

**(Volume 6) PART 2: Itemization & elucidation on variations between
the *Textus Receptus* (TR) and Majority Byzantine Text (MBT)
where the TR is something other than the MBT**

(e.g., the MBT might be fairly evenly split between two readings).

Readings in Part 2 are in general areas of disagreement between neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* & Burgonites of the Majority Text (although where the MBT is fairly evenly split a Burgonite may potentially agree with the TR), and may or may not also be areas of disagreement between neo-Byzantines and neo-Alexandrians.

There are rival New Testament texts, such as the Byzantine Text, Western Text, Alexandrian Text, and various independently corrupted texts. Thus when in the 16th century the great neo-Byzantine textual analyst of Protestant Geneva, Beza of Geneva (d. 1605) in Switzerland, considered certain readings in the Western Text, he drew the obvious conclusion that the leading Western Greek Text, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Codex D 05), and therefore the Western Text was a corrupt text, and rightly dismissed it. So too, when in the 16th century the great neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Erasmus of Rotterdam (d. 1536) in Holland, considered certain readings in one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, he drew the obvious conclusion that Codex Vaticanus (Codex B 03) and therefore the Alexandrian Text was a corrupt text, and rightly dismissed it.

The New Testament Received Text of the Authorized King James Version of 1611 A.D., is a neo-Byzantine text. At the time of the Reformation in the 16th century, and then into the 17th century, Protestants defended, and Protestant Christian Bible translations were based on, a neo-Byzantine New Testament text. Initially the Roman Catholic Church allowed neo-Byzantines to flourish, as seen in the Complutensian Bible's New Testament (1514), or the Greek New Testament editions of the learned Erasmus of Rotterdam (e.g., 1516 & 1522). But once the Church of Rome saw the power of the Word of God as the Holy Ghost wrought through it the Reformation ignited by God under the great Protestant leader, Martin Luther in 1517, in fear and trembling of Biblical Christianity as recovered by the Protestants, they moved to close down the Neo-Byzantine School inside the Roman Church following the Council of Trent (1546-1563), and promote in its place the Papists' old Latin School which held sway in the Roman Church till the Vatican Two Council (1962-1965). Thereafter, the Papists joined with neo-Alexandrians seeking to promote the two main Alexandrian Texts of Rome Vaticanus (Codex B 03, 4th century) and London Sinaiticus (Codex Aleph 01, 4th century), as via the Neo-Alexandrian School they continued their post-Trent Council attack on the pure Word of God as found in the much hated Protestants' Bible.

*The Byzantine Text is the basic New Testament Greek text that was preserved over time and through time. Thus for those of the Neo-Byzantine School who recognize the teaching of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture (Pss. 12:6,7; 117:2; Isa. 40:8; Matt. 5:18; 24:35; I Peter 1:25), the starting point for a Greek New Testament neo-Byzantine textual analyst must always be the representative (or majority) Byzantine Text. Therefore neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* have a high regard for the Greek*

Byzantine Text of the New Testament which is the starting point, and USUALLY the finishing point for the Received Text. Thus the Received Text or Textus Receptus (TR) of the Greek New Testament follows the representative Byzantine Text UNLESS there is a CLEAR and OBVIOUS textual problem with it. If so, another reading may be selected which remedies the textual problem, that is found inside the closed class of sources that were Providentially preserved by God over time, and through time, namely, a minority Greek Byzantine text reading, and / or a Latin text reading from the Vulgate or old Latin Versions, and / or a reading from one or more Greek or Latin church writers. Given the Neo-Byzantine School's high regard for the representative Greek Byzantine Text of the New Testament, it therefore follows that the ONUS OF PROOF for any such departure from the majority Byzantine text is on the neo-Byzantine textual analyst discovering the textual problem to make out his case. For on the textual analysis rules of the Neo-Byzantine School, in the absence of any such GOOD textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, by default, the reading of the majority Byzantine text is therefore correct and so must stand.

The following *Textus Receptus* (TR) itemizations
that are not Majority Byzantine Text (MBT)
are discussed in Part 2,
whereas TR itemizations that are MBT are discussed in Volume 6, Part 1.
(See also Appendices 1-3.)

Mark Chapter 4:

Mark 4:4; 4:9a; 4:30b; & 4:33 and associated Mark 5:3e.

Mark Chapter 5:

Mark 5:3e see 4:33; & 5:11.

In this work, the *AUTHORIZED KING JAMES VERSION (AV) OF 1611* is used as *the model neo-Byzantine version* to give the rendering of the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* (TR), although reference may sometimes be made to other neo-Byzantine versions e.g., Tyndale (1526), the Geneva Bible (1560), and the Bishops' Bible (1568).

And the *AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (ASV) OF 1901* is used as *the model neo-Alexandrian version* to give the rendering of a neo-Alexandrian text which in general is usually the rendering found in other neo-Alexandrian versions considered in this textual commentary e.g., the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Mark 4:4 “of the air” (TR & AV) {B}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The First Matter: In order to discuss the relevant textual issue here at Mark 4:4, it is necessary to consider the Marcan usage of “*elthe* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb from *erchomai*).” This therefore requires consideration of some verses where it is Majority Byzantine Text (MBT), but a variant exists in the Alexandrian reading and thus the neo-Alexandrian texts (Mark 6:1, 9:7,33), though I shall simply stipulate for our immediate purposes here at Mark 4:4, that in these instances that the MBT stands as there is no good argument against it, (seen in their consistency with the way Marcan Greek uses *elthe*, *infra*) and leave further reference to them till later looking at these verses in these textual commentaries.

However, there is one verse, to wit, Mark 15:43, that will be determined in regard to the correct Byzantine text reading, here rather than later. Since it can be rendered the same in either instance, it would normally have been dealt with in an Appendix 3 of a later volume, but shall instead be dealt with here in Volume 6. At Mark 15:43, Hodges & Farstad’s majority text (1985) considers the text is “seriously divided” between their preferred main text reading of “*elthen* (‘he came’ = ‘came,’ AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb from *erchomai*)” (*Reading 1*) which is found in Scrivener’s text, and their footnote reading of “*elthon* (‘coming’ = ‘he came’ = ‘came’¹, masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*)” (*Reading 2*); though by contrast, Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text (2005) considers “*elthen*” (*Reading 1*) is so well established as the Majority Byzantine Text that no sidenote alternative is necessary².

Going to the common source book of von Soden (1913), and like Robinson & Pierpont using a K group Byzantine priority methodology, von Soden says that inside his K group, “*elthon*” (*Reading 2*) is found in his Kr subgroup (i.e., 90%+ of Kr), and “*elthen*” (*Reading 1*) is found elsewhere in K (i.e., 90%+ of the rest of K group) Of c. 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, von Soden’s Kr group contains c. 175 Gospel manuscripts. This means that c. 175 manuscripts out of c. 860 manuscripts, or c. 20%, which as a rounded number is about one-fifth of the K group, follow “*elthon*” (*Reading 2*), and c. 80% or about four-fifths follow “*elthen*” (*Reading 1*). Therefore on any reasonable extrapolation of these figures from such a large sample of Byzantine manuscripts as found in K group, one can fairly say that these results more generally represent the percentages of the Byzantine text’s many more manuscripts. Thus “*elthen*” (*Reading 1*) is clearly MBT at Mark 15:43. The respective merit of these two readings will hereafter be discussed in the Principal Textual Discussion, *infra*.

¹ Cf. e.g., *elthon* rendered as, “it came” in Matt. 2:9 or “he came” in Matt. 2:23.

² Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 174; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), p. 114.

The Second Matter: The two principle readings that will be discussed from Mark 4:4 are the majority Byzantine reading “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls)” (*Reading 1*), and the minority Byzantine reading, “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls) *tou* (of the) *ouranou* (air)” (*Reading 2a*). Von Soden (1913) says that within his K group, only one manuscript, G 011, follows the minority Byzantine reading; (though he also shows in his I group further support in the Byzantine text from M 021 & Minuscule 1375). This means that *Reading 1* has the residual support of *c.* 90%+ of the 860 K group Gospel manuscripts. On the one hand, von Soden’s groups are “too rubbery” to say for sure anything more than that the majority Byzantine text has the support of more than *c.* 90% of K group, and by extrapolation, more than *c.* 90% of the Byzantine texts overall; and that the minority Byzantine reading has the support of less than *c.* 10% of K group, and by extrapolation, less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine texts overall. But on the other hand, on these figures, and the lack of any further Byzantine Greek manuscript support shown for this reading in the other Greek New Testament textual apparatuses I consult that here have textual data provided at Mark 4:4 (Tischendorf’s 8th edition 1869-72 – shows G 011 & M 021; & Swanson, 1995 - shows G 011 & M 021, and a “corrector scribe” of Minuscule 2), it should be said that *it is certainly possible*, though by no means certain, that the support for the minority Byzantine reading is less than 1% of the Greek Byzantine texts.

Of course, this is not some kind of “startling new revelation” that neo-Alexandrians can latch onto and claim that, “the neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries did not know *Reading 1* has little manuscript support in the Greek.” And nor can one claim, as for instance does majority text Burgonite, Jack Moorman, that “the majority of MSS [manuscripts] extant today may not reflect at every point what the true ... and majority reading was 500 years ago³.” For we find on the one hand, that Elzevir’s Greek New Testament (1624) follows *Reading 1*; and on the other hand, Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) shows one out of six selected manuscripts following *Reading 1* (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and five out of six selected manuscripts following *Reading 2a* (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum / Library).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Mark 4:4 *Reading 1* (the TR’s reading), found in Scrivener’s Text is Greek, “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls) *tou* (of the) *ouranou* (‘air’ or ‘heaven’),” i.e., “the fowls of the air” or “the fowls of heaven,” in the wider words, “the fowls of the air came and devoured it up” (AV). This is a minority Byzantine reading with the support of less than *c.* 10% of

³ Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, 2nd edition, The Bible For Today, New Jersey, USA, 1988, p. 27; see also my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, 2009, (incorporating corrigenda up to 2016 found in Appendix 6,) at Preface, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

the Byzantine Greek texts, and *possibly* less than *c.* 1% of the Byzantine Greek texts (see Preliminary Textual Discussion, *supra*). It is supported by *Codex Seidelianus* (G 011, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England, UK), *Codex Campianus* (M 021, 9th century, National Library, Paris, France), and Minuscule 1375 (12th century, Moscow, Russia). It is further supported as Latin, “*volucres* (the fowls) *caeli* (‘of the air’ or ‘of heaven’),” in *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century, Vercelli, Italy), *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century, Cambridge University, England, UK), *Codex Vindobensis* (old Latin Version i, 5th century, Naples, Italy), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century, Munich, Germany), and *Codex Usserianus I* (named after His Grace James Ussher, d. 1656, sometime Archbishop of Armagh and Anglican Primate of the *Church of Ireland*, old Latin Version r1, 7th century, Dublin, southern Ireland). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of the Neo-Byzantine School’s Erasmus of Rotterdam (1516 & 1522); and the Neo-Byzantine School’s Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus of Geneva (1550), Beza of Geneva (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir of Leiden (1624 & 1633).

Reading 2a, Greek, “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls),” i.e., “the fowls” is the majority Byzantine reading with the support of at least *c.* 90% of the Byzantine text manuscripts. It is found in e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), H 013 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 19 (13th century, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, England, UK). It is also found as Latin, “*aves* (the fowls),” in Jerome’s Vulgate (4th / 5th centuries), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as Latin, “*volucres* (the fowls),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), and l (7th / 8th century), and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.); and as Latin, “*volatilia* (the fowls)” in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century), and the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258).

The Greek textual issue here at Mark 4:4 relates to the Marcan usage of the indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb from *erchomai*, which is *elthe* (or with an optional “*n*” at the end, *elthen*). This involves a Marcan nuance that does not attach to Marcan Greek in other declensions of this indicative active aorist verb. Furthermore, it should be noted that though this is a singular verb, here at Mark 4:4 it is not rendered as a singular, but as a plural, because in Greek, a neuter plural subject usually, though not always, has singular verbs⁴. Thus here at Mark 4:4, the neuter plural subject, “*ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural nominative definite article, from *to*) *peteina* (‘fowls,’ neuter plural

⁴ The exception to the general rule occurs where one wants to emphasize the individuality of each subject in the plural subject. See my further discussion of this at Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), 2008, Revised Edition 2010, Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 2010, (incorporating corrigenda up to 2016 found in Appendix 6,) at Appendix 3, at Mark 6:32.

nominative noun, from *peteinon*),” takes the singular verb “*elthe*” and means “they [plural] came,” in the wider words, “and the fowls ... came”

In Marcan Greek, we find that St. Mark uses *elthe* (*elthen*) always with reference to *coming out from somewhere that is contextually specified*. Thus at Mark 1:9 we read, “that Jesus came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’) from Nazareth.” He was thus “baptized of John in Jordan” (Mark 1:9), then went “into the wilderness” (Mark 1:12), and then in Mark 1:14, “after that John was put into prison, Jesus came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’) into Galilee.” Thus in the Marcan nuance, this means that Jesus came from the area of his temptation “in the wilderness” (Mark 1:13), where he heard that “John was put in prison,” and from there “came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’) into Galilee” (Mark 1:14). By contrast, the absence of this nuance in Matthean Greek, *infra*, requires more explanatory wordage from St. Matthew, who after our Lord’s temptation (Matt. 4:1-11), says, “Now when Jesus heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee” (Matt. 4:12).

