



*W.M.A. Hendriks*

---

## IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT IN MARK 9:38

### ABSTRACT

The text-critical situation of Mark 9:38 is very complicated. This complex situation already becomes evident in the different readings of the critical editions. While there is almost no variation in the first part of the verse, the critical editions offer four different readings in the last part of it. So there is until now no consensus at all. The question remains which text appears to be the more original one. Several scholars – such as Vaganay, Duplacy, Amphoux, and others – in search of the original text of Mark – opt for a so called Western text, the main stream still prefers the Neutral text of Westcott and Hort. A text-critical analysis of Mark 9:38 may provide an answer to this question.

### 1. COMPLICATED TEXT-CRITICAL SITUATION

The story of the strange exorcist in Mark 9:38-40 according to N28 runs as follows: *εφη αυτω ο ιωαννης· διδασκαλε, ειδομεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια και εκωλυομεν αυτον, οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν. ο δε ιησους ειπεν· μη κωλυετε αυτον. ουδεις γαρ εστιν ος ποιησει δυναμιν επι τω ονοματι μου και δυνησεται ταχυ κακολογησαι με· ος γαρ ουκ εστιν καθ ημων, υπερ ημων εστιν, John said to him: “Teacher, we saw someone in your name driving out demons and we tried to stop him, because he was not following us.” Jesus said: “Do not stop him. For no one who will do a deed of power on my name will quickly be able to speak evil of me. Indeed, who is not against us, is for us.”*

The text-critical situation of verse 38 is very complicated. In the words of Dieter Lührmann (1987:166): “Textkritisch ist der Vers außergewöhnlich kompliziert, ohne daß daran viel für sein Verständnis hängt.” This complex situation already becomes evident in the different readings of the critical editions. While there is almost no variation in the first part of the words of

---

*Dr. Wim Hendriks, e-mail: [wmahendriks@outlook.com](mailto:wmahendriks@outlook.com)*

John (διδασκαλε ... εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια), the critical editions offer four different readings in the last part of the verse. So there is no consensus at all.

The margin of W&H follows D with *οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον*, Tis<sup>7</sup> Sod Bov Sou BOC HGr follow *λ* with *οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον*, W&H Vog UBS Nol N28 follow *κ* B with *και εκωλυομεν αυτον στι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν*, Tis<sup>8</sup> Wss Nes<sup>3-25</sup> Mrk with *οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον στι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν* follow in this part of the verse the conflate reading of the Byzantine text (with *εκωλυομεν* instead of *εκωλυσαμεν* and *ηκολουθει* instead of *ακολουθει* of TR).

## 2. IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT

In fact, Hort (1881:120) made it quite clear that the earliest readings which can be fixed chronologically are so called Western readings and that the most widely spread text was the so called Western text. Nevertheless, as is known, Westcott and Hort chose the so called Neutral text as the more original one. The question remains which text appears to be more original. Maybe the Western text? Some indications will be given.

At the Lille colloquium in 2000 I read a paper concerning the textual variation in the Gospel of Mark, illustrated by an analysis of Mark 6:33 (Hendriks 2003). This verse is so to say the cornerstone of the argumentation of Hort in favour of the priority of the text of the codices *κ* and B. Hort (1881:95) divides the readings as follows into three groups: *α* (called Neutral), *και προηλθον αυτους* of *κ* B, with variations, *β* (called Western), *και συνηλθον αυτου* of D 28 b, with variations, and *δ* (called Syrian), *και προηλθον αυτους και συνηλθον προσ αυτον* of A Π σ ε ω plurimi f q sy<sup>h</sup> eth, with variations. His main point is the conflation of *α* and *β* found in *δ*. However, Hort did not see that *και συνηλθον αυτου* of D is in fact a duplication of the preceding *συνεδραμον εκει*.<sup>1</sup> The phrase *και συνηλθον αυτου* seems a marginal note crept into the text. So the following sketch of the transmission of Mark 6:33 has been proposed. Now with the insertion of φ788 as reading 3, according to Lafleur (2013:288) (with *ιδων* written instead of *ειδον*). Only the six main types are recorded here.

1 The words *εκει* (there, in that place) and *αυτου* (just there) have the same local meaning. Cfr Acts 18:19 *εκει* P74 *κ* A D E 33 104 326 1241, *αυτου* B L Ψ 323 614 945 1175 1505 1739 plurimi.

