IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT IN MARK 9:38

ABSTRACT

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

1. COMPLICATED TEXT-CRITICAL SITUATION

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

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

The margin of W&H follows D with οσ σων ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκαλυμεν αυτον, Tis7 Sod Bov Sou BOC HGr follow λ with οσ σων ακολουθει ημιν και εκαλυμεν αυτον, W&H Vog UBS Noi N28 follow κ B with και εκαλυμεν αυτον σων ηκαλουθει ημιν, Tis8 Wss Nes3-25 Mrk with οσ σων ακολουθει ημιν και εκαλυμεν αυτον σων ηκαλουθει ημιν follow in this part of the verse the conflate reading of the Byzantine text (with εκαλυμεν instead of εκαλυσαμεν and ηκαλουθει instead of ακολουθει of TR).

2. IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT

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

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

---

1 The words εκει (there, in that place) and αυτου (just there) have the same local meaning. Cfr Acts 18:19 εκει P74 κ Α D E 33 104 326 1241, αυτου B L Ψ 323 614 945 1175 1505 1739 plurimi.
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The shorter reading found in \(\lambda 205-209\) is head of the transmission (Ausgangstext).

In the Revue Biblique I wrote an article with respect to Hort’s second example of a conflate reading in the majority text, namely Mark 8:26 (Hendriks 2007). According to Ernst Lohmeyer, the accepted text (Legg 1935, Nes\(^2\)) of this verse is ununderstandable. Very few authors allude to the reading of Codex Bezae D.05 as being head of the transmission.\(^5\)

\[\text{υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και μηδενι ειπες εις την κωμην} \]
\[\text{vade in domum tuam et nemini dixeris in vico} \]

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

---

2 A.02 repeats \(\text{συνεδραμον} \) at the place of \(\text{συνηλθον} \).
3 For the shorter reading principle see Hendriks (2005, 2011).
5 Explicitly only Allen (1915: 116).
6 So among others Lohmeyer (1967:158).
Hereafter I will discuss Hort’s third example of conflation in the majority text, namely Mark 9:38. His fourth example concerning Mark 9:49 has been discussed elsewhere (Hendriks 2014).

3. THE COMMON VIEW: HORT AND METZGER

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

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} & \text{και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν} \\
& \text{και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων} \\
& \text{και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν} \\
\hline
\text{κ} & \text{B} \Delta \\
\text{L} & \text{C curs}^3 f sy^p sy^l bo eth \\
\text{D} & \text{Bo k} \\
\text{X} & \text{λ1-209} \\
\text{b c ff}^2 i vg sy^{hmg} arm \\
\text{A N EFGH KM SUV} \\
\text{Γ Π curs}^{\text{multi}} sy^h got \\
\end{array}
\]

(in reading δ 565 has ηκολουθει and ali^1 μεθ ημων in the first clause and ali^2 μεθ ημων in the third)

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

---

7 Hort reads ειδαμεν (with α as in D N Σ Ψ 346). He notes that 33 is defective.
8 According to Ross (1983:63): “this is hardly a sufficient motive for so radical an alteration.”
One might make the following two remarks. Firstly: more important than a supposed inclination to alter imperfects into aorists in both Mark and Luke is the actual preference for the imperfect in the gospel of Mark and for the aorist in the gospel of Luke. The historical books of the LXX show a high percentage of narrative aorists (some 78 %) as compared with the Hellenistic historical literature (some 42 %). Luke Matt Mark (in this order) are in between. So in this respect Mark is the more Hellenistic writer, furthest away from the Semitic world.

Secondly: Luke’s actual preference for the aorist is not seen in the imperfect εκωλυομεν according to P45vid P75vid Β L Ξ 157 579 892 1241 a b e l arm geo, which imperfect here in Luke 9:49 might be the more original one. Apart from Tis and TR the editions read εκωλυομεν in Luke.

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

a και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν
“and we forbade him, because he was not following us”

b οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυομεν αυτον
“who does not follow us, and we forbade him”

d οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι
“who does not follow us, and we forbade him, because he does not follow us”

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

4. PLEA FOR THE WESTERN READING

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

---

9 Stein (2008:451) adds: “The other variants involve primarily differences in tenses and in the order of the clauses; εκωλυομεν is a tendential/conative imperfect.” Precisely the order of the clauses is my main concern.
εκβάλλοντα δαιμονία, οσ ουκ ακολουθεῖ ημιν, και εκωλυομεν αυτον, *vidimus quendam in nomine tuo eicientem daemonia, qui non sequitur nos, et prohibuimus eum, nous avons vu quelqu’un qui chassait des démons en ton nom, qui ne nous suit pas, et nous l’avions empêché*. Lagrange prefers the text of von Soden (and of Tischendorf without the last phrase) to that of Westcott-Hort and Vogels. It is the text of family λ and the Latin vulgate. Lagrange interprets εκωλυομεν αυτον (nous l’avions empêché) as a past perfect (plusque-parfait), and considers prohibuimus eum (nous l’avons empêché) of the vulgate as stronger (less anxious).  