In Mark 5:25-34 we read of “a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years” (Mark 5:25), and she “came in the press behind, and touched his garment” (Mark 5:27). Then when our Lord “said, Who touched my clothes?” (Mark 5:30), “the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘she came’) and fell down before him, and told him all the truth” (Mark 5:33) i.e., she “came” from “the press behind” our Lord, *infra*. “Jesus” “cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue (Mark 5:36,38). “And he went out from thence, and came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’) into his own country” (Mark 6:1) i.e., he “came” from “the house of the ruler of the synagogue.” At Mark 7:31 we read of our Lord, “And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came (Greek, *elthe*) unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis.” Flowing on from this location in Mark 7:31, at Mark 8:10 we read, “And straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples, and came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’) into the parts of Dalmanutha” i.e., he came immediately from “a ship” (Mark 8:10), and beyond this, from “the sea of Galilee” (Mark 7:31).

At *The Transfiguration of our Lord* (Mark 9:2-10) (remembered on 6 August as a black letter day in the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*), we read in Mark 9:7, “And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘it came’) out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him” i.e., this was the voice of God the Father which “came out of the cloud.” And our Lord later “passed through Galilee” (Mark 9:30). “And he came (Greek, *elthen*) to Capernaum ...” (Mark 9:33) i.e., “he came to Capernaum” from “Galilee.”

In the passage of Mark 10:35-45, we first read that “James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying ..., Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory” (Mark 10:35,37). And we later read in Mark 10:45, “For even the Son of man came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘he came’) not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” Thus in the Marcan nuance, in a very immediate contextual sense, one can fairly deduce that our Lord was not only going to his “glory,” but that he was *returning* to his “glory” for he “came” (Mark 10:45) from his “glory” (Mark 10:37). That is because the Marcan recognition of

the Deity of “the Son of God” as “Lord” (Mark 1:1,3), here at Mark 10:45 includes a necessarily implied recognition of his pre-existence that is only detectable to the reader if one first understands this Marcan nuance, and considers these words in the wider context of the Holy Gospel of Mark in which the Deity of Christ as “the Son of God” and “Lord” (Mark 1:1,3) is expressly recognized, “For” in Psalm 110:1 “David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord David therefore himself calleth hi Lord . . .” (Mark 12:36,37). Thus this teaching of Mark 10:45 understood with the Marcan nuance in the wider context of the Holy Gospel of St. Mark in which Christ’s Deity is recognized, has similarity with the teaching of our Lord in St. John’s Gospel, “I am from above,” “I am not of this world” (John 8:23); and the words of our Saviour’s high priestly prayer, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5). “Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me . . .” (John 17:24). But the *from* glory and *to* glory teaching is found in much less words in St. Mark’s Gospel, through reference to this Marcan *elthen* nuance, and the wider recognition of Christ’s Deity in Mark’s Gospel. By contrast, the absence of this nuance from Matthean Greek, *infra*, means that in the passage of Matt. 20:20-28, Matthean Greek would allow, but not require the implication in Matt. 20:28, that Christ contextually came from his “kingdom” (Matt. 20:21). (Although other passages in St. Matthew’s Gospel also clearly recognize the Deity of Christ as the Son of God and Second Divine Person of the Holy Trinity e.g., Matt. 1:23; 3:3; 22:44,45; 28:19,20)

In the passage of Mark 10:46-52, “blind Bartimaeus, sat by the highway side begging” (Mark 10:46). “And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘he came’) to Jesus” (Mark 10:50). Or “when they were come from Bethany,” it is said of our Lord, that “he came (Greek, *elthen*)” to “a fig tree” (Mark 11:12,13). And when our Lord was “in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper,” “there came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘she came’) a woman” who in the Marcan nuance was therefore contextually also from “Bethany” (Mark 14:3). And in Mark 14, our Lord “prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him” (Mark 14:35). “And he cometh the third time” to his disciples in Mark 14:41, “and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest, it is enough, the hour is come (Greek, *elthen*, ‘it come’)” i.e., it has come *in time* from where our Lord earlier foretold it.

At Mark 15:43, *c.* 80% or about four-fifths of the Byzantine manuscripts follow the Majority Byzantine Text reading of “*elthen* (‘he came’ = ‘came’)” (*Reading 1*) (e.g., E 07, 8th century; G 011, 9th century; H 013, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; V 031, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; Minuscule 2, 12th century; & Lectionary 340, 13th century, twice in two different readings), and *c.* 20%, or about one-fifth of the Byzantine manuscripts follow minority Byzantine Text reading of “*elthon* (‘coming’ = ‘came’)” (*Reading 2*) (e.g., A 02, 5th century; Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; K 017, 9th century; M 021, 9th century; Y 034, 9th century; Pi 041, 9th century; Gamma 036, 10th century; & Lectionaries 2378, 11th century⁵; & 1968, 1544 A.D.) (See Preliminary

⁵ Lectionary 2378 (p. 8b, column 1), revowells the omega (“*ω*”) to omicron (“*ο*”), and as it comes at the end of a line, and places above the “*ο*” an abbreviation that

Textual Discussion, *supra*). The Greek grammatical form of “*elthen* (‘he came’ = ‘came,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)” (*Reading 1*), is also supported in the Latin grammatical form of “*venit* (‘he came’ = ‘came,’ indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*)” (Jerome’s Vulgate, 4th / 5th centuries; and old Latin Versions k, 4th / 5th centuries; d, 5th century; ff2, 5th century; q, 6th / 7th century; aur, 7th century; l, 7th / 8th century; & c, 12th / 13th century; the Book of Armagh, 812 A.D.; and the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian, d. 258). *Reading 1* as found in Scrivener’s Text (1894 & 1902), Greek “*elthen* (came),” is earlier found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565), and Elzevir (1624)⁶.

If we look at the immediate context of Mark 15, St. Mark first says in Mark 15:41 that a number of people “came up with” Christ “unto Jerusalem.” He then says in the representative Byzantine reading of Mark 15:43, “Joseph of Arimathaea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came (Greek, *elthen*, ‘he came’), and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus.” Thus in the Marcan nuance, does this mean that Joseph of Arimathaea came immediately from the area of “Jerusalem” (Mark 15:41) (cf. Mark 1:12-14; 14:3, *supra*)? Or does this mean that Joseph came from “Arimathaea” (Mark 15:43), for “Arimathaea” was “a city of the Jews” (Luke 23:51)? Irrespective of how one answers that question, it is clear that the Majority Byzantine Text at Mark 15:43 contains no incongruity with Marcan Greek, and since there is no good textual argument against the MBT reading, therefore “*elthen* (‘he came’ = ‘came’)” (*Reading 1*) is the correct reading.

We now come to a passages in St. Mark’s Gospel, to wit, Mark 4:4, where to understand this Marcan Greek nuance of the indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb from *erchomai*, i.e., *elthe* (which does not necessarily attach to Marcan Greek in other declensions of this indicative active aorist verb⁷), evident in Mark 1:9,14; 5:33; 6:1; 7:31; 8:10; 9:30,33; 10:45,50; 11:13;14:41,15:43, *supra*, acts to show us both a textual problem in the representative Byzantine text, and also to select the correct reading from

looks something like a semi-circle i.e., “ô” - though more curved than this pointed figure.

⁶ However, Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) says that five of its eight selected Gospel manuscripts have at the beginning of this verse “*elthon* (‘coming’ = ‘came’)” (*Reading 2*) (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

⁷ Cf. e.g., the Marcan singular, “I came (*elthon*, indicative active aorist, 1st person singular verb from *erchomai*),” at Mark 2:17; or the Marcan plural *elthon* (‘they went,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb from *erchomai*), at Mark 6:29; although it is like the singular at Mark 1:29; 3:8; 5:1; 6:53 & 14:16. Cf. at Mark 4:3 the compound word, “*exelthen* (‘he went out’ = ‘there went out,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb from *exerchomai*, from *ex* / ‘out’ + *erchomai*),” in which the addition of *ex* to form a compound word, i.e., “went out” is sufficient for Marcan Greek to here have a different possible nuance, as he going out FROM where he had been.

inside the closed class of New Testament sources to remedy the textual problem.

The majority Byzantine text of Mark 4:4 (*Reading 2a*) reads with regard to Greek *elthen*, “And it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls (Greek, *peteina*) came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘they came’) and devoured it up.” Relative to the Marcan nuance, this raises the question, Where did they come from? Did they come from a certain geographical region specified in the parable? Or did they like the Mark 4:32 “fowls (Greek, *peteina*) of the (*tou*) air (*ouranou*),” come from the sky? To this, there is no contextual answer in this parable. *Clearly something is wrong! This is NOT Marcan Greek!* By contrast, the minority Byzantine reading at Mark 4:4 (*Reading 1*) supplies the want, for it reads, “fowls (Greek, *peteina*) of the (*tou*) air (*ouranou*),” and thus tells us that they came from the sky. Therefore, since the minority Byzantine reading (*Reading 1*) at Mark 4:4 soothes the stylistic tension and turbulence caused by the majority Byzantine reading (*Reading 2a*), it follows that *Reading 1* is the correct reading.

By way of contrast, on the hand, Matthean Greek may sometimes *prima facie* show a similarity to Marcan Greek in the usage of *elthen* (cf. Matt. 9:1; 12:9; 12:42; 13:36; 15:29,39; 19:1; 21:19; 27:57). But on the other hand, Matthean Greek sometimes shows a dissimilarity to Marcan Greek in the usage of *elthen*, so that what is described as *elthen* may, as it were, be coming from nowhere contextually specified (cf. Matt. 11:18,19; 13:25; 17:12 - Matthean Greek here shows the contrast with Marcan Greek which in Mark 9:13 uses a different declension⁸; 24:39; 25:10; 26:47 - Matthean Greek here shows the contrast with Marcan Greek in Mark 14:43 which uses *paraginetai* for Judas’ appearance, as it were, from nowhere⁹; 28:1 - Matthean Greek here says “Mary Magdalene” “came,” i.e., singular; “and the other Mary;” and this shows the contrast with Marcan Greek in Mark 16:2 which uses “they came” or *erchontai* from *erchomai* for the appearance of both Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, as it were, from nowhere¹⁰). Therefore, while our Lord repeated his teachings on multiple occasions, so that one must be weary of so called “parallel” gospel readings, it is notable that in telling the parable of the sower, in Matt. 13:4 to say, “the fowls came (Greek, *elthe*) and devoured them up,” is clearly *not* contrary to Matthean Greek, in the way that such a reading clearly *is* contrary to Marcan Greek at Mark 4:4.

There thus appears to be some kind of connection between the erroneous Majority Byzantine Text reading of Mark 4:4, and the reading of Matthean Greek at Matt. 13:4. Was *Reading 2a* an accidental alteration of *Reading 1*? Greek, “*tou* (of the) *ouranou* (air)” (*Reading 2a*) may be abbreviated to “*tou ounou*” with a bar on top of “*ounou*,” as

⁸ Greek, “*eleluthē* (‘is ... come,’ AV, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*).”

⁹ Greek, “*paraginetai* (‘he cometh’ = ‘cometh,’ indicative middle present, 3rd person singular verb, from *paraginetomai*).”

¹⁰ Greek, “*erchontai* (‘they came,’ indicative middle present, 3rd person plural verb, from *erchomai*).”

indeed it is here in, for instance, Codices G 011 and M 021. Did copyist Scribe 1 first write “*tou*,” and then either with “*ouranou*” or “*ounou*” following, did his eye jump from the “*ou*” suffix of “*tou*” to the “*ou*” suffix of “*ouranou*” or “*ounou*,” and did he then keep writing? Did copyist Scribe 2 looking at such a manuscript reading “*peteina* (fowls) *tou* (of the),” seek to “investigate” what went wrong here, by looking at what he regarded as “the parallel reading” of Matt. 13:4? Did he then conclude that Scribe 1 had accidentally “added the *tou* (of the)”? Acting as a “corrector scribe,” did Scribe 1 then omit the *tou* (of the)? Was *Reading 2a* a deliberate alteration of *Reading 1*? Did an arrogant and impious scribe, seeking “a more standard gospel text,” deliberately take it upon himself to make an assimilation between Mark 4:4 and Matt. 13:4, by wilfully pruning away the “*tou* (of the) *ouranou* (air)” of Mark 4:4? Was this an accidental or deliberate alteration of *Reading 1* to *Reading 2a*? We cannot be sure. But we thank God for the preservation of the pure text of Scripture in the *Textus Receptus* as found here at Mark 4:4 in Byzantine Greek *Reading 1*, in harmony with the promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, “Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away” (Mark 13:31).

On the one hand, the Majority Byzantine Text’s *Reading 2a* at Mark 4:4 is followed in the Greek by at least *c.* 90% of the Byzantine text manuscripts, and *possibly* followed by more than *c.* 99% of the Byzantine text manuscripts. It is also followed in the Latin by Jerome’s Vulgate, and about twice as many Latin manuscripts have been cited for it than have the four which have been cited for *Reading 1*. But on the other hand, the TR’s *Reading 1* at Mark 4:4 is clearly supported by textual analysis of Marcan Greek. It also has support in the Greek from at least three Byzantine manuscripts from mediaeval times; and in the Latin, by a relatively strong minority of four old Latin Versions cited above, three of which are from ancient times (old Latin a, 4th century; old Latin d, 5th century; & old Latin i, 5th century), and one of which is from early mediaeval times (old Latin r1). We thus see how in harmony with the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, that when the textual analysis is placed on the Greek, *Reading 1* is clearly the correct reading. And we also see how in harmony with the dutiful servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, the TR’s *Reading 1* is supported in the Latin textual tradition from ancient to early mediaeval times, as a compliment to the fact that we find the Neo-Byzantine School *Textus Receptus*’s reading of *Reading 1* is supported in the Greek Byzantine textual tradition in mediaeval times; so that the combination of the Latin and Greek manuscripts show that the TR’s *Reading 1* is supported *over time* from ancient times in the 4th century (old Latin a) to the 12th century (Greek Minuscule 1375), and *through time* in the 4th century (old Latin a), 5th century (old Latin d & i), 7th century (old Latin r1), 9th century (Greek Codices G 011 & M 021), and 12th century (Greek Minuscule 1375). Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Mark 4:4 a middling “B” (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Mark 4:4, *Reading 1* (the TR's reading) Greek, “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls) *tou* (of the) *ouranou* (‘air’ or ‘heaven’),” i.e., “the fowls of the air” (AV), is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

Reading 2a, Greek, “*ta* (the) *peteina* (fowls),” i.e., “the fowls,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 28 (11th century, Byzantine text other than in Mark; depending on one's view, Mark 1:1-5:30 Western text & in Mark 5:31-16:20 “Caesarean” text; or an independently corrupted text throughout Mark), and 1071 (12th century, independent). And a similar reading (*Reading 2b*), Greek, “*ta* (the) *ornea* (fowls),” is also found in Codex W 032 (Western Text in Mark 1:1-5:30). *Reading 2* is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); the Gothic Version (4th century); the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Mark 4:4, the erroneous *Reading 2a* was adopted by the neo-Alexandrian School's NU Text *et al.* Thus the neo-Alexandrian *American Standard Version* (1901) reads, “and the birds came and devoured it” (ASV). So too, this incorrect reading is also found in the neo-Alexandrian NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, and Moffatt.