1	και ιδοντες αυτους υπαγοντας εγνωσαν πολλοι και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει	λ205-209
2	και ειδαν αυτους υπαγοντας και εγνωσαν πολλοι και πεζη απο πα<σω>ν των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει και συνηλθον αυτου	D
3	και ιδων αυτους υπαγοντας οι οχλοι και επεγνωσαν αυτον και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει και συνεισηλθον αυτω	φ788
4	και ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας και επεγνωσαν πολλοι και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει και προηλθον αυτους	x B <sup>c</sup> etc
5	και ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας και επεγνωσαν αυτους πολλοι και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει και προηλθον αυτους και συνηλθον προς αυτον	(A)NΠ etc <sup>2</sup>
6	και ιδων αυτους υπαγοντας οι οχλοι και επεγνωσαν αυτον και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει και προηλθον αυτους και συνεισηλθον προς αυτους	φ <sup>rel</sup>

The shorter reading found in λ205-209 is head of the transmission (Ausgangstext).<sup>3</sup>

In the *Revue Biblique* I wrote an article with respect to Hort's second example of a conflate reading in the majority text, namely Mark 8:26 (Hendriks 2007). According to Ernst Lohmeyer, the accepted text (Legg 1935, Nes<sup>25</sup>) of this verse is ununderstandable.<sup>4</sup> Very few authors allude to the reading of Codex Bezae D.05 as being head of the transmission.<sup>5</sup>

υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και μηδενι ειπησ εις την κωμην  
vade in domum tuam et nemini dixeris in vico  
go to thy house and tell no one in the village

This reading of D d (q) fits nicely in the context. From this all other readings can be explained. Some authors refer to the African text of c k [W&H<sup>m9</sup>] as being original.<sup>6</sup> I suggested an accidental loss of υπαγε εις τον οικον σου in these two witnesses (cfr Mark 2:11 and 5:19).

2 A.02 repeats συνεδραμον at the place of συνηλθον.

3 For the shorter reading principle see Hendriks (2005, 2011).

4 Lohmeyer (1967:159): "Auch sachlich wäre ein Befehl: 'Gehe nicht in das Dorf!' unverständlich. Wohnt der Blinde nicht im Dorf, so ist er überflüssig; steht 'sein Haus' aber im Dorf, so ist er unsinnig."

5 Explicitly only Allen (1915: 116).

6 So among others Lohmeyer (1967:158).

Hereafter I will discuss Hort's third example of conflation in the majority text, namely Mark 9:38. His fourth example concerning Mark 9:49 has been discussed elsewhere (Hendriks 2014).

### 3. THE COMMON VIEW: HORT AND METZGER

Hort (1881:100-101) gives the documentary attestation of Mark 9:38 after the phrase *διδασκαλε ειδαμεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια* as follows.<sup>7</sup> In some points the table has been adapted to present-day conventions.

α και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	κ B Δ L C curs <sup>3</sup> f sy <sup>p</sup> sy <sup>i</sup> bo eth
β1 οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	D a k
β2 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	λ1-209 X φ13-69-346 28 alii <sup>4</sup> b c ff <sup>2</sup> i vg sy <sup>hmg</sup> arm
δ οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	A N EFGH KM SUV Γ Π curs <sup>multi</sup> sy <sup>h</sup> got

(in reading δ 565 has ηκολουθει and alii<sup>1</sup> μεθ ημων in the first clause and alii<sup>2</sup> μεθ ημων in the third)

According to Hort part of the confusion of readings is due to obvious causes. From Luke 9:49 comes *ακολουθει μεθ ημων*. In both Mark and Luke there is an inclination to alter imperfects into aorists and so the variant *εκωλυσαμεν* in these gospels can be explained. Besides assimilation to Luke there is a transposition in reading β of the last clause to bring it into proximity to its subject, with the change of *οτι* into *οσ*.<sup>8</sup> Reading β2, being the most widely spread, has *ημιν* in conformity with reading α. Finally the transposed clause *οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν* is preserved in both places by reading δ with exact similarity of ending. This resulting conflate reading is not supported by any early version. So far the interpretation of Hort (1882:101).