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

1. οσ ουκ ακολουθεί μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον  
   D a k  
   λ (φ 28 700) b c ff i arm  
   W 565
2. και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν  
   κ B (C, L) Δ Θ sy a
3. οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν  
   plurimi

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

5. ANALYSIS OF MARK 9:38

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

---

10 Lagrange (1947:247): «L’imparfait εκωλυομεν semble indiquer cette inquiétude: nous l’avions empêché (Vulgate etc) serait plus ferme.»
11 Taylor’s printed Greek text follows more or less the old Nestle, but with οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν within square brackets.
12 For the questionable reason see Aland-Aland (1995:103).
Reuben Swanson (1995:150) has been consulted, together with other sources, including reproductions and the like.\textsuperscript{13}

The following families with their symbols are used.

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda &= 1 118 205 209 1582 2193 \text{ (f1)} \quad \text{Lake, TTW} \\
\phi &= 13 69 124 346 543 788 826 828 983 1689 \text{ (f13)} \quad \text{TTW, Lafleur} \\
\sigma &= 349 517 954 1424 1675 \text{ (f1424) (if 3 out of 5)} \quad \text{TTW} \\
\pi &= K \Pi 114 265 489 1079 1219 1346 1816 \text{ (Ka)} \quad \text{New, Geerlings} \\
\varepsilon &= E F G H (\text{Ki}) \quad \text{Geerlings} \\
\omega &= S V \Omega (\text{Ki}) \quad \text{Geerlings}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\begin{align*}
\text{Latin} & \quad \text{a b c d f ff}^2 \text{ i k l q r}^1 \text{ r}^2 \text{ z} \bar{\delta} & \text{Itala, editions (z = aur = 15)} \\
\text{Syriac} & \quad \text{sy}^a \text{ sy}^b \text{ sy}^h \text{ sy}^l & \text{Kiraz, White, Land} \\
\text{English} & \quad \text{sa bo} & \text{Horner} \\
\text{French} & \quad \text{arm} & \text{Künzle}\textsuperscript{14} \\
\text{English} & \quad \text{eth} & \text{Zuurmond} \\
\text{Latin} & \quad \text{geo}^1 \text{ geo}^A \text{ geo}^8 & \text{Blake} \\
\text{Greek} & \quad \text{got} & \text{Streitberg}\textsuperscript{15}
\end{align*}

Below one finds a survey of variants in Mark 9:38 (after \textit{ειδομεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια}).\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>a b c d f ff</th>
<th>i k l q r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D W&amp;H^mg</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>dAugustine</td>
<td>geo^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\textsuperscript{14} Using the Lexicon.

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

\textsuperscript{16} Absent witnesses: P45 P84 P88 P 33 e n t.

\textsuperscript{17} Augustine (\textit{De consensu evangelistarum} 4.5), CSEL 43, 398.
According to D.05 John said: διδασκαλε ειδαμεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον (“Teacher, we saw someone in your name driving out demons who does not follow with us, and we tried to stop him”). This sentence is well constructed: the impersonal τινα is explicated by the phrase οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων, and the last phrase says that the disciples tried to stop that person. Jesus responds: do not stop him. It is evident that the phrases are given in the right order: someone is seen who does not follow with us, we tried to stop him, Jesus replied: do not do that. The evangelist writes the better Greek. The vetus latina followed by Augustine translates μεθ ημων with nobiscum, and understands εκωλυομεν as a perfect tense, not as an imperfectum de conatu. I suppose that both μεθ ημων and εκωλυομεν are presynoptic. The phrase qui nobiscum non it in geo is equivalent to ακολουθει μεθ ημων (see sy8 and sy9 hereafter sub 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν</th>
<th>και εκωλυομεν αυτον</th>
<th>λ (exc 118)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν</td>
<td>και εκωλυομεν αυτον</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus illum</td>
<td>c ff²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>b r²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>gat il vg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>Ps-Jerome²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>r¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qui non sequitur nos</td>
<td>et prohibuimus eum</td>
<td>syhmg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

18 See BDF § 326. Nor as a plusquamperfectum.
21 Literally: and does not go behind us (so Baarda, by email).
Like the Latin translators reading 3 interprets έκωλυομεν not as an *imperfectum de conatu*, with no indication as to whether the act is momentary or not: έκωλυσαμεν, we forbade him, we stopped him. Codices W 565 change ακολουθει into ηκολουθει, he was following (or he had been following). Minor changes: ημιν ex errore 346, οστις loco οσ 2542.  

