B. GRAMMATICAL AND SYNTACTIC COMMENTS

1. v. 3-4. Ὡτοι ... ἁμαρτιῶν: The only verb that we can suppose is εἰσί after the word γάρ. The absence of the verb here is not probationary.

2. v. 7. ἔλευθεροι: It must be nominative and not accusative case (ἐλεύθεροι) in order to agree with the participle καυχώμενοι, because the subject is the same person.


4. v. 8. τὸ ἀληθὲς: The scribe has missed the accent in τὸ. He may wanted to write ταληθὲς.

5. v. 13. παραδίδοται: The writing of ο is not clear in the syllabe δο. There seems to be doubts about whether he ought to write παραδίδονται or παραδίδεται.

5a. v. 15. γοὖν: need only circumflex without the soft spirit.


7. v. 19. τὰ ταὐτοῦ: In τὰ the accent is missed and in ταὐ the soft spirit, ie. he ought write τὰ ταὐτοῦ. But the more probationary was to write τὰ ἑαυτοῦ.

8. v. 24. προθείς: More probationary was to write προσθείς.

9. v. 25. μυσταγωγῆσειν: The dependance of the infinitive is unclear. If it depends from the verb προσεπήγαγε, then it must be a participle of the purpose and not infinitive, ie. μυσταγωγήσων ὁ Μάρκος, which agree to the sense of the phrase. If it depends from ἐπιστατοῖ, then the subject is τὴν ἐξήγησιν, that is fully not probationary.

10. v. 27. προπαρεσκεύασεν: It is not clear what is the object of the verb, his Gospel or himself before his death?

11. v. 30-32. Τῶν δὲ μιαρῶν ... ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν: The whole phrase has wrong syntax. It must be: Ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν μιαρῶν δαιμόνων ὀλεθρὸν τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει πάντοτε μηχανώντων ὁ Καρποκράτης διδαχθείς.

12. v. 31. μηχανώντων: The grammatical form of active voice of the verb was never in use. Only once we find the verb μηχανάω. The usual and probationary is μηχανωμένων.

13. v. 32. ἀπατηλοῖς: It must be corrected in ἀπατηλαῖς.

14. v. 33. κατεδούλωσεν or whether κατεδολῶσεν? It is not clear if the scribe has written δο or δου. If it is δο the the word is κατεδόλωσεν, which does not exist in this form, it would be better to write
(κατα)δολιεύσας because the meaning of wiliness agrees to the sense. If it is δου the word is κατεδούλωσεν which is known, but has not to do with the sense of the action.

15. v. 34. ἀπογράφον: This word with the meaning of a copy of book and not of the imitation of a text is very modern. The correct word must be ἀντίγραφον.

16. v. 34. ὁ: Must be corrected in ὃ.

17. v. 35. βλασφημόμον: Must be corrected in βλάσφημον.

18. v. 35. δόξα: Must be corrected in δόξαν.

19. v. 37. ἐξαναλτήται: Must be corrected in ἐξαναλτεῖται. There is not reason of subjunctive declination. More probationary would to be put the preposition ἐκ before the words τοῦ κράματος τούτου, because the sense is that “the dogm emanates from this alloy”, otherwise the use of this verb is inappropriate.

20. v. 38-40: οὐδὲ προτείνουσιν … εὐαγγέλιον: The syntax is very dense. Προτείνουσιν as dative of person referent to εἰκτέον and ἀρνητέον suppose to be ἡμῖν. But the words προτείνουσιν αὐτοῖς have the position of dative referent to συγχωρητέον, and so an infitive is missing (for ex. λέγειν, διατείνεσθαι), from which must depend the phrase ἔχει τοῦ Μάρκου τὸ μυστικὸν εὐαγγέλιον. The sense is: It is not permited to those who suggest the lies to sustain that this is the secret gospel of Marc.

21. v. 41. ἀληθῆ: More correctly must be τἀληθῆ.

22. v. 44. ἔχοντος ἀρθήσεται: The passage must be completed as follows: τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται.

23. v. 44. ὁ μωρὸς ἐν σκότει πορεύεται: Cf. ὁ ἄφρων ἐν σκότει πορεύεται (Ecclesiastes 2, 14, 2).

24. v. 47. ἠρωτημένα: More appropriate would be πρός τά ἠρωτημένα or τοῖς ἐρωτηθεῖσιν.

25. v. 56. απ᾽ εκύλισε instead of ἀπεκύλισε

26. v. 61. ἐπέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς: An infinitive as object of ἐπέταξεν is missing, eg. ἐλθεῖν.

27. v. 67. οὐκ: instead of οὐχ

We can divide these observations in two categories.

A) Those which due to the author: Nos 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28 and

B) Those which due to the copist: Nos 3, 4, 5, 14, 15a, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 27

The first category concerns the syntactic and the meaning errors, that Clement would not be possible to make. The second category concerns the wrong
dictation of some words. This phenomenon is frequent in the Byzantine and post Byzantine manuscripts and we can not give particular importance. However, if the scribe generally appears as an experienced and very careful, some of these mistakes show that he had not sufficient knowledge of the language. For. ex. Nos 3, 14, 15a, 19, 27.