

Internal Evidence of Readings

Wim Hendriks

KTU

UTRECHT

RESUMEN En los estudios de tipo crítica textual la regla fundamental es que hay que llegar a la interpretación de que se puede explicar el origen de los otros con facilidad. Desgraciadamente este principio no se puede llevar a la práctica fácilmente. Por eso se añaden varias reglas. Pero la mayoría de estas reglas solamente engaña. Además, la mayor parte del tiempo las discusiones sobre este asunto siguen siendo teóricas. Lo que necesitamos en primer lugar son ejemplos útiles. Se los doy aquí en cuatro rúbricas.

PALABRAS CLAVE Crítica de textos, Probabilidad intrínseca, Hechos lingüísticos, Evangelios, Romanos

SUMMARY *In matters of textual criticism there exists the basic rule that one has to obtain the reading that most easily explains the rise of the others. Unfortunately, this principle is not always easy to practice. This is why different rules are added. But most of these rules do help in the wrong way or do not help at all. Moreover, many discussions on this topic are actually too theoretical. First of all we need examples. I shall provide them here under four headings.*

KEYWORDS *Textual criticism, Intrinsic probability, Linguistic facts, Gospels, Romans*

Applying textual criticism to books of the New Testament is necessary because of the fact that none of the original documents is extant and that the existing copies differ from one another in many instances. For example, in Mark 5:21 one finds at least eight different readings¹. Only one of them can be original. The textual critic tries to ascertain from such divergent readings which

¹ See W. HENDRIKS, "Leçons pré-alexandrines du Codex Bezae dans Marc (illustrées par Mc 10,1 et 1,4 et 5,21)", in: D. PARKER – C.-B. AMPHOUX (eds.), *Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (NTTS 22; Leiden etc. 1996) 232-239, especially 235-237. See below in § 2 and in § 3.

of them should be regarded as most nearly conforming to the original². “Perhaps the most basic criterion for the evaluation of variant readings is the simple maxim *choose the reading that best explains the origin of the others*”³. It is the principle put forward for the first time by Johann Jakob Griesbach: one has to look for the reading “*e qua caeterarum ortus facillime explicetur*”⁴. Unfortunately, this principle is not always easy to practice. Therefore different additional rules are used. However, most of the auxiliary rules, such as listed in *Der Text des Neuen Testaments* edited by the Alands, are misleading or even useless⁵. Moreover, the considerations and discussions on this topic are often too theoretical.

According to Hort, “Internal Evidence of Readings is of two kinds, which cannot be too sharply distinguished from each other; appealing respectively to Intrinsic Probability, having reference to the author, and what may be called Transcriptional Probability, having reference to the copyists. In appealing to the first, we ask what an author is likely to have written: in appealing to the second, we ask what copyists are likely to have made him seem to write”⁶. Concerning copyists Jerome says it even stronger: “*qui scribunt non quod inveniunt sed quod intelligunt*”, they do not write what they find but what they understand. Sometimes this seems true also for biblical scholars⁷. Jerome continues: “*et dum alienos errores emendare nituntur ostendunt suos*”, and while they strain to correct the errors of others, they manifest those of their own⁸. Here (correct) *language is at issue*. Nothing else matters. Internal arguments concern linguistic factors and signals within the text itself, within every reading

2 See B. M. METZGER – B. D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (New York – Oxford 2005) xv.

3 METZGER – EHRMAN, *Text of the New Testament*, 300.

4 J. J. GRIESBACH, *Novum Testamentum Graece. Textum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum recensuit et lectionis varietatem adjecit. Volumen I, quattuor evangelia complectens* (Halae Saxonum-Londini 1796) lix-lxxx, quotation lx.

5 K. ALAND – B. ALAND, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik* (Stuttgart 1989) 284-285.

6 F. J. A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek. Volume II, Introduction – Appendix* (Cambridge – London 1882 = Graz 1974) 20.

7 Sometimes scholars invent constructions, e.g. the so called *coniugatio periphrastica* with *aorist* forms of the auxiliary, or meanings, e.g. εὐθεὺς = *shortly, soon*. Both examples are not found in Greek.

8 Hieronymus, *Epistulae* 71,5 (*ad Lucinum Baeticum*), in: *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, ed. I. HILBERG (CSEL 55; Vindobonae 1996) 5-6.



in a variation unit. Apart from theoretical considerations and discussions we need above all examples⁹. I'll provide them under four headings.

1. *BREVIOR LECTIO PRAEFERENDA VERBOSIORI (GRIESBACH)*¹⁰

Under the heading of Johann Jakob Griesbach's canon, I offer as a first example a survey of the different readings of Matt 6:33 (strive first for the kingdom of heaven) found in the writings of the church fathers. Pseudo-Augustin follows **℣.01**. Each reading (after ζητείτε δε) will be given with its first occurrence. Approximate dates are added¹¹.

1	την βασιλειαν των ουρανων	Justin	150
2	πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουρανων	² Clement	195
3a	πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουρανων και την δικαιοσυνην	⁴ Clement	205
3b	πρωτον την βασιλειαν του θεου και την δικαιοσυνην	Hilary	360
4	πρωτον την βασιλειαν και την δικαιοσυνην του θεου	Cyprien	250
5	πρωτον την βασιλειαν του θεου και την δικαιοσυνην αυτου	Basil	370
6	πρωτον την βασιλειαν και την δικαιοσυνην αυτου	℣.01 , Ps-Aug	330

The reading of Justin (from about 150) is, no doubt, the more original. This beautiful text is a *dictum* in two parts of the same length.

ζητείτε δε την βασιλειαν των ουρανων
και ταυτα παντα προστεθησεται υμιν

Three things are noteworthy. Firstly, assuming that the critical editions of Justin's first Dialogue represent what he actually wrote, his reading is evidently the oldest one. Secondly, his reading explains the rise of all other readings of Matt 6:33 found in the church fathers and in the manuscripts. Thirdly, his reading

9 E. J. EPP, "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism", in: D. A. BLACK (ed.), *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids 2002) 17-76.

10 GRIESBACH, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, lx (canon 1: a shorter reading is to be preferred to a more verbose one). See W. HENDRIKS, "Lectio e qua caeterarum ortus facillime explicetur": *FNT* 22 (2009) 3-39.