7 Hort reads *ειδαμεν* (with α as in D N Σ Ψ 346). He notes that 33 is defective.

8 According to Ross (1983:63): "this is hardly a sufficient motive for so radical an alteration."

One might make the following two remarks. Firstly: more important than a *supposed* inclination to alter imperfects into aorists in *both* Mark and Luke is the *actual* preference for the imperfect in the gospel of Mark and for the aorist in the gospel of Luke. The historical books of the LXX show a high percentage of narrative aorists (some 78 %) as compared with the Hellenistic historical literature (some 42 %). Luke Matt Mark (in this order) are in between. So in this respect Mark is the more Hellenistic writer, furthest away from the Semitic world.

Secondly: Luke's *actual* preference for the aorist is not seen in the imperfect *εκωλυομεν* according to P45<sup>vid</sup> P75<sup>vid</sup> ⋈ B L Ξ 157 579 892 1241 a b e l arm geo, which imperfect here in Luke 9:49 might be the more original one. Apart from Tis and TR the editions read *εκωλυομεν* in Luke.

Bruce Metzger (1994:86) follows Hort with a too dense survey. Apart from many minor variations, he gives the following principal readings (for the witnesses of each reading see also N28).

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| a | και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν<br>“and we forbade him, because he was<br>not following us”   | ⋈ B Δ Θ Ψ sy <sup>s</sup> sy <sup>p</sup> sy <sup>i</sup> <i>alii</i> |
| b | οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον<br>“who does not follow us, and we forbade him”  | (D) λ <i>alii</i> ( <i>alii</i> )                                     |
| d | οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι<br>ουκ ακολουθει ημιν<br>“who does not follow us, and we forbade him,<br>because he does not follow us” | <i>plurimi</i>  |

According to Metzger (1994:86) reading d is a conflation that presupposes the existence of the other two. He prefers reading a because of superior witnesses and because in reading b there has been a transposition of the last clause to bring it into proximity to its subject (with the change of *οτι* into *οσ*). However, like Hort, also Metzger forgets that sometimes minor variations may form a key to a solution. Among others Robert Stein follows Metzger.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4. PLEA FOR THE WESTERN READING

The approach of Hort and Metzger is surely not the only one. Lagrange (1947:246) for instance gives the following text: *ειδομεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου*

9 Stein (2008:451) adds: “The other variants involve primarily differences in tenses and in the order of the clauses; *εκωλυομεν* is a tendential/conative imperfect.” Precisely the order of the clauses is my main concern.

εμβαλλοντα δαιμονια, οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν, και εκωλυομεν αυτον, *vidimus quendam in nomine tuo eicientem daemonia, qui non sequitur nos, et prohibuimus eum, nous avons vu quelqu'un qui chassait des démons en ton nom, qui ne nous suit pas, et nous l'avions empêché*. Lagrange prefers the text of von Soden (and of Tischendorf without the last phrase) to that of Westcott-Hort and Vogels. It is the text of family λ and the Latin vulgate. Lagrange interprets εκωλυομεν αυτον (nous l'avions empêché) as a past perfect (plus-que-parfait), and considers *prohibuimus eum* (nous l'avons empêché) of the vulgate as stronger (less anxious).<sup>10</sup>

Vincent Taylor (1966:406-407) puts forward more or less the same view of the case. According to him the Western text omits *οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν* of the old Nestle, and inserts *οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν* after *δαιμονια*. This reading (see below sub 1) should be preferred to that of the W&H text, in spite of its support in  $\kappa$  B, for the reading with *οτι* in 38b may be an assimilation to the text of Luke 9:49 which reads *οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων*.<sup>11</sup> See the following summary.

1	<i>οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον</i> <i>οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον</i> <i>οσ ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον</i>	D a k λ (φ 28 700) b c ff <sup>2</sup> i arm W 565
2	<i>και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν</i>	$\kappa$ B (C, L) Δ Θ sy <sup>s</sup> alii
3	<i>οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν</i>	<i>plurimi</i>

Charles Cranfield (1966:310) joins Taylor: "Probably we should follow the Western text and omit the *οτι*-clause, which looks like assimilation to Luke." Maybe Lagrange and Taylor and Cranfield deserve more attention.

