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PREFACE

In 1959 I published two articles on the development of the inquiries into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts during the years 1949 to 1959. They were meant to be a sequel to my book published in 1949 with the title *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*.

When I started to study the developments during the last ten years, I soon arrived at the conclusion that so many important discoveries had been made and so many valuable books and articles had appeared that a survey in the form of an article would be impossible. I had to choose the form of a book. In this book the inquiries during the years 1949 to 1969 have been incorporated so as to make it in the real sense of the word a second part of the first *Survey*.

The plan and the contents of this book have been dictated by the inquiries of the last twenty years. This means that some parts of the problem of the Western Text have received much more emphasis than other parts. This might seem to give an unbalanced character to this work. However, a glance at the contents shows that no region where the Western Text was used, has been omitted.

In addition to this we have tried to make this book more than a mere summary of other men’s opinions. In many cases we have added our own contributions to the different problems. Finally, in the last chapter we hope to have offered an original contribution to the question of the origin of the Western Text. But we are obliged to say that this chapter could not have been written but for the findings of so many scholars who have devoted their energies to solving the age-old problem of the

Western Text of the Gospels and Acts.

---

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF JOURNALS AND PERIODICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Journal Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibl</td>
<td>Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>Biblica et Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCO</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTT</td>
<td>Gereformeerde Theologisch Tijdschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>Journal of Bible and Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT</td>
<td>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTS</td>
<td>New Testament Tools and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Oriens Christianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Recherches de Science Religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S and D</td>
<td>Studies and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T and S</td>
<td>Texts and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Theologische Rundschau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Texte und Untersuchungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Vigiliae Christianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vox Theologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZTK</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The inquiries during the years 1949 to 1969 can be divided into two periods of about ten years each. In the first ten years the result of work done in the previous decades was evaluated. This led to an intensive study of the Old Syriac text and a deeper penetration into the riddles of the Caesarean Text. Studies into the Diatessaron had reached their culminating point just a few years earlier and fell into the back-ground.

The second period was dominated by some spectacular discoveries. We only mention the papyri of the Bodmer Collection with large parts of the Gospels of John and Luke, the Syriac commentary of Ephrem on the Diatessaron in the Chester Beatty Collection, the Gospel of Thomas with its many "Words" of Jesus discovered among the important Gnostic writings from Nag Hammadi, and a Coptic Manuscript of Acts with a Western Text.

Textual critics were obliged to fit these discoveries into the picture they favoured of the history of the text. It appeared that this was not always possible. The history of the text in Egypt and Syria seemed to invite a fresh inquiry. This emphasis on the text in Syria and Egypt perhaps led to a lack of interest in the problems of the Latin text and the Caesarean text. In this book, however,

---


Suppl. to Novum Testamentum XXI 1
INTRODUCTION

we hope to show that studies of the Syriac text and the Egyptian text have their bearing upon the Latin text and especially upon the Caesarean text.

In this introduction we may point to some important studies which do not deal with the Western Text in particular but nevertheless touch the problem in one way or another.

First of all we may mention three text-books on textual criticism written by V. Taylor 1, J. H. Greenlee 2, and B. M. Metzger 3. The first two books are clearly meant for the average student. They give a good insight into the material and the practice of textual criticism. The book by Metzger gives valuable observations on the history of textual criticism. Otherwise, the contents of these books are not particular different from those in the text-books written sixty years ago.

We hope below to show something which was already becoming known, namely that the grouping of manuscripts into the four classical types of text which we still find referred to even in the modern text-books, is out of date. This grouping was the result of ideas which can no longer be accepted.

Next, we still get the impression from these books that one can speak about textual criticism without going into the origins of the Gospels. The more we go into the history of the text the more we notice the link between the problems of the text and those of the Gospel origins. In some articles it has been said that when Matthew and Luke incorporated Mark into their Gospels, the Gospel of Mark had already been modified by an occasional or even a thorough rewriting 4. Inquiries into the quotations in the very early ecclesiastical authors show the importance of the period of oral tradition not only for the formation of the Gospels but also for the development of the text 5.