Within Romanism, we here see the incorrect *Reading 2a* followed by the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. By contrast, the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council (1546-1563) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-1965) times, followed the correct reading of the TR on the basis of its support in the Latin textual tradition in both the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592); as well as in the Douay-Rheims (NT, 1582, & OT 1610), which here reads at Mark 4:4, “the birds of the air came and ate it up.”

At Mark 4:4, the Majority Text Burgonites adopted the incorrect *Reading 2a* in both the Greek Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). And while the Burgonite translators of the *New King James Version* (1979 & 1982) placed the correct *Reading 1* of the TR in their main text; these NKJV translators say that while the “Majority Text is similar to the Textus Receptus, ... it corrects those readings which have little or no support in Greek manuscript tradition” (NKJV Preface). And they here say in a footnote at Mark 4:4, “M[ajority]-Text omit ‘of the air’.” In the first instance, such Burgonites are really Burgonite Revisionists because unlike Burgon, they only include the Greek texts in their “majority” count; and in the second instance, unlike the Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont type of Burgonite Revisionists, the NKJV type of Burgonite Revisionists, and even more so some other Burgonite Revisionists, love to give the impression that Burgon's majority text principles are a lot

closer to the Received Text than what they really are. But (either on Burgon's "majority" count or a revised Burgonite "majority" count limiting this to Greek texts), the reality is that Burgon's principles claimed, "the '*Textus Receptus*' ... calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities"¹¹;" and thus Burgon's proud boast was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction"¹²."

Let us thank God that even though the neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite "fowls of the air came and devoured it up" in their so called "modern" versions; nevertheless, the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus* has been Divinely Preserved for us here at Mark 4:4 in our Authorized King James Versions of 1611, to wit, "the fowls of the air came and devoured it up" (AV).

An Evangelical Meditation: In Mark 5:25-34 we read of "a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years" (Mark 5:25), and she "came in the press behind, and touched his garment" (Mark 5:27). Then when our Lord "said, Who touched my clothes?" (Mark 5:30), "the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came (Greek, *elthe*, 'she came') and fell down before him, and told him all the truth" (Mark 5:33) i.e., she "came" from "the press behind" our Lord, *supra*. And though our Lord may still graciously undertake physical healing miracles (e.g., James 5:14,15), there is no longer any such guarantee of this. E.g., the Apostle Paul had "a thorn in the flesh" which he had "besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from" him (II Cor. 12:7,8), and this *may* have *possibly* involved poor eyesight (Gal. 6:11, "a letter," AV, is Greek *grammasin*, a neuter plural dative noun, from *gramma*, and so may be rendered, "letters" as in the ASV, and if so, "see how large letters I have written," *might* indicate poor eyesight). And so while we may still pray for healing, it must be made subject to the petition of *The Lord's Prayer*, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10).

Why is this so? Why is there no longer any such guarantee of physical healing? It is because in his earthly Ministry, our Lord and Saviour used such physical healing as object lesson miracles, so that in the holy gospel according to St. Mark, our Lord does not perform miracles of physically healing people as ends in themselves, as though he came to simply show that he was a great physical healer. Rather, our Lord uses physical healing for the purposes of explaining the Gospel message that he gives spiritual healing. Thus the key words that our Lord "said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague" (Mark 5:34), teach us that if we recognize we are sin "sick" "sinners" needing to come "to repentance" (Mark 2:17), and we "repent ... and believe the gospel" (Mark 1:15), so that by "faith" we accept Christ's power and be "made" "whole" spiritually, we too may thus be "in peace," and "be" made "whole of" the "plague" (Mark 5:34) of sin.

And this same teaching is found with respect to the spiritual senses of spiritual

¹¹ Burgon's *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

¹² Burgon's *Revision Revised*, p. 21.

sight and spiritual hearing that Christ may give to us (cf. I Cor. 2:12-14), for the unsaved are spiritually deaf and blind, for “seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them” (Mark 4:12). And so in the passage of Mark 7:31-37, we read of our Lord, “And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came (Greek, *elthe*) unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis. And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to put his hand upon him” (Mark 7:32,32). And our Lord, “looking up to heaven” and thus in his body language pointing us to God the Father; “sighed,” thus in his body language expressing his compassion (cf. Mark 8:2); and in Aramaic “saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And straightway his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain” (Mark 7:34,35). *This miracle was thus contextually done in Mark 7 with reference to the teaching of Mark 4:12 as an object lesson, that Christ can give us spiritual apprehension with spiritual hearing, and a change in our hearts and minds that allows us to speak in a Christian spiritual way.*

And so too in the passage of Mark 10:46-52, “blind Bartimaeus,” “sat by the highway side begging. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me” (Mark 10:46,47). “And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called” (Mark 10:49). “And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came (Greek, *elthe*, ‘he came’) to Jesus” (Mark 10:50). “And Jesus answered and said unto him. What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight. And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way” (Mark 10:51,52). In St. Mark’s Gospel the words of Mark 4:12 are explanatory of such miracles. Dost thou see why Jesus performed such physical healing as object lesson miracles? Dost thou see that this usage of Greek, “*elthe* (he came)” in Mark 10:50 teaches us that *Jesus knows where we are coming from* when we turn to him in faith? Dost thou perceive the answer to the question, “Why do not these type of physical healing miracles occur today, as in the time of Jesus’ public ministry?”

And as seen in the passage of Mark 10:35-45, *supra*, this salvation given in God’s “mercy” (Mark 10:47,48) and accepted through faith (Mark 10:52), is accomplished through the substitutionary atonement of Christ who died in our place and for our sins, when he hung on the cross at Calvary. “For ... the Son of man came (Greek, *elthe*) ... to give his life a ransom for many” (Mark 10:45); as found in the passion of Christ who declared, “the hour is come (Greek, *elthen*, ‘it come’)” (Mark 14:41); so that he who came from “glory” might take to “glory” (Mark 10:37) those who “repent ..., and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15) “of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” (Mark 1:1). For he is “the Lord” (Mark 1:3; 12:36,37); and “Truly this man was the Son of God” (Mark 15:39).

Mark 4:9a “unto them” (TR & AV) {C}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The First Matter. At Mark 4:9a, *Reading 2* (the majority Byzantine text reading) is followed in von Soden’s K group of which over 90% are Byzantine text; and no manuscripts from his K group are itemized for *Reading 1* (the minority Byzantine text reading). Von Soden’s K group, consists of 983 manuscripts, of which 860 are Gospel manuscripts, and over *c.* 90% are Byzantine text. Thus on any reasonable statistical extrapolation, the MBT *Reading 2* here has the support of over *c.* 90% of the Byzantine texts.

The combined strength of von Soden’s I and K groups is *c.* 1,500 manuscripts of which *c.* 1,300 or over 86% are completely Byzantine text (and *c.* 1,360 are Byzantine text including those that are Byzantine text only in parts). In von Soden’s I group, *Reading 1* is supported as a minority Byzantine text reading in Minuscule 267. But von Soden makes no reference to his K group Codex S 028 (10th century) which contains the TR’s reading as a marginal reading (Tischendorf, 1869-72)¹³; and nor does von Soden refer in his I group Codex M 021 (9th century), which in its original form followed *Reading 2* (Swanson, 1995), and then the original reading was altered to *Reading 1* by a later “corrector scribe” of M 021 (Tischendorf, 1869-72; & Swanson, 1995). These facts merely act to highlight the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups. On the one hand, the fact that only one known Byzantine manuscript is itemized by von Soden for *Reading 1* means that its support may be less than 1% of the Byzantine manuscripts¹⁴; but on the other hand, given the broad generalist nature of von Soden’s groups, the minority Byzantine reading (*Reading 1*) could have support anywhere in the range of less than 1% up to *c.* 10%. We simply do not know.

Of eight gospel manuscripts looked at, Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) lists one in favour of this *Reading 1* (Gospel manuscript z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8) which is found in Elzevir’s text (1624 & 1633); and four manuscripts in favour of *Reading 2* (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v,

¹³ Tischendorf marks this reading with a question mark “?,” and since I am not entirely sure what he means by this uncertainty, I shall not refer to it further, *infra*.

¹⁴ Von Soden also refers to a further four Greek manuscripts in his I group that follow *Reading 1*, but these are unclassified outside of von Soden’s system (Minuscule e7, 12th century, von Soden’s ε 287 in his I^{φb} group; Minuscule 659, 12th century, von Soden’s ε 1216 in his I^{φb} group; Minuscule 118, 13th century, von Soden’s ε 346 in his I^{ηb} group; & Minuscule 713, 13th century, von Soden’s ε 351 in his I^σ group). While it is *possible* that one or more of these *might* be Byzantine text, when numbers are this small, one cannot safely use statistical analysis to say that because von Soden’s I group is more than two-thirds Byzantine text, therefore $\frac{2}{3}$ rds of 4 is $2\frac{2}{3}$, and so 2 of these 4 must be Byzantine text. For when numbers are this small, such statistical projections are at their most unreliable.

Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis). It is thus not some kind of “startling new revelation of modern research” for neo-Byzantines to understand the TR’s reading as a minority reading.

The Second Matter. On the textual apparatus available to me, I only have two Byzantine text manuscripts in clear support of the TR’s reading. Due to limited time, I isolated selective readings that I examined in a number of manuscripts I examined on my sixth trip to London (Oct. 2012-March 2013). Thus I give humble thanks to Almighty God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity, for *this exciting discovery of the TR’s reading clearly in a third Greek Byzantine text manuscript!* This discovery was made on 2 November 2012 in Lectionary 19 at Oxford University, *infra*. It is found on p. 182, in the right hand column, where the “*autois* (unto them)” comes in the penultimate line of this reading, and it is followed by a red cross “+” after the black ink, before the words of our Lord, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, von Soden (1913) says Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Western Text in Mark 1:1-5:30; von Soden’s ε 014 in his I^a group for Mark¹⁵), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century; von Soden’s ε 050 in his I^a group), and Minuscule 700 (11th century, depending on one’s view, either independently corrupted, or “Caesarean” text; von Soden’s ε 133 in his I^a group), all follow *Reading 1*; whereas Swanson (1995) says all three follow *Reading 2*. Therefore no reference will be made to these three manuscripts, *infra*. (It is to be hoped that von Soden’s reference to the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version which I here use, is more certain; but if it is not, it does not matter with regard to the TR or TR’s rating, as manuscripts outside the closed class of sources have no impact on the TR or its rating.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Mark 4:9a, *Reading 1* (the TR’s reading), found in Scrivener’s Text is Greek, “*elegen* (he said) *autois* (unto them),” i.e., “he said unto them,” in the wider words spoken of our Lord, “And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear” (AV). This is a minority Byzantine reading with less than 10% support of the Byzantine texts which is possibly as low as less than 1%. It is supported by Minuscules 2 (12th century; Basel, Switzerland) and 267 (12th century; National Library, Paris, France); and Lectionary 19 (13th century, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, England, UK). It is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522, Greek, “*autois*” / “unto them,” & Latin “*illis*” / “unto those [ones]”); and the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (& 1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633).

¹⁵ My photocopy of W 032 is limited to its Byzantine Text sections in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; and I do not regard text outside the closed class of sources in W 032 to be sufficiently important for my purposes to consult the copy of W 032 I obtained these sections from at Sydney University, in order to resolve this von Soden-Swanson discrepancy.

Reading 2, is Greek, “*elegen* (he said),” i.e., “he said,” in the wider words spoken of our Lord, “and he said,” This is the majority Byzantine reading which is found in over *c.* 90% of the Byzantine text manuscripts. It is found in e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), and Pi 041 (9th century). It is also found as Latin, “*dicebat* (he said),” in Jerome’s Vulgate (4th / 5th centuries), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), i (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

In order to understand this relevant issue at Mark 4:9a, we must first consider Marcan Greek usage of the verb *legō*, meaning “say,” firstly, in more general terms; and thereafter, in more specific terms as it is used, as at Mark 4:9a, as Greek “*elegen* (‘he said,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *legō*).” But in doing so, we must also detect that in “the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” “according to” the evangelist “Mark” (Mark 1:1, and title – which is part of the inspired text), a relevant nuance of Marcan Greek is to provide *a greater specificity of detail* when referring to the words of our Lord. And so I here note in passing, that the English language tradition of printing Christ’s words in red, might be said to have some sort of Biblical precedent in the way that St. Mark has a different nuance for Greek “*elegen*” as he uses it for Christ’s words, than he does for others words.