## 5. ANALYSIS OF MARK 9:38

Beforehand something must be said about the Greek witnesses and the versional evidence. As to the Greek readings, use has been made of *Text und Textwert* (TTW) edited by Kurt and Barbara Aland (1998:259-265). However, some uncials are not recorded in TTW.<sup>12</sup> In addition, there may be some errors. Therefore *New Testament Greek Manuscripts* edited by

10 Lagrange (1947:247): «L'imparfait *εκωλυομεν* semble indiquer cette inquiétude: nous l'avons empêché (Vulgate etc) serait plus ferme.»

11 Taylor's printed Greek text follows more or less the old Nestle, but with *οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν* within square brackets.

12 For the questionable reason see Aland-Aland (1995:103).

Reuben Swanson (1995:150) has been consulted, together with other sources, including reproductions and the like.<sup>13</sup>

The following families with their symbols are used.

$\lambda$ = 1 118 205 209 1582 2193 (f1)	Lake, TTW
$\phi$ = 13 69 124 346 543 788 826 828 983 1689 (f13)	TTW, Lafleur
$\sigma$ = 349 517 954 1424 1675 (f1424) (if 3 out of 5)	TTW
$\pi$ = K Π 114 265 489 1079 1219 1346 1816 (Ka)	New, Geerlings
$\varepsilon$ = E F G H (Ki)	Geerlings
$\omega$ = S V Ω (KI)	Geerlings

As to the versional evidence, the question arises in which language the versional readings will be given. According to Tjitze Baarda (1994:60), the most appropriate way in recording them would be to give *verbatim* quotations in the original script, but without translation this would be of little benefit for those who do not know these languages. Therefore I prefer to provide the readings in question in the language of the sources used.

Latin	a b c d f ff <sup>2</sup> i k l q r <sup>1</sup> r <sup>2</sup> z δ	Itala, editions (z = aur = 15)
Syriac	sy <sup>s</sup> sy <sup>p</sup> sy <sup>h</sup> sy <sup>i</sup>	Kiraz, White, Land
English	sa bo	Horner
French	arm	Künzle <sup>14</sup>
English	eth	Zuurmond
Latin	geo <sup>1</sup> geo <sup>A</sup> geo <sup>B</sup>	Blake
Greek	got	Streitberg <sup>15</sup>

Below one finds a survey of variants in Mark 9:38 (after *ειδομεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια*).<sup>16</sup>

1	οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	D W&H <sup>mg</sup>
	qui non sequitur nobiscum	et vetuimus illum	k
	qui non sequitur nobiscum	et prohibuimus illum	a
	qui non sequitur nobiscum	et prohibuimus eum	d Augustine <sup>17</sup>
	qui nobiscum non it	et prohibuimus eum	geo <sup>1</sup>

13 Reproductions (P45 A B W Δ), microfilms (28 33 700 892), facsimilia (x B C L Θ), and editions (A C D N Π Σ Φ Ψ 0274 λ φ ε ω 565 579).

14 Using the Lexicon.

15 The Greek agrees with the Gothic: saei ni laisteiþ unsis, jah waridedum imma, unte ni laisteiþ unsis.

16 Absent witnesses: P45 P84 P88 P 33 e n t.

17 Augustine (*De consensu evangelistarum* 4.5), CSEL 43, 398.

According to D.05 John said: διδασκαλε ειδαμεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον (“Teacher, we saw someone in your name driving out demons who does not follow with us, and we tried to stop him”). This sentence is well constructed: the impersonal τινα is explicated by the phrase οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων, and the last phrase says that the disciples tried to stop that person. Jesus responds: do not stop him. It is evident that the phrases are given in the right order: someone is seen who does not follow with us, we tried to stop him, Jesus replied: do not do that. The evangelist writes the better Greek. The *vetus latina* followed by Augustine translates μεθ ημων with *nobiscum*, and understands εκωλυομεν as a perfect tense, not as an *imperfectum de conatu*.<sup>18</sup> I suppose that both μεθ ημων and εκωλυομεν are presynoptic.<sup>19</sup> The phrase *qui nobiscum non it* in geo<sup>1</sup> is equivalent to ακολουθει μεθ ημων (see sy<sup>s</sup> and sy<sup>j</sup> hereafter sub 4).

