτῶν οἱ ἀχλοὶ λέγοντες· τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν; **omit οὖν:** D, N
NA28 John 6:30 Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῶ· τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημείον **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· εἷς οὐρανοῦ, ἔρει· 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, C², D, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, sa-mss

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:25 τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἔρει ἡμῖν· διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;
omit οὖν: D, L, 28, 700, 892, 1071, al²⁰

NA28 Luke 20:5 οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες· ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἔρει· διὰ τί οὖν 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."

Rating: 1? (= omission probably right) (Mk 11:31)
Rating: - (indecisive) (Mk 12:9)
 Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:14 καὶ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: οὕδαμεν ὥσπερ ἀλήθης εἰ
cαι οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός; οὔ γαρ βλέπεσιν εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων,
ἀλλ’ ἐπ’ ἀληθείας τὴν οὐδὲν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις;

T&T #155+156

οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες ἥραντο ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ λέγουτες
G, W, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 28, 565, 700, al & q, r, Sy-S, sa & arm, geo,
von Soden

καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
D, 1579, d, k

ἐλθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ
ff²

ἐλθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγουτες
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
tῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν λέγουσιν· διδάσκαλε,
NA28 Luke 20:21 καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγουσιν· διδάσκαλε, ...

Justin, Apol. 17:2: (not clear which Gospel)

προσελθόντες τινὲς ἡρώτων αὐτὸν, ...

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαίοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, οἵτινες
λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες;
NA28 Mark 14:1 καὶ ἔξητον 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:14
εξεστὶν δοῦναί κῆνσον Καίσαρὶ ἢ οὕ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;

T&T #157

étikefálaion D, Ì, 124, 565, 1071, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, Bois
étikefálaion δοῦναί κῆνσον 1071

it = "tributum"
k = "capitularium"

B: umlaut! (p. 1296 A 14 L) ἔξεστὶν δοῦναί κῆνσον

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:17 εἶπε ὁμιν τὶ σοι δοκεῖ ἔξεστὶν δοῦναί κῆνσον
Καίσαρὶ ἢ οὕ;
NA28 Luke 20:22 ἔξεστὶν ήμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναί ἢ οὕ;

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 ο δὲ εἶδος αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: τί με πειράζετε; 

تباع υποκριται 
P45, F, G, N, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, 579, al, q, vg

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:18 γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν· τί με πειράζετε, ΥΨΙΚΡΙΤΑΙ;

NA28 Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
BYZ Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τι με πειράζετε;

(add υποκριται: 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 ἔπ’ 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, NA28, 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 ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς 01, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, pc
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, r¹

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.

Context:

NA28 Mark 12:15 ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρίσιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι ὁμολόγιον ἵνα ἴδω.  safe!
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 καί 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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπέθανεν
μὴ καταλιπών σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὦσαύτως·

BYZ Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπέθανεν
καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὦσαύτως·

T&T #158

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj.
Lat(a, aur, d, l, q, vg), Sy, sapt, goth

txt 01, B, C, L, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1093, 1342, 2786, c, sapt, bo

αἱ 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

καταλιπῶν "leave, leave behind"
καταλείπω participle aorist active nominative masculine singular

Compare immediate context:
NA28 Mark 12:19 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνη καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνον, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 12:20 ἔπτα ἀδελφοὶ ἰδιαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα καὶ ἀποθησάκων οὐκ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα·
NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἔπτα οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα.
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:25 καὶ μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα ἀφῆκεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.

Mt and Lk have a different wording, although Lk has κατέληπσαν once. Either καταλήπτων has been inserted to break the monotonous style (previous and next verse read ἀφήκησε), 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 ἐσχάτως:
NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἕπτα οὐκ ἀφήκαν σπέρμα· ἐσχάτῳ πάντων καὶ ή γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

BYZ Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφήκεν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἐσχάτως:
BYZ Mark 12:22 καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἕπτα καὶ οὐκ ἀφήκαν σπέρμα ἐσχάτῃ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ή γυνὴ

ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἕπτα 01, B, C, L, Δ*, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Co
ὡσαύτως· οἱ ἕπτα καὶ W, 28
ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἕπτα καὶ M*, f13
simili modo. Et omnes septem (c), k

ὡσαύτως ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν· καὶ οἱ ἕπτα Θ
ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὡσαύτως· οἱ ἕπτα καὶ f1, 700
ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν· καὶ οἱ ἕπτα καὶ 565
καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἕπτα· καὶ D, b, ff², r¹ (omit ὁ τρίτος), ὡσαύτως· καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν ὡσαύτως καὶ οἱ ἕπτα καὶ A, pc, l, vg, Sy-H, goth
ὡσαύτως· καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἕπτα καὶ K, M*, Δ*, 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 ἐκεῖ τῶν ἕπτά.

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)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:23 ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει οὕτως ἔσται γυνη; οἱ γὰρ ἐπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.

BYZ Mark 12:23 ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει ὅταν ἁναστῶσιν τίνος αὐτῶν ἐσται γυνη οἱ γὰρ ἐπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα

T&T #159

txt A, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, b, ff², i, l, q, vg),
Sy-S, Sy-H, goth, NA₂₅, Weiss
οὕτως ἔσται ἁναστῶσιν ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει
add οὕς; A, K, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, al

ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει
01, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Ψ, 33, 69, 579, 892, 1342,
al²², c, d, k, r¹, Sy-P, Co, WH, Trg
add οὕς; D, W, 33, 579, 892

ἐὰν οὕς ἁναστῶσιν aeth (Tis)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:28 ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει οὕς τίνος τῶν ἐπτὰ ἔσται γυνη;
πάντες γὰρ ἔσχον αὐτὴν
NA28 Luke 20:33 ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνη;
οἱ γὰρ ἐπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἁναστῶσιν οὕτε γαμοῦσιν οὕτε
γαμίζονται, ἀλλ’ εἰσίν ὃς ἀγγελοὶ 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 ἀναστάσεις has been omitted as either redundant or accidentally after ἀναστάσεις. 22 Byzantine minuscules omit it.

Rating: - (indecisive)
   brackets ok.
117. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστώσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσίν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

BYZ Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστώσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσίν ὡς ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

T&T #160

| ἄγγελοι οἱ | A, G, X, Φ, Ψ, 565, 788, Maj-part₁⁵₀₀, Sy-P, goth, [Trg] |
| ὡς ἄγγελοι | W, 892, pc², bo |
| ἄγγελοι οἱ | В, Θ, pc¹³, sa, Or, WH, Weiss, [Trg]²⁹ |
| ἄγγελοι θεοῦ οἱ | f13, pc⁴ |
| ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ | 69, 1071, pc⁵₀, l |
| ἄγγελοι | 33, pc² |
| txt ἄγγελοι | 01, C, D, F, K, L, Μ, У, Δ, Π, Ω, f1, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1612, 2542, al¹⁴⁰, Lat, Sy-H, WH, NA²⁵ |

Δ: εἰς ἄγγελοι instead of ὡς ἄγγελοι.

Tregelles reads ἄγγελοι οἱ [οὶ] as txt and has [οῖ 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 ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσίν.
BYZ Matthew 22:30 ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰσίν

Compare:
NA28 Mark 13:32 οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ
BYZ Mark 13:32 οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ

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 peri ðe twn nekrw n òti ògeiropnatai ouk anègnwte en
th ð biblw Mouwsew òpî toû bátou pwz eîpen autw ò òthdç légw n
ègw ò òthdç 'Abraam kai [ò] òthdç 'Isaak kai [ò] òthdç 'Iakwb;

omit first ò: 157, 579, 983, 1689(=f13c), pc
omit ò2,3: B, Trg, WH, NA25, Weiss
omit all three ò: D, W, Or

txt P45vid, 01, A, C, L, D, Ò, Ï, f1, f13, 28, 33, 565, (579), 700, 892, 1071,
1342, 1424, Maj

P45: Acc. to Swanson P45 has a lacuna for the first two ò, but the third ò is
visible.
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:
NA28 Mark 12:27 ouk èstîn ò thdç nekrw w òllâ w zównw n
BYZ Mark 12:27 ouk èstîn ò òthdç nekrw w òllâ thdç zównw n
ò thdç B, D, K, L, M5, U, W, D, Ï, 28, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, al, Lat, Co,
ò thdç 01, A, C, F, Ï, Ï, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj, Sy-H,

Parallels:
omit ò2 and ò3: 01

Origen to this verse (acc. to Tischendorf): ou gâr geyp. eîmi thè. abp. k. is.
k. is. all eîw eîmi thè. abp. k. thè. is. k. thè. is. k. ouw y gr anegrapw matb. k ma. k. loupw.

NA28 Luke 20:37 òti ðe ògeiropnatai ou nekrw o, kai Mouwsew èmînswen
èpî ths bátou, òwz lêgei kûriouv tôw òthdn 'Abraam kai òthdn 'Isaak kai òthdn 'Iakwb.

txt, omit ò2 and ò3: 01, B, D, L, R, 579, 892, pc, Or
add articles: A, W, Ï, Ï, f1, f13, 33, Maj
Compare:

NA28 Acts 3:13 ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ
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 ἔγω ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ.

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 ἔγω εἰμὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακὼβ
LXX Exodus 3:15 ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακὼβ
LXX Exodus 3:16 θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακὼβ
LXX Exodus 4:5 θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακὼβ

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 Ἰθεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ Ἰωύλων·
BYZ Mark 12:27 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ θεὸς ζώντων·

---

**Θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ **B, D, K, L, M*, U, W, Δ, Π, 28, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, al, Lat, Co, WH, NA**²⁵

---

**ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ **01, A, C, F, X, Ψ, f1, 157*, 565, 700, 1424, WH**²⁶

---

one of the above: goth

---

**ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ **Γ, 157°C, Maj, q, Sy-H**

---

**ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ **Θ, f13, 33, 1342, pc, Sy-S**

M*, 1241, 1582°C

---

**B: no umlaut**

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:32 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακὼβ; οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

---

**ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων **B, L, Γ, Δ, f1, 33, pc**

---

**ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων **01, D, W, 28, 1424*, Lat**

---

**ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς** νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων **Θ, 0138, f13, 565, 579, Maj, Sy-H**

---

**ὁ θεὸς ὁ 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 εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, ἴδων ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς ποιὰ ἦστιν ἐντολή πρώτη πάντων;

BYZ Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, εἶδως ὅτι καλῶς αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίθη, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς, Ποιὰ ἦστιν πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή;

**Byz** 01^c^2, A, B, X, Δ, 124, 33, 157, 579, 1424, Maj, Co, WH, NA^28, Weiss, Gre, Trg^oa

**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
εἰδώς = οἶδα

**Context, verse 15 + 34:**

NA28 Mark 12:15 ὁ δὲ εἶδως αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τί με πειράζετε; φέρετε μοι δημάριον ἵνα ἴδω.

εἰδὼν 01*, D, f13, 28*, 565, 1342(!), pc, it corrected by 01^c^2 ( = C^a Tisch.)