The *general rule* for the Marcan usage of Greek *legō* (to say) with reference to the words of our Lord, is for a qualifying specificity of audience to follow *legō*. But to this there are three exceptions, to wit, optionally (cf. Mark 15:2, *infra*), where contextually the words of either Mark or our Lord include in them a named specificity as to who is being addressed in immediate proximity to *legō* (*Exception 1*) (often, though not always, in a question and answer context); an open question where the deliberate lack of specificity acts to indicate that this is not addressing all specific individuals in a given circumstance, but is addressing one individual deliberately not specifically identified (*Exception 2*); and a sharp stylistic breaker in which *legō* is used of Christ’s words to indicate some kind of significant change of thought (*Exception 3*). Given that this nuance is only necessarily present with the words of our Lord, we shall only consider in the main discussion the three forms found in St. Mark’s Gospel with respect to Christ’s words, to wit, Greek 1] “*legei* (he said),” 2] “*eipen* (he said)” and 3] “*elegen* (he said)”¹⁶.

¹⁶ Other instances of *legō* in a declension not used of Christ in St. Mark’s Gospel are: 1] Greek “*legousin* (‘they said,’ indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*),” found in harmony with the general *legō* rule only as others “said (*legousin*) unto him” (Mark 1:37, stylistically paralleling “said” in Mark 1:38; & Mark 6:35; 14:12), or they “said (*legousin*) unto Jesus” (Mark 11:3). 2] Greek “*elegon* (‘they said,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*).” Found in harmony with the general *legō* rule as “said (*elegon*) unto him” (Mark 2:24; 5:31); they “said (*elegon*) unto them” (Mark 11:5); they “said (*elegon*) among themselves” (Mark 15:31; 16:3);

Looking at these features of *lego* with 1] Greek “*legei* (‘he said,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*),” means that with reference to the words of our Lord, there is generally a qualifying specificity of audience that thereafter follows *lego*. And thus we most commonly read a quote after either Jesus “said (*legei*) unto him” (Mark 2:14; 10:51), or “said (*legei*) unto them” (Mark 1:38; 4:13; 14:20; 14:24), or “said (*legei*) unto the sick of the palsy” (Mark 2:5).

But with regard to the three *qualified exceptions* to this general rule of Marcan Greek, we find an instance of *Exception 1 to lego general rule with legei*: Where contextually the words of either Mark or our Lord include in them a named specificity as to who is being addressed in immediate proximity to *legei*. In such an instance, the qualifying specificity of the general rule is simply achieved in a different way. Thus at Mark 3:34 we read of our Lord, “And he looked round about on them which sat about him, “and said (*legei*), Behold my mother and my brethren.” Here the words, “And he looked round about on them which sat about him,” contextually identifies a named specificity to the “multitude” that “sat about him” (Mark 3:32).

It should be understood that in the relevant nuance of Marcan Greek used for Christ’s words, this nuance is not necessarily used for others. Thus in St. Mark’s Gospel, in harmony with the general rule only, for others one may find Greek “*legei* (he / she / it said),” so used for those other than Christ. (Mark 7:28; 9:5; 14:61,67 – vs. 67 identified in immediate context as “she said” unto “Peter.”)

“they said (*elegon*) unto his disciples” (Mark 2:16); they “said (*elegon*) one to another” (Mark 4:41); and they “said (*elegon*) ... to Peter” (Mark 14:70). Used as *Exception 1* for *elegon* among those “that stood by” in Mark 15:35. Used with a different nuance for persons other than Christ as, “they said (*elegon*)” (Mark 3:21,22,30; 14:2), and “others said (*elegon*)” (Mark 6:15 - twice). 3] Greek “*eipon* (‘they said,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epo* in aorist declension *eipon*, used for *lego*.” Found in harmony with the general *lego* rule as, they “said (*eipon*) unto him” (Mark 3:32; 10:4,37,39); “they said (*eipon*) unto them” (Mark 11:6); and “they said (*eipon*) unto him” (Mark 12:16). And with a different nuance for persons other than Christ as, “they said (*eipon*)” (Mark 8:5,20). 4] Greek “*legontes* (masculine nominative plural, active present participle, from *lego*.” Used with a different nuance for persons other than Christ as, they “said (*legontes*)” (Mark 5:35; 14:4). 5] Greek “*legein* (active present infinitive, from *lego*.” Used with a different nuance for persons other than Christ as, “said (*legein*)” (Mark 9:26). Additionally, used with a different nuance, when not used with a quote after, but one just before, “Likewise also said they (*elegon*) all” (Mark 14:31); and “neither said they (*elegon*) anything” (Mark 16:8). Cf. with persons other than Christ, Greek “*ephe* (indicative imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*);” where Peter “said (*ephe*) unto him” i.e., Christ (Mark 14:29). There is also a different usage which is not followed by a quote, seen with reference to Christ “as he had said (*eipen*) unto them” i.e., his disciples (Mark 14:16).

Before considering these features of *lego* with 2] Greek *eipon*, it should first be understood that the second aorist declension of *eipon* (from *epo*, Strong's Dictionary¹⁷), is used for the aorist tense in order to supply the want of *lego* which lacks its own aorist declension form (Vine's Dictionary¹⁸), and so in Greek lexicons *eipon* may be classified under *lego* (Mounce¹⁹).

Looking at these features of *lego* with 2] Greek “*eipen* (/ *eipe*, ‘he said,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epo* in aorist declension *eipon*, used for *lego*),” means that with reference to the words of our Lord, there is generally a qualifying specificity of audience that thereafter follows *eipen*. And thus we most commonly read a quote after Jesus “said (*eipen*) unto him” (Mark 9:23; 10:18,21,52; 12:34; 13:2; 14:72 – a recall quotation, “Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice”); 15:2 (this shows the optionality of *Exception 1*, as the “unto him” could have been omitted in Marcan Greek in the words spoken of our Lord, “And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest it”); or “said (*eipen*) unto her” (Mark 5:34,41; 7:27,29); or “said (*eipen*) unto it” (a tree) (Mark 11:14); or “said (*eipen*) unto them” (Mark 1:17, 2:8,19; 6:31,37; 7:6; 8:34; 9:29,36; 10:3,5,14,36,38,39; 11:29; 12:15,17,24; 14:48²⁰); or “said (*eipen*) unto the sea” (Mark 4:39).

Exception 1 to lego general rule with eipen: Optionally (cf. Mark 15:2, *supra*), where contextually the words of either Mark or our Lord include in them a named specificity as to who is being addressed in immediate proximity to *eipen* (often, though not always, in a question and answer context). In such an instance, the qualifying specificity of the general rule is simply achieved in a different way. Thus at Mark 9:38,39 we read, “And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followed not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said (*eipen*), Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.” At Mark 10:27-29, “And Jesus looking upon them” (his “disciples,” Mark 10:23), “saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God:

¹⁷ Strong's Concordance Dictionary, Greek word 2036, *epo* (distinguished from word Greek 3004, *lego*), in *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, by James Strong (1822-1894).

¹⁸ Unger, M.F. & White, W. (Editors), *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of the OT and NT*, 1st edition by William Vine (1873-1949), Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1984 & 1996, pp. 548-549.

¹⁹ See Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 299 (*lego*).

²⁰ Though Mark 16:15 follows the same format here, I exclude specific reference to it as I understand Mark 16:9-20 to be an autograph of the Apostle Andrew, which was present from the Gospel of St. Mark from the very start, and which acted to give Apostolic authority to this Gospel from the time it was written i.e., this is *not* a later addition to St. Mark's Gospel as some have claimed.

for with God all things are possible. Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. And Jesus answered and said (*eipen*), Verily I say unto you,” At Mark 14:3-6, “there came a woman having ... ointment ... very precious; and she ... poured it on” our Lord’s “head. And there were some that had indignation within themselves And they murmured against her. And Jesus said (*eipen*), Let her alone, why trouble ye her? She hath wrought a good work on me.”

At Mark 14:17,18, “And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said (*eipen*), Verily I say unto you (*‘umin / humin / hymin*)” At the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion at Mark 14:22, “And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said (*eipe*), Take, eat: this is my body” (Mark 14:22). At Mark 14:60-62, “And the high priest stood up in the midst” contextually of those “assembled” (Mark 14:53), “and asked Jesus Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And” contextually addressing the assembly “in the midst” (Mark 14:60) on the high priest’s questions, “Jesus said (*eipen*), I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.”

It should be understood that in the relevant nuance of Marcan Greek used for Christ’s words, this nuance is not necessarily used for others. Thus in St. Mark’s Gospel, when our Lord is speaking, on the one hand, he may say in a parable, that they “said (*eipen*) among themselves” (Mark 12:7): and on the other hand, in quoting Old Testament Scripture he may say, “Moses said (*eipen*),” quoting Moses (Mark 7:10), or quoting David, “David ... said (*eipen*) ... The Lord said (*eipen*) to my Lord” (Mark 12:36). And more generally dealing with others in Mark’s Gospel, one may (Mark 6:22,24; 10:20,51; 12:32; 15:12 – cf. 15:14; 16:7) or may not (Mark 5:7; 6:16,24; 9:17,21; 15:39), find Greek “*eipen* (he said),” so used for those other than Christ.

Looking at these features of *lego* with 3] Greek “*elegen* (‘he said,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*),” means that with reference to the words of our Lord, there is generally a qualifying specificity of audience that thereafter follows *elegen*. And thus we most commonly read a quote after either Jesus “said (*elegen*) unto him” (Mark 5:8), or Jesus “said (*elegen*) unto them” (Mark 2:25; 3:23; 4:2,9a,11,21,24; 6:4,10; 7:9,14; 8:21; 9:1,31; & 12:38).

But there are three *qualified exceptions* to this general rule of Marcan Greek.

*Exception 1 to *lego* general rule with *elegen**: Optionally (cf. Mark 15:2, *supra*), where contextually the words of either Mark or our Lord include in them a named specificity as to who is being addressed in immediate proximity to *elegen* (often, though not always, in a question and answer context). In such an instance, the qualifying specificity of the general rule is simply achieved in a different way. Thus at Mark 12:35 we read, “And Jesus answered and said (*elegen*), while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the Son of David?” Here the words, “while he taught in the temple,” contextually identifies a named specificity to those in the temple. Or at Mark 14:35,36 we read, “And” Christ “went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and

prayed” i.e., contextually to God the Father, “that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said (*elegen*), Abba, Father (*Pater*), all things are possible unto thee (*soi*); take away this cup from me; nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.” Here the words “prayed,” “Abba, Father,” and “unto thee” contextually identifies a named specificity to God the Father.

Exception 2 to lego general rule with elegen: An open question where the deliberate lack of specificity acts to indicate that this is not addressing all specific individuals in a given circumstance, but is addressing one individual deliberately not specifically identified. This is found in the passage of Mark 5:25-34 where “a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, ... when she had heard of Jesus came in the press behind, and touched his garment. For she said, If I may touch by his clothes, I shall be whole” (Mark 5:25,27,28). She is healed and then in Mark 5:30, in a *deliberately open question not addressing a specified individual* Christ “said (*elege*), Who touched my cloths?”

Exception 3 to lego general rule with elegen: A sharp stylistic breaker in which *elegen* is used of Christ’s words to indicate some kind of significant change of thought, even if there is also some level of continuity amidst the change with what has been previously said by our Lord. Thus in Mark 4 our Lord tells a number of parables, and after the parable of “a candle ... under a bushel” (Mark 4:21) in Mark 4:21-26, there is the parable of “a man” who “should cast seed into the ground” (Mark 4:26) in Mark 4:26-29 introduced with *elegen* as a sharp stylistic breaker with a change of thought in the words spoken by our Lord, “And he said (*elegen*), So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground” etc.; and so also, the following parable of Mark 4:30-32 is likewise introduced with the *elegen* as a sharp stylistic breaker with a change of thought in the words spoken by our Lord, “And he said (*elegen*), Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God?” etc. .

And so likewise we see such a usage in Mark 7:17-23. Here our Lord first “saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?” (Mark 7:18,19). These words “purging (*katharizon*, neuter nominative singular, present active participle, from *katharizo*) all meats” are an extremely important conclusion to what our Lord has first said, since “purging” is Greek, *katharizo*, which is derived from *katharos* meaning “clean” (Strong’s Concordance Dictionary, Greek words 2507 & 2513); and *kathairo* meaning to “cleanse” is also derived from *katharos* meaning “clean,” but when the negative particle, “*a*” is placed before it to become *akathartos*, it has the sense of “unclean” (Strong’s Concordance Dictionary, Greek words 169, 2507, & 2513), and is used for “unclean” Jewish dietary foods of Lev. 11 & Deut. 14 in Acts 10:14; 11:8. And so *akathartos* in Acts 11:8 is used as a contrast with *katharizo* in Acts 11:9, “What God hath cleansed (*ekatharise*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *katharizo*), that call not thou common.” Therefore, when our Lord says in Mark 7:19 that food that goeth “into the belly, and goeth out into the draught,” is thus “purging all meats,” it follows that by this teaching he thereby has declared all foods clean; and hence

the Jewish dietary laws are not binding on Christians (cf. Col. 2:16; I Tim. 4:3-5), even though Jewish Christians may still choose to keep them as part of their cultural heritage, and if so, Gentile Christians should not offend them and so should in this limited instance also abide by them in fellowship meals between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25); although the Gentile Christian cultural palate's dislike for such food naturally means that there will not be *too many* such inter-racial fellowship meals. And so in the context of first dealing with this important teaching that "whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him," thus "purging all meats" (Mark 7:19,10); in Mark 7:20 the words of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, are then introduced with *elegen* as a sharp stylistic breaker with a change of thought in the words spoken by our Lord, "And he said (*elegen*), That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man," as he now moves from what goes into the man that does not matter, to that which comes out of the man that does matter, for it "defileth the man" (Mark 7:20).

It should be understood that in the relevant nuance of Marcan Greek used for Christ's words, this nuance is not necessarily used for others. Thus in St. Mark's Gospel, one may (Mark 6:18; 9:24; 15:14) or may not (Mark 6:14; 8:24), find Greek "*elegen* (he said)," so used for those other than Christ.