11 Superscript numerals as in ²Clement and ⁴Clement refer to the quotations in my list. See W. HENDRIKS, "Brevior lectio praeferenda est verbosiori": *RB* 112 (2005) 567-595, list 576-580.



may be pre-synoptic, because it well explains both the origin of *ζητετε δε πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουρανων και ταυτα παντα προσεθησεται υμιν* of the matthean reading in ²Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogus* II 12:120.2) and *ζητετε δε την βασιλειαν του θεου και ταυτα παντα προσεθησεται υμιν* of the lukan reading in Marcion (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42:11.6+17). In addition, this supposed pre-synoptic reading is not reflected in the ancient versions of the Gospels. This fact confirms the pre-synoptic character of Justin's reading.

Reading 2 with *πρωτον* added (and still with *των ουρανων*, conform to the writer's usage) may be the authentic reading of Matthew (the authentic reading of Luke may be without *πρωτον* but with *του θεου* and *ταυτα παντα*)¹². The addition of *και την δικαιοσυνην* in reading 3 (⁴Clement, *Stromateis* IV 6:34.6) probably comes from Clement himself. The quotation occurs in the middle of chapter 6 of Book IV. This chapter, dealing with the Beatitudes, begins and ends (as an inclusion) with Matt 5:10: *μακαριοι οι δεδιωγμενοι ενεκεν δικαιοσυνης*, blessed are those who have suffered persecution for the sake of righteousness (yes, theirs is the kingdom of heaven). The word *δικαιοσυνη* (16 times in his chapter 6) clearly has an ethical meaning. In this case *βασιλεια των ουρανων* and *δικαιοσυνη* are synonymous expressions. However, the transposition of *του θεου* in reading 4 moves the sense from an ethical meaning to a theological meaning: that is to say towards the (pauline) concept of divine justification.

All these patristic readings (from 1 to 4) precede the ambiguous reading of N27 (see reading 5 or 6, with or without the words *του θεου* after *βασιλειαν*). This is the striking result of the present investigation.

Reading 5, with both *την βασιλειαν του θεου* from reading 3b and *την δικαιοσυνην αυτου* from reading 4 seems to be a conflation (reading out of two earlier ones, thus tertiary). Reading 6, actually a difficult reading, originated by the *accidental loss* of *του θεου*. With the consequence that *αυτου* after *την δικαιοσυνην* has no point of reference within this logion. *Language is at issue*.

A second example may be given. Matt 14:8 (D.05) *ειπεν δοσ μοι ωδε <επι πινακι>* compared with Mark 6:25 (D.05) *ειπεν δοσ μοι επι πινακι ωδε* offers a good example to illustrate how the text of Mark moves away step by step from the text of Matt. Look at the different readings of Matt and Mark. The text of Mark becomes increasingly verbose (*cf.* Griesbach's canon). So we may accept that the readings of Codex Bezae D.05 are the more original ones.

¹² Matt uses *βασιλεια των ουρανων* at least 32 times and Luke *βασιλεια του θεου* 31 times.



1a	ειπεν δος μοι ωδε επι πινακι	Matt	D.05 W.032
1b	ειπεν δος μοι επι πινακι ωδε	Mark	D.05
2a	δος μοι φησιν ωδε επι πινακι	Matt	<i>ferē omnes</i>
2b	ειπεν εξ αυτησ δος μοι επι πινακι	Mark	Θ.038
3b	ειπεν θελω ινα μοι δωσ <εξ αυτ>ησ επι πινακι	Mark	W.032 ¹³
4b	ητησατο λεγουσα θελω ινα μοι δωσ εξ αυτησ επι πινακι	Mark	A.02
5b	ητησατο λεγουσα θελω ινα εξ αυτησ δωσ μοι επι πινακι	Mark	κ.01

Compared with the simple reading *ειπεν δος μοι ωδε επι πινακι* or *ειπεν δος μοι επι πινακι ωδε*, readings 4b and 5b are really verbose, saying nothing more than reading 1. Note that *ωδε* (*as it is, here and now*) and *εξ αυτησ* (*this very moment*) are synonymous here, with the meaning *hic et nunc*¹⁴.

Illustrating is the next example. It shows the evolution of a seemingly small detail in the story of the feeding of the five thousand¹⁵. The origin and transmission of Mark 6:33, which in all the gospels is part of the introduction to this story, can be sketched as follows. Each time something is added¹⁶.

1	ηκολουθει δε αυτω οχλος πολυσ	John 6:2
2	οι δε οχλοι γνοντες ηκολουθησαν αυτω	Luke 9:11
3	και ακουσαντες οι οχλοι ηκολουθησαν αυτω πεζη απο των πολεων	Matt 14:13
4	και ιδοντες αυτους πολλοι εγνωσαν αυτους και ηκολουθησαν αυτω πεζη απο πασων των πολεων	Mark 6:33 in sy ⁸
5	και ιδοντες αυτους υπαγοντας εγνωσαν πολλοι και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει	Mark 6:33 in λ205-209

13 According to H. A. SANDERS, *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels* (New York 1912) 228, W.032 reads *δωσισ pro δωσ* and omits *εξ αυτησ*. However, *δωσισ* is not a correct form of the verb *διδωμι*.

14 For *εξ αυτησ* = *εξ αυτησ τησ ωρασ* = *hic et nunc*, see V. TAYLOR, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (London etc. – New York 1951, 1966) 316. For *εξ αυτησ* = *εξ αυτησ τησ οδου*, see J. H. MOULTON – G. MILLIGAN, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London 1930) 222. See also LSJ, *sub verbo*.

15 See W. HENDRIKS, "Variation textuelle dans l'Evangile selon Marc (illustrée par Mc 6,33)", in: C.-B. AMPHOUX – J. K. ELLIOTT, *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity. Proceedings of the Lille colloquium, July 2000* (HTB 6; Lausanne 2003) 349-367, especially 361-362.

