

B. GRAMMATICAL AND SYNTACTIC COMMENTS

1. v. 3-4. **Οὔτοι ... ἁμαρτιῶν**: The only verb that we can suppose is **εἰσι** after the word **γάρ**. The absence of the verb here is not probationary.
2. v. 7. **ἐλευθέρους**: It must be nominative and not accusative case (ἐλεύθεροι) in order to agree with the participle **καυχώμενοι**, because the subject is the same person.
3. v. 7. **ἄνδραποδώων**: Must be corrected in **ἄνδραποδωδῶν**. **Ἀνδραποδώης ἐπιθυμία** See Gregory of Nissa, Life of Moses, chap. 2, par. 271, v. 2. / John Chrysostom, De Anna, PG. v. 54, p. 658, v. 41.
4. v. 8. **το ἀληθές**: The scribe has missed the accent in **το**. He may wanted to write **τᾶληθές**.
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. **γούν**: need only circumflex without the soft spirit.
6. v. 19. **ὁ Μάρκος**: pleonasm.
7. v. 19. **τα ταυτου**: In **τα** the accent is missed and in **ταυ** the soft spirit, ie. he ought write **τὰ ταῦτου**. But the more probationary was to write **τὰ ἑαυτοῦ**.
8. v. 24. **ἐπιθεῖς**: More probationary was to write **προσθεῖς**.
9. v. 25. **μυσταγωγῆσεν**: 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. **μυσταγωγῆσων** ὁ Μάρκος, which agree to the sense of the phrase. If it depends from **ἠπίστατο**, 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 μιᾶρῶν ... ὑπ' αὐτῶν**: The whole phrase has wrong syntax. It must be: Ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν μιᾶρῶν δαιμόνων ὄλεθρον τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει πάντοτε μηχανώντων ὁ Καρποκράτης διδαχθεῖς.
12. v. 31. **μηχανώντων**: The grammatical form of active voice of the verb was never in use. Only once we find the verb **μηχανῶ**. The usual and probationary is **μηχανωμένων**.
13. v. 32. **ἀπατηλοῖς**: It must be corrected in **ἀπατηλαῖς**.
14. v. 33. **κατεδούλωσεν** or whether **κατεδόλωσεν**? 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 beter 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. ἀπόγραφον: 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 αντίγραφον.
16. v. 34. ο: Must be corrected in ὁ
17. v. 35. βλασφημόν: Must be corrected in βλάσφημον.
18. v. 35. δόξα: Must be corrected in δόξαν.
19. v. 37. ἐξανληται: Must be corrected in ἐξαντεῖται. There is not reason of subjunctive declination. More probatory would be to 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 ἀρητέον suppose to be ἡμῖν. But the words προτείνουσιν αὐτοῖς have the position of dative referent to συγχωρητέον, and so an infinitive is missing (for ex. λέγειν, διατείνεσθαι), from which must depend the phrase εἶναι τοῦ Μάρκου τὸ μυστικὸν εὐαγγέλιον. The sense is: It is not permitted to those who suggest the lies to sustain that this is the secret gospel of Marc.
21. v. 41. ἀληθῆ: More correctly must be τὰληθῆ.
22. v. 44. ἔχοντος ἀρθήσεται: The passage must be completed as follows: τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὁ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται.
23. v. 44. ὁ μωρὸς ἐν σκότει πορευέσθω: Cf. ὁ ἄφρων ἐν σκότει πορεύεται (Ecclesiastes 2, 14, 2).
24. v. 47. ἠρωτημένα: More appropriate would be πρὸς τὰ ἠρωτημένα or τοῖς ἐρωτηθεῖσιν.
25. v. 56. ἀπ' ἐκύλισε instead of ἀπεκύλισε
26. v. 61. ἐπέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς: An infinitive as object of ἐπέταξεν is missing, eg. ἐλθεῖν.
27. v. 67. ουκ: instead of οὐχ
28. v. 69. αὐτὸν: pleonasm

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.