5 E. Fascher, Textgeschichte als hermeneutisches Problem, Halle 1953;
With these text-books we may mention a book written by Kieffer 1. Starting from only a few verses in the Gospel of John, he tries to make a complete assessment of the available textual material and to show internal relationships. The results are forced into the classical types of text. This does not appear a satisfactory procedure. The author has also had to draw general conclusions from a very limited field of research.

A few editions of the Greek New Testament call for our attention. The Nestle-Aland-Editions has added to its apparatus the evidence of the newly discovered papyri, but the text still reflects the well known nineteenth century editions. A new edition of the text and apparatus is to be expected 2. The edition of Merk has given the evidence of the papyri in an appendix. For those interested in the Western text it is good to know that in this edition the evidence of the Diatessaron has been cited in the apparatus 3. The publication of the Greek text of the New English Bible is to be welcomed. It is an eclectic text which shows a great deal of agreement with the Nestle-Aland text. The appendix with notes on variant readings is very useful 4.

The Greek text published by the United Bible Societies serves a particular purpose. It is meant for translators who are presented with readings which are of any importance for our restoring of the original text. This means that only a limited number of variant readings are given in the apparatus. But in order to make a choice, the evidence of the different readings is given as fully as possible. In addition to this the variant readings are grouped according to their claim to be more or less in accordance with the original text 5.

3 Novum Testamentum Graece et Latinum, ed. A. Merk, Roma 1964.
5 The Greek New Testament, ed. by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren, American Bible Society, British and Foreign Bible Society, National Bible Society of Scotland, Netherlands Bible Society,
Although this last edition is also based on the eclectic method, it also provides a text with only a few deviations from Nestle-Aland. This again proves that the nB text is still supposed to contain the greatest percentage of original readings. This, however, is not to say that the text as a whole is identical with the original text.

The joint English and American project to publish a Greek text with the greatest possible number of variant readings has published at last one page of Luke in order to show what the coming edition will look like. This proof sheet was, however, not very favourably received by Aland.

Finally we may mention a concordance of Greek words especially met with in readings particular to the Manuscript D. This work compiled by Yoder is very useful for every student of the Western Text.


In 1939 C. Peters brought together the results of the work by D. Plooy and A. Baumstark in a book entitled: *Das Diatessaron Tatians, seine Überlieferung und sein Nachwirken im Morgen- und Abendland sowie der heutige Stand seiner Erforschung*. They had come to the conclusion that Tatian made use of a fifth source, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and that the Diatessaron had a great influence upon the early versions of the New Testament, in particular on the Old Syriac, the Old Latin, the Armenian and the Georgian version.

These results were far from generally accepted. In 1948 B. M. Metzger summed up the points of view in these words: "A still larger problem which continues to divide scholarly opinion is the extent of the alleged Tatianic influence upon the textual history of the Gospels—a problem which perhaps will never by satisfactorily settled". And more than ten years later L. Leloir, one of the connoisseurs of the Diatessaron, writes about the apocryphal element: "La proportion d'éléments apocryphes dans le Δ (sc. Diatessaron) n’est pourtant pas élevée, si bien qu’un évangile purement apocryphe n’a pu intervenir dans le rédaction du Δ que comme source occasionnelle et secondaire".

These sceptical remarks did not prevent the publishing of a number of very important editions of the Diatessaron. In 1951 the Persian Diatessaron appeared with an Italian translation. Messina, who published this text, had a keen eye for the importance of this

---


2 See KLIJN, Survey, p. 87-110.


text with its parallels with the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Protevangelium of James. However, the order of this Diatessaron is quite different from the other known Diatessara and this poses the question whether this text can be called a Diatessaron or whether it is a compilation of Old Syriac pericopes translated into Persian ¹.