16 A more complete listing of readings with their witnesses can be found in HENDRIKS, "Variation textuelle", 357-362.



- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | και ιδοντες αυτους υπαγοντας εγνωσαν πολλοι
και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει
και συνηλθον αυτου | Mark 6:33 in D (565)
(<i>cfr</i> 28 700 788) |
| 7 | και ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας και επεγνωσαν πολλοι
και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει
και προηλθον αυτους | Mark 6:33 in Σ B ^s 0187
349 892 1342 2427 |
| 8 | και ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας και επεγνωσαν αυτον πολλοι
και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει
και προηλθον αυτους και συνηλθον προς αυτον | Mark 6:33 in P84 (A)
(φ) π ε ω <i>plurimi</i> |

Crucial in this overview is the fact (overlooked by Hort) that D.05 doubles συνεδραμον εκει by adding και συνηλθον αυτου. Both phrases have the same meaning. Maybe a marginal note has crept into the text. The calligraphers of **Σ**.01 and B.03 did not understand the meaning of αυτου = εκει, and altered και συνηλθον αυτου into και προηλθον αυτους. The majority text provides the conflation of both.

If I am right, the given sketch tells something about the relationship between the four gospels, at least so far as the story of the feeding of the five thousand is concerned. See also my proposed solution of the synoptic problem: the gospel of Mark has been composed out of two earlier collections of which the second was not known to Luke. Mark seems to be the latest gospel¹⁷.

Finally a fourth example will be given. John 20:31 reads after ταυτα δε γεγραπται ινα πιστευσητε the following words, with a different place of εστιν in various witnesses¹⁸.

- | | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1 | στι ιησους χριστος υιος του θεου εστιν | e (τ ⁵⁶) |
| 2 | στι ιησους χριστος υιος εστιν του θεου | P66 ^{vid} D d |
| 3 | στι ιησους - - - - - εστιν ο υιος του θεου | Irenaeus ^{lat} (accidental loss) |
| 4 | στι ιησους ο χριστος εστιν ο υιος του θεου | W b (c) f |
| 5 | στι ιησους εστιν ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου | <i>plurimi</i> N27 |
| 6 | στι ο ιησους εστιν ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου | <i>pauci</i> TR |

17 W. HENDRIKS, "Zur Kollektionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums", in: M. SABBE, *L'Evangile selon Marc. Tradition et rédaction* (BETL 34; Leuven 1974, 21988) 35-57.

18 HENDRIKS, "Variation textuelle", 362-363.

The first two readings can be dated in the second half of the second century, readings 3 and 4 near the beginning of the third century, the fifth reading shortly after Nicea, and the last one in the second millenium. In the given order εστιν is advanced (it moves to the left). What effect does this transposition have? With εστιν moving to the left as the text is transmitted, one observes the addition of the article before υιος, before χριστος, and even before ησουσ. The transmission begins with the confession: Jesus Christ is son of God (as we are υιοι του θεου, sons and daughters of God), but ends (after Nicea) with the confession: Jesus is the Christ, (he is) the son of God. So we can see a transition from a more general sonhood of Jesus (*declared* son of God as in Rom 1:4, or *adoptive* son as in the baptism stories) to a more unique sonhood of a (possible) *pre-existent* being, like η σοφια (in Wisdom) or ο λογος (in John's prologue) or התורה (in Rabbinic literature).

2. PROCLIVI SCRIPTIONI PRAESTAT ARDUA (BENDEL)¹⁹

A clear example of Bengel's canon is to be found in Mark 1:4. According to N27 the text runs: εγενετο ιωαννης [ο] βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιασ εισ αφεσιν αμαρτιων, (so) came John [the] baptizing in the wilderness and preaching a baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins. The translation with "the" in square brackets shows the ungrammatical Greek of this text. Translators try to make sense of it. It happens that biblical scholars using false interpretations explain away the difficulties they encounter. Otherwise said, they prove what they want to prove. So Vincent Taylor about the use of εγενετο in Mark 1:4: "The word may be taken with κηρυσσων, thus forming a periphrastic tense"²⁰. And Keith Elliott: "John was baptizing and preaching"²¹. The supposed construction εγενετο διδασκων is not found in Greek literature. Periphrastic constructions are always with present stem forms of εμι or εχω. See

19 J. A. BENDELIIUS, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Tubingae 1734) 433. GRIESBACH, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, lxi, paraphrases Bengel's canon *proclivi lectioni praestat ardua* as follows: "Durior lectio praeferatur ei, qua posita, oratio suaviter leniterque fluit" (canon 3: a harsher reading may be preferred to that which instead flows pleasantly and smoothly in style).

20 TAYLOR, *Saint Mark*, 154.

21 J. K. ELLIOTT, "The Case for Thoroughgoing Eclecticism", in: Black, *Rethinking*, 110.

the detailed study of Willem Johan Aerts, *Periphrastica*²². Instead I prefer to look for a more authentic reading. If we put the most similar readings one after the other, we will get the following order of succession (1 2 3 4 or 4 3 2 1)²³.

1	εγενετο ιωαννης εν τη ερημω βαπτιζων και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας	D.05
2	εγενετο ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας	A.02
3	εγενετο ιωαννης ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας	ℵ.01
4	εγενετο ιωαννης ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας	B.03

Readings 1 and 4 are the extremes: one of them may be identical with the original reading (*Ausgangstext*). The Greek of reading 3 is impossible and ungrammatical, and reading 4 with the deletion of *και* is an unfortunate correction of this corruption. The order *ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω* in reading 2 gives rise to the addition of the article before *βαπτιζων*. Reading 1 with the phrase *ιωαννης εν τη ερημω* (a qualification of John, parallel with *φωνη εν τη ερημω*) *pushes itself* as the reading *e qua caeterarum ortus facillime explicetur*. As a matter of fact the verbal forms *βαπτιζων και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας* indicate John's activity, like *βαπτιζων* in Acts 19:4 and the beginning of the gospel of the Ebionites. This in striking contrast with the epithet (*adpositio*) *ο βαπτιστης* according to D.05 in Mark 6:14+24+25 and 8:28. In conclusion, reading 1 is non-obvious and unruly: in latin words *scriptio ardua*. Another example occurs in Mark 5:21. Below four out of eight different readings²⁴.