The textual issue at Mark 4:9a in the Majority Byzantine Text. When we look at the reading of Mark 4:9a in the representative Byzantine text, we find that it reads of our Lord, Greek, "*Kai* (And) *elegen* (he said), '*O* (He) *echon* ('having' = 'that hath') *ota* (ears) *akouein* (to hear) *akoueto* (let him ear)," that is, "And he said (*elegen*), He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." But is this consistent with the Marcan nuance for *lego* here with *elegen*? While there is an earlier reference to the "great multitude" and how Christ "taught them" (Mark 4:1) before the start of the *Parable of the Sower*, there is no named specificity as to who is being addressed in immediate proximity to *lego* at Mark 4:9a, and so *Exception 1* does not apply. Mark 4:9a is not an open question where the deliberate lack of specificity acts to indicate that this is not addressing all specific individuals in a given circumstance, but is addressing one individual deliberately not specifically identified, and so *Exception 2* does not apply. And given the tight interconnection between the *Parable of the Sower* and the concluding words of Mark 4:9a, there certainly is not a sharp stylistic breaker in which *lego* is used of Christ's words to indicate some kind of significant change of thought, and so *Exception 3* does not apply. *Therefore the Majority Byzantine Text at Mark 4:9a is not Marcan Greek.* The textual turbulence created by this massive wave of stylistic incongruity at Mark 4:9a can only be calmed and remedied by adopting the minority Byzantine reading which adds after "*elegen* (he said)," the word "*autois* (unto them)," i.e., "and he said (*elegen*) unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Therefore the minority Byzantine reading is the correct one.

At Mark 4:9a, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) is translated from the Greek into English as "he said unto them," in e.g. the versions of Tyndale (1526), Matthew's Bible (1537), the Geneva Bible (1560), the Bishops' Bible (1568), and the Authorized King James Bible (1611, Authorized to be read in Anglican Churches 1662).

On the one hand, the TR's reading is supported by textual analysis of the Greek.

But on the other hand, there is no ancient support in either the Greek or Latin, and no later Latin support for this reading in the above manuscripts, with the only known clear main text support for it located in three Greek manuscripts; and so these factors must act to reduce the rating to nothing higher than a C. Weighing up these competing factors, and giving full credence to the support for the TR's reading in textual analysis of Marcan Greek, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading in Mark 4:9a a solid "C" (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Mark 4:9a, *Reading 1* (the TR's reading) Greek, "*elegen* (he said) *autois* (unto them)," i.e., "he said unto them," in the wider words spoken of our Lord, "And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (AV), is found in the Allophylian tongue of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

However, *Reading 2*, Greek, "*elegen* (he said)," i.e., "he said," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in the leading representative of the Western Text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, depending on one's view, either independently corrupted, or "Caesarean" text), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in as the *Family 1 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*), Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Mark 4:9a the erroneous *Reading 2* was adopted by the neo-Alexandrian NU Text *et al.* Thus the ASV reads, "And he said, Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." So too, at Mark 4:9a the incorrect *Reading 2* is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, and Moffatt. The incorrect *Reading 2* is also found in the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB; who thus here continued the attack on the *Textus Receptus* earlier found under the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council (1546-1563) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-1965) times in the Douay-Rheims, based on the Latin as found in both the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592). Thus at Mark 4:9a the Douay-Rheims Version

(NT, 1582, & OT 1610), “And he said, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

At Mark 4:9a, Majority Text Burgonites adopted the incorrect *Reading 2* in both the Greek Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005); and this same William Pierpont’s confidence in this reading is seen in his work in *Green’s Textual Apparatus* (1986), where he says *Reading 2* at Mark 4:9a has his highest level of “Level 3” “Majority support” in which “95-100% of all manuscripts support the change” to *Reading 2* from the TR’s *Reading 1*²¹. And while the Burgonite translators of the *New King James Version* followed the TR’s correct reading i.e., *Reading 1*, in their main text, a footnote says, “NU-Text and M[ajority]-Text omit, ‘to them’;” and in their “Preface” the NKJV translators say, “the Byzantine Text ... largely supports the Textus Receptus,” but “those readings in the Textus Receptus which have weak support are indicated in the footnotes as being opposed by both” “the Alexandrian” NU Text “and Majority Texts;” and though the “Majority Text is similar to the Textus Receptus, ... it corrects those readings which have little or no support in Greek manuscript tradition.” Thus they erroneously consider the Majority Greek Text such as found in Hodges & Farstad here “corrects” the Received Text. And while these Majority Text Burgonites are revisionist of Burgon’s work which counted up the majority manuscripts of various tongues, whereas these Burgonite revisionists limit their count to Greek manuscripts, they are nevertheless in broad general agreement with “their leader,” Burgon. And so all this accords with John Burgon’s claim, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities” (Burgon’s *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and thus Burgon’s proud boast was this, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21).

We thus find that as occurs elsewhere, here at Mark 4:9a the Neo-Alexandrian School of the NU Text *et al*, forms an unholy alliance with the Burgonite Majority Text School, so that in a pincer movement, they act in unison to attack the Neo-Byzantine School’s *Textus Receptus*. But in their spiritual blindness, they do not perceive that theirs is not a fight against “man,” but a “fight against God” (Acts 23:9). For what saith the Word of the Lord? “The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever” (Ps. 12:6,7). For the Divine Inspiration (II Tim. 3:16) and Divine Preservation (I Peter 1:25) of Holy Writ are the two sides of the one coin. What? Hast thou not heard? Or hath it not been told unto thee? *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!”²²

²¹ In Jay P. Green’s *The Interlinear Bible*, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Massachusetts, USA, 1976, second edition 1986 (ISBN 0-913573-25-6), pp. 967-974 (Mark 4:9a at p. 967).

²² In its Latin form from the Vulgate, motto of the Lutheran or First Stage of the Reformation, taken from I Peter 1:25.

A Meditation: At Mark 14:35,36, *supra*, we read, “And” Christ “went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed” i.e., contextually to God the Father, “that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said (Greek, *elegen*), Abba, Father (*Pater*), all things are possible unto thee (*soi*); take away this cup from me; nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.” We here see how that Christ subjects his human will to the Divine will, contrary to the claims of the Monothelite heretics condemned by the Sixth General Council of Constantinople III in 681; which here “declared” the orthodox Christological Trinitarian teaching “out of holy Scripture” (Article 21, Anglican *39 Articles*; cf. Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35, Anglican *39 Articles*²³). For “The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and the Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men” (Article 2, Anglican *39 Articles*).

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion for Mark 4:30b.

Mark 4:30b is a reading dealt with in a format, in parts, more similar to that of Appendix 3; although there are also some Parts 1 & 2 features not generally found in Appendix 3 e.g., a rating. It has been placed here, rather than in Appendix 3, as part of the wider policy to highlight those places where the *Textus Receptus* (TR) is not the same as the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT), even though it generally is.

Prima facie it would be possible for *Reading 1*, “*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken’)” to be either a subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *‘omoioo*, in which under a local dialect revowelling, the omega / o / Greek letter, ω, is revowelled to omicron / o / Greek letter, ο; or for *Reading 1* to be an indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *‘omoioo*. However, if such a local dialect revowelling of the omega (o) to an omicron (*o*) had been undertaken for *Reading 1*, then it would be reasonable to allow that either the nearby second subjunctive active aorist in this verse, “*parabalomen* (‘shall we compare,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *paraballo*)” would likewise have been revowelled, or if this was done in connection with the variant reading of Mark 4:30c, then the variant “*thomen* (subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *tithemi*),” would have also been revowelled. And while, for instance,

²³ This Homily refers to how a later early 8th century “Council of bishops in the West Church, ... did condemn ... the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly.”

Codex F 09 (9th century, Byzantine text) reads “*parabalomen*,” the generality of manuscripts do not; and so for our immediate purposes I think it fair to stipulate that the manuscript evidence indicates that *Reading 1* is meant to be an indicative active future verb.

While one could *prima facie* argue that *Reading 1* was so understood in the Vulgate, which here reads, Latin, “*adsimilabimus* (‘shall we liken,’ indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *adsimil*);” I do not regard this as conclusive. For translation is an imprecise art, and the good Christian reader will note that in Part 1, at the connected Mark 4:30c, I understand the Greek, “*parabalomen* (‘shall we compare,’ word 4, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *paraballo*),” to be rendered in the Vulgate by Latin, “*comparabimus* (‘shall we compare,’ word 4, indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *comparo*);” and so on this basis it could also be argued that here the Latin is likewise using a Latin indicative active future verb in “*adsimilabimus*” to render a Greek subjunctive active aorist verb in the *Reading 2*’s “*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*).” Thus I think it best not to rest anything on the Latin rendering of the Greek here at Mark 4:30b.

The stylistic analysis rests on the accuracy of the MBT and TR reading of Mark 4:30c, discussed in Part 1 of this Volume 6, although paradoxically, even if one followed the erroneous variant at Mark 4:30c of “*thomen* (‘shall we set forth,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *tithemi*),” since it is a subjunctive active aorist, the basic stylistic analysis would still be applicable with reference to Mark 4:30b *vis-à-vis* Mark 4:30c. But in saying this, I do not doubt that the correct reading at Mark 4:30c is that of the TR. (See e.g., at Mark 4:30, the noun *parabolē*, which is from the verb of the TR’s reading at Mark 4:30c, *paraballo*, thus contextually showing that the TR’s reading is certainly not contrary to Marcan Greek, and so since it is the MBT, it must stand.)

Principal Textual Discussion at Mark 4:30b {with rating **A**}. *Inside* the closed class of sources, at **Mark 4:30b** Scrivener’s Text (1894 & 1902) reads “*omoiosomen*” (*Reading 1*). Hodges & Farstad’s majority text (1985) considers the text is “seriously divided” between their preferred main text reading of Greek, “*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ an indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*)” (*Reading 1*), and “*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*)” (*Reading 2*); and Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text (2005) regards the text as “significantly divided” between their preferred main text reading of Greek, “*omoiosomen* (shall we liken)” (*Reading 2*), and their sidenote reading of Greek, “*omoiosomen* (shall we liken)” (*Reading 1*); although in *Green’s Textual Apparatus* (1986), Pierpont did not at this earlier time consider the reading of the text as “*omoiosomen* (shall we liken)” (*Reading 2*) should be changed²⁴.

²⁴ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 119; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 78.

Going to the common source book for all three, to wit, von Soden (1913), and using a Byzantine text priority methodology with von Soden's K group (like Robinson & Pierpont's methodology), von Soden says that of 158 Kx subgroup manuscripts counted, 96 support “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 1*) which also has the support of his Kr subgroup; whereas of 158 Kx subgroup manuscripts counted, 58 support “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 2*), as does his K1 subgroup other than 1 manuscript, and his Ki subgroup. Von Soden's Kr subgroup contains *c.* 175 Gospel manuscripts, and so in support of “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 1*) this has 96 (Kx) + 175 (Kr) = 271 K group manuscripts. Von Soden's K1 subgroup has *c.* 50 manuscripts, and his Ki subgroup has 7 manuscripts, so that in support of “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 2*) there is 58 (Kx) + 49 (K1 of 50 – 1 = 49) + 7 (Ki) = 114. In total we are thus looking at *c.* 385 K group manuscript (271 *Reading 1* + 114 *Reading 2*). Thus “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 1*) has the support of 271 out of 385 or *c.* 70% of the counted K group; and “*‘omoiosomen*” (*Reading 2*) has the support of 114 out of 385 or *c.* 30% of the counted K group manuscripts. Hence *on majority texts principles* Hodges & Farstad are correct to make it their main text reading, and Robinson & Pierpont are correspondingly incorrect; since on any reasonable statistical extrapolations from such a large sample as 385 Greek manuscripts, *Reading 1* is clearly the majority Byzantine text reading with the support of *c.* 70% of the manuscripts, whereas *Reading 2* is clearly a large minority Byzantine reading with the support of *c.* 30% of the manuscripts.

Thus at Mark 4:30b, *Reading 1*, Greek, “*‘omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ an indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*),” is MBT (e.g., K 017; Minuscules 1223, 10th century; 23, 11th century; 1188, 11th / 12th century; 1010, 12th century; 1085, 12th century; 1441, 13th century; & 2093, 13th century,) with the support of *c.* 70% of the Byzantine manuscripts; whereas *Reading 2*, Greek, “*‘omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from “*‘omoioo*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, M 021, U 030, Pi 041; Minuscule 2; & Origen) with the support of *c.* 30% of the Byzantine manuscripts.

A first stylistic feature evident in the Gospel of St. Mark is that Marcan Greek uses a subjunctive active aorist verb about 10 dozen times (and Andrean Greek uses a subjunctive active aorist verb in Mark 16:9-20 another time)²⁵, and Marcan Greek uses an indicative active future verb about 3 dozen times (and Andrean Greek uses an indicative active future verb in Mark 16:9-20 about another ½ dozen times)²⁶. Thus on the one

²⁵ Mark 1:38,44; 3:2,6,12,27,29,35; 4:15,16,22,26,29,35; 5:7,10,12,23,43; 6:10 (twice),11,23,25,36 (twice),37; 7:9,11,32; 8:2,3,26,35,36; 9:1,5,9,12,18 (twice),22,25,30, 41 (twice),42; 10:11 (twice),15, 17 (twice),19 (5 times),30,35 (twice),37,48,51 (twice); 11:3,16,32; 12:2,7 (there is no “s” / sigma in the aorist form of *apokteino*, raising the question, Is *apokteinomen* here a subjunctive active 1st person plural verb that is a present or aorist? See Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 22 & 91; & Rogers & Rogers, *New Linguistic & Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*, *op. cit.*, p. 94); 12:13,15 (thrice), 19 (5 times),23,36; 13:7,11 (twice),14,21,29,30,36; 14:10,11,12 (twice),14 (twice),25,35,38,44; 15:9,11,12,20,21,24,32,36; 16:1 & 18.