NA28 Mark 12:34 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἴδων [αὐτῶν] ὅτι νοουχώς ἀπεκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ· οὐ μακρὰν εἰ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὕκετι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαι.

εἰδώς H^*, 579, 700, pc

Compare:

NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἶδως αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἄγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἥπορεί, καὶ ἣδεως αὐτοῦ ἥκουεν.

ἐίδως 565

ἐίδως L, N, W, Θ, Σ, 28

NA28 Matthew 9:4 καὶ ἴδων ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν.
ινατί ἐνθυμεῖσθε ποιηρά ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;

εἶδως  B, Θ, Πc, f1, 565, 700, 1424, L844, L2211, al50,
      Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, mae, arm, WH, NA25, 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 εἶδως δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἡ πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθείσα καθ’ ἕαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἡ οἰκία μερισθείσα καθ’ ἕαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.

Occurrences: Mt    Mk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>εἶδως</th>
<th>12 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἶδως</td>
<td>2 times (Mk 6:20, 12:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other occurrences of ίδων in Mk are basically safe (note only 7:2 εἶδότες for ίδόντες by D, perhaps accidental itacism?). Both occurrences of εἶδως show an ίδων variant (see above). Compare also Jo 6:14 εἶδότες by L and Jo 6:61 ίδων by C.

It is possible that the variation is at least in part accidental, because εί and ι are pronounced alike (compare the ίδως and εἶδως variants).

ίδων is clearly the more common word. It is possible that the change from εἶδως to ίδων at 12:15 is a conformation to common usage.

The εἶδως variant at 12:28 could be a conformation to 12:15. On the other hand ίδων could be a conformation to 12:34.

The εἶδως 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 εἶδως at 12:28.

Compare also discussion at Mt 9:4.

Difficult!

Rating: - (indecisive)
121. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 12:29 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν: ἀκούε, Ἰσραὴλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν.

BYZ Mark 12:29 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν. ἀκούε Ἰσραὴλ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν

**omit:** 229, k, sa

ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν 01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892*, 1342, pc, sa\textsuperscript{ms}, bo, WH, NA\textsuperscript{25}

Πάντων πρώτη D, W, Θ, 565, al, it(a, b, d, i, r'), Sy-S
Πάντων πρώτων 28, 700
Πρώτων πάντων f1, 2542
Πρώτη πάντων 788(=f13)

ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων X (h.t.?)

ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν ἐντολή 892\textsuperscript{c}

ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή A, K, M, U, Π, 33, 1424, al, Trg\textsuperscript{ca}
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή ἐστίν C
ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν 124, 157, Maj,

Lat(aur, c, ff\textsuperscript{z}, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

ὅτι Πρώτη πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐστίν 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 εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν σὺζητοῦντων, ἵδον ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοῖν· ποία ἐστίν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων:

ἔστιν ἐντολὴ πρώτη D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700

(Not noted in NA, but connected!)
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:36 διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολή 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 εξ ὀλης τῆς καρδίας σου
2 καὶ εξ ὀλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
3 καὶ εξ ὀλης τῆς διανοίας σου
4 καὶ εξ ὀλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

omit 1 349
omit 2 K, Π*, 472, pc
omit 3 D, H, pc, c, Bois
omit 2+3 157, k, (Justin²/₅)

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 ο δὲ ἐφη αὐτῷ άγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὀλη τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὀλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὀλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.
omit καὶ ἐν ὀλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου: 33
add καὶ ἐν ὀλη τῇ ἰσχύι: Θ, f13, 33

omit καὶ ἐν ὀλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου: 157

LXX:
LXX Deuteronomy 6:5 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου εξ ὀλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ εξ ὀλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ εξ ὀλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου for καρδίας B' has διανοιας (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 ὀλη γεν’ ἐξ ὀλης 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 διανοιά 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 ἴσχύος σου.

No txt in NA and SQE!

**omit** B, D*, X, f13, pc, WH

txt 01, A, Dc, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, NA25, Weiss, WH

**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 ἴσχύος καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς 
ἐαυτὸν περισσότερον ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

**omit** B, U, X, Ψ, pc, WH

txt 01, A, Dc, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, NA25, Weiss, WH

**omit τῆς in front of ἴσχύος:** 01* (corrected by 01c2)

Lacuna: C (in both verses)

**B: no umlaut**

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:37 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν 
ὅλη τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ 
σου.

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 καρδιάς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου for καρδιάς, read by A. B C has: διανοιας (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 καρδιάς 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 καρδιάς 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
αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή
αὕτη πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή
αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ πρώτη ἐντολή
αὕτη ἔστιν πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἐντολή pc⁴

txt 01, B, E, L, Δ, Ψ, 1342, pc¹⁰, 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 ἔστιν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή.
BYZ Matthew 22:38 αὕτη ἔστιν πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἐντολή

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητοῦντων, ἰδοὺ ὁ τι καλὸς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοῖς· ποία ἔστιν 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 ἀλλή ἐντολή οὐκ ἔστιν.

BYZ Mark 12:31 καὶ δευτέρα ὡμοία αὕτη: Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν μείζων τούτων ἀλλή ἐντολή οὐκ ἔστιν

Byz A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth
καὶ δευτέρα ὡμοία αὕτη A, W, X, f1, f13, Maj, Sy, goth
δευτέρα δὲ ὡμοία αὕτη D, Θ, 33, 565, 579, 700, Lat
δευτέρα ὡμοία αὕτη 1675, Trg (!)

txt 01, B, L, Δ, Ψ, 579, 892, 1342, pc, Co
δευτέρα αὕτη ἔστιν 01, 1342
ἡ δευτέρα αὕτη Δ, Ψ
δευτέρα δὲ αὕτη 579
ἡ δὲ δευτέρα αὕτη 892

1342 omits μείζων τούτων ἀλλή ἐντολή οὐκ ἔστιν
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:39
δευτέρα δὲ ὡμοία αὕτη: 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 γραμματεὺς· καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἰς 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, NA28, Weiss, WH

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)
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 διανοιαίας σου, verse 30**

1 + 4: 01, B, L, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, 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 εὖ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου
3 καὶ εὖ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
2 καὶ εὖ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου
LXX Joshua 22:5 καὶ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ
5 εὖ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν
3 καὶ εὖ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς ὑμῶν

Verse 30:
NA28 Mark 12:30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου εὖ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου
3 καὶ εὖ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
5 καὶ εὐ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου
4 καὶ εὐ ὅλης τῆς ἵσχύος σου.
   3 + 4  D, H
   5 + 4  K, Π *
4 + 3 + 5  1424
(These omissions are probably simply due to h.t.)

3 καὶ εὖ ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου
4 καὶ εὖ ὅλη τῇ ἵσχύί σου
5 καὶ εὖ ὅλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου,
καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

NA28 Matthew 22:37 ο从此 ἡ ἐφή αὐτῷ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου εὖ ὅλη τῇ καρδίᾳ σου
3 καὶ εὖ ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου
5 καὶ εὖ ὅλη 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.
ψυχῆ (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:


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

eἰδὼς for ἴδων: H*, 579, 700, pc (cp. 12:28)
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

The construction of ὄραω with accusative and ὦτι is rare in Hellenistic Greek (Lk 19:4 is not really parallel, because it’s a ἴνα 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 ὦτι 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
123. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 12:36 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου.

BYZ Mark 12:36 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς 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, Ῥᾳ

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 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου;
BYZ Matthew 22:44 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς 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

ὑποκάτω D, pc, it, Sy-C, Sy-P

LXX quote:
LXX Psalm 109:1 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου

Compare:
NA28 Acts 2:35 ἡώς ἄν θώ τούς ἐχθροὺς 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 ὑποπόδιου 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 ὑποπόδιου.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 272
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 12:40 οἰ κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι: οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

Τ καὶ ὀρφανῶν
"orphaned"

et pupillorum a, b, d, i, q, r¹, vg
et orphanorum c, ff²

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 ὀρφανῶν οὐ κακώσετε
LXX 2 Maccabees 8:28 μετὰ δὲ τὸ σάββατον τοῖς ἡκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαστες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία διεμερίσαστο
LXX Zechariah 7:10 καὶ χήραν καὶ ὀρφανῶν καὶ προσήλυτον καὶ πένητα μὴ καταδυναστεύετε

NA28 James 1:27 θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτή ἐστιν, 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)
The last time Jesus had been mentioned as a direct subject was in verse 35. It is only natural to add it here.

έστως 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 ὅτι άλλος ἐπὶ λίθων ὡς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

BYZ Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκρίθηκες εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ἄλλος ἐπὶ λίθῳ, ὡς 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, NA28, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal

*one of these:*  
Lat(e, ff², i, k, l, r¹, vg)

**ὦῶε 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

**ὦῶε 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 ὅτι άλλος ἐπὶ λίθων ὡς οὐ καταλυθῆσαι.  
W* omits ὅτι, otherwise save.

οὐκ ἀφεθῆσαι λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὡς οὐ καταλυθῆσαι.  
A, G, Δ, Θ, Π, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H

**λίθος ἐπὶ λίθω**  
S, W, Ψ, 157, 1071

**λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον**  
01c, L, f13-part

**ὦῶε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον**  
f1, 33, 579, 1241, pc, Sy-C

**ὦῶε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὡῶε**  
01*, B, (D, it), f13-part, 892, 2542, pc D, it add ἐν τοῖς

Here I consider the txt reading probably wrong and think that the 01, B reading is original (compare Lk commentary).
Compare also:
Byz: ἐν σοὶ λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον

BYZ Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ὁδὲ ἀπόλλυμαι

The reading of NA25 is probably a relict of considering the omission of ὁδὲ 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 ὁδὲ is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). ἐπὶ λίθῳ might be from Lk.

The support for a reading without ὁδὲ 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 μή ἀφεθῇ ὦδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθου ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

T&T #166

καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν
D, W, it(a, b, c, d, ff², i, n, r¹), Cyprian (3rd CE)

et in triduo aliud resuscitetur sine manibus b
et in triduo illud resuscitetur sine manibus ff²
et in triduo resuscitabo illud sine manibus c
et in triduo aliud resurget sine manibus n
et in triduo aliud resurget sine manibus r¹
et in tridum aliud resurget sine manibus i
et post triduum aliud 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 CypTestim. 1,15
et 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 suscitato non manibus factum ff²
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 Ἰησοῦς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντας ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ἱερὸν τούτον τῶν χειροποιήτων καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἁχειροποιητὸν οἰκοδομήσω.
D, it: ... ἀναστήσω ἁχειροποιητὸν
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:2 οὐ βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα; άμην λέγω ύμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὁδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὡς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

Compare also:
NA28 John 2:19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τούτον καὶ ἐν τρισίν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτὸν.

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 ἑθνός ἐπ’ ἑθνός καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαιν, ἐσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἐσονται λιμοὶ ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων ταῦτα.