1	και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εις το περαν) παλιν συνηχθη οχλος πολυς προς αυτον) παρα την θαλασσαν)	two opposite directions (εις →) and προς ←) meet each other) by the lakeside	D it
2	και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εις το περαν παλιν συνηχθη οχλος πολυς προς αυτον και ην παρα την θαλασσαν		P45 Θ 565 700 (focus on Jesus: <i>et ipse erat ad marem</i> a.3)

22 One may think of Mark 1:6 *ην ενδεδυμενος* and 1:22 *ην διδασκων* as examples. See W. J. AERTS, *Periphrastica. An investigation into the use of ειναι and εχειν as auxiliaries or pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the present day* (Amsterdam 1965). Also G. BJÖRCK, *Ην διδασκων: Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen* (HVUS 32,2; Uppsala – Leipzig 1940).

23 See HENDRIKS, "Lectio e qua", § 3, 11-17.

24 See HENDRIKS, "Leçons pré-alexandrines", 235-237.



- 6 και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εν τω πλοιω παλιν εισ το περαν α + β text-type
 συνηχθη οχλος πολυς επ αυτον
 και ην παρα την θαλασσαν
- 8 και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εν τω πλοιω παλιν ηλθεν εισ το περαν φ983
 και συνηχθη οχλος πολυς προς αυτον
 και ην παρα την θαλασσαν

The addition of και ην violates the dynamic composition of reading 1. This addition, focusing on Jesus, clears the way for all other changes. Certainly the harder reading 1 is to be preferred. It should be noted that this harder reading is not difficult (according to Bengel *arduus* and *difficilis* are surely not synonymous).

Still another example can be seen in Mark 7:33. The word πτυσασ here moves from left to right in the sentence during the transmission of this verse²⁵.

- 1a πτυσασ εβαλεν τους δακτυλους αυτου εισ τα ωτα αυτου D
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 1b επτυσεν εισ τους δακτυλους αυτου και εβαλεν εισ τα ωτα του κωφου 0131
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης του μογγιλαλου
- 2 εβαλεν πτυσασ τους δακτυλους αυτου εισ τα ωτα αυτου Θ 565
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 3 (επ)εβαλε(ν) τους δακτυλους αυτου πτυσασ εισ τα ωτα αυτου (W) φ 28
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 4 ενεβαλεν τους δακτυλους αυτου εισ τα ωτα αυτου πτυσασ P45
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 5 εβαλεν τους δακτυλους εισ τα ωτα αυτου (N) L 892
 και πτυσασ ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 6 εβαλ(λ)ε(ν) τους δακτυλους αυτου εισ τα ωτα αυτου ABN(Δ)ΣΦ λ 700 *plurimi*
 και πτυσασ ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου
- 7 επεβαλε τους δακτυλους αυτου εισ τα ωτα αυτου φ124
 και ηψατο της γλωσσης αυτου πτυσασ

²⁵ See HENDRIKS, "Variation textuelle", 363-364.



Reading 1a says that Jesus wets his own fingers with spittle and puts them into the man's ears and touches his tongue. This interpretation of 0131 (reading 1b) is found also in the Arabic Diatessaron²⁶. Reading 1 is surely the harder reading. It is avoided by copyists: πτωσασ is transposed step by step from the first place in the sentence (D.05) into the last one (codex 124 of family φ).

As a final example under this heading follows Matt 11:27. For this verse I found until now 216 quotations (adaptations, allusions) in 42 fathers. This very high number of quotations in so many fathers can be explained by the theological content of the quoted verse: the mutual knowledge of father and son. For example, Justin quotes the saying about this mutual knowledge three times. His second quotation reads as follows: και παλιν ο ιησους ως εδηλωσαμεν ... ειπεν, ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ο ιος αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη²⁷.

As I said before, I found some 216 quotations of this saying –almost 10 times the number of *maiusculi* available for this verse– with an array of differences, including the occurrence of εγνω or οιδε or (επι)γνωσκει, of και ο ιος αν or και ω αν, or of ο υιος αποκαλυψη or βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι. The following main readings were found (with one or two of the first fathers quoting the reading).

- 1 ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ο ιος αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (²Justin, *cfr* ¹Justin)
- 2a ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ω αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (⁵Irenaeus, *cfr* ¹Irenaeus)
- 2b ουδεις οιδε τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ω εαν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*cfr* ¹¹Athanasius, ³⁺⁹Epiphanius)
- 2c ουδεις γνωσκει τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ο ιος αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (³Justin, *cfr* ⁶Irenaeus)
- 3a ουδεις εγνω τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (²Origen, *cfr* ⁴⁺⁵Clement)

26 TATIANUS, *Diatessaron*, in: *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, ed. A. MENZIES (ANF X; Edinburgh – Grand Rapids 1995) 76, reads: “and spat upon his fingers and thrust *them* into his ears and touched his tongue” (word in *italics* added by the original editor).

27 In English: “And again, Jesus, as we made already clear, while he was with them, said: no one knows the father but the son nor the son but the father and those to whom the son reveals *him*.” See JUSTINUS, *Apologiae* I 63.13, in: *First Apology*, ed. A. ROBERTS – J. DONALDSON (ANF I; Edinburgh – Grand Rapids 1996) 184. Also in: *Apologiae pro Christianis*, ed. M. MARCOVICH (PTS 38; Berlin 1994) 123. And in: *Apologie pour les Chrétiens*, ed. trad. CH. MUNIER (Paradosis 39; Fribourg 1995) 116.



- 3b ουδεις οιδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος
και ω εαν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (¹Eriphanus, *cfr.* ⁷Eriphanus)
- 3c' ουδεις γινωσκει τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα τισ επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιος
και ω εαν βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι (⁹Didymus, ¹Chrysostom)
- 3c'' ουδεις επιγινωσκει τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα τισ επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιος
και ω αν βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι (⁴Irenaeus, Codex Bezae Matt)
- 4a ουδεις επιγινωσκει τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα τισ επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιος
και ω εαν βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι (Matt, N27, *Mss. fere omnes*)
- 4b ουδεις γινωσκει τισ εστιν ο υιος ει μη ο πατηρ και τισ εστιν ο πατηρ ει μη ο υιος
και ω εαν βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι (Luke, N27, *Mss. fere omnes*)

As one can see, all ten of these readings have affinities with each other. There is a clear sequence (from 1 to 4ab or from 4ab to 1). So it is not necessary to think of two different sayings, one canonical, the other non-canonical (extra- or pre- or post-canonical). This is in clear conflict with the opinions of Wilhelm Bousset and Arthur Bellinzoni²⁸. Both authors appeal to a 'non'-canonical source (Bousset extra-canonical or pre-synoptic, Bellinzoni post-synoptic), in order to explain the difference of Justin's text as compared with that of Matt and Luke. My overview of these ten readings tells against their opinions. In addition, there are two extremities, one of which may be original: either the reading in Justin's first *Apology*, or one of the two readings of N27. Which one is original?