Two years later Leloir published a new edition and a translation of the Armenian version of Ephrem’s commentary on the Diatessaron ². Again two years later after this, he was entrusted with the publication of the original Syriac text of this commentary ³. Textual critics were already indebted to Leloir for these two works but he added to these a summary of quotations from the New Testament in the Syriac and the Armenian text of Ephrem’s commentary with an apparatus of the readings in the Old Syriac translations, the Peshitto, the Armenian translation, quotations in Syriac and Armenian authors, the Latin translations and quota-


tions in Latin authors\(^1\). Finally Leloir published a French translation based upon both the Armenian and the Syriac text\(^2\).

To all this we may add a collection of quotations from the Diatessaron in early Syriac ecclesiastical authors brought together by Ortiz de Urbina\(^3\) and two parts of the edition of the Liège Diatessaron by Dr. A. H. A. Bakker\(^4\).

But it is seemed as if all these important publications did not affect the general attitude towards the value of the Diatessaron. We may quote the words of Leloir again as found in his latest work: “Il n’est pas possible, dans l’état actuel de nos connaissances, de déterminer avec une absolue certitude si le Diatessaron a été écrit en Orient ou en Occident, si la langue dans laquelle il est écrit a été le syriaque ou le grec. Pourtant, l’origine syriaque paraît plus probable”\(^5\). This conclusion is in agreement with what can be found in the textbooks. Metzger even deals with the Diatessaron in his chapter on “Patristic Quotations”, but he concludes: “It is doubtless true, however, that not a few instances of harmonisation of the text of the Gospels in certain witnesses (notably the Western witnesses) are to be ascribed to Tatian’s influence”\(^6\).

Now quite unexpectedly the text of the Diatessaron has become the centre of interest since the discovery that this text shows a large measure of agreement with the Gospel of Thomas, one of the writings discovered in Nag Hammadi.

Already before the official publication of the text\(^7\) Quispel had noticed the agreement between a number of logia in the Gospel


\(^6\) Metzger, Text, p. 92.

\(^7\) A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and †Yassah ‘Abd al Masih, The Gospel according to Thomas, Coptic Text established and translated, Leiden-London 1959 (also in Dutch and French editions).
of Thomas, the Diatessaron, the quotations in the Ps. Clementines, fragments of Jewish Christian Gospels and quotations in the work of Justin Martyr. In an article written in 1957 Quispel stated his opinion which has hardly changed during the twelve years following. It amounts to this: Tatian used a fifth source, a Jewish-Christian Gospel, in composing his Diatessaron, which source was also known to Justin and the Ps. Clementines and which influenced the Western Text.

These important conclusions—not only for the Diatessaron but also for the Western Text as a whole—have to be critically reviewed. We may follow up five lines of approach:

1. The Text of the Logia in the Gospel of Thomas and the Text of the Diatessaron

The many agreements between the Logia of the synoptic type in the Gospel of Thomas and the text of the Diatessaron proves that in Syria, where the Gospel of Thomas was written, a particular text of the New Testament existed.

To this general statement we may add a few remarks. The parallels between Ev. Th. and the Diatessara can be explained in several ways. The Diatessaron might depend on the Ev. Th., but this seems improbable, because the parallels are limited to

---


2 Quispel's ideas about the Jewish-Christian Gospels are not clear. Usually he speaks about a Gospel of the Hebrews, but in one of his latest publications he refers to the "'Gospel of the Hebrews' (Nazarenes)". This curious title is probably intended to say that, according to Quispel, some relation exists between the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Nazarenes. But what relation? In his article mentioned in the preceding note he says, p. 191: "... the Nazarene Gospel and the Ebionite Gospel were just recensions of an underlying Gospel of the Hebrews". This is repeated in his "L'Évangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron", in: VC 1959, p. 87-117, p. 116, n. 2, where it is said that the Gospel of the Hebrews is "d'origine araméenne". But in 1967 Quispel writes in his "Makarius, das Thomas-evangelium und das Lied von der Perle", in: Supplement. to NT XV 1967, p. 81, contrary to his earlier statements: "Es ist naheliegend, das Hebräerevangelium für eine erweiternede Übersetzung des Nazaräerevangeliums zu halten".