BYZ Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἑθνός ἐπ’ ἑθνός καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαιν καὶ ἐσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί: ἀρχαὶ ὀδίνων ταῦτα

T&T #167

καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί GPS A, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, q, Sy, sa mss

ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί 28, 892, Weiss

καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί 565, 700

καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί Θ, pc

καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί Σ, 1342, pc

λιμοὶ ταραχαί W

ἐσονται λιμοὶ 01, B, L, Ψ, pc, Lat, sa mss, bo

καὶ λιμοὶ D, Lat

καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ 579, Trg (with καὶ in brackets), Gre

ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ 2542, pc

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, ἐσονται λιμοὶ 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 ἐγερθῆσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους:
BYZ καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ 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


Compare:
LXX Isaiah 22:5 ὅτι ἤμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλέσας καὶ καταπατήσας καὶ πλάνης παρὰ κυρίου

BYZ John 5:4 ἀγγελὸς γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασεν τὸ ὑδάτω. ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὑδάτως, ὑγιὴς ἐγίνετο, ὥ ὁ ἐπέτεισε κατείχετο 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 καὶ: A, Θ, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, Maj
Possibly the addition of καὶ ² is a harmonization to Mt?

ἐγερθῆσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους ἔσονται - - -

The simple ἔσονται λιμοὶ 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 ταραχῆς (28, 892)

All other readings are tertiary variations.
Already WH speculated that καὶ παραχαὶ 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 παραχαὶ fell out before ἀρχαὶ accidentally.

Interestingly both Mt and Lk have the same text up to βασιλεῖαν and then go different ways:

**Mk**

ἐσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους,
ἐσονται λιμοὶ_

**Mt**

καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ
καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους

**Lk**

σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι
cαι κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ
cαι λοιμοὶ ἐσονται

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:

BYZ Mark 13:8 ἀρχαὶ ὡδίνων ταῦτα.

Not in NA and SQE!

Θ, f13, 28, 69, 565, (1071) read:

ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων. Θ
ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων. f13, 28, 565
ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχαὶ ὡδίνων. 69
ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων ταῦτα πάντα. 1071
ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων ὡδίνων. 1582*
omit(1) 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

ὡδίνων genitive feminine plural
"birth-pains; pain, suffering"
ἀρχὴ nominative feminine singular
ἀρχαὶ nominative feminine plural

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:8 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων.
W, f1, f13, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων.

The Caesarean variation is clearly a harmonization to Mt. ἀρχαὶ is possibly a conformation to the plural ὡδίνων.

Weiβ defends ἀρχαὶ with the argument that otherwise the omission of καὶ ταραξαῖ cannot be explained (see previous variant). But this is only true if καὶ ταραξαῖ is original at all, which is not clear.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:9

Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς· παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς διαρθήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

εἶτα (δὲ) ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς παραδώσουσιν

D, Θ, 565, 700, it(a, b, d, ff², i, n, r¹)

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 γάρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς· 18 καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς θείσιν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 24:9 Τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν θείων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. 10 καὶ τότε οἰκοδομήσουσιν πολλοί καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσι καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους:

NA28 Luke 21:12 Πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φιλακάς,
NA28 2 John 1:8 βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἢ εἰργασάμεθα ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε.

There is no parallel for the Βλέπετε δὲ ὑµεῖς ἑαυτοὺς, except for 2.Jo 8. = "But you, for yourselves, beware (or take care)!"

Μt 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 ἁγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, ὅλλῳ ὁ εἰναὶ δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν.

BYZ Mark 13:11 ὅταν δὲ ἁγαγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε μὴδὲ μελετᾶτε· ὅλλῳ ὁ εἰναὶ δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν.

Not in NA, but in SQE!

Byz A, K, Π, X, Δ, f1, f13, 22, 1071, Maj, a, n, Sy-P, Sy-H μὴδὲ 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:
προμελετάων 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 "Оταν δὲ ἤδη τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὅρη,

BYZ Mark 13:14 "Οταν δὲ ἤδη τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥήθην ὕπο Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἐστώς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὅρη

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♀♀♀, Sy-P, Sy-H

διὰ  Φ, f1, 28, 579, 1424, pc
quod dictum est ante profeta  k* (kʰ removes ‘ante’ and adds ‘a Danielo’)

txt  01, B, D, L, W, Ψ, 565, 700, 892,
Lat(d, ff², i, n, r¹, vg), Sy-S, Co, arm, geo

Lacuna: C, 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1297 C 33 R)  τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:15 "Оταν οὖν ἤδη τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥήθην διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω,
ὕπο  pc² (Legg: 1402, 2145)

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.
Note that some manuscripts read διὰ as in Mk.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 1:22 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὕπὸ κυρίου
NA28 Matthew 2:15 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὕπὸ κυρίου
NA28 Matthew 2:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου ὕπὸ: L, Maj
NA28 Matthew 2:23 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὕπὸ: 01, C
NA28 Matthew 4:14 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου
NA28 Matthew 8:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου ὕπὸ: 1424
NA28 Matthew 12:17 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου ὕπὸ: C, N, 1424
NA28 Matthew 13:35 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου
NA28 Matthew 21:4 τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ὕπὸ: 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 δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἀραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

omit B, F, H, 1342, 1424, 2542, pc, c, Co, WH, NA28, Weiss, SBL

txt 01, A, L, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1071, Maj, Sy-H, WHmg, [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 δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

καὶ ὁ 124, 346, 157, 700c, pc

ο` δὲ D, 33

NA28 Luke 17:31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὡς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δῶματος καὶ τὰ σκεῦη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ,

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 13:14 Ὄταν δὲ ἦδη τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὑπὸ οὗ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ фευγὲτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὀργ.

NA28 Mark 13:16 καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἄρα τὸ ἰμάτιον 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 δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθήτω ἀραὶ τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Mark 13:15 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω **εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν**, μηδὲ εἰσελθήτω ἀραὶ 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, pc35, 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 δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω ἀραὶ τα ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

NA28 Luke 17:31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δὲ ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δῶματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἀραὶ 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 ἐἰς 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 δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἀραὶ τῇ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,

τῇ ἀραὶ  
B, K, Π*, L, Ψ, 892, pc, Υ, WH, NA28, Weiss, Gre\textsuperscript{old}, Trg, SBL

txt 01, A, D, Δ, Θ, Π, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Gre\textsuperscript{new}

ἀραὶ  
(W), 2542
W reads: (Swanson and Facsimile)
ἀραὶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ τῇ

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δῶματος μὴ καταβάτω ἀραὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ,
ἀραὶ τῇ  
D, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 1424, TR
ἀραὶ  2


Context, verse 16:
NA28 Mark 13:16 καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἁγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἀραὶ τὸ ἴματιον αὐτοῦ.

It is interesting that no witness in Mk changed τῇ into the Matthean τὰ (Greeven notes L17), but that several witnesses changed τὰ into the Markan τῇ. Nevertheless it is possible that the order ἀραὶ τῇ is a harmonization to the Matthean order.
There is no reason to change τῇ ἀραὶ.
Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 627) notes a possible chiasm:

τι ἀραί ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, ... ἀραὶ τὸ ἴματιον αὐτοῦ.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
TVU 284
NA28 Mark 13:18 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμώνος·

BYZ Mark 13:18 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμώνος·

Byz 01, 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

Note also:

χειμώνος ἡ σαββάτου L, n²
ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμώνος ἡ ἐν σαββάτου 346, 1424, k
ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμώνος μηδὲ σαββάτω 1071, 1342, pc

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:20 προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμώνος μηδὲ σαββάτῳ.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
**TVU 285**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:22 ἑγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανάν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς.

**ποιήσουσιν** D, Θ, f13, 28, 565, pc, a, geo², Or?, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis, Bal

**WH, Trg read txt.**
Or: Mt Comm. tom. 17:1
ότι ἐν τῇ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐξουσίᾳ ποιεῖ πᾶσαν δύναμιν καὶ σημεία καὶ τέρατα,

Lacuna: 33

**B: no umlaut**

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:24 ἑγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὡστε πλανήσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς.

Compare:
NA28 John 2:11 Ταῦταν ἐποίησεν ἄρχην τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 John 2:23 θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὰ σημεῖα ἀπομίανεν:
NA28 John 3:2 οὐδείς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἃ ἐν ποιεῖς,
NA28 John 4:54 Τοῦτο [δὲ] πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 John 6:2 ὅτι ἐθεώρησαν τὰ σημεῖα ἀπομίαν αὐτὸς εἰπὼν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων.
NA28 John 6:14 Ὅτι οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἵδοντες ὅ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον
NA28 John 6:30 Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον.
NA28 John 7:31 μὴ πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσῃ ὃν οὕτως ἐποίησεν:
NA28 John 9:16 ἄνθρωπος ἀμαρτώλως τοιαύτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν.
NA28 John 10:41 ὅτι ἤλοιπος τῶν σημείων ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν,
NA28 John 11:47 οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα.
NA28 John 12:18 ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον.
NA28 John 12:37 Τοσαύτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος
NA28 John 20:30 Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν
It is possible that ὁδόσουσιν is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). The combination of σημεῖον with ποιέω is characteristically Johannine. It appears nowhere in the Synoptic Gospels. ὁδόσουσιν σημεῖα is Hebrew-Aramaic idiom (Act 14:3).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
**TVU 286**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 13:28 Ἄπο δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἢδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύη τὰ φύλλα τῶν παραβολῶν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἔστιν.

Not in NA but in SQE, Tis!

---

**Αʹ ἐν αὐτῇ** D, Θ, 28, 124, 565, 700, pc, q, arm

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:32 Ἄπο δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἢδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἀπαλὸς καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύη, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος.

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, οię δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται.

οὐ παρελεύσονται B, WH, NA28, Weiss, Bois, Trg

οὐ παρέλθωσιν D*

οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται 01, L, 892, 1342, 1424, pc, Gre, Tis, Bal
οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν A, C, Dc, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, Maj, WH32, Trg32

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:35 ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται, οię δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν. (safe!)

οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν A, C, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

Context, previous verse 30:
NA28 Mark 13:30 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθη ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη μέχρις οὐ ταύτα 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 μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι). BDR (§ 355) 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)
127. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 13:32 Ἡμέρας ἔκεινης ἡ τῆς ὥρας οὐδείς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ θεός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

BYZ Mark 13:32 Ἡμέρας ἔκεινης ἡ τῆς ὥρας οὐδείς οἶδεν οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ θεός εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ


txt: 01, D, K*, L, U, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, bo*, NA25, WH

ἄγγελος B, bo*, Aug, WHmg, Trgmg

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

**Compare:**

NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὐτὲ γαμοῦσιν οὐτὲ γαμίζονται, ἀλλ’ εἰσίν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

BYZ Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὐτὲ γαμοῦσιν οὐτὲ γαμίζονται, ἀλλ’ εἰσίν ὡς ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

It is possible that the οἶ 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 οὐδείς, ὁ θεός, 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 πατὴρ.

omit: X, 983, 1689 (=f13c), pc, vg

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 01C2, L, W, Σ, f1, 22, 33, 892, Maj1500, vg, Sy, Co(+ mae-2), Hier

txt 01*, B, D, Θ, Φ, f13, 28, 2680, a190, it, vg, Sy-Pal, arm, geo118, Ir, (Or), Chrys, Cyr(Hesych), Hier

Compare also next verse:
NA28 Mark 13:33 Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε· οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ τὸ πότε ὁ καιρός ἔστιν.  \[\text{T} \text{εἶ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱός \; W}\]

Full discussion at Mt 24:36

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 290

128. Difficult variant


BYZ Mark 13:33 βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε: οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν.

T&T #170

Byz 01, A, C, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat(aur, f, ff², i, l, q, r¹, vg), Sy, Co, Gre, [Trq]

txt B, D, 0233, pc⁶, it(a, c, d, k), vgns
pc = 122, 1467, 1494, 1632, 1657, 2773
UBS3c adds: Copfay

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 οἶδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:41 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς πειρασμόν: τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενῆς.
NA28 Mark 14:38 γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς πειρασμόν: τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενῆς.

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."

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, ff², i, vg<sup>ms</sup>  
**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. (...ἰν λέγω - ...ἰν λέγω).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 292

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:3 Καὶ ὁντὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανία ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ ἠλθεν γυνὴ ἐχοῦσα ἀλάβαστρον μῦρον νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς, συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς.

θραύσασα D, Θ, 565

fracto "break" aur, d, ff², i, l, q, r¹, 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.

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 ἢσαν δὲ τίνες ἁγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς· εἰς τί ἢ ἀπώλεια αὐτή τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν;

οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ διεπόνυντο καὶ ἔλεγον

D, Θ, 565, it (a, d, ff², i, r¹), arm
discipuli autem eius indigne ferebant (a: fremebant inter se) dicentes

ἡσαν δὲ τίνες τῶν μαθητῶν ἁγανακτοῦντες 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 ἴδοντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἁγανάκτησαν λέγοντες· εἰς τί ἢ ἀπώλεια αὐτή;

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 ἁγανακτέω.
By the way, it has been conjectured that instead of ἤσαν one should read ἐλάλησαν (compare I.A. Heikel-Helsingfors TSK 106, 1934/35, p. 314-17). Of ἐλάλησαν the ἐλάλ fell out and left ἤσαν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 294

NA28 Mark 14:5 ἢδύνατο γὰρ τούτῳ τὸ μῦρον πραθήναι ἐπάνω δημαρίων τριακοσίων καὶ δοθήναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς καὶ ἐνεβριμώντο αὐτῇ.

BYZ Mark 14:5 ἢδύνατο γὰρ τούτῳ ______ πραθήναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δημαρίων καὶ δοθήναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς καὶ ἐνεβριμώντο αὐτῇ

Not in NA and SQE!

tούτῳ ______ πραθήναι
E, F, G, H, M, S, V, X, Γ, 2, 22, 157, Maj, c, k, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo, goth, TR

tούτῳ τὸ μῦρον πραθήναι
A, B, C, K, Π, Λ, U, Δ, Ψ, f1, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, al, sa, Sy-H, Or

01 τὸ μῦρον πραθήναι
D, f13, 700

prαθήναι τὸ μῦρον τοῦτο
W

prαθήναι τοῦτο τὸ μῦρον
Θ

τὸ μῦρον τοῦτο πραθήναι
28, 565, pc

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:9 ἢδύνατο γὰρ τούτῳ ______ πραθήναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθήναι πτωχοῖς.

BYZ Matthew 26:9 ἢδύνατο γὰρ τούτῳ τὸ μῦρον πραθήναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθήναι [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 τούτῳ τὸ μῦρον οὐκ ἐπράθη τριακοσίων δημαρίων καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς;

Compare previous verse 4:
NA28 Mark 14:4 ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς έαυτούς· εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη τοῦ μῦρον γέγονεν;

omit τοῦ μῦρον: 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)
129. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 14:7 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ’ έαυτῶν καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς ________ ἐὰν ποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

\[ \text{πάντοτε ἐὰν} \]

01, B, L, (Ψ), 892, 1071, 1342, pc, sa, bo, WH, Trg

**txt**

(01*), A, C, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, goth, NA, Weiss

01* reads: δύνασθε ________ ἐὰν ποιῆσαι

Ψ reads: \[ \text{πάντοτε} \] δύνασθε αὐτοῖς ἐὰν ποιεῖν

Lacuna: 33

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:11 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ’ έαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

NA28 John 12:8 τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ’ έαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

Compare LXX:

LXX Deuteronomy 15:11 ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἐνδεής 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 ἔξηλθον σὺν μαθηταῖς καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἤτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Not in NA and not in Tis, but in SQE!

\[\text{T έτοιμάσα] \quad W, \Theta, 124, 565, pc, sa}^{\text{mss}}\]
\[\text{T έτοιμάσα] αὐτοῦ] \quad 28, 1071\]

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:19 καὶ ἐποίησαν σὺν μαθηταῖς ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἤτοιμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 14:15 καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δεῖξει ἀνάγκην μέγα ἐστρωμένου ἔτοιμον καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν.

Not in the parallels, but a natural addition. The only reason for an omission would be to avoid the repetition of the several έτοιμάζω.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 297

130. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Mark 14:19 ἢρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἰς μῆτι ἐγὼ;

BYZ Mark 14:19 οἱ δὲ ἢρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς καθ’ εἰς Μῆτι ἐγὼ καὶ ἄλλος, μῆτι ἐγὼ;

T&T #171

εἰς κατὰ εἴς = "one after another"

Byz D, X, Θ, f1, 700, 892, Maj, it(a, d, f, ff², i, k, q), Sy-Hmg, arm, geo, Or, Gre, Bois, Trgmg

eἰμὶ κύριε καὶ ἄλλος, μῆτι ἐγὼ 517, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, pc²
eἰμὶ Ραββί καὶ ἄλλος, μῆτι ἐγὼ A, 267
eἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλος, μῆτι ἐγὼ f13, 28, 1071, pc³⁰
eἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλος, μῆτι ἐγὼ eἰμὶ Σ, pc⁶

καὶ ὁ ἄλλος: 579

ἡ ἄλλος: c

txt 01, B, C, L, P, W, Δ, Ψ, 828 (=f13), 1342, 2786, al¹²⁵, Lat(aur, l, vg), Sy, Co

Lacuna: 33

Β: umlaut! (p. 1299 B, line 28) εἰς· μῆτι ἐγὼ; 20 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:22 καὶ λυπούμενοι σφόδρα ἢρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκαστος· μῆτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ, κύριε;

NA28 Matthew 26:25 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδίδος αὐτὸν εἶπεν· μῆτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ῥαββί; λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶπας.


The omission could be due to haplography: μῆτι ἐγὼ - μῆτι ἐγὼ. 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 ἀλλὰς 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 ἱστός by A). The reading of 579 makes good sense. "Is it me or another one?"

Note that both Mt and Lk have εἶμι against Mk (Minor Agreement).

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: εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ’ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον.

T&T #172

τρύβλιον dish, bowl (of food)

[B, C*, Θ, 565, Weiss, [WH], [NA25]]

C is corrected by C2.

Note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>εἶν τῷ τρυβλίῳ</th>
<th>047, 1424, pc53 (Mt?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἶν τῷ τρύβλιον</td>
<td>2446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὸ τρυβλίῳ</td>
<td>648c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:23 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ’ ἐμοὶ τὴν χεῖρα εἶν τῷ τρυβλίῳ οὕτως με παραδώσει.

[εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον] D (not in NA and SQE)


Compare:

NA28 1 John 5:8

τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν ἐσιν.

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 εἰς τὸ ἐν τρυβλιῶ (checked at the film).
From this evidence one must conclude that the ἐν 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 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 ἐν had been omitted, because it was not understood anymore. For the phrase εἰς τὸ ἐν τρυβλίον 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 ἐντρυβλίον 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 ἰρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν: 
λάβετε τούτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου.

BYZ Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν 
Δάβετε, φάγετε: τούτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου.

Byz Χ, Σ, f13, 28, 1241, 1342, Maj, ff², bo

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, τούτο ἐστιν

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν: 
λάβετε φάγετε, τούτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου.
NA28 Luke 22:19 καὶ λαβὼν ἰρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων: τούτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· 
tοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. Liturgical usage.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 300

NA28 Mark 14:24 καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

BYZ Mark 14:24 καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τὸ τῆς καλυνῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον

T&T #173

Byz A, X, Δ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1342, 2509*, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa,…, bo,

txt 01, B, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0211, 565, 2509c, d, (ff²), k, sa,…, bo,

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 γὰρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης
BYZ Matthew 26:28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τὸ τῆς καλυνῆς διαθήκης

Byz A, C, D, W, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy, sa, bo


Compare:
NA28 1 Corinthians 11:25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτῆριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσας λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτῆριον ἢ καλυνὴ διαθήκη ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἔαν 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 αἷμα 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 τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἢς 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 ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

T&T #174

| οὐ μὴ πίω | 01, C, L, W, Ψ, 0103, 892, 1342, pc34, c, bo |
| οὐ μὴ προσθῶ πεῖν | D, a, d, f |
| οὐκέτι οὐ προσθῶ πεῖν | 565 |
| οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ προσθῶμεν πεῖν | Θ |

**οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω**

A, B, X, Δ, f1, f13, 700, Maj,

Lat(aur, b, ff2, 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’ ἀρτί ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου …


Compare:
LXX Amos 7:8 + 8:2 οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῶ τοῦ παρελθεῖν αὐτῶν
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 ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτη, ὅτι γέγραπται Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα

Byz  A, C*, K, N, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, 2542, Maj-part, c, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^ms, bo^ms
txt  01, B, C*, D, L, X, Γ, Δ, Ψ*, Ω, 828(=f13), 2, 1342, Maj-part, it^pl(b, d, ff^2, q), sa^ms, bo^st

ἐν ἐμοὶ  G, Ψ*, 28, 157, pc, it^pl(a, aur, f, i, k, l), Sy-S, sa^ms, bo^ms

ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτη  νγ

Faijum-fragment, P.Vindob G 2325 (3rd CE):
ἐν ταύτη] τη νυκτι σκανδαλισ[θησθε

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 ύμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτη, 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 νυκτί πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτωρα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

omit: D, Θ, f13, 565, 700, pc, it(a, b, d, f, ff², i, q, r¹), sa⁸⁸, 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 νυκτί πρὶν ἀλέκτωρα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.
NA28 Luke 22:34 ὦ δὲ εἶπεν· λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἑως τρῖς με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι. δὲς 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 νυκτί πρὶν ἢ δὲς ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

_____ ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι _____ 01, D, W, 579, 983 (=f13), pc

ἡ ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι C

one of these: it(a, b, c, d, ff², i, r¹), vg

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):
πρὶν ἀλεκτρύων δῆς κοκ[κύζει]

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί πρὶν ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

BYZ Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λέγω σοι Πέτρε ὦ μὴ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἴδεις με ὦ μὴ φωνήσῃ δῆς ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν Sy-C

NA28 John 13:38 ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἔμοι θήσεις· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὦ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἐως ὦ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.