²⁶ Mark 1:2,8,17; 2:20; 3:2,27; 6:23; 8:35,36,37; 9:39,50; 10:33 (twice),34 (4

hand, the subjunctive active aorist verb is over three times more common in Marcan Greek than is the indicative active future verb, and so it is a more common stylistic feature of Marcan Greek; but on the other hand, it is clear that Marcan Greek uses both. Therefore taken in isolation, one can only use this fact in a non-conclusive way to show that in broad terms there is a *preference tendency* towards a subjunctive active aorist verb over an indicative active future verb. But taken with other relevant stylistic factors pointing to the usage of a subjunctive active aorist verb in preference to an indicative active future verb, it is relevant to show that such a conclusion would mean that the verse in question more commonly fits within a Marcan normativity of style. Thus while this factor is *not conclusive*, it is nevertheless *relevant* and so is here stated.

A second stylistic feature of Marcan Greek is that when a subjunctive active aorist verb is used in a connected sentence structure with an indicative active future verb, that this is a conditional sentence structure in which there is qualifying conjunction. I.e., conditional “*ei* (whether)” + indicative active future verb + qualifying conjunction “*hina* (that)” + subjunctive active aorist verb (Mark 3:2); or conditional “*ean me* (except)” + subjunctive active aorist verb + qualifying conjunctions “*kai* (and) *tote* (then)” + indicative active future verb (Mark 3:27); or conditional “*Ean* (Whatsoever)” + subjunctive active aorist verb + indicative active future verb + qualifying conjunction “*eos* (unto)” (Mark 6:23). Thus we read at Mark 3:2, “*ei* (whether) ... *therapeusei* (‘he would heal,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *therapeuo*) *auton* (him) ‘*ina* (that) *katēgōresōsin* (‘they might accuse,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *katēgoreō*) *autou* (him)” i.e., “whether he would heal him ... that they might accuse him” (AV). Or at Mark 3:27, “*ean me* (except) *prōton* (first) *ton* (the) *ischuron* (strong [man]) *dese* (‘he will bind,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *deo*) *kai* (and) *tote* (then) *ten* (the) *oikian* (house) *autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’) *diapasei* (‘he will spoil,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *diapazō*)” i.e., “except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house” (AV). Or at Mark 6:23, “*Ean* (Whatsoever) *me* (me) *aiteseis* (‘thou shalt ask of,’ subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *aiteō*) *dosō* (‘I will give [it],’ indicative active future, 1st person singular verb, from *didomi*) *sou* (‘unto thee’ = ‘thee’), *eos* (unto) *emious* (the half) *tes* (of the) *basileias* (kingdom) *mou* (‘of me’ = ‘my’)” i.e., “Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give *it* thee, unto the half of my kingdom” (AV, shewing AV’s italics for added word)²⁷. Cf. Mark 8:35 (e.g., conjunction, “and / *kai* the

times); 11:2,13,29 (twice),31; 12:9; 13:6,9,12 (twice),22,27; 14:13,15,18,27,28,58 (twice); 16:3,17 (twice), & 18 (5 times).

²⁷ This second stylistic factor should *not* be taken to mean that this is the only way that St. Mark may use a conditional sentence structure, for instance, in Mark 8:2,3 our Lord refers to those who, “*echousi* (‘they have’ = ‘have’) *ti* (nothing) *phagōsi* (‘they eat’ = ‘to eat,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *esthiō*). *Kai* (And) *ean* (if) *apoluso* (‘I send away,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *apoluō*) *autous* (them) *nesteis* (fasting) *eis* (to) *oikon* (houses) *auton* (‘of them’ = ‘their own’), *ekluthesontai* (‘they will faint,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *ekluō*) ...;” i.e., those who “have nothing to eat: and if I send them away fasting to their own houses, they will faint ...” (AV).

gospel”),36.

A third stylistic feature of Marcan Greek is that whether or not the second stylistic factor is present, Marcan Greek may use matching couplets of either two subjunctive active aorist verbs, or two indicative active future verbs (not that these are the only possible combination of verbs in Marcan Greek), *but never* a couplet of a subjunctive active aorist verb with an indicative active future verb. Thus with regard to a couplet of two subjunctive active aorist verbs where the second stylistic factor is not present, we read at Mark 6:36 our Lord says to, “Send them away, that they may ...,” “*agopasōsin* (‘they buy’ = ‘buy,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *agopazō*) *eautois* (themselves) *artous* (bread) *ti* (nothing) *gar* (for) *phagosin* (‘they eat’ = ‘to eat,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *esthiō*) *ouk* (nothing) *echousin* (they have),” i.e., “buy yourselves bread: for they have nothing to eat” (AV). Cf. Mark 10:19 (not a couplet, but five in a row with reference to *The Ten Commandments*, “Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not” – last one, “Defraud not,” a principle drawn from both the 8th commandment, “Do not steal” & 9th commandment, “Do not bear false witness,” see “Meditation,” *infra*). Or with regard to a couplet of two subjunctive active aorist verbs where the second stylistic factor is present, we read the words of our Lord at Mark 10:11, “*Os ean* (Whosoever) *apoluse* (‘he shall put away’ = ‘shall put away,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apoluō*) *ten* (the) *gunaika* (wife) *autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’) *kai* (and) *gamese* (‘he marry’ = ‘marry,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *gameō*) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (‘he committeth adultery’ = ‘committeth adultery’) ...,” i.e., “Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery ...”²⁸. Cf. Mark 10:17 (see “Meditation,” *infra*),35; 12:15,19; 14:12. And so likewise, with regard to a couplet of two indicative active future verbs we read at Mark 10:33 of how our Lord prophesied, saying, “Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes,” “*kai* (and) *katakrinousin* (‘they shall condemn,’ indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *katakrino*) *auton* (him) *thanato* (to death), *kai* (and) *paradosousin* (‘they shall deliver’ = ‘shall deliver,’ indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *paradidomi*) *auton* (him) *tois* (to the) *ethnesi* (Gentiles)” Cf. Mark 10:34 (of Christ, “they shall mock ... shall scourge ... shall spit upon ... and shall kill him”); 11:29 (“I will ... ask ..., and I will tell ...”).

We are now in a position to consider the couplet in Mark 4:30b, in which our Lord said Greek, “*Tini* (Whereunto)” + either ‘*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ an indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioō*’)” (*Reading 1*), or “‘*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioō*’)” (*Reading 2*) + “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom) *tou* (Of) *Theou* (God) ; (?) *ē* (Or) *en* (with) *poia* (what) *parabole* (comparison) *parabalomen* (‘shall we compare,’

²⁸ On permissible divorce, cf. e.g., Matt. 5:32; 19:9 (adultery e.g., passive adultery, I Cor. 7:3-5, for instance, desertion, Judg. 19:2; or inducing a cessation of any desire for conjugal relations in the innocent party via the cruelty of the guilty party, Mal. 2:14-16); I Cor. 7:15 (desertion).

subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *paraballo*) *auten* (it) ; (?)”

If *Reading 1* is followed, then we have a couplet of an indicative active future verb + a subjunctive active aorist verb. But in the first place, as seen by the second stylistic feature of Marcan Greek, *supra*, namely, that when a subjunctive active aorist verb is used in a connected sentence structure with an indicative active future verb, that in Marcan Greek this is a conditional sentence structure in which there is qualifying conjunction; we thus immediately see that *Reading 1* is not Marcan Greek. In the second place, in harmony with the third stylistic feature of Marcan Greek, *supra*, to wit, that whether or not the second stylistic factor is present, Marcan Greek may use matching couplets of either two subjunctive active aorist verbs, or two indicative active future verbs, we see that if the subjunctive active aorist verb of *Reading 2* is followed, this is compatible with Marcan Greek. Therefore, since the textual turbulence caused by the majority Byzantine text’s *Reading 1* can only be calmed by the minority Byzantine text’s *Reading 2*, it follows that *Reading 2* is the correct reading. And having first determined this, we additionally note as a piece of “icing on the cake,” that this is further compatible with the non-conclusive first stylistic feature of Marcan Greek, *supra*, namely, that St. Mark far more commonly uses a subjunctive active aorist verb such as we find in *Reading 2*, than he uses an indicative active future verb such as we find in *Reading 1*.

Was the change of *Reading 2* “‘*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*)” to the *Reading 1* “‘*omoiosomen* (‘shall we liken,’ an indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from ‘*omoioo*),” an accidental change following a paper fade or loss resulting in *Reading 2* looking something like, “‘*omoios men*;” or was it a deliberate change? In either instance, did the “corrector” scribe quickly “flip to the end” of the Marcan manuscript, at which point was he then at all influenced by elements of the grammatical style of Mark 16:17,18, in which there is one subjunctive active aorist verb, and seven indicative active future verbs? For our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who earlier declared in his Olivet Discourse (Mark 13:3) with respect to the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, “Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away” (Mark 13:31); here in Mark 16 says, “And these signs shall follow (*parakolouthesei*, indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *parakoloutheo*) that believe; In my name shall they cast out (*ekbalousi*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *ekballo*) devils; they shall speak (*lalesousi*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *laleo*) with new tongues; they shall take up (*arousi*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *airo*) serpents; and if (*kan*) they drink (*piosin*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *pino*) any deadly thing, it shall not hurt (*blapsei*, indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *blapto*) them, they shall lay (*epithesousi*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *epitithemi*) hands on the sick, and they shall recover (‘*exousin*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *echo*).”

Looking at this, the reader will note that at Mark 16:7,8, the second stylistic feature of Marcan Greek is absent i.e., when a subjunctive active aorist verb is used in a connected sentence structure with an indicative active future verb, that this is a conditional sentence structure in which there is qualifying conjunction. I.e., the structure

of: conditional “*kan* (and if)” + indicative active future verbs + subjunctive active aorist verb, lacks the addition of a qualifying conjunction. If St. Mark had translated our Lord’s Aramaic words into Greek, then under verbal inspiration of the Holy Ghost using Mark’s vocabulary they would have been rendered with a qualifying conjunction here e.g., a “*tote* (then)” (cf. Mark 13:14) i.e., “and if they drink any deadly thing, then it shall not hurt them.” But given that I understand Mark 16:9-20 to be a verbally inspired authorizing autograph by St. Andrew which was present in St. Mark’s Gospel from the very outset (a matter I shall further discuss in these textual commentaries at Mark 16), the matter is of no concern since it merely goes to show that this is Andean Greek. However, did a Greek scribe who did not realize that Mark 16:9-20 was Andean Greek, rather than Marcan Greek, wrongly conclude that a connecting conjunction was optional in Marcan Greek; and from this, then *further presume* a conditional sentence structure was *also* optional in Marcan Greek, with the consequence that he wrongly concluded *Reading 1* “was Marcan Greek”? Alas, there are so many pages missing in the dark ages of such textual corruptions that we can only guess, and perhaps wrongly, at such matters. But we can be sure that *Reading 2* is the original one of Marcan Greek.

On the one hand, the TR’s *Reading 2*, Greek, “‘*omoiosomen* (shall we liken),” is a minority Byzantine reading, and lacks clear and definite support in the Latin (see my comments at “Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion,” *supra*). But on the other hand, it has strong minority support in the Greek with *c.* 30% of the Byzantine manuscripts, and this clearly dates from ancient times (A 02 & Origen); and it is supported by textual analysis. Therefore on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Mark 4:30b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Outside the closed class of sources the TR’s *Reading 2* is the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence it is found in the NU Text *et al.* Thus from the Neo-Byzantine perspective, at Mark 4:30b what constitutes the correct reading is not an issue between Neo-Byzantines and Neo-Alexandrians, but an issue between Neo-Byzantines and Majority Text Burgonites. Yet some the Burgonites themselves are exceedingly shy of admitting this here at Mark 4:30b. For while Hodges & Farstad’s majority text (1985) put the MBT in their main text, they still qualify this on the basis that the text is “seriously divided;” and while Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text (2005) says the text as “significantly divided,” they abandon their majority text principles without telling their readings they are doing so when they make the TR’s *Reading 2* their preferred reading in the main text; and indeed in *Green’s Textual Apparatus* (1986), William Pierpont did not consider *Reading 2* should be changed. There is also no footnote in the NKJV telling their Burgonite readers that the TR’s reading here at Mark 4:30b is not that of the Majority Text. But for all that, it must also be said that while the readings have a different meaning in the Greek, they may both be rendered the same in English as “shall we liken.”

Meditation: In Mark 10:17 we see the third stylistic feature of Marcan Greek in which whether or not the second stylistic factor is present, a matching couplet of two

subjunctive active aorist verbs are used, “And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do (*poiesō*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *poieō*) that I may inherit (*kleronomēsō*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *kleronomeō*) eternal life?” Here the subjunctive indicates the idea of possibility or desire, as opposed to fact²⁹. And then once again illustrating this third stylistic feature of Marcan Greek, we find that to this justification by works question, our Lord says he should keep the covenant of works as found in the Sinai Covenant of the Ten Commandments. Thus not in a couplet, but rather as five in a row, we find five imperative subjunctives of prohibition³⁰ with reference to *The Ten Commandments* as our Lord says to the rich young ruler at Mark 10:19, “Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery (*Me / ‘not,’ moicheuses*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *moicheuo*), Do not kill (*Me / ‘not,’ phoneuses*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *phoneuo*), Do not steal (*Me / ‘not,’ klepsēs*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *klepto*), Do not bear false witness (*Me / ‘not,’ pseudomarturesēs*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *pseudomartureō*), Defraud not (*Me / ‘not,’ aposteresēs*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *apostereō*)” i.e., “Defraud not” as a principle drawn from both the 8th commandment, “Do not steal” & 9th commandment, “Do not bear false witness.”