2	οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	λ (exc 118)
	οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημων	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	2100
	qui non sequitur nos	et prohibuimus illum	c ff <sup>2</sup>
	qui non sequitur nos	et proibuimus eum	b r <sup>2</sup>
	qui non sequitur nos	et prohibuimus eum	gat i l vg Ps-Jerome <sup>20</sup>
	quia non sequitur nos	et prohibuimus eum	q
	qui non se[quitur nos]	et prohibuimus eum	r <sup>1</sup>
	וכלינייהו	הו דלי נקב לן	sy <sup>hmg</sup>
	et il ne faisait pas partie des nôtres <sup>21</sup> et nous l'empêchions		arm
	qui non sequitur nos	et prohibuimus eum	geo <sup>A</sup>
	qui non sequitur nos	et nos prohibuimus eum	geo <sup>B</sup>

Reading 2 shows the change from (ακολουθει) μεθ ημων to ημιν. The verb ακολουθεω is usually constructed with the dative (with μετα τινοσ apart from Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:49 also in Rev 6:8 and 14:13, with οπισω τινοσ in Matt 10:38 and Mark 8:34). So here one finds a change from unusual to common. Minor changes: quia *ex errore* q, explicative addition of nos (ημεισ) geo<sup>B</sup>.

18 See BDF § 326. Nor as a *plusquamperfectum*.

19 Luke 9:49 reads: και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων. BDF § 193<sup>1</sup>: “μεθ ημων not follow us, but follow [you] together with us.”

20 Pseudo-Jerome (*In evangelium secundum Marcum* 9.38), PL 30, 616.

21 Literally: and does not go behind us (so Baarda, by email).



3	οσ ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν	και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	W (so ms, error in TTW) 565
	οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	X φ (exc 346) 28 700 1241 σ1424
	οσ ουκ ακολουθει υμιν	και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	φ346
	οσ τισ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον	2542

Like the Latin translators reading 3 interprets *εκωλυομεν* not as an *imperfectum de conatu*, with no indication as to whether the act is momentary or not: *εκωλυσαμεν*, we forbade him, we stopped him. Codices W 565 change *ακολουθει* into *ηκολουθει*, he was following (or he had been following). Minor changes: *υμιν ex errore 346*, *οστις loco οσ 2542*.<sup>22</sup>

4	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν	κ B Δ Θ
	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημασ	2427
	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	οτι ουκ ακολουθη μεθ ημων	L (so Tis <sup>ed</sup> ), cfr Luke 9:49
	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	Ψ (edition ακ-, TTW ηκ-)
	κ]αι [εκωλυομεν αυτον]	οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν]	0274
	και εκωλυομεν αυτον	οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν	892
	et prohibuimus eum	quia non sequitur nos	f z δ
	בתן דלא אהא בתן		sy <sup>s</sup>
	לן דלא אהא לן		sy <sup>p</sup>
	בתן דלא אהא בתן		sy <sup>j</sup>
	and we forbade him, because he		
	was not following you with us		eth

In reading 4 one finds an inversion of the two phrases: first the prohibition, thereafter the reason of it (*οσ* becomes *οτι*). As in readings 1 and 2 the prohibition says *και εκωλυομεν αυτον*, *et prohibuimus eum*. The reason is expressed by *οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν*, *quia non sequitur nos*. As in W 565 *ακολουθει* has been changed into *ηκολουθει* in κ B Δ Θ 2427. While manuscript 0274 has a marked affinity with L.019, I read *ακολουθει ημιν*.<sup>23</sup> The phrase *μεθ ημων* in L may be a reminiscence of Luke 9:49. The phrase *ερχεται οπισω ημων* in sy<sup>s</sup> sy<sup>j</sup> is a Syriac translation of *ακολουθει ημιν*.<sup>24</sup> Minor change: *ημασ loco ημιν 2427*.

22 BDF § 293: "The definite relative *οσ* and the indefinite relative *οστις* are no longer clearly distinguished in NT."

23 See Plumley – Roberts (1976:42), with note 45: "168-70: These lines are barely legible in the photograph." Their reconstruction of the text with *ηκολουθει* follows Nes.