Probably the δῆς 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 δὲν μὴ συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὔ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. ώσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.

BYZ Mark 14:31 ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον, ἐὰν δὲν μὴ συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὔ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι ώσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.

Not in NA, but SQE!

ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει 01, B, D, Ψ, 083, 1342, Co, WH, NA
ὁ δὲ περισσῶς ἐλάλει L
ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐλάλει 892

ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον K, Π, Χ, Γ, 2, 157, 579, 828(=f13), Maj
ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσίας 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 ὦ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ:

No reason for an omission of μᾶλλον.

Note that both Mt and Lk don't have ἐκπερισσῶς (Minor Agreement).

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:

omit: 01, B, L, Δ, 892, 1342, pc⁴, 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' οὔ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλα τί σύ.

οὗ ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλ' οὗ σύ θέλεις
ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλ' ὡς σύ θέλεις
ὡς ἐγὼ ἔλθης ἄλλ' ὡς σύ θέλεις
μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι ἄλλ' ὡς σύ θέλεις

D, it, vg⁴, Co
Θ
565
f13, 2542 (Mt)
Justin_

Lat(aur, k, l, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:39 πλήν οὔχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἄλλ' ὡς σύ.

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 οὗ σκανδαλισθήσομαι at the end of the verse.

Note that both Mt and Lk have πλήν here against Mk (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 307

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσημάζατο τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών.

Western non-interpolation

**omit:** D, it(a, b, c, d, ff², 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 προσημάζατο λέγων: πάτερ μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τούτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πώ, γεννηθῆτω τὸ θέλημα σου.
NA28 Matthew 26:44 καὶ ἀφεῖς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσημάζατο ἐκ τρίτου τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών 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)
133. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθών ...  
NA28 Mark 14:40 καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὑρέν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ἤδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Mark 14:40 καὶ ὑποστρέψας εὑρέν αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν βεβαρημένοι, καὶ οὐκ ἤδεισαν 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, ΤΤ υποστρέψας πάλιν εὑρέν Θ, 565, 2542, pc29
omit πάλιν Σ, pc30
καθεύδοντας πάλιν N, X

txt 01, B, (D), L, Ψ, 083, 892, 1342, it, Sy-S, Co, Trg
omit πάλιν:
ἐλθὼν εὑρέν αὐτοὺς D, it(a, b, c, d, ff2, 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 εὑρέν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας,
BYZ καὶ ἐλθὼν εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 14:35 καὶ προελθὼν μικρόν
NA28 Mark 14:37 καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς
NA28 Mark 14:39 καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθών
NA28 Mark 14:40 καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὑρέν 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 ἔλθὼν (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, ἵδιον 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, geo², (sa)

**ἀπέχστο τὸ τέλος** Θ et al.
**ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος ἵδιον** 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** geo²

"The work is ended!"

"Adest finis! Venit hora," b, f, r¹
"Adest enim consummatio! Venit hora," c, ff²
"Consummatus est finis! Advenit hora," a
"Sufficit finis! Venit hora," d, q
"Sufficit! Venit hora," au-r, l, vg
"Iam ora est" k

**ἀπέστη (τὸ τέλος)** conj. A. Pallis (1932)

κ omit 892, (k) (892 has a big semicolon ; after ἀναπαύεσθε)

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, geo¹

**ἀπέχει** ἡ ὥρα 157 (omit ἦλθεν)

Lacuna: 33

**B:** umlaut! (p. 1300 B, line 7) ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:45 ὁτε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε [τὸ] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἴδοὺ ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:26 καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ δύναται στήναι ἄλλα τέλος ἔχει.

τὸ τέλος ἔχει. 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· ἡ λόθεν 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 ὀχλὸς 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 ἦ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· ἀπέστην Λ, Θ, 565, 892 ἀπέστη 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 ἦ ὃρα, about which already the Latins were at a loss."

Compare:
- J. de Zwaan Expositor VI, 12, p. 452ff.
- G. H. Boobyer "Ἀπεχεῖ in Mk 14:41." NTS 2 (1958/59) 44-48
- K.W. Mueller "Ἀπεχεῖ (Mk 14:41) – absurda lectio?" ZNW 77 (1986) 83-100

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὑρήκες ἐὰν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ἔξων παρὰ τῶν ἄρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

ὁ Ἰουδας (A), B, [WH], [NA²⁸], 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 Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης Α, [Trq]
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης Κ, Π, Μ, U, Υ, Θ, Φ, 0116, 579, 700°, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, al, Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, Gre
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης 124, 346, 565, pc, Or
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης D, Latt

Greeven notes 22 for ὁ Ἰουδας.
Tregelles has: ὁ Ἰουδας [ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης].
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 42:
NA28 Mark 14:42 ἐγείρεσθε ἠγωμένη ἵδοὺ ὁ παραδίδουσι με ἡγικεν.

NA28 Mark 14:10 Καὶ Ἰουδας Ἰσκαριώθ ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώθ 01*, B, C*, D, Ψ, f13, 28, 892, 1071, 1424
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώθ 01°, A, C°, L, Δ, Θ, 565, Maj-part
ὁ Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώθ W, f1, 157, 579, 700, Maj-part

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:47 Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἵδοὺ Ἰουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ἔξων ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ. safe!

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 'Ισκαριώτης has been added from there.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 311
NA28 Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὀχλός μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

BYZ Mark 14:43 Καὶ εὐθεώς, ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας εἰς ὧν τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὀχλός 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

txt 01, B, L, Ψ, 083, f13, 565, 1342, pc, it(a, aur, f, ff², q), Sy-H, Co, arm, goth

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:47 Καὶ ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὀχλός 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 αὐτὸν.

BYZ Mark 14:45 καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐθέως προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ῥαββί ῥαββί καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτὸν.

B: umlaut! (p. 1300 B, line 30) λέγει· ῥαββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν

**Parallel:**

NA28 Matthew 26:49 καὶ εὐθέως προσελθὼν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπεν· χαίρε, ῥαββί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτὸν. (safel)

**Compare:**

NA28 Matthew 23:7 καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί. BYZ καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὲρ ῥαββί ῥαββί. BYZ D, W, 0107, f13, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H

The addition of χαίρε 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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 14:51 καὶ ἡμετέρος τῆς συνήκολούθη ἀυτῷ περιβεβλημένος συνδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ, καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν·

BYZ Mark 14:51 καὶ εἰς τῆς ἡμετέρου ἠκολούθησεν ἀυτῷ περιβεβλημένος συνδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν· οἱ ἡμετέροι·

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 τῆς D, 79, Lat, sa

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 22:50 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
NA28 John 11:49 εἰς δὲ τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν Καὶάφας

The construction εἰς τῆς with nominative is singular in the Greek Bible. On the other hand the construction nominative plus τῆς appears only in Luke, but here 16 times. It is therefore possible that scribes changed the singular εἰς τῆς plus nom. into the more common nom. plus τῆς.

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 συνόδα ἔπι γυμνοῦ, καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 14:51 Καὶ εἰς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος συνόδα ἔπι γυμνοῦ καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν οἱ νεανίσκοι.

καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν
καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν νεανίσκοι
καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν οἱ νεανίσκοι
οἱ δὲ νεανίσκοι κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν

"and many people went and seized him"

omit ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ: W, f1, c, k, Sy, sa


Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1300 C, line 13) κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν. 52 ὁ δὲ καταλίπτὼν

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. τίνες 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 οὐδὲν. πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

Τ ἐκ δευτέρου λέγων: W, Θ, f13, 565, 700, 25425, pc, Sy-S, Or
Β: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Mark 14:60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἔπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδὲν τί οὕτω οὐκαταμαρτύροισιν;

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 ἔξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἥμιν εἴπης εἰ σὺ εἰ 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 Ἰησούν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνη σοὶ ὁ Ισραήλιταί σοι καταμαρτυροῦσιν;
NA28 Mark 14:61 ὁ δὲ ἔσωπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδὲν. **πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα ἀὐτὸν καὶ λέγει ἀὐτῷ·** σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦν τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;
NA28 Mark 14:62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς **εἶπεν·** ἐγώ εἰμι,

Only incomplete in NA, full in SQE and Tis!

- **καὶ λέγει ἀὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς.** D, (a), d, q
- **ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει ἀὐτῷ·** D, it
- **ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·** G, W, f1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>εἶπεν,</th>
<th>σὺ εἶπας ὅτι</th>
<th>700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, σὺ εἶπας ὅτι</td>
<td>f13, 1071, 2542^5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ, σὺ εἶπας ὅτι</td>
<td>Θ, 565, pc, arm, geo, Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B:** no umlaut

Parallel for verse 61:
NA28 Matthew 26:63 καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
BYZ Matthew 26:63 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ

- **Byz** A, C, D, W, 22, 157, 565, 579, 700, Maj.
- **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 ἃτι ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, Δ


NA28 John 18:37 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος· οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σὺ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι.
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 confirmation 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 εἶμι. 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 ἥκουσατε τῆς βλασφημίας ἃ: τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται; οἱ
dὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἐνοχον εἶναι θανάτου.

_T αὐτοῦ_ D, G, N, f1, 1071, 2542_, pc,
q, vg_mss, Sy-S, goth

_T τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ_ W, Θ, f13, Sy-P, Sy-H_mg

_T αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ_ 124, 565

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 22:71 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· τί ἐτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν; αὐτοὶ
γὰρ ἥκουσαμεν 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
tὸ 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 αὐτὸν, οὗ δὲ ἐράπισαν
NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, 64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες: προφήτευσον, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παῖς 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 ἦρεμαντό τινες ἐμπύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτὸν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ: προφήτευσον Ἰησοῦ, καὶ οἱ υπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον.

Γ Χ Ξ Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1243, 1424, pc, gat, Sy-H, bo, sa

Γ Ζ, f1

Ψ, c, f, k

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:68 λέγοντες: προφήτευσον Ἰησοῦ, χριστόν, τίς ἐστιν ὁ πάσας σε;
NA28 Luke 22:64 καὶ περικαλύπταντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες: προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ πάσας 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, 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 ἠρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· προφήτευσον, καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἐλαβον.

BYZ Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἠρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ· Προφήτευσον καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἐβαλλον.