3 See Quispel, Diatessaron, p. 89-95, and R. Schippers, Het Evangelie van Thomas, Kampen 1960, with a contribution by Tj. Baarda giving a very useful list of witnesses supporting variant readings in Ev. Th.
those of the synoptic type in the Ev. Th. The Ev. Th. might depend on the Diatessaron and this is less improbable though it means that the Ev. Th. must have been written at the end of the second century. This seems rather late. A third possibility is the dependence of both Ev. Th. and Diatessaron on a similar text of the Gospel. This might be a canonical Gospel or an Apocryphal Gospel. Quispel gives some parallels between Ev. Th. and Diatessaron which would show that the two writings are dependent on the same extra-canonical text. These are:

Matth. 5, 11; ... καὶ διώξωσιν...
Luk. 6, 22; ... μισήσωσιν...
Ev. Th. 68; ... when you are hated and persecuted...
Ta¹ 1: ... hate and persecute...
Ps. Clem. Hom. XI 20 2; ... χωρίζοντες, διώκοντες, μισούντες.
XII 29 4; ... διωκόμενοι, μισούμενοι, λοιδοροῦμενοι.
Polyc., ad Phil. 12, 3; ... pro prosequentibus et odientibus.

Both the Ev. Th. and Diatessaron seem to harmonise Matthew and Luke. It appears that this harmonisation is already present in Polycarp and the Ps. Clementines. These last two writings might be using independent Gospel-tradition. But even if they did in these passages, it appears to be absolutely unnecessary to suppose that for this reason Ev. Th. and Diatessaron are using the same or a similar independent source. Harmonising Matthew and Luke seems to be an obvious procedure for Tatian in this passage.

In Ev. Th. 33 we find an interesting parallel with T¹ which reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T¹</th>
<th>Ev. Th.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one sets a light,</td>
<td>for no one lights a lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it is kindled, under</td>
<td>and puts it under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the cornvat, nor under the bed,</td>
<td>a bushel, nor does he put it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor in a hidden place,</td>
<td>in a hidden place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but one sets it on the</td>
<td>but he sets it on a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candlestick, that it may</td>
<td>lampstand, so that all who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light all those that are</td>
<td>go in and out may see the light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the house ³.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ So Baarda, in: Schippers, Het Evangelie van Thomas, p. 155.
² See Quispel, Diatessaron, p. 111-114.
³ Nimen en sett dat licht alst ontfinct es onder dat corenvat noch onder dat bedde noch in ene verborgene stat mar op den candelere so sett ment opdatt lichten sole allen den ghene die int hus syn.
Quispel supposes that the text in the Diatessaron can be explained from a text like that in Ev. Th. The only thing which Tatian had to do was to add part of Mark 4, 21 (under the bed) and adapt the end to the text of Matth. 5, 14.

A close look at the text, however, shows that we are dealing with two quite different traditions which can be traced back to different Gospels. T1 consists of two parts. The first part is the result of a harmonisation of Luk. 8, 16 and Luk. 11, 33. This is apparently the original text of the Diatessaron because the same harmonisation can be found in Aphraates I 24 19-22. The second part has been taken from Matth. 5, 15.1

The text of Ev. Th. appears to be almost identical with Luk. 11, 33 as it is rendered in sye. Here we find:

The only deviation is the reading "nor does he put" l. (or). The end of the passage in Ev. Th. must be a free rendering by the author of this Gospel.

Now that we have been able to point to two different traditions from which the passages in the Diatessaron and Ev. Th. can be explained, it is impossible to suppose mutual dependence. Matters are much more complicated but also much more interesting. We might even suggest that the text in Ev. Th. and in sye was present in a pre-Diatessaron text of the Gospel in Syria.