24 For sy<sup>j</sup> see Land (1875).



- 3 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον  
(W 565) X φ (υμιν 346) 28 700 1241 σ1424 (οσ τισ 2542)
- 4 και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν  
κ B (L, Ψ 0274 892, 2427) Δ Θ f z δ sy<sup>s</sup> sy<sup>p</sup> sy<sup>l</sup> eth W&H Vog UBS Nol N28
- 5 και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν  
C 579 1071 (1342) sa bo
- 6 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν  
A M N U Y Γ Σ (Φ) 0211 σ π ε ω 118 157 2193<sup>c</sup> plurimi (Bas) sy<sup>h</sup> got TR  
(*hontel* φ124 131 174 σ349 π1816)
- 7 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν  
Tis<sup>8</sup> Wss Nes<sup>3-25</sup> Mrk

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

First of all it has become evident that Codex Bezae D.05 provides the reading that explains the rise of the others: (ειδαμεν τινα) οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον, (*videmus quemdam*) *qui non sequitur nobiscum et prohibuimus eum*, (we saw someone) who does not follow with us and we tried to stop him.<sup>27</sup> Immediately hereafter follows: Jesus said: do not stop him. The edition of Westcott and Hort gives this reading in the margin. Maybe this reading is at the same time presynoptic (see below).

The second reading (family λ and several old versions) with ακολουθει ημιν is found in Tis<sup>7</sup> Sod Bov Sou BOC HGr. It is preferred by Taylor, Cranfield, and likewise by Ernst Haenchen (1966:327): “Die Worte ‘weil er uns nicht folgt’ (Nes<sup>17</sup>) könnten ein späterer Zusatz sein.” The third reading, found in (W 565) X φ 28 700 1241 1424 (2542), with εκωλυσαμεν instead of εκωλυομεν, is not found in any modern critical edition. The transposition of the two phrases in the fourth reading (κ B (L) etc) is followed by W&H Vog UBS Nol N28. This means that the new Nestle (SQE<sup>15</sup> UBS<sup>4</sup> N28<sup>1</sup>) follows W&H<sup>txt</sup>, and not the conjectural emendation of the old Nestle. The text behind the versions (f z δ) is not certain. The fifth reading (C 579 1071 (1342)) provides εκωλυσαμεν (as in reading 3). The artificial sixth reading has been composed out of readings 3 and 5 (conflation). The likewise artificial seventh reading seems to be a conjectural emendation of reading 6, with εκωλυομεν instead of εκωλυσαμεν and ηκολουθει instead of ακολουθει.<sup>28</sup> It is only found in critical editions (since Tis<sup>8</sup>).

27 Latin *et prohibuimus eum*: and we stopped him.

28 See Lührmann (1987:166): “Tischendorfs Konjektur, die bis Nes<sup>25</sup> übernommen war, ist in N26 und bei Greeven [HGr] aufgegeben, freilich mit unterschiedlichen Ergebnis. Die Bezeugung für die Textfassung von N26 ist zwar quantitativ

The reading of Mark 9:38 in Codex Bezae can be presynoptic. I consider as presynoptic the reading that explains the rise of the readings of Matt and Mark and Luke. Apart from this Bezan reading, one finds the phrase *μεθ ημων* (or equivalent) in L Φ 1342 eth Basil. As has been said, it may be a reminiscence of Luke 9:49. Or rather a reminiscence of a presynoptic reading. Here are three examples (including Mark 9:38) of a supposed presynoptic reading as compared with the reading of the synoptic gospels.

Presynoptic	<i>και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν</i>
Matt 26:74	<i>και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν</i>
Mark 14:72	<i>και ευθυσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν so x L (plus εκ δευτερου B)</i> <sup>29</sup>
John 18:27	<i>και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν</i>
Luke 22:60	<i>και παραχρημα επι λαλουντος αυτου εφωνησεν αλεκτωρ</i>
Presynoptic	<i>ος ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον</i>
Mark 9:38 D.05	<i>ος ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον</i>
Luke 9:49 P75 <sup>vid</sup>	<i>και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων</i> <sup>30</sup>
Luke 9:49 afra	<i>et vetabamus illum quia non sequitur nobiscum</i>
Presynoptic	<i>αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω</i>
Luke 20:25 D.05	<i>αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω</i>
Matt 22:21 D.05	<i>αποδοτε τα --- καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω</i> <sup>31</sup>
Mark 12:17 D.05	<i>αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω</i>

In the last example the Bezan text provides in a perfect balance a pure parallelism (more so than in the official readings of this synoptic saying): *send what comes from Caesar back to Caesar and what comes from God back to God*. Paraphrased: give what bears the image of Tiberius back to Tiberius and what bears the image of God back to God (= give the man back to himself, show respect to a human being). It is N28 that provides free (read uncontrolled) variants of this saying of Jesus: Luke adds *τοιουν*, Matt adds *ουν*, and Mark shows the inversion *τα καισαρος αποδοτε*. All three provide *καισαρος* and *καισαρι* without the article.<sup>32</sup>

---

gering (x B Δ Θ 0274 pc f z sy<sup>s</sup> sy<sup>p</sup>) und steht ebenfalls unter dem Verdacht der Beeinflussung durch Lk 9,49, kann sich aber immerhin auf x und B stützen.”