At this point, the Biblically correct response of the rich young ruler would have been to say something in harmony with the following principles. “My Lord, ‘I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence . . . For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me [Rom. 7:7-11; citing Exod. 20:17]’. Thou sayest, O Lord, the precept says, ‘Do not commit adultery;’ but whensoever I ‘looketh on a woman to lust after her,’ I have ‘committed adultery with her already in’ my ‘heart’ [Matt. 5:27]. Thou sayest, O Lord, the precept says, ‘Do not kill,’ but whensoever I am ‘angry with’ my ‘brother without a cause’ I break the precept, ‘Thou shalt not kill’ [Matt. 5:21,22]. Thou sayest, O Lord, the precept says, ‘Do not steal;’ but because I cannot give adequate and pure praise to God, I do ‘steal’ from him the honour due to his holy ‘name,’ and thus do I also violate the precept, ‘Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain’ [Exod. 20:7,15; Rom. 2:21-24]. O Lord, I cannot perfectly keep even one, let alone all ten of these commandments to the standard of God’s perfection needed to merit everlasting life, for though I have tried, I constantly fail. ‘For . . . the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For . . . what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.’ ‘For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.’ ‘For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law

²⁹ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 463; Young’s *Greek*, p. 137.

³⁰ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 469; Young’s *Greek*, pp. 143-144.

in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' [Rom. 7:14,15,18,19,22-24]."

And then our Lord would have taught him along these lines. "The law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound" (Rom. 5:20). For "before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:23-26). "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants" i.e., salvation by the covenant of works reissued from pre-fall times in the Sinai Covenant which no fallen man can ever keep and so merit salvation, or the covenant of grace wherein we are justified by faith in Christ's atoning sacrifice, which has operated as a covenant within a covenant in diverse dispensations (or eras), but remains the one "everlasting covenant" (Heb. 13:20) whereby any men that ever have been saved, are saved, to wit, the "covenant" of "grace" (Gen. 6:8,18), through which "by faith, Noah, ... became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" (Heb. 11:7).

For our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ declared he came "to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45), when at Calvary they did "mock him, and ... scourge him, and ... spit upon him, and ... kill him," before "the third day he" did "rise again" (Mark 10:34; cf. Mark 14-16). Wherefore, when one doth cry out to him for "mercy" (Mark 10:48), saying "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me" (Mark 10:47), then faith, not being the grounds of our salvation, but the means of it, "for by grace are ye saved through faith" (Eph. 2:8), our Lord doth declare, "thy faith hath made thee whole" (Mark 10:52); of which the healing of "blind Bartimaeus" in Mark 10:46-52 is an object lesson that flows from our Lord's atonement teaching of Mark 10:45. For Christ saith of the symbols of bread and wine representing his body and blood respectively in the holy sacrament of Communion, "Take eat, this is my body" (Mark 14:22), and "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many" (Mark 14:24).

But this impious and arrogant rich young ruler of Mark 10:17-22, was among those Jews who both then and now, and others such as e.g., Romanists, or semi-Romanist Eastern Orthodox, not knowing the Biblical Gospel of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity, are a man "willing to justify himself" (Luke 10:29). Wherefore, to our Lord's question, the rich young ruler "answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth" (Mark 10:20). Now in terms of his question regarding the covenant of works reissued at Mount Sinai and associated justification by works question, "what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" (Mark 10:17), this is a clear documented case of one clear sin by the rich young ruler, to wit, "Do not bear false witness" (Mark 10:19), for no fallen man can ever keep God's law to this required standard of perfection! Does this mean that our Lord hates sinners? What saith the

Scripture? “Then Jesus beholding him loved him” (Mark 10:21). Our Lord then isolates “one thing” that can be itemized as something he “lackest,” namely, man’s inability to every perfectly keep the first, second, and tenth commandments (Exod. 20:2-5,17; Matt. 6:24; Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5), for if one kept it to the nth degree, one would be penniless as one gave away everything one had in Christian charity. And so to make this point, our Lord then says to the rich young ruler with regard to the first, second, and tenth commandments, “go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me” (Mark 10:21). *Here is the rich young ruler’s second chance* to say, “My Lord, I cannot do it, I cannot ever keep the law from Sinai to the required standard of God’s perfection so as to merit salvation;” and then cry out for “mercy” (Mark 10:47,48) under the covenant of grace, “saying, God be merciful to me a sinner” (Luke 18:13). But instead, what does this headstrong and arrogant and hardhearted religiously apostate Jew do? Well, “he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions” (Mark 10:22).

So good reader, consider the words our Lord put to the rich young ruler, “Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God” (Mark 10:18). I.e., bearing in mind that God’s standard of perfection takes one to the nth degree, in terms of the nth degree of the meaning of the word “good” in harmony with the First Commandment (Exod. 20:2,3), do not call Jesus “good” unless he is “God.” So is he God? (See Mark 1:1,3; citing Isa. 40:3 where “Lord” is Hebrew *J’hovah* or as it is Anglicized, “Jehovah.”) And going to the nth degree, canst thou keep the reissued covenant of works as found in the Sinai Covenant of the Ten Commandments to the standard of God’s perfection so as to merit thy salvation (Mark 10:17,19)? Or dost thou look instead to the covenant of grace crying out, for “mercy” (Mark 10:48), saying “Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me” (Mark 10:47)? *What is thy reply?*

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion for Mark 4:33 & associated Mark 5:3e (with further reference to MBT & TR readings of **Mark 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5a**).

Mark 4:33 (minority Byzantine reading), and the associated Mark 5:3 (minority Byzantine reading), would have been dealt with in Appendix 3 in former volumes. However, Mark 4:33; 5:3e, 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5a will be dealt with in the Part 2 of Volume 6 as this involves following minority Byzantine readings in two of these five instances. But these readings shall be dealt with in a format, in parts, more similar to that of the Appendices 1 & 3. It has been placed here, rather than in Appendix 3, as part of the wider policy to highlight those places where the *Textus Receptus* is not the same as the Majority Byzantine Text, even though it generally is.

Principal Textual Discussion at Mark 4:33 & associated Mark 5:3e (with further reference to MBT & TR readings of **Mark 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5a**).

At **Mark 4:33** Scrivener's Text reads Greek, "*edunanto* ('they were able,' indicative passive / middle³¹ imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *dunamai*)," in the wider words spoken about our Lord's parables, "and with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear *it*" (shewing AV's italics for added word). This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; F 09, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; Lectionary 19, 13th century, Oxford, UK). It is found in Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633). By contrast, the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) reads Greek, "*edunanto* ('they were able,' indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *dunamai*)" (e.g., A 02, 5th century; K 017, 9th century; M 021, 9th century; Pi 041, 9th century; & Minuscule 2, 12th century). It is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

Von Soden (1913) says the MBT reading at Mark 4:33 has the support of his K group other than one itemized manuscript, so that due to the selective generalist nature of von Soden's work, this means that the MBT is here followed by more than *c.* 90% of the K group manuscripts, and thus on any reasonable statistical extrapolation, more than *c.* 90% of the Byzantine manuscripts overall; and correspondingly the minority Byzantine reading is followed by less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine manuscripts. Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows four out of five gospel manuscripts following the MBT (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; & L, Codex Leicestrensis); and one out of five gospel manuscripts following the minority Byzantine reading (Gospel manuscript: H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum / Library)³².

These two readings at Mark 4:33 are simply two different Greek imperfect forms of *dunamai* (found more widely in Mark's Gospel³³), as the imperfect sometimes takes

³¹ The middle voice has the idea of stressing the subject's participation (though it was falling out of usage in the Koine Greek of the NT), so that if here applicable the subjects are active hearers getting something done that is in their own interest; whereas in the passive voice the subject receives the action of the verb, so that if here applicable the subjects here are passively listening to our Lord (Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, pp. 34 & 37; Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 414-415; 431; Young's *Greek*, pp. 134-136. Both have the same declension, so is this Greek word best characterized at Mark 4:33 as a middle or passive voice?

³² Greek "*edunanto* (they were able)," is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.*

³³ Mark 1:40,45; 2:7,19 (2); 3:20,23,24,26; 4:32; 7:15,18; 8:4; 9:3,22,23; 9:28,29; 10:26,38,39; 14:7; & 15:31.

the regular augment of an epsilon “*e*” / “*ε*,” rather than an eta “*ē*” / “*η*”³⁴; and thus the meaning is the same either way. Therefore before further considering Mark 4:33, we will first consider the wider Marcan usage of the imperfect augment of *dunamai* in St. Mark’s Gospel. There are four further usages of this, all in the singular of, *ēdunato* or *edunato* (“he” / “she” / “it was able,” indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dunamai*), at Mark 5:3e; 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5a.

At **Mark 5:3e** Scrivener reads Greek, “*ēdunato* (‘he could’ = ‘could’)” in the wider words, “no man could bind him” (AV). But the MBT reads “*edunato* (‘he could’ = ‘could’),” a reading that Majority Text Burgonites’ Robinson & Pierpont (2005) consider is so well established as the Majority Byzantine Text that no sidenote alternative is necessary³⁵. Majority Text Burgonites’ Hodges & Farstad (1985) are broadly of the same Burgonite opinion as Robinson & Pierpont, since they place the MBT in their main text, and provide a footnote stating that the reading of the “TR” is found in “M”, which equates von Soden’s Kr (/ K^r) subgroup; and in stating their general principles, they take the view that “it is probable, as von Soden thought, that the large group M^r (K^r) is traceable to a single source which is not the original text³⁶.”

Von Soden (1913) says that inside his K group, “*ēdunato*” has the support of his Kr sub-group and one manuscript from Ki. Of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, von Soden’s Kr group contains *c.* 175 Gospel manuscripts. Thus *c.* 176 out of *c.* 860 manuscripts, or *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the manuscripts in K group, and thus on any reasonable statistical extrapolations in the wider number of Byzantine Greek manuscripts *c.* 20% of the Byzantine texts in general, support “*ēdunato*” (e.g., Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; F 09, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; & Minuscule 2, 12th century); whereas *c.* 80% or about four-fifths of the Byzantine manuscripts read “*edunato*” which is thus clearly the MBT (e.g., A 02, 5th century; K 017, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; Pi 041, 9th century)³⁷. The minority Byzantine reading is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633). Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) says the MBT is found in all six Gospel manuscripts consulted with this reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum / Library; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and so Elzevir (1624) was following what was a known minority reading.

At **Mark 6:5a** the preferred main text reading of “*ēdunato* (he could)” in the

³⁴ Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

³⁵ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), p. 79.

³⁶ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxii & 120.

³⁷ Greek “*edunato* (he could),” is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.*

wider words, “he could there do no mighty work, save that ...” etc., is said by the Majority Text Burgonites’ Hodges & Farstad (1985) to be “Majority Part” (“Mpt”) as is also “*edunato* (he could)” i.e., what they call “a substantial division within the Majority Text” or a “seriously divided” text; whereas Majority Text Burgonites’ Robinson & Pierpont (2005) consider “*edunato* (he could)” is so well established as the Majority Byzantine Text that no sidenote alternative is necessary³⁸. Going to the common source book of von Soden (1913), and (like Robinson & Pierpont) using a Byzantine Text priority methodology, von Soden says that within his wider K group, “*edunato* (he could)” is supported by his Kx subgroup and Kr subgroup. Of c. 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, von Soden’s Kx subgroup contains c. 500 Gospel manuscripts; and his Kr subgroup contains c. 175 Gospel manuscripts³⁹; and thus c. 675 out of c. 860 K group manuscripts, or c. 78.5% or between three-quarters and four-fifths of K Group, and thus on any reasonable statistical projections in the wider number of Byzantine Greek manuscripts, support “*edunato*” (e.g., E 07, 8th century; U 030, 9th century; & Origen, d. 254), which is thus clearly the MBT; whereas c. 22.5% or between one-fifth and one-quarter of the Byzantine manuscripts read “*edunato*” (e.g., A 02, 5th century; Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; N 022, 6th century; K 017, 9th century; & Minuscule 2, 12th century) which is thus clearly a minority Byzantine reading⁴⁰. The MBT is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522); Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633). Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) says the MBT is found in both of the Gospel manuscripts consulted with this reading (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 1; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum / Library).

At **Mark 6:19** Greek “*edunato* (she could),” in the wider words, “but she could not” (AV) is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; N 022, 6th century; E 07, 8th century; U 030, 9th century; Minuscule 2, 12th century; & Lectionaries 2378, 11th century, & 1968, 1544 A.D.). However, “*edunato* (he could)” is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02, 5th century; K 017, 9th century; & Pi 041, 9th century)⁴¹. Von Soden (1913) says the MBT reading has the support of his K group other than two itemized manuscripts, so that due to the selective generalist nature of von Soden’s work, this means that the MBT is here supported by more than c. 90% of the K group manuscripts, and thus on any reasonable statistical extrapolation, more than c. 90% of the Byzantine

³⁸ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv, xxi & 125; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), p. 82.

³⁹ See Commentary at Matt. 21:28a, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter.”

⁴⁰ Greek “*edunato* (he could)” is found in Codex Sinaiticus, and the Western text’s D 05; whereas “*edunato* (he could),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus & C 04 (mixed text type, 5th century), and the NU Text *et al.*

⁴¹ Greek “*edunato* (she could),” is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.*

manuscripts overall; and correspondingly the minority Byzantine reading is followed by less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine manuscripts. The MBT is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522); Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633).

At **Mark 14:5a** Greek “*edunato* (it might),” in the wider words, “For it might have been sold” (AV) is MBT (e.g., A 02, 5th century; Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; M 021, 9th century; X 033, 10th century; Gamma 036, 10th century; Minuscule 2, 12th century; & Lectionary 2378, 11th century⁴²). However, “*edunato* (he could)” is a minority Byzantine reading (K 017, 9th century; H 013, 9th century; & Pi 041, 9th century)⁴³. Von Soden (1913) says the MBT reading has the residual support of his K group, so that due to the selective generalist nature of von Soden’s work, this means that the MBT is here supported by more than *c.* 90% of the K group manuscripts, and thus on any reasonable statistical extrapolation, more than *c.* 90% of the Byzantine manuscripts overall; and correspondingly the minority Byzantine reading is followed by less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine manuscripts. The MBT is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522); Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633). Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) says the MBT is found in one of two of the Gospel manuscripts consulted with this reading (Gospel manuscript: P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18); and the minority Byzantine reading is also found in one of two of the Gospel manuscripts consulted with this reading (Gospel manuscript: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16).