T&T #178

ἐβαλλον  H, 28, 1071, Maj-part
ἐβαλον  E, M, U, X, Σ, 33, 118, 124, 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj-part
ἐλάμβανον  D, G, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, Sy-H
ἐλαβον  01, A, B, C, K, L, N, S, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Π, Ψ, Ω, 067, 1342, 2766, al
κατέλαβον  579

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

ἐλαβον is equivocal and unusual. Swete suggests "They caught him with blows."

BDAG (3rd ed.) notes:
οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἐλαβον 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 ἐλαβες; "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. ἐβαλον is the result of failure to recognize this rare usage.

Blass (Grammar) calls ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἐλαβον "vulgar" and notes a 1st CE papyrus which has αὐτὸν κονδύλοις ἐλαβον (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
cai exei le v eic to povaioy [kaI alEktpo evfynsev].

BYZ Mark 14:68
cai exei le v eic to povaioy kaI alEktpo evfynsev

T&T #179

omit: 01, B, L, W, Psi*, 222, 579, 892, c, Sy-S, sa^mss, bo,
WH, NA25, Weiss, Bal

txt A, C, D, X, Delta, TH, Psi^c, 067, f1, f13, 33, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^mss, bo^mss, goth, Eus
kai euBheoi alEktpo evfynsev  517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc^11

Psi: The words have been added in the margin in a different ink.
B: no umlaut

NA28 Mark 14:72 kai euBheoi ek deuteprou alEktpo evfynsev.
omit ek deuteprou 01, C*, L, 579, pc, c, vg^ms

[...] oti prin alEktpora fownhsai dics tric me aparheshi.
omit dics 01, C*, W, Delta, 579, it(all, except aur, k!), vg^ms
omit oti ... aparheshi D, a, d
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 14:30 kai legei autro o ihsiouc amin lego sou oti su
simeiron taute th vukt pi prin dics alEktpora fownhsai tric me
aparheshi.
omit dics 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 ὁμιλών ὦτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἀνθρώπον. καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.
NA28 Matthew 26:71 ἐξελθόντα δὲ εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα
NA28 John 18:27 πάλιν οὖν ἥρμηνατο Πέτρος, καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

Faijum-fragment, P.Vindob G 2325 (3rd CE):
πρὶν ἀλέκτρῳ δὶς κοκκύζει

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 δἰς 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 ἔπειν ἡμεῖσαι...).

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 ἔ ὑ δὶς ἀλέκτορας φωνῆσαι
verse 68 καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἐξ ἐς τὸ πρωάλλιον
(omit καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν)
verse 72 ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι δὶς
Changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verse 30:</th>
<th>group 1 (01, 579)</th>
<th>group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verse 30:</td>
<td>omit δις as a harmonization to the parallels.</td>
<td>leave as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse 68:</td>
<td>no addition</td>
<td>add καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν to harmonize with verse 72 (two crowings are required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse 72:</td>
<td>omit ἐκ δευτέρου</td>
<td>leave as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse 72:</td>
<td>omit δις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ἴδούσα αὐτὸν ἥρεστο πάλιν λέγειν
tοῖς παρεστώσιν ὅτι οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν.

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα αὐτὸν εἶπεν  
B, Co, WH\textsuperscript{ma}, Weiss, Trg\textsuperscript{ma}

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα αὐτὸν ἥρεστο  
M, N, W, 579

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα αὐτὸν πάλιν  
01, C, L, Δ, Ψ, 892, 1424,
\textit{WH, NA}\textsuperscript{25} = txt

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα αὐτὸν πάλιν ἥρεστο  
A, X, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
goth, Trg
157, a
1342

καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα πάλιν αὐτὸν ἥρεστο
καὶ ἥρεστο πάλιν ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδούσα αὐτὸν
πάλιν δὲ ἴδούσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη ἥρεστο
D, Θ, 565, 700, 2542\textsuperscript{s}, Lat,
Sy-S, Sy-P, Eus

\textbf{B: no umlaut}

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:71 ἐξελθόντα δὲ εἰς τῶν πυλῶνα εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη καὶ
λέγει τοῖς ἐκεί· οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου.

NA28 Luke 22:58 καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ ἔτερος ἴδον αὐτὸν ἔφη· καὶ σὺ ἐξ
αὐτῶν εἰ. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη· ἀνθρώπε, οὐκ εἰμί.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 14:66-67 Καὶ ὁντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται
μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως 67 καὶ ἴδούσα τὸν Πέτρου
θερμαίνομενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει· καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ
ὕσθα 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 ἦρξατο 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 (ἀλλὰ and ἔτερος), whereas Mk has the same παιδίσκη speaking πάλιν (Minor Agreement?).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
What is interesting and makes an assessment difficult is that the Byzantine text uses the word ὀμοιάζει (which appears also in "Western-Mt"). It is basically possible that the shorter text is an omission due to h.t. εἶ - εἶ. 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 εἶ - εἶ h.t. We have three εἶ in this verse with almost equidistant separation.

The following textual developments are possible:

1. Western Mt original
txt Mt result of a διορθωτῆς (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 δηλὸν σε ποιεῖ reading (by a διορθωτῆς) 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.

Greeven (TC Mark, 2005, p. 689) suggests that the change in D is possibly a translation variant. Perhaps ὄμοιωζει 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 οὐδὲ ἐπισταμανία 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 ἀνεμισθὴ οṕ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι δίς τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνήσει καὶ ἐπιβαλῶν ἐκλαίειν.

omit ἐκ δευτέρου 01, C*, L, 579, pc, c, vgms
omit δἰς 01, C*, W, Δ, 579, it, vgms

καὶ εὐθὺς δἰς ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. 1342

omit οṕ ... ἀπαρνήσει D, a

txt φωνῆσαι δἰς τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνήσει Cc, L, Ψ, 892,
aur, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Bois, Gre, Tis
B, k,
NA28, WH, Weiss, Trg, Bal
1342
01, C*, W, Δ, it, vgms
579 (Mt)

Byz φωνῆσαι δἰς ἀπαρνήσει μὲ τρίς A, X, f1, f13, 33, 1424, Maj,
Sy-H, Co, goth
Θ, 565, 700

dἰς φωνῆσαι ἀπαρνήσει μὲ τρίς

Swanson has Cc 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:
"καὶ εκ δευτέρου for καὶ εὐθεῖα (or εὐθὺς). Tischendorf noted that καὶ was at the end of line 37 and εκ δευτέρου at the beginning of line 38. In the margin a modern hand (perhaps Wetstein) has verified this by writing καὶ εκ δευτέρου. 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) καὶ 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 e’s and u’s of δευτέρου indicate that it also is by B. The text of A, therefore, must have fitted in the place occupied by δευτέρου (without the
marginal εκ. Hence καὶ εὐθεώς (or εὐθυς). Codex C, then, unites with Codd. 01, L in writing καὶ εὐθεώς (or εὐθυς) ἀλέκτωρ."

Lyon notes on the δίς:
"[first corrector] added, probably, δίς after φωνῆσαι. This is the solution proposed by Tischendorf. Something has been added to the text. I consider it less likely that αἰρησθη was changed to απαριησθη."

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:74-75 καὶ εὐθεώς ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. 75 καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτωρα φωνήσαει τρίς ἀπαριησθη μὲ καὶ ἔξελθων ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πυκρώς.


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 δίς?

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 δίς 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 ρῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτωρα φωνῆσαι διὰ τρὶς μὲ ἀπαρνήσῃ καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαεν.

καὶ ἔρεξατο ἔκλαεν D, Θ, 565, Latt, Sy-S, sa ms, gotth
καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἔκλαυσεν bo
καὶ ἐβαλεν τὴν χείρα κλαίειν sa
καὶ ἔξελθον ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς 579

Baljon has ἐπιβαλὼν in brackets with a question-mark.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:75 καὶ ἔξελθον ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαεν 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 ἐπικαλυφάμενος with the meaning "having covered his head".

BDAG:
The mng. of καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαεν Mk 14:72 is in doubt. Theophylact. offers a choice betw. ἐπικαλυφάμενος τ. κεφαλήν (so ASchlatter, Zürcher Bibel '31; Field, Notes 41-43; but in that case τὸ ἰμάτιον could scarcely be omitted) and ἄρξάμενος, which latter
sense is supported by the v.l. ἔρχατο κλαίειν and can mean begin (PTebt 50, 12 [112/111 BC] ἐπιβαλλὼν 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 ἐν τῷ νοῦν or τῇ διάνοια (Diod. S. 20, 43, 6) and fr. the fact that ἐν 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. Whl. ad loc. has urged against this view that it is made unnecessary by the preceding ἀνεμισθησθα κτλ. Least probable of all is the equation of ἐπιβαλλών with ἀποκριθεὶς (HEwald) on the basis of Polyb. 1, 80, 1; 22, 3, 8; Diod. S. 13, 28, 5 ἐπιβαλλών 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 ἐπιβαλλόν means ἐπιβαλλών τὸ ἱμάτιον or ἐπὶ βλήμα 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 ἐπιβαλλόν from all points with admirable learning and reaches the same conclusion as I am urging.”

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
142. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:1 Καὶ εὐθὺς πρῶτοι συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον, ἦν δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήμενον καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

**έτοιμάσαντες** 01, C, L, 892, 1342, pc, **NA²⁵**: 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*, pc, it, Or

**B**: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:1 Πρῶτας δὲ γενομένης συμβούλιον ἠλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτεροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡστε θανατώσαι αὐτὸν. γενομένης συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν D

Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:6 καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦ διανῷ συμβούλιον ἐδίδοσιν κατ’ αὐτὸν ὣσπερ αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

**συμβούλιον ἐποίουν** A, (D, W), f1, 33, 579, 1424, Maj

**συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν** 01, C, Δ, Θ, 892, 1071, pc

**txt** ἐδίδουν B, L, f13, 28, 565, 700, 892*, pc

NA28 Matthew 12:14 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἠλαβον κατ’ αὐτὸν συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν L

NA28 Matthew 22:15 οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἠλαβον

NA28 Matthew 27:7 συμβούλιον δὲ λαβόντες

NA28 Matthew 28:12 μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συμβούλιον τε λαβόντες συμβούλιον 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 ἐτοιμάσαντες instead. Weiss (Mk Com.) finds ἐτοιμάσαντες the more difficult reading. συμβούλιον ἐτοιμάσαντες 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 ποιεῖω 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 ἐτοιμάσαντες.

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

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:1 Καὶ εὑθὺς πρῶι συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλου τὸ συνεδρίου, δήσαντες τὸν Ἡσυχίον ἀπήγαγαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

ἀπήγαγον εἰς τὴν αὐλήν 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.

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 14:54 καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν ἡκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἐσώ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἁρχιερέως καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θερμανόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς.
NA28 Mark 14:66 Καὶ ὄντως τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἁρχιερέως
NA28 Mark 15:16 Οἱ δὲ στρατιώται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐσὼ τῆς αὐλῆς, ὁ ἐστὶν 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 ἀγω 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 Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων ὁὐκ ἀποκρίνη ὦδέν; ἵδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν.