29 *και ευθυσ* in x B L 0250 2427 2542 and seven other less known mss. The majority reads *ευθεωσ* instead of *ευθυσ*.

30 Luke 9:49 according to (*sine αυτον* P45<sup>vid</sup>) P75<sup>vid</sup> x B L Ξ 157 579 892 1241 a b e l arm geo.

31 Accidental loss of *του*.

32 Nota bene: *καισαρ* with the article refers to the actual imperator Tiberius.

## 7. METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

As to the approach of Hort, the following may be observed. It is not only that he prefers the so called Alexandrian reading (Alpha text-type) to the so called Western reading (Delta text-type), but also that he distinguishes merely three categories ( $\alpha \beta \delta$ ), whereas one sometimes has to divide the readings into more categories (multiple main readings). The summary above presents six readings from manuscripts instead of merely three categories by Hort. Therefore the following methodological note is needed.

In 1881 Hort examined the Posteriority of Syrian readings to Western and Neutral readings shown by analysis of conflate readings, as I have shown in the foregoing pages. In 1911 Edward Ardron Hutton (1911) urged the use of what he called *triple* readings: he published a list of readings in which the Alexandrian and Western and Syrian authorities divide. According to Ernest Cadman Colwell (1969:27), Hutton's work is far from perfect. In a note on the same page Colwell reminds us that modern obsession with three text-types is derived from Jerome's preface to Chronicles, rather than from a study of manuscript groupings based upon readings.<sup>33</sup> He concludes with the remark that the New Testament manuscript material (which provides a multiple of different readings) is too varied to fit into only three text-types. So Colwell speaks of *multiple* readings. According to Frederik Wisse (1982:29)

The multiple readings give much more detail than Hutton's tool.  
... Colwell has a much better range of existing textual groups, and hence will end up with much less ambiguous results.

Nevertheless, Metzger (1994:15\*-16\*), in the second edition of his Textual Commentary, maintains (actually returns to) the division into three categories of witnesses: Alexandrian, Western, Byzantine.

At the Lunel Colloquium of 1994 (Hendriks 1996:235-237) I proposed a division into eight readings of Mark 5:21, with as the first *και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εις το περαν παλιν συνηχθη οχλος πολυς προς αυτον παρα την θαλασσαν* ("When Jesus had crossed to the other shore, much people again gathered round him by the lakeside," of D.05. In the *Revue Biblique* (Hendriks 2005:581-587) I described six different readings of Matt 6:33 found in the fathers, with *ζητειτε δε την βασιλειαν των ουρανων και ταυτα παντα προστεθησεται υμιν* ("Strive for the kingdom of heaven and all these things shall be added to you," of Justin). In the *Revue Biblique* (Hendriks 2007:266-271) I divided Mark 8:26 into five readings, with *υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και μηδενι ειπησ εις την κωμην* ("Go

---

33 Concerning Jerome's preface to Chronicles I refer to Aland (1995:65-66). For the text of Jerome's preface see Weber (1975:546-547).

to your house and tell no one in the village”, of D.05) again as being the head of the transmission. Let these examples be sufficient.

From a methodological point of view the *fact* of multiple readings within the same variation unit must be preferred to a *theoretical* division into only three categories. So Hort makes a methodological error.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALAND, K. & ALAND, B.

1995. *The text of the New Testament: An introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*. Second Edition (paperback). Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans.

1998. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (= TTW)*. Band 4,1,2. Das Markusevangelium. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter. ANTF 27.

2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Begründet von Eberhard Nestle und Erwin Nestle. Herausgegeben von Barbara und Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo Maria Martini, Bruce M Metzger, 28. revidierte Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft [= N28].

ALLEN, W.C.

1915. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark: With introduction and notes*. London: Rivingtons. OCBC.

BAARDA, T.