The aorist εγω is a gnomic aorist: "An act which is valid for all time can be expressed by the aorist" (BDF § 333). "Im Klassischen steht dieser sogenannte gnomische Aorist in Sentenzen" (BDR § 333). "L'aoriste gnomique exprime les vérités communes, les maximes que nous traduisons par le présent. Le grec se réfère, pour ainsi dire, aux faits d'expérience qui les ont établies" (Abel)²⁹. Such a *gnomon* is rooted in experience. Justin's reading is a good example.

ουδεις εγω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ
no one 'knows' the father except the son and no one the son except the father

28 W. BOUSSET, *Die Evangelienzeit Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen 1891) 100-103, and A. BELLINZONI, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Suppl to *NovT* 17; Leiden 1967) 28.

29 F.-M. ABEL, *Grammaire du grec biblique suivie d'un choix de papyrus* (Etudes Bibliques; Paris 1927) 256.



The occurrence of the Greek gnomic aorist points to the originality of the readings with εγνω. The repetitions (like ουδεις (επι)γινωσκει ... τισ επιγινωσκει in 3c) and the additions (like τισ εστιν in 4b, and βουληται in 3c and 4ab) point to the secondary character of readings 3 and 4.

Most striking, however, is the inversion of father and son in the readings 3 and 4. The *logically* correct order is that of father and son as in Justin (and in the readings under 2). The inversion may have been caused by the following phrase και οισ (ω) αν ο υιοσ αποκαλυψη, (no one knew the son except the father and no one the father except the son) and anyone to whom the son reveals. This may be called the *grammatically* correct order. Once again the question: which reading is the more original one? The following quotations of Irenaeus and Adamantius provide an answer.

παντα μοι παρεδοθη υπο του πατροσ μου. και ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιοσ και τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ω αν ο υιοσ αποκαλυψη, ¹Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* I 20,3, SC 264, 292-293 (Marcosian).

nemo cognoscit patrem nisi filius neque filium nisi pater et quibus filius revelaverit, ²Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* II 6,1, SC 294, 60.

nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius (*bis*), ³Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* II 14,7, SC 294, 142 (Valentinian).

ουδεις επιγινωσκει τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ ουδε τον πατερα τισ επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιοσ και ω αν βουληται ο υιοσ αποκαλυψαι (= Matt 11:27 according to D.05), ⁴Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV 6,1, SC 100, 436-439.

ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιοσ ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και ω αν ο υιοσ αποκαλυψη, ⁵Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV 6,1, SC 100, 438-439

ουδεις επιγινωσκει τον πατερα ει μη ο υιοσ ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ και οισ αν ο υιοσ αποκαλυψη, ⁶Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV 6,3, SC 100, 442-445 = *Against Heresies* IV 6,7, SC 100, 454-455.



θεον ειδεναι ουδεις δυναται μη ουχι θεου διδαξαντος ... γνωσονται γαρ αυτον οις αν αποκαλυψη ο υιος (allusion), Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV 6,4 (= *Fragmentum graecum* 5), SC 100, 446-447.

ουδεις επιγνωσκει τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος, Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV 7,4, SC 100, 464-465, compare *Against Heresies* IV 6,7, SC 100, 452-453 (see ⁶Irenaeus).

ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον τισ γινωσκει ει μη ο πατηρ, ¹Adamantius, *De recta in deum fide* 1,23, GCS 4, 44 (in the mouth of Megethios).

ουδεις γινωσκει τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ (καιτοι υπο παντων εωρατο αλλ ουκ εγινωσκετω) ... ουδεις οιδε τον υιον, ²Adamantius, *De recta in deum fide* 1,23, GCS 4, 44, see ³Adamantius.

ουδεις οιδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ, ³Adamantius, *De recta in deum fide* 1,23, GCS 4, 44 (Euthropius).

Irenaeus uses the phrase ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα (¹⁺⁵Iren, *cf.* ³Iren), and so does Adamantius (¹Adam). However, these fathers are quoting heretics (Gnostics and Marcionites). Irenaeus says about them: “They who would be wiser than the apostles, write in the following manner: ‘No man *knew* the father but the son nor the son but the father and he to whom the son reveals’ (⁵Iren), and they explain it as if the true God were known to none prior to our Lord’s advent, and that God who was announced by the prophets they allege not to be the father of Christ.”

So Irenaeus did not regard εγνω as a *gnomic* aorist, but as a *past tense* aorist, and therefore he rejects it. But the use of the reading ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ, by both Marcionites and Gnostics proves its originality. Irenaeus on the contrary refers once to the synoptic gospels: “No man knows the son except the father, no man knows the father except the son and he to whom the son will reveal him (⁴Iren = Matt 11:27 in D.05). Thus has Matthew set it down, and Luke in like manner, and Mark the very same (sic!), for John omits this passage.” In this case Irenaeus bears explicit witness to the inversion of father and son. And so does Adamantius elsewhere



(²⁺³Adam). Nevertheless, Irenaeus himself, too, uses the ‘Marcionite’ reading, with the father ahead, albeit changing εγνω into the present (επιγνωσκει ⁶Iren, *cognoscit* ²Iren, *noscit* Diat^E).

This leaves only one conclusion. In the debates against Marcion and his followers the church (Irenaeus first) changed the *gnomic* aorist εγνω –conceived as a *past tense* aorist– into οιδε or into επιγνωσκει (Matt) or γνωσκει (Luke). *Language is at issue*. However, many fathers quoted or continued quoting the text with εγνω τον πατερα first: Justin, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, the Pseudo-Clementines, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Paul of Samosate, Didymus the Blind, and even John Bekkos (who died in 1297).