Looking at the Marcan usage of the imperfect singular, *edunato* or *edunato* (“he” / “she” / “it was able,” indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dunamai*), at Mark 5:3e; 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5; firstly, it is clear that three of these that use “*edunato*” are strongly MBT (Mark 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5), and with no clear and obvious textual argument against them, they must be accepted as Marcan. Secondly, having so determined this, it follows that the Mark 5:3e MBT reading of “*edunato*,” “sticks out like a sore thumb,” as not being Marcan Greek, and so the minority Byzantine reading of “*edunato*” must be adopted at Mark 5:3e to calm this textual disturbance. And thirdly, having first determined that Mark 5:3e; 6:5a; 6:19; & 14:5 all read “*edunato* (indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dunamai*),” it follows that the MBT reading at Mark 4:33 of “*edunanto* (‘they were able,’ indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *dunamai*),” is incongruous relative to the wider Marcan usage of the augment of eta / *e* rather than epsilon / *e* for the imperfect of *dunamai*. Therefore to relieve this textual turbulence at Mark 4:33 it is necessary to adopt the minority Byzantine reading of “*edunanto* (‘they were able,’ indicative passive / middle imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *dunamai*).”

⁴² In my microfilm photocopy of Lectionary 2378 (p. 69b, column 1), the first letter is smudged and unclear, though at a guess it looks more like an eta “H” than an epsilon “ε.” Therefore I checked the original at Sydney University in Sept. 2016, and found this was in fact an eta “H”.

⁴³ Greek “*edunato* (it might),” is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.*

Therefore the correct readings at both Mark 4:33 and Mark 5:3e are the minority Byzantine readings of “*edunanto*,” as found in Scrivener’s Text (1894 & 1902).

Mark 5:11 “the mountains” (TR & AV) {B}

Inside the closed class of Greek and Latin NT sources at Mark 5:11, *Reading 1* (the TR’s reading), found in Scrivener’s Text is Greek, “*ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article, from *to*) *ore* (‘mountains,’ neuter plural accusative noun, from *oros*),” in the wider words, “now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding” (AV). This is a minority Byzantine reading with the support of less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine Greek texts, and *possibly* less than *c.* 1% of the Byzantine Greek texts. It is supported by the purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew & St. Mark, Tirana, Albania), and Minuscules 2 (12th century; Basel, Switzerland) and 485 (12th century; Burney 23 in British Library, London, UK). It is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of the Neo-Byzantine School’s Erasmus (1516 & 1522) as Greek “*ta* (the) *ore* (mountains)” and Latin “*montes* (‘[the] mountains,’ masculine plural accusative noun, from *mons*);” and the Neo-Byzantine School’s Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633).

Reading 2, Greek, “*to* (‘the,’ neuter singular dative, definite article, from *to*) *orei* (‘mountain,’ neuter singular dative noun, from *oros*),” i.e., was there nigh unto the mountain,” is the majority Byzantine reading with the support of at least *c.* 90% of the Byzantine text manuscripts. It is found in e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century). It is also found as Latin, “*montem* (‘[the] mountain,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *mons*),” in Jerome’s Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), i (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258).

The Greek textual issue here at Mark 5:11 relates to the Marcan usage of a definite article with *oros* (mountain) when St. Mark is signifying a particular mountain or mountains when accompanied with a contextual identifier with *oros* (mountain) (Mark 9:2,9; 11:1; 13:3,14; & 14:26). This is in contradistinction to: 1] the Marcan usage of a definite article with *oros* (mountain) when there is no such contextual identifier and so the meaning is “a mountain” (Mark 3:13; 6:46); 2] the Marcan non-usage of a definite article with *oros* (mountain) to mean “a” / “an” (Mark 9:2) as opposed to his usage of the definite article to mean “the” with a contextual identifier (Mark 9:9); and 3] the Marcan usage of a definite article with *oros* (mountain) in a general maxim (Mark 11:23).

Looking at the Marcan usage of *oros* (mountain) more widely in the *Holy Gospel According to Saint Mark*, we find that in the plural form the definite article is used with a contextual identifier in Mark 13:14. Here with reference to the words of the Old Testament prophet, Holy Daniel, “for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate” (Dan. 9:27b), and for the greater fulfillment (as earlier typed by Antiochus Epiphanes) of “the abomination that maketh desolate” (Dan. 11:31; 12:11) i.e., the pagan Roman Empire’s “armies” work of “desolation” (Luke 21:20), our blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, says with regard to the 70 A.D. Destruction of Jerusalem and associated events (which contextually are a prophetic type of the Final Judgement at the Second Coming), “But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains” (Mark 13:14). Contextually, Greek *ta orē* i.e., “the (*ta*) mountains (*orē*),” here are those of “Judea” in general, with a special, though not exclusive reference to, Jerusalem in particular. And in the singular form, Marcan Greek also uses the definite article with a contextual identifier in Greek *to oros* for “the (*to*) Mount (*oros*) of Olives” in Mark 11:1; 13:3; & 14:26.

By contrast: 1] Greek *to oros* in which the definite article is used for a generic class i.e., rather than distinguishing one person or one thing from others, it acts to distinguish *one class* of objects from *other classes* of objects⁴⁴, is evident in Mark 3:13; 6:14. Here Christ does not mean *one particular* “mountain,” i.e., he does not mean “*the mountain*”⁴⁵, but rather, mountains *as a class* of objects. Thus *to oros* is used for “a mountain” in Mark 3:13; 6:14 as there is no contextual identification here for the definite article to be rendered as “the.” 2] At *The Transfiguration of our Lord* (remembered with a black letter day on 6 August in the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*), there is no definite article in Marcan Greek for *oros*, in Mark’s reference to “an high mountain (*oros*)” (Mark 9:2), and there is no contextual identification of it. However, having first so isolated *a particular* “mountain” (Mark 9:2), St. Mark then uses a definite article to mean “the” in Mark 9:9 when he says, “they came down from the (*tou*) mountain (*orous*).” Thus Mark’s usage of “the (*tou*) mountain (*orous*)” in Mark 9:2 has grammatical propriety because of his identification of “an” otherwise unknown “high mountain (*oros*)” in Mark 9:2. 3] There is also a Marcan Greek usage of a definite article with *oros* (mountain) in Mark 11:23. Here in connection with a demonstrative pronoun (*outos-aute-touto*), reference is made to Greek, *to orei touto* i.e., “this mountain,” as part of a general maxim in the words of Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, “That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed ...” etc. .

Therefore, having considered these issues of Marcan Greek, we are inexorably led to see the problem with the Majority Byzantine Text reading of Mark 5:11, “Now there

⁴⁴ See e.g., Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) (Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 2010,) at Appendix 3, “The Definite Article,” a, “The Definite Article (‘the’”) in Matthew 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d,” at comments using example of John 10:12 (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

⁴⁵ Such an erroneous rendering of Mark 3:13 & 6:46 is found in e.g., the ASV.

was nigh unto the (to) mountain (*orei*)." For at Mark 5:11, (unlike Mark 3:13 & 6:46) there is a prior contextual identifier in Mark 5:5 of "the mountains" – *tois oresi*, and so Marcan Greek should read "a mountain" with no definite article, as the definite article at Mark 5:11 links it back to Mark 5:5 which is plural (cf. Mark 9:2,9); i.e., if Mark 5:11 is meant to be read in the singular as "a mountain," then inside the parameters of Marcan Greek, Mark 5:11 would read simply *orei*; but we can eliminate this possibility as there is no such reading in the closed class of sources. And nor is this Majority Byzantine Text reading of Mark 5:11 explicable on the basis that Mark 5:11 is a general maxim, which it clearly is not (cf. Mark 11:23). Thus inside the parameters of Marcan Greek, the reading of, to *orei* ("the mountain," *Reading 2, supra*) at Mark 5:11 is incongruous with the reading *tois oresi* ("the mountains") at Mark 5:5. However, there is a reading inside the closed class of sources at Mark 5:11 of *ta ore* ("the mountains," *Reading 1, supra*), and this usage of a definite article is congruous with wider Marcan Greek as it is consistent with the earlier identification in Mark 5:5 of "the mountains" (cf. Mark 11:1; 13:3,14; & 14:26). Therefore the minority Byzantine reading (*Reading 1*) must be the correct reading as it alone is inside the parameters of Marcan Greek.

Was the variant (*Reading 2*) an accidental alteration? In a manuscript reading Greek, "*ta* (the) ore (mountains)" (*Reading 1*) in which "ore" was at the end of a line, due to a paper fade / loss, did this come to look something like, "*t or* "? Was this then "reconstructed from context" by a scribe as "to (the) *orei* (mountain)" (*Reading 2*), possibly with some reference to "to *orei*" at Mark 11:23 and "*to oros*" at Mark 3:13 and / or Mark 6:46 by a well intentioned, but none too competent, scribe? Or was the variant (*Reading 2*) a deliberate alteration? Is it possible that the corrupter scribe was a gnostic heretic? Did he then change "*ta* (the) ore (mountains)" (*Reading 1*) to "to (the) *orei* (mountain)" (*Reading 2*) in connection with cultic claims of "secretive knowledge" as to "where this mountain was"?

On the one hand, the TR's *Reading 1*, Greek, "*ta* (the) ore (mountains)" is a minority Byzantine reading with only three itemized Greek manuscripts, and no itemized Latin manuscripts; and while the exact manuscript count of Byzantine Greek texts in its support is unknown, it is certainly less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine Greek texts, and possibly less than *c.* 1% of the Byzantine Greek texts. But on the other hand, it is the only reading that conforms to Marcan Greek style, and clearly it is attested to over time from early medieval times with Codex Phi 043 (6th century), and though time into the High Middle Ages (11th –13th centuries) with Minuscules 2 (12th century) and 485 (12th century), as preserved down to our own day. Therefore on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Mark 5:11 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Mark 5:11, *Reading 1* (the TR's reading) Greek, "*ta* (the) ore (mountains)," i.e., "the mountains" (plural) (AV), is found in Minuscule 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine

elsewhere, Basel University Library, Switzerland). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

And the erroneous variant, “the mountain” (singular), is found in e.g., one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codex Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western Text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, depending on one’s view, either independently corrupted, or “Caesarean” text), 28 (11th century, which in Mark is independent text i.e., independently corrupted, & Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, depending on one’s view, either independently corrupted, or “Caesarean” text), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); the Gothic Version (4th century); Syriac Harelean h (616) Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Reading 2 Greek, “τῶ (the) *orei* (mountain)” is found in the Alexandrian text’s, Codex Vaticanus; whereas simply Greek, “τῶ (the)” is found in the Alexandrian text’s, Codex Sinaiticus. This indicates some further tampering of the text beyond the initial corruption to *Reading 2* by the ancient Alexandrian School of North Africa and Arabia. Given that the founder of the *Dean Burgon Society* in the USA, Donald Waite, has argued that the Alexandrian Text shows the influence of “gnostic heresies⁴⁶,” was the original “*τα* (the) *ορε* (mountains)” (*Reading 1*) changed to “τῶ (the) *orei* (mountain)” (*Reading 2*) in connection with gnostic heretic cultic claims of “secretive knowledge” as to “where this mountain was”? And in further development, did a later gnostic heretic corrupter scribe prune this down to just the “τῶ (the)” of the variant (*Reading 2*) in Codex Sinaiticus, as an intensification of the idea that a gnostic heretic cultic Alexandrian School of corrupter scribes was connected with “secretive knowledge” as to “what this Scripture *really* means”?

The erroneous variant “τῶ (the) *orei* (mountain)” (*Reading 2*) was adopted by the neo-Alexandrian School NU Text *et al*, and also the Burgonite Majority Text School as found in Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont’s Majority Text (2005).

And thus at Mark 5:11 the neo-Alexandrian School’s ASV reads, “the mountain.” So too the erroneous variant is followed in the neo-Alexandrian School’s NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, and semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt. Though the ASV’s “the mountain” is the type of rendering also found in the NASB (2nd

⁴⁶ Donald Waite, “The History of the Received Text,” Sermon 16 Feb. 2009 (59 mins), *Sermonaudio* (<http://www.sermonaudio.com>).

edition 1977 & 3rd edition, 1995); the more interpretative rendering of “hill-side” found in Moffatt, is the type of rendering also found in the NASB (1st edition, 1960-1971), RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT; and Papists’ Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. In so following the variant, the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ of the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB, were “following in the footsteps” of the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times who on the basis of the Latin also followed this variant in the Clementine & Douay-Rheims, the latter of which reads, “the mountain.”

At Mark 5:11, the Majority Text Burgonites adopted the incorrect *Reading 2* in both the Greek Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). By contrast, the Burgonite translators of the *New King James Version* here follow the TR but did not put a footnote stating that at Mark 5:11 the Majority Text follows *Reading 1* rather than the TR’s *Reading 2*. Unlike the greater honesty of the Greek Majority Text compliers such as Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont “at the academic end,” whose Greek texts would never be read by most Burgonite supporters “at the church end;” this type of NKJV “sleight of hand” *is all too common* by Burgonites “at the popularist end,” who like the NKJV translators are “dealing more closely with the people.” Thus the NKJV translators here help to create the common fiction put out by Burgonites “at the church end” that the Majority Text and KJV Received Text are a lot closer than what they really are. Though such Burgonites love “to sing the praises” of John Burgon, the reality that they do not generally tell their people is that Burgon claimed, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities” (Burgon’s *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and thus Burgon’s proud boast was this, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21).