1994. What kind of critical apparatus for the New Testament do we need? The case of Luke 23:48. In: B. Aland – J. Delobel (eds), *New Testament textual criticism, exegesis, and early church history: A discussion of methods* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, Contributions 7), pp 37-97.

COLWELL, E.C.

1969. *Studies in methodology in textual criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill. NTTS 9.

CRANFIELD, C.E.B.

1966. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark: An introduction and commentary: With additional supplementary notes*. Cambridge: University Press. CGTC.

HAENCHEN, E.

1966. *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann. Sammlung Töpelmann 2,6.

HENDRIKS, W.M.A.

1996. Leçons pré-alexandrines du Codex Bezae dans Marc. In: D.C. Parker, – C.-B. Amphoux (eds), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (Leiden: Brill, NTTS 22), pp. 232-239.

2003. Variation textuelle dans l'Évangile selon Marc (illustrée par Mc 6,33). In: C.-B. Amphoux – J.K. Elliott (eds), *The New Testament text in early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille colloquium, July 2000* (Lausanne: Du Zèbre, HTB 6), pp 349-367.
2005. Brevior lectio praeferenda est verbosiori. *Revue Biblique* 112(4):567-595.
2007. Mc 8:26: ne le dis à personne dans le village. *Revue Biblique* 114(2):255-272.
2009. Lectio e qua caeterarum ortus facillime explicetur [Mark 1:4.5.16.28.29]. *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 22:3-39.
2011. Internal evidence of readings. *Estudios Bíblicos* 69:301-322.
2014. The case for the primacy of the Western Text. *Estudios Bíblicos* 72:411-436.
- HORT, F.J.A.  
 1881. *The New Testament in the original Greek*. Vol II, Introduction & Appendix. Cambridge – London: Macmillan.
- HUTTON, E.A.  
 1911. *An atlas of textual criticism: Being an attempt to show the mutual relationship of the authorities for the text of the New Testament up to about 1000 AD*. Cambridge: University Press.
- LAFLEUR, D.  
 2013. *La Famille 13 dans l'évangile de Marc*. Leiden – Boston: Brill. NTTSD 41.
- LAGRANGE, M.-J.  
 1947. *Évangile selon Saint Marc*. Paris: Gabalda et Cie. Etudes Bibliques.
- LAND, J.P.N.  
 1875. *Anecdota Syriaca* IV. Leiden: Brill.
- LEGG, S.C.E.  
 1935. *Novum Testamentum Graece, Secundum textum westcotto-hortianum, Evangelium secundum Marcum cum apparatu critico novo plenissimo*. Oxonii: Clarendoniano.
- LOHMEYER, E.  
 1967. *Das Evangelium des Markus: Nach dem Handexemplar des Verfassers durchgesehene Ausgabe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. KEK 1,2.
- LÜHRMANN, D.  
 1987. *Das Markusevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck). HNT 3.
- METZGER, B.M.  
 1994. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament: A companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. Second Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

PLUMLEY, J. M. & ROBERTS, C.H.

1976. An Uncial Text of Saint Mark in Greek from Nubia, *The Journal of Theological Studies* NS 27:34-45.

ROSS, J.M.

1983. Some unnoticed points in the text of the New Testament. *Novum Testamentum* 25(1):59-72.

STEIN, R.H.

2008. *Mark*. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic. BECNT.

SWANSON, R.

1995. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant readings arranged in horizontal lines against Codex Vaticanus: Mark*. Sheffield: Academic Press – Pasadena CA: William Carey International Academic Press.

TAYLOR, V.

1966. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark: The Greek text with introduction, notes, and indexes*. London etc: Macmillan – New York: St Martin's.

WESTCOTT, B.F. & HORT, F.J.A.

1881. *The New Testament in the original Greek*. Vol I, Text. Cambridge – London: Macmillan.

WEBER, R.

1975. *Biblia Sacra, iuxta vulgatam versionem, editio altera emendata*. Tomus I. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

WISSE, F.

1982. *The profile method for the classification and evaluation of manuscript evidence, as applied to the continuous Greek text of the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans. StD 44.

### Keywords

Gospel of Mark

Textual criticism

Fenton Hort

Priority Western text

### Trefwoorde

Evangelie volgens Markus

Teks kritiek

Fenton Hort

Voorkeur Westerse teks