3. NATURALIS DICTIO PRAEFERENDA DICTIONI ARTIFICIALI (HENDRIKS)³⁰

Before giving some illustrations of a natural and non-artificial sentence structure, I’ll quote Bengel: *duae sunt boni sermonis virtutes, profunditas et facilitas ... in scripturis divinis summa profunditas cum summa facilitate conjungitur; quare cavendum est ne ad nostrum illas modulum in interpretando exigamus*, beautiful language has two properties: depth and facility ... in the sacred scriptures greatest depth is joined with greatest facility; therefore we have to avoid measuring the scriptures according to our standard when we interpret³¹. I repeat: *non ad nostrum modulum*.

Justin	ζητειτε δε την βασιλειαν των ουραων και ταυτα παντα προσεθησεται υμιν
Matt 6:33	ζητειτε δε πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουραων και ταυτα παντα προσεθησεται υμιν
Luke 12:31	ζητειτε δε την βασιλειαν του θεου και ταυτα παντα προσεθησεται υμιν

³⁰ See HENDRIKS, “Lectio e qua”, 7-8: “une leçon grammaticalement juste et sémantiquement plus sensée, est à préférer à une leçon difficile, courbe ou boiteuse. Bref, le meilleur grec vient de l’évangéliste, pas du copiste.”

³¹ J. A. BENGEIUS, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti. In quo ex nativa verborum vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinnitas, salubritas sensuum coelestium indicatur. Secundum editionem tertiam (1773) denuo recusus* (Berolini ⁴1855, ⁵1860) xii.



The pre-synoptic reading in Justin about striving for the kingdom of heaven is in fact a *dictum* in two parts of the same length. Matt keeps the Semitic idiom την βασιλειαν των ουρανων conform to his usage (Matt has this expression at least thirty-two times), and adds πρωτον (see e.g. 5:24 υπαγε πρωτον, 13:30 συλληξατε πρωτον, 23:26 καθαρισον πρωτον). Luke changes this foreign idiom into βασιλεια του θεου (Luke has this expression thirty-one times).

Matt 11:27 ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος
ουδε τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ
και οισ αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη

Joachim Jeremias points to the Semitic style of this logion. The use of ουδεις (ουδε) with ει μη as a translation of the Aramaic אלא ... תל (lêt ... 'ellâ) = *only*. Next the synthetic parallelism in stead of a reciprocal pronoun. See Tobit 2:5 א: αυτοσ ου γινωσκει με και εγω ου γινωσχω αυτον, we do not know each other. Also the generic use of the definite article: only *a* father knows his son and only *a* son knows his father. We learn from experience that father and son know each other³². The preceding phrase παντα μοι παρεδοθη υπο του πατροσ μου makes clear that God and Jesus are meant.

Mark 1:3 φωνη βοωντοσ εν τη ερημω
Mark 1:4 εγενετο ιωαννησ εν τη ερημω

Exactly the parallelism between the quotation from Isaiah and the account of the coming of John confirms the originality of the Bezan reading. The phrase εν τη ερημω is a qualification of John as *voice crying in the wilderness*.

Mark 6:3 ουχ ουτοσ εστιν ο τεκτων ο υιος μαριασ
John 6:42 ουχ ουτοσ εστιν ιησουσ ο υιος ιωσηφ

The striking agreement between these two texts underlines the authenticity of both³³. See hereafter the natural and balanced phrasing of Luke 20:25 and parallels in Codex Bezae.

32 J. JEREMIAS, "Die Echtheit des Logions Mt 11:27 // Lk 10:22", in: IDEM, *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen 1966) 47-54. IDEM, *Neutestamentliche Theologie. Erster Teil: Die Verkündigung Jesu* (Gütersloh 1971) 62-67.

33 See HENDRIKS, "Brevior lectio", 571-572.





Mark 5:21 και διαπερασαντος του ιησου εις το περαν
παλιν συνηχθη οχλος πολυς προς αυτον
παρα την θαλασσαν

In one sentence two opposite directions (εις → and προς ←) meet each other by the lakeside. The addition of και ην does disappear the dynamic content of the communication. The eighth reading consists of three sentences in stead of one (see above in § 2).

Mark 4:21 μητι απτεται ο λυχνοσ ινα υπο τον μοδιον τεθη

Here one finds in one phrase the simple contrast between lighting the lamp and putting it out. This is figurative language. The difficulty with the usual markan reading μητι ερχεται ο λυχνοσ seems to be that the metaphor is interpreted prematurely (the lamp = Jesus). The Bezan reading rightly keeps the metaphor. See Hilary, *Saint Matthew* 413: *nec lucerna accenditur recondenda sub modio*, neither a lamp is lighted to be hid under a bowl (if so, the lighting is immediately nullified). The contrast is intentional.

Mark 14:45 και προσελθων λεγει αυτω
Matt 14:49 και ευθεωσ προσελθων τω ιησου ειπεν

These two Bezan readings are much more natural than the superabundant reading in Mark according to \aleph and 1342: και ελθων ευθυσ και προσελθων αυτω λεγει. Both participle and connective are redundant. The last phrase does not run well.

Luke 20:25 αποδοτε τα του καισαροσ τω καισαρι
και τα του θεου τω θεω

Here one finds in the Bezan text a pure parallelism in a perfect balance (more than in the official readings of this synoptic saying): *give 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). A supposed pre-synoptic reading explains the rise of all other readings.





Pre-synoptic	αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Luke D.05	αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Matt D.05	αποδοτε - - - - καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Mark D.05	αποδοτε τα του καισαρος τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Luke N27	τοιουν αποδοτε τα - - - καισαρος - - καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Matt N27	αποδοτε ουν τα καισαρος - - καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Mark N27	τα καισαρος αποδοτε - - καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω

My last illustration concerns the metaphor of pottery in Romans 9:22-23. Here is, however, nothing wrong with the *Greek* text, but actually with *modern translations*. Let me quote as an example the NRSV. This translation is really understandable.