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

Also in reading 5 the aorist εκωλυσαμεν of reading 3 does not indicate whether the act is momentary or not: we forbade him. The words μεθ ημων in 1342 (cfr sa bo eth) may be a reminiscence of Luke.

οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν
οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων
οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν μεθ ημων και εκωλυσαμεν – – – – – οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν

Reading 6 combines οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον of reading 3 with οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν of readings 4 and 5. This artificial and conflate reading of A Π is found in 1391 witnesses. Again μεθ ημων in Φ and Basil may be a reminiscence of Luke 9:49. Minor change: omission of αυτον in Bas. The phenomenon homoioiteleuton is found in 122 witnesses. In addition to φ124 I mention explicitly 131 174 c349 π1816. Likewise in an artificial and conflating way syh*** adds οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν to reading 2.

οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν

Finally, some critical editions provide in this part of the verse the byzantine text (with εκωλυσαμεν instead of εκωλυσαμεν and ηκολουθει instead of ακολουθει of TR). These are Tis8 Wss Nes3-25 Mrk.

After this survey of the succession of readings the following summary may be given.

1 οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον
D a d k Aug geo1 W&Hmg
2 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον
λ b c ff² gat i l (q) r¹ r² vg Ps-Jer syhmg arm geo2 Tis7 Sod Bov Sou BOC HGr

26 Basil the Great (Moralia – Regula 19.2), PG 31, 736: ειδομεν τινα εν τω ονοματι σου εκβαλλοντα δαιμονια οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυσαμεν οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν.
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3 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον
(W 565) X φ (υμιν 346) 28 700 1241 (σι424 (οσ τιο 2542)

4 και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν
κ Β (L, Ψ 0274 892, 2427) ΔΘ f δ sy σ yth W&H Vog UBS Nol N28

5 και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν
C 579 1071 (1342) sa bo

6 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ημιν
A Μ Ν Υ Σ (φ) 0211 3 p ε ω 118 157 2193c plurimi (Bas) syh got TR
(homtel φ124 131 174 σ349 π1816)

7 οσ ουκ ακολουθει ημιν και εκωλυσαμεν αυτον οτι ουκ ηκολουθει ημιν
Tis8 Wss Nes4-28 Mrk

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

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

The second reading (family λ and several old versions) with ακολουθει ημιν is found in Tis7 Sod Bov Sou BOC HGr. It is preferred by Taylor, Cranfield, and likewise by Ernst Haenchen (1966:327): “Die Worte ‘weil er uns nicht folgt’ (Nes17) könnten ein späterer Zusatz sein.” The third reading, found in (W 565) X φ 28 700 1241 1424 (2542), with εκωλυσαμεν instead of εκωλυομεν, is not found in any modern critical edition. The transposition of the two phrases in the fourth reading (κ Β (L) etc) is followed by W&H Vog UBS Nol N28. This means that the new Nestle (SQE15 UBS4 N28’) follows W&Hext, and not the conjectural emendation of the old Nestle. The text behind the versions (f z δ) is not certain. The fifth reading (C 579 1071 (1342)) provides εκωλυσαμεν (as in reading 3). The artificial sixth reading has been composed out of readings 3 and 5 (conflation). The likewise artificial seventh reading seems to be a conjectural emendation of reading 6, with εκωλυομεν instead of εκωλυσαμεν and ηκολουθει instead of ακολουθει.28 It is only found in critical editions (since Tis6).

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

Presynoptic  και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησην
Matt 26:74  και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησην
Mark 14:72  και ευθυσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησηον  so κ L (plus εκ δευτερου B) 29
John 18:27  και ευθεωσ αλεκτωρ εφωνησην
Luke 22:60  και παραχρημα ετι λαλουντοσ αυτον εφωνησην αλεκτωρ
Presynoptic  οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον
Mark 9:38 D.05  οσ ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων και εκωλυομεν αυτον
Luke 9:49 P75vid  και εκωλυομεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων 30
Luke 9:49 αfra  et vetabamus illum quia non sequitur nobiscum
Presynoptic  αποδοτε τα του καισαροσ τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Luke 20:25 D.05  αποδοτε τα του καισαροσ τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω
Matt 22:21 D.05  αποδοτε τα --- καισαροσ τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω 31
Mark 12:17 D.05  αποδοτε τα του καισαροσ τω καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω

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

29 και ευθυσ in κ B L 0250 2427 2542 and seven other less known mss. The majority reads ευθεωσ instead of ευθυσ.
31 Accidental loss of του.
32 Nota bene: καισαρ with the article refers to the actual imperator Tiberius.
7. METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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