**T αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο**
ipse autem nihil respondebat.
N, U, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1071, 1424, 2542\(^2\), al, a, c, vg\(^{ms}\), 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.

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)
Difficult variant
NA28 Mark 15:8 καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὀχλὸς ἥρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Mark 15:8 καὶ ἀναβοήσας ὁ ὀχλὸς ἥρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἀεὶ ἐποίει αὐτοῖς

Byz 01ε, A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 700, 1342, Maj, Sy, bo, arm, Tr
txt 01*, B, (D), 892, Latt, Co

omit: k
ἀναβάς 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 ἐκραξαν´ σταύρωσον αὐτῶν.

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 θόλος ἠρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθώς ἔποιει αὐτοῖς.

  * καθώς ἔθος ἦν ἵνα τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς
    
    Θ, 565, 700 (adds αὐτοῖς after ἦν)

**καθώς ἀεί ἔποιει 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 ὀχλὸν ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. omit μᾶλλον: Θ, 565

NA28 Matthew 27:15 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν εἰλθεῖ ο ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἐνα τῷ ὀχλῳ δέσμιον ἢν ἠθελον. "to maintain a custom or tradition, be accustomed"

καθώς ἔθος: Jo 19:40, Heb 10:25

* The short καθώς ἔποιει 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
Note next verse:
NA28 Mark 15:11 οἱ δὲ ἄρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὀχλοὺς ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.

C.H. Turner (Marcan Usage) accepts the short reading:
"The above reading, παραδέδωκεν αὐτὸν without οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς to follow, is that of B 1 k and the Sinai Syriac, and is supported by Matt. 27:18 ἦδει 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 παραδέδωκεν 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 παραδέδωκεν: but it would be awkward even for Mark to end one sentence with οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς and begin the next sentence with οἱ δὲ ἄρχιερεῖς, and I incline to think
that the first oí ἀρχιερεῖς is just an early scribal insertion, or more probably gloss, intended to make the sense of παραδείγματάν clear to the reader."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
**TVU 332**

145. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 15:12 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὔτοῖς· τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω [ὅν λέγετε] τοῖς βασιλεῖα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

**omit:** 01, B, C, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1342, pc, Co

**NA**

NA25, 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 Πιλάτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων· θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

and also:
NA28 Mark 10:36 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί [θέλετε] [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 Πιλάτος· τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν; λέγουσιν πάντες· σταυρωθήτω.


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.
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:12 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς· τί οὖν [Θέλετε] ποιήσω ὅν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

T&T #182

omit: A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, pc⁴, 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, Trg⁴⁴

λέγετε B, Weiss WH, NA²⁵ both have ὅν 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 ἡρῴατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι ὅτι οὐκ ὁδα τὸν ἀνθρώπου τούτου ὅν 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 ὅν cannot be original, because only when it is missing the text is difficult. It has been changed either by deleting λέγετε or by adding ὅν.

Rating: (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
147. **Difficult variant**
NA28 Mark 15:20 καὶ ὁτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 15:20 καὶ ὁτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἰμάτια τὰ ἱδία, 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 ἰμάτια | D, 732, 2610, L547 (h.t.) (not d ! d has "suis") |
| Τὰ ἱδία | 2786* (h.t.) |

| Τὰ ἱδία ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ | 01, 472, 1009, Tis |
| Τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ τὰ ἱδία | pc²⁸ |
| txt | B, C, Δ, Ψ, 1342, pc⁷ |
| 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: ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΑΙΔΙΑΙΜΑ[ΤΙΑ ΚΑΙΕΩΓΟΥΞΙΝΑ]ΥΤΟΝΙΝΑ

Since it is the first preserved line of the papyrus, one cannot know what comes before ἰμάτια. 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 ὁτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμῦδα καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι.
Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἐστίν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεύσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. ἵδια 01ε, Α, Λ

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 ἵδια 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 παράγοντα τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναίου ἐρχόμενον ἀπ’ ἄγρου, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ῥούφου, ἵνα ἁρη τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

τοῦ Ῥούφου pc, Tis: 47. (et cod ap Erasm)
omit: ff²

omit: ἵνα ἁρη 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) Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ῥούφου, ἵνα

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:32 Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναίου ὄνοματι Σίμωνα, τοῦτον ἡγαρέυσαν ἵνα ἁρη τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

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 Γολγοθὰν τόπον, ὥστειν μεθερμηνευόμενον Κρανίου Τόπος.

**μεθερμηνευόμενος**
A, B, N, 892, L844, pc, k, WH, NA²⁸, Weiss, Trq

txt 01, C, D, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, WH

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 τὸν τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθὰν, ὥστειν Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος,

**λεγόμενον** W, 69, 1071, pc
**μεθερμηνευόμενον** M, N, pc

NA28 Luke 23:33 Καὶ ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλοῦμενον Κρανίον,

NA28 John 19:17 καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον, ὥστειν Ἁβραϊστὶ Γολγοθὰ.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 5:41 ταλιθά κοῦμ, ὥστειν μεθερμηνευόμενον τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγειρέ.

NA28 Mark 15:34 ἐλώ ἐλώ λεμα σαβαχθανι; ὥστειν μεθερμηνευόμενον ὧ θεός μου ὦ θεός μου, εἰς τι ἐγκατέλιπες 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· ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἠλάβεν.

BYZ Mark 15:23 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἠλάβεν

Byz A, C, D, P, X, Θ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sapt, goth
txt 01, B, C*, L, Δ, Ψ, 700, 1342, pc, n, Sy-S, sapt, bo

Lacuna: W
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:34 ἐδωκαν 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:25 ἵν δὲ ὡρὰ τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν.

εκτη Θ, 479**, pc, Sy-H, mg, αεθ

Lacuna: W
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 19:14 ἵν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὡρα ἤν ὡς εκτη. καὶ λέγει τοῖς 'Ἰουδαίοις· ἵδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν.

τρίτη 01c2, b5, L, Χ, 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 ἢν δὲ ὡρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν.

ἐφύλασσον D, it(d, ff², k, n, r¹), sa

custodiebant

et crucifixerunt eum et custodiebant eum vg

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’ αὐτὸν τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν
et qui cum eo erant custodientes Iesum

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:24 Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἴματα αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρον ἐπ’ αὐτὰ τίς τι ἥρη.
NA28 Mark 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λῃστὰς, 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 ἢν ... 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 \textsuperscript{T1} καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων \textsuperscript{T2} αὐτοῦ.

\textsuperscript{T1} nomine Zoathan \quad c
\textsuperscript{T2} nomine Chammatha \quad c

B: no umlaut

Codex Colbertinus, c (12\textsuperscript{th} 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 \textsuperscript{T1} καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων \textsuperscript{T2}.

\textsuperscript{T1} nomine Zoatham \quad c
\textsuperscript{T2} nomine Camma \quad c

Another tradition appears in Luke:
NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἡγοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοūργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ \textsuperscript{T1} ἀναίρεθημαι \textsuperscript{T2}.

\textsuperscript{T1} Ioathas et Maggatras \quad l
\textsuperscript{T2} ... et Capnatas \quad r\textsuperscript{l} (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:

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 341
NA28 Mark 15:28

BYZ Mark 15:28 καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἢ λέγουσα, Καὶ μετὰ ἄνόμων ἔλογίσθη.

Byz K, Π, L, P, Ymg, Δ, Θ, 083, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bopt, goth, Eus, [Trg]

omit = txt 01, A, B, C, D, X, Y*, Ψ, 047, 059, 157, pm173, d, k, Sy-S, sa, bopt

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 Matthew 13:14 καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτῶς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἡ λέγουσα: ἀκοῇ ἀκούστε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε, ...

NA28 John 19:24 ἦνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]: διεμερίσαντο τὰ ιμάτια μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμὸν μου ἑβαλον κλῆρον.
omit ἡ λέγουσα: 01, B, L844, it, sa, ac², pbo

Source:
LXX Isaiah 53:12 διὰ τούτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἱσχυρῶν μεριές σκῦλα ἀνθ’ ὃν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄνομοις ἔλογίσθη ...

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 numbered 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 λησταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνυμῶν.

Mk 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστάς, ἑνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἑνα ἐξ εὐωνυμῶν αὐτοῦ.

28 Καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα, Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.

39 Οἱ δὲ παραπορεύομενοι ἑβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν 40 καὶ λέγοντες ὁ καταλῦων τὸν ναόν καὶ ἐν τρισίν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομών,

29 Καὶ οἱ παραπορεύομενοι ἑβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες οὐά ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισίν 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 ἔγοροι 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 Bibliothèque 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

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 342

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:34 καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἔβοήσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· ἐλώη εἰς τοὺς λεμα σαβαχθανίν; ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέληπες με;

λαμα B, D, N, Θ, 059, f1, 565, 25425, L844, pc, vg, TR!, WH, NA25, Weiss, Gre, Trg, Bal

txt λεμα O1, 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 ἠλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι;

λαμα D, Θ, f1, 22, TR

λεμα O1, B, L, 33, 700, 892, pc, Lat, Co,
WH, NA25, 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 הִמִלִּי (Ps 21:1), represents λαμα, and the Aram. נַּחַל, 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:

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 343
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:34 ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἶς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;

ὁ θεός μου A, K, P, Y, Γ, Δ, Θ, 059, 083, f1, f13, Maj-part, vgms, sams, Eus

ὁ θεός Justin (Dial. 99:1)

μου B, 565, boms

Lacuna: W
B: umlaut (p. 1302 C, line 5) μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου εἶς τί

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:46 Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἰνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες;

Compare:
Compare also:
LXX Psalm 21:2 ὁ θεός 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 ὃ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;

"My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

**ὁνείδισας με**
D (not dl), 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, ff², k², l, n, vg): dereliquisti
k has been corrected by the late m. 3.

Lacuna: W

**B: no umlaut**

ὁνείδιζω "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 did you reproach me?"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 27:46 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόσθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων: ἥλι ηλη λεμα σαβαχθανι; τούτ' ἔστιν: Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἰνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες:

The quote is from:
LXX Psalm 21:2 ὁ θεός ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ὑνα τί ἐγκατέλιπες 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 ὤνείδιζον 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 ἐγκατέλιπες is an early harmonization to Mt (or to the LXX). ὤνειδίζος makes good sense in Mk, where everyone else mocks Jesus as well.

Harnack: ὤνειδίζος is not a translation of the Aramaic σαβαχθανεί (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 ὤνειδίζοµεν 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 ὤνειδίζος 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, ff², 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 ὤνειδίζειν, 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 ὤνειδίζος με in D an explanation is still missing".

Ehrman argued (Orthodox corruption, p. 143-44) that the change from ἐγκατέλιπες to ὤνειδίζος 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 ὤνειδίζος and ἐγκατέλιπες 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 δὲ τίς [καὶ] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὀξὺς περιθέλεις καλάμω ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν λέγων· ἀφετε ἵδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελείν αὐτὸν.