What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, *has endured* with much patience the *objects* of wrath that are made for destruction; and what if he has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory *for the objects* of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory – ... ? (*italics added by the present author*)

The Greek text begins with *ει*, mostly introducing a condition, sometimes a question. In both cases it concerns a dependent or an independent sentence. Here we find an independent condition: *suppose that God*, who wants to make plain his anger and to make known his power. Since *ηνεγκεν* is an augmented form of the *aorist* of *φερω*, it surely points to an *irrealis*. The meaning of *φερω επι* evidently is: *to bear* or *to carry* (a load) *to*, or *to bring* (something) *to*. Here in Romans: *to destine* jars that evoke anger *to* jars that evoke mercy. The meaning here is surely not *to endure*, or *to tolerate*. Supposing that God would *destine* jars that evoke anger *for* jars that evoke mercy, our answer is: no, God would not do that. Paul says: yes, he does! “As indeed he says in Hosea: those who were my not-people I will call my people” (Romans 9:25 quotes Hosea 2:23). Below my translation (the *και ινα* clause is in fact parenthetical). The parallel phrases *σκευη οργησ* and *σκευη ελεουσ* are constructed with *genitivi objectivi*. Jars that evoke anger become jars that evoke mercy. The language still remains figurative: pottery (*σκευη*) is meant. Application of the metaphor begins in verse 24 with *ουσ και εκαλεσεν ημασ*.



ει δε θελων ο θεος ενδειξασθαι την οργην
 suppose that God, who wants to make plain his anger
 και γνωρισαι το δυνατον αυτου
 and to make known his power,
 ηνεγκεν εν πολλη μακροθυμια σκευη οργησ
 would destine with great patience jars that evoke anger,
 καταρητισμενα εισ απωλειαν
 (jars) ready to be thrown away
 – και ινα γνωριση τον πλουτον της δοξης αυτου –
 – precisely in order to make known the wealth of his glory –
 (ηνεγκεν) επι σκευη ελεουσ
 (would destine) for jars that evoke mercy,
 α προητοιμασεν εισ δοξαν
 (jars) he had prepared beforehand for glory.

4. *DIFFICILIOR LECTIO CORRUPTIONEM INDICAT* (HENDRIKS)

Let me begin with Griesbach's canon *lectio difficilior potior*: “difficilior et obscurior lectio anteponeunda est ei, in qua omnia tam plana sunt et extricata, ut librarius quisque facile intelligere ea potuerit” (canon 2: a more difficult and more obscure reading is preferable to that in which everything is so plain and free of problems that every scribe will easily be able to understand it)³⁴. However, this canon is ambiguous, because application of this rule has led to the canonisation of corruption on several occasions. I will indicate some of them.

Matt 6:33 ζητειτε δε πρωτον την βασιλειαν και την δικαιοσυνην αυτου
 reading 6 Ⲙ (~ B Didymus) Ps-Augustin (allusions Ps-Macarius, Aphraates)
 Tis W+H (Wss) Nes UBS¹⁺² SQE¹⁺⁴ SGQE³⁵

The word αυτου after δικαιοσυνην has no point of reference within this logion. So this reading is rather vague. The probable cause is the accidental loss of του θεου after την βασιλειαν. Only readings 1 and 2 and 3a with των ουρανων are conform to the evangelist's usage.

³⁴ GRIESBACH, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, lx-lxi.

³⁵ Critical editions are indicated with three letters, like BOC = BOVER – O'CALLAGHAN, but TR = *Textus Receptus*, and SGQE = *Synopsis Graeca Quattuor Evangeliorum* (BOISMARD - LAMOUILLE).



- Mark 1:4 ἐγενετο ιωαννης ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω κηρυσσων βαπτισμα
μετανοιας
- reading 4 B 33 892^{*vid} (*sine* o 892^c) 2427 bo^{mss}
W+H (ιωανης Wss, *cfr* B) Nes Bov SQE^{1,4} BOC SGQE

Reading 4 with the deletion of *και* is an unfortunate correction of the impossible and ungrammatical Greek of reading 3: (so) came John the baptizing in the wilderness and preaching a baptism of repentance. All four readings have their partisans³⁶. So among scholars there is no *consensus* at all.

- Mark 6:3 ουχ ουτος εστιν ο τεκτων ο υιος μαριας + αδελφος δε ιακωβου κτλ
- reading 8 A N Σ Φ λ π ε ω 28 157 1071
(της *ante* μαριας Sod) TR

Reading 8 has been composed –artificially– out of the first part of reading 1 and the second part of reading 4³⁷. Readings 1-7 succeed one after the other in a natural way. Reading 9 (33? 579) is really corrupt: ουχ ουτος εστιν ο του τεκτονος υιος (first part of reading 7) + και αδελφος ιακωβου κτλ (second part of reading 3). The mention of Mary has been lost or suppressed.

- Mark 8:26 μηδε εις την κωμην εισελθησ
- reading 4 ❧² B L λ 2427^{vid} sy^s geo¹
(μη Tis) W+H Wss Nes Sod Vog Mrk Bov UBS SQE BOC N27 HG
Nol SGQE

According to Ernst Lohmeyer an order *not even to go into the village* is inconceivable: “Wohnt der Blinde nicht im Dorf, so ist er überflüssig; steht ‘sein Haus’ aber im Dorf, so ist er unsinnig”³⁸. Why do so many critical editions follow this nonsense reading? The Bezan reading with υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και μηδενι ειπησ εις την κωμην is to be preferred³⁹.

36 Many scholars choose the reading of B.03, Schniewind, Lane, Gnilka and Focant select the reading of ❧.01, Boismard and Lamarche the reading of A.02, while I myself opt for the reading of D.05. See HENDRIKS, “Leçons pré-alexandrines”, 234-235.

37 See W. HENDRIKS, “Marc 6,3: celui-là n’est-il pas le charpentier?” (forthcoming in *RB*).

38 E. LOHMEYER, *Das Evangelium des Markus. Nach dem Handexemplar des Verfassers durchgesehene Ausgabe mit Ergänzungsheft* (KEK 1,2; Göttingen 141957 = 161963) 159.

39 See W. HENDRIKS, “Mc 8:26: ne le dis à personne dans le village”: *RB* 114 (2007) 255-272, using the readings of all the 1651 known manuscripts.



Mark 1:23	και ευθυσ ην εν τη συναγωγη αυτων ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω
5th (below)	NBL λ 33 579 2427 sa bo Tis W+H Wss Nes Sod Vog Mrk Bov UBS SQE BOC N27 HGr Nol SGQE

An ευθυσ before ην is simply strange (temporal ευθυσ does not stand with forms of εμ). According to the Handbook of Robert Bratcher and Eugene Nida the sense is difficult⁴⁰. Some scholars opt for a weakened sense (*now* there was). I agree with Taylor who remarks: “when the adverb is connected with ην, neither ‘immediately’ nor ‘so then’ is a satisfactory translation”⁴¹. However, in my opinion there may be a solution to the difficult use of ευθυσ in Mark 1:23. Look at the following phrases.

Pre-synoptic		εν τη συναγωγη	ην ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω
Luke	N.01	εν τη συναγωγη	ην ανθρωπος εχων πνευμα δαιμ. ακ.
Mark	Origen	ευθυσ εν τη συναγωγη αυτων	ην ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω
Mark	D.05	ην εν τη συναγωγη αυτων	ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω
Mark	N.01	ευθυσ ην εν τη συναγωγη αυτων	ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω

The text of Origen may be translated as follows: “*exactly* in their synagogue there was a man possessed by an unclean spirit.” Of course, synagogue and uncleanness are not compatible with each other! One can think of the Attic use of ευθυσ before numbers with the meaning *exactly*. See also Epictetus, *Diatribae* III 13.22: ου, αλλ ευθεωσ ως σοφοι διαγειν εθελομεν και ωφελειν ανθρωπους, no (that is not our way), but *precisely* as wise men we will act and help people⁴². Apart from that, ευθυσ in Mark 1:23 is probably not original.

40 R. BRATCHER - E. NIDA, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (London etc 1961) 47, about ευθυσ in Mark 1:23: “as it stands this phrase is difficult to translate.” They continue: “RSV ‘immediately there was’ is impossible English.”

41 Taylor, *Saint Mark*, 173.

42 See W. HENDRIKS, “ΕΥΘΕΩΣ Beyond the Temporal Meaning” (to be published).

5. CONCLUSION

Under four headings several examples were discussed to illustrate and prove the soundness of the *canones* in question. Attention was payed on intrinsic and transcriptional probability. In the case of Matt 6:33 // Luke 12:31 and Matt 11:27 // Luke 10:22 church fathers give evidence of an older text than available manuscripts provide⁴³. This confirms Marie-Emile Boismard's statement that there is a patristic textual tradition which is different from the manuscript tradition, and often almost fully ignored by the manuscript tradition⁴⁴.

Apart from this rather general conclusion I will add the following remarks concerning the basic rules for textual criticism proposed by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland⁴⁵. They provide twelve (actually thirteen) rules⁴⁶. Their list begins with the simple statement: "Only *one* reading can be original, however many variant readings their may be." That is correct. The second rule, *only the reading which best satisfies the requirements of both external and internal criteria can be original*, is disputable. There is a snake somewhere (a nigger in the woodpile). One does not know the quality of the witnesses unless on the base of internal evidence⁴⁷. In stead of rule 11, *the shorter reading is the more probable reading*, I prefer Griesbach's original wording: *brevior lectio praeferenda est verbosiori, a shorter reading is to be preferred to a more verbose one* (without definite articles)⁴⁸. This principle, it is said, "is not valid for witnesses whose texts otherwise vary significantly from the characteristic patterns of the textual tradition." Here codex D.05 is given as an example. It is irresponsible to exclude any witness in advance. Scientific research demands completeness, so all witnesses have to be included. Likewise I prefer Bengel's original wording:

43 The discussion of Matt 11:27 // Luke 10:22 was part of my paper "Misquoting Jesus and Orthodox Corruption" read at the fifth Birmingham Colloquium on Textual Criticism (2007).

44 M.-E. BOISMARD, "Critique textuelle et citations patristiques": *RB* 57 (1950) 388-408, especially 388.

45 K. ALAND – B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids 21989) 280-282 (second German edition 284-285).

46 The rule numbered 11 contains two different statements. The second one (*neither should the commonly accepted rule of thumb etc*) refers tot rules 10 and 11! (the second English edition drops the reference to rule 11, which seems an unfortunate correction).

47 See HENDRIKS, "Lectio e qua", § 2, Priorité de la critique interne, 11: "Ici il y a une anguille sous roche. On ne connaît la qualité des témoins que sur la base de la critique interne."

48 See HENDRIKS, "Brevior lectio", 568, note 3: Griesbach ne dit pas 'plus longue', mais 'plus verbeuse' (*verbosiori*). En plus, parce que la leçon (la) plus courte ne mène pas automatiquement à la leçon préférable, il faut comprendre la phrase latine *brevior lectio* comme 'une leçon plus courte'.

proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua, a harsher reading is superior to a smooth one. On the contrary there is no truth in the maxim: *lectio difficilior lectio potior*.

In addition to the two principles, that of Bengel and that of Griesbach, I propose a third one as useful: *naturalis dictio praeferenda dictioni artificiali*, inspired on the words of Bengel: *in scripturis divinis summa profunditas cum summa facilitate conjungitur*. The maxim *lectio difficilior lectio potior* does not match with this third principle⁴⁹.

I agree with the content of rule 8: “The reconstruction of a stemma of readings for each variation unit is an extremely important device, because the reading which can most easily explain the derivation of the other forms is itself most likely the original”⁵⁰.

49 Concluding note: In the above given examples manuscript groups (families) are indicated as follows:

λ = 1 118 205 209 1582 2193 (f^1)

φ = 13 69 124 346 543 788 826 828 983 (f^{13})

σ = 349 517 954 1424 1675 (f^{1424})

π = K II 114 265 489 1079 1219 1346 1816 (K^9)

ϵ = E F G H (K^1)

ω = S V Ω (K^1)

Since the text of 205 is almost identical with that of 209, it seems superfluous to quote 205 in a critical apparatus distinct from family λ . See K. LAKE, *Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies* [λ] (TSt 8,3; Cambridge 1902 = Nendeln (Liechtenstein) 1967) xxi-xxii: “I was convinced ... that 205 was a copy of 209.” The agreement of 205 with 209 is 95.2%. See K. ALAND – B. ALAND in Verbindung mit K. WACHTEL – K. WITTE, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* IV,1: Das Markusevangelium 1,2 (ANTF 27; Berlin etc 1998) 512-513.

50 Here “most likely the *more* original” would be better.