τίς___ B, L, Ψ, pc, WH, NA28, Weiss
τίς καὶ 01, Δ, 083, 579, 892, [Trg]

εἰς καὶ A, C, (f1), 33, 157, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Gre\textsuperscript{new}
εἰς Gre\textsuperscript{old} (Error? No support!)

καὶ δραμὼν εἰς καὶ γεμίσας f1
καὶ δραμὼν εἰς καὶ πλήσας D, Θ, 565, 700 (Mt)

καὶ δραμώντες ἕγέμισαν f13, 2542, L844

NA has no notation for τίς/εἰς, but notes everything with καὶ under txt. This is an oversimplification, resulting in "Maj" reading txt. Greeven in his Synopsis reads εἰς 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 εἰς ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὀξὺς καὶ περιθέλεις καλάμω ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν.
NA28 Luke 23:36 ἐνεπαίζαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιώται προσερχόμενοι, ὄξος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ
NA28 John 19:29 σκεῦος ἐκεῖτο ὀξὺς μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνηκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσδραμὼν εἰς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν
Compare also:
NA28 Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς τίς 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 δὲ [τίς] τῶν παρεστηκότων

NA28 Mark 14:51 καὶ νεανίσκος τίς
BYZ Καὶ εἷς τίς 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 τίς. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 721) notes that the normal Markan usage is the use of εἷς (see examples above). Both occurrences of τίς 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:

[ Rating: 2? (= NA probably correct) for τίς ]

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)
TVU 346

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:39 ἵνα ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκώς εἰς ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὃτι οὕτως ἔξεπνευσεν εἴπεν· ἄληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὦ ἱερός θεόν ἢν.

αὔτῳ   W, f1, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P
ἐκεῖ   D, Θ, 565, d, i, n, q ("ibi")
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:54 'Ὁ δὲ ἐκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἴδοντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες· ἄληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἢν οὗτος.

The construction ὁ παρεστηκώς εἰς 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 (Minor Agreement).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 347

150. Difficult variant

NA28 Mark 15:39 Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κέντρικως ἡ ἑστήκτικας εὖ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὐτως εξέπνευσεν ἐπειν' ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος νῦς θεοῦ ἦν.

BYZ Mark 15:39 Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κέντρικως ἡ ἑστήκτικας εὖ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὐτως κράζας εξέπνευσεν ἐπειν Ἁληθῶς ὁ ἀνθρώπος οὗτος νῦς ἦν θεοῦ

T&T #186

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, goth, Gre, [Trg]

οὔτως κράζας αὐθὴκεν τὸ πνεῦμα εἶπεν 1424 (Mt 27:50)
οὔτως αὐτὸν κράζαντα καὶ εξέπνευσεν ἀληθῶς D

κράζας W, Θ, 565, 2542, pc², L844
pc = 763, 1542

txt 01, B, L, Ψ, 083vid, 892, pc², Co
pc = 297, 2430

083: Harris, in "Studia Sinaitica I", 1890, p. 104 reads (or suggests, in cursive letters): οὔτως ἐκραζεν 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 CE. There is a bar visible, probably Nu ephelkustikon. Note that the same word (EΦΕΙΝΕΤΙΟΥCE) 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 οὔτως κραζες εξέπνευσεν.

B: no umlaut
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:54 'Ο δὲ ἐκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἴδοντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες: ἀληθῶς θεοὶ ὕδως ἦν οὗτος.

The words refer back to verse 37:
NA28 Mark 15:37 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοὺς ἀφεῖς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἔξεπνευσεν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 27:50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράζας φωνῆ μεγάλη ἀφήκεν 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 οὐτως κράζας ἔξεπνευσεν appeared awkward and stimulated variation. What was special of this cry to refer to it with οὐτως?

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 Ἄσσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαν, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ ὘ακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἡσίητος μήτηρ καὶ Ὁσώμης,

Μαρία          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, NA28, Weiss

Μαρία          ἡ ὘ακώβου 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
Μαρία          C, Λ, Δ, Θ, f1, pc, sa-mss
Μαρία          2 C, Δ, Θ

Compare:
Matthew 27:61-1 Μαρία          01, B, C, L, Δ, Θ, f1, L844, pc, mae, bo-ms
Μαρία          A, D, W, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
Μαρία          2 Δ, 700

Matthew 28:1-1 Μαρία          01, C, L, Δ, Θ, 1582, L844, L2211, pc, mae
Μαρία          A, B, D, W, 1, 33, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
Μαρία          2 L, Δ, Θ

Mark 15:47-1 Μαρία          01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
Μαρία          Θ, f1, 33, Sy-H
Μαρία          ἡ ὘ακώβου Θ, f1

Mark 16:1-1 Μαρία          01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
Μαρία          Θ, f1, 33 (not in NA and SQE!)
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:

omit B^?, 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,
NA25, Weiss, WH^py

Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ B^?
Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ W^* (there is a dot above the o, indicating its deletion)

B p. 1303 A 1: Swanson conjectures that B* originally read:
B*: ΙΩΣΗΦ ΑΠΟΑΡΙΜΑΘΑΙΑΣ
B̄: ΙΩΣΗΦΑΠΟΑΡΙΜΑΘΑΙΑΣ

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 O-circle is quite different from the normal Phi. The O after ΙΩΣΗΦ is a perfect circular shape, whereas the circle of B's Phi is always ovate: . 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 Ὄψιας δὲ γενομένης ἤλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλοῦσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τούνομα Ἰωσὴφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

NA28 Luke 23:51 - οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθεμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει, αὐτῶν - ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς προσδεχέτο τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ,
NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐρώτησαν τὸν Πιλᾶτον Ἰωσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας,

omit ὃ P66 ind, A, B, D^5, L, Ψ, 579, pc, WH, NA25

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 Ἰωσῆφ ἀπὸ Ἄριμαθαιᾶς, without the article, could mean that Arimathea was the starting point of his journey, not his provenance.

Externally the reading with 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 Πιλάτος ἔθαμμασεν εἰ ᾗδη τέθηκεν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν.

Τ&Τ #188

εἰ ήδη ἀπέθανεν B, D, W, Θ, Σ, 205, 372, 2737, pc₁⁻¹, Lat, WH, Trg

εἰ ήδη τεθηκεν 1342

εἰ ἀπέθανεν 544, pc, Sy-S

καὶ εἰπεν ἀπέθανεν Δ

txt 01, A, C, K, Π, L, Χ<sup>sid</sup>, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, WH<sup>mg</sup>, Trg<sup>mg</sup>

Χ: in part within a lacuna: ἐπηρώτησεν αὐ[τὸν εἰ πάλα]ὶ ἀπέθανεν.

Coptic not clear. Horner: bo "... probably ᾗδη ..."

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 πάλαὶ or the variant εἰ ᾗδη. UBS4 is similar. However, according to the preceding discussion S’s text could easily have been produced from the variant εἰ ᾗδη, 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 ܐܐ ܐܐ=== in S earlier in the verse to represent ᾗδη, that S is, as usual, avoiding repetition. At any rate the citations in NA27 and UBS4 are highly uncertain."


**B: no umlaut**

πάλαὶ adv. "long ago, formerly"

No parallel.
On the one hand πάλαλι could have been changed to ἦδη 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 ἦδη is a mechanical repetition of the first ἦδη.

On the other hand ἦδη could have been changed to πάλαλι to avoid repetition.

πάλαλι appears only here in Mk, ἦδη appears 8 times.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 351

153. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 15:46 καὶ ἀγοράσας συνδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ συνδόνα καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ ὤ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.

μνηματι 01, B, 1342, pc, WH, NA⁶, Weiss, Tis, Bal

txt μνημείων 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 συνδόνι f13
- ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ D
- ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ f13
- προσκυλίσας D, f1
- μέγαν after λίθου 01
- (καὶ) ἀπῆλθεν after μνημείου D, G, f1, 157, pc

μνηματι μνήμα
μνημείων μνημείων

**Compare context:**
NA28 Mark 16:2 καὶ λίαν πρώ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημείον ἀνατελέσας τοῦ ἁλίου.

μνήμα 01*, C*, W, Θ, 565

**Parallels:**
NA28 Matthew 27:60 καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ ὦ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθου μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπῆλθεν. safe!


μνημείων D, 579
NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακαλουθήσασαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἳτινες ἦσαν συνεληκυθήσει τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῇ, ἐθέσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ως ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ,

NA28 John 19:42 ἔκει ὁ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον, 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 μνημεῖον (so Weiss). The immediately preceding 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 Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγάρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἔλθοῦσιν ἀλείψωσιν αὐτῶν.

πορευθείσαι 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)

diαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη πορευθείσαι Θ, 565

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 15:47:
NA28 Mark 15:47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Mark 16:1  Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ὑπὸ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἐγόρασαν ἀρώματα ὑπὸ ἑλθόνσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτῶν.

ἡ Μαρία
01, B*, L, [WH], [NA28], Weiss

ἡ δὲ Μαρία
01* (from 15:47)

Compare context:
NA28 Mark 15:46 καὶ ἀγοράσας συνόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ συνόνᾳ καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ ὡς ἐν λειτομημένον ἐκ πέτρας καὶ προσεκύλλουσαν λίθον ὑπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.
NA28 Mark 15:47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος ἔθεσαν ποῦ τέθεται.

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 28:1 Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων ἠλθεν Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρήσατε τὸν τάφον.

ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία 157

NA28 John 20:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἐρχεται προὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὐκες εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἡρμένου 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 ὅς.
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)
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: καὶ ο Κυριος ανεβηκε λεγων, Η δυναμις μου η δυναμις, κατελειψας με και επιπων 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 ὧτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

ἡν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ εὑρίσκουσιν ἀποκεκυλισμένον τὸν λίθον
D, Θ, 565, it(aur, c, d, ff², n), Sy-S, Eus

Lat(k, l, q, vg) read txt
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 24:2 εὑρον 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 ὧτι 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· ἣν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

**ἀνακεκύλισται**

(01), B, L, WH, ₳ις, NA25, Weiss, ₳ρ γιν.οὐκολοβ.01

**txt**

A, C, (D), W, Δ, (Θ), Ψ, f1, f13, 33, (565), 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

ἀποκεκυλισμένον 01

**B:** no umlaut

Compare context, verse 3:
NA28 Mark 16:3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτᾶς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;**safe**

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 28:2 καὶ ἤδη σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβάς εἰς οὐρανοῦ καὶ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Luke 24:2 εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου,

The occurrences 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, λίθος Luc.Luct.8, cf. D.H.Comp.20; overturn, ἀμάξας Plu.2.304f: metaph., χιλισταλάντους ἀνακυλιῶν 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 λίθος ... αφ εαυτου κυλίσθεις επεχωρησε παρα μέρος, και ο τάφος 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](TC-Mark-Ends.pdf)