Finally Quispel points to Ev. Th. 57 and T1. In Ev. Th. a parallel is found with Matth. 13, 25. It shows some deviations from the accepted text which are in agreement with T1:

It is said that the enemy comes "during the night" l. ἐν τῷ νύκτα. Next we find:

he sowed l. ἐποίησεν cum D ek q sySCP sa bo Ir Ta seed l. τοῦ σιτου cum Titus of Bostra.

1 See Plooy, Liège Diatessaron, p. 67.
Undoubtedly these readings are interesting, but we do not see any reason to explain them from an uncanonical text. The source could have been any text of the canonical Gospels.

From these examples it appears that agreement between the Diatessaron and the Ev. Th., whether supported by other witnesses or not, can never be explained from a common use of extra-canonical matter, since it remains possible and it is even conceivable that these writings which originated in the same region, quoted from the same canonical text of the Gospels, a text which many peculiar readings.

The readings Quispel has shown are interesting in so far as they show a curious text of the Gospels in Syria.

2. *The Text of the Logia in the Gospel of Thomas and the Quotations in the Ps. Clementines and Justin Martyr*

The significance of the agreement between these writings is that most scholars agree that both the Ps. Clementines and Justin Martyr quoted from an extra-canonical Gospel tradition. But, as far as we know, it is also true that nobody likes to go so far as to say that these writings show extra-canonical matter only.\(^1\)

For this reason Quispel is making a methodological mistake when he states that those instances where the Ev. Th. agrees with the Ps. Clementines, have been taken from a Jewish-Christian Gospel.\(^2\) This opinion overlooks the difficulty of differentiations between those quotations in the Ps. Clementines which have been taken from the canonical Gospels and those which come from other sources.

It was Strecker who tried to find a rule by which we might decide which quotations were taken from extra-canonical sources. This rule reads:\(^3\):

a) The main variants in a quotation must be available, literally of almost literally, in a non-Clementine text, but it has to be assumed that the one text does not depend upon the other.

---


3 Strecker, o.c., p. 130.
b) The variants in a quotation must not occur in any canonical text and it has to be assumed that the author of the Ps. Clementines is not responsible for this form of the text himself.

If we apply this rule the result usually will be that only agrapha can be accepted as being taken from extra-canonical sources.

It is of course wise that Strecker keeps on the safe side. But still we doubt whether his rule is as safe as it appears to be. The decision whether a passage is canonical or not depends inter alia upon the presence or absence of the passages in our canonical Gospels. This rule could only be applied safely if we knew all the canonical texts. It is possible at any time that a hitherto unknown parallel between the Ps. Clementines and a canonical text may be discovered. At the same time Strecker has to decide that the passage or the reading is no longer extra-canonical. On the other hand Strecker seems to exclude the possibility that both a canonical text and the Ps. Clementines were independently influenced by extra-canonical matter.

From this we see how difficult it is to decide what is canonical and what is extra-canonical. For this reason we abstain from giving general rules and go into some examples given by Quispel 1:

1. Rec. Syr. III 14 7 and Ev. Th. 9: on the road 1. παρά τὴν ὅδον in Matth. 13, 4, Mark 4, 4 and Luk. 8, 5, but ἐπὶ 1. παρά (Mark) cum 1958, 33 827 1241 and (Luke) cum R Te a. Quispel supposes an original εἰς τὸν υἱόν, but it seems unnecessary because harmonisation with the following verse is obvious 2.

: 2. Rec. Lat. VI 13 5: si illi mutuo dant his qui habent unde reddant, nos etiam his demus a quibus recipere non speramus.

Hom. XI 32 I: εὰν δὲ ἐν πλάνῃ δανίζῃ τοῖς ἐχουσιν, ἡμεῖς καὶ τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν.

Ev. Th. 95: If you have money do not lend at interest but give (them) to him from whom you will not receive them (back).

Luk. 6, 34: καὶ ἐὰν δανείσητε παρ’ ὅν ἔπικζετε λαβεῖν . . .

Luk. 6, 35: καὶ δανείζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπιστοκεῖτε.

We notice an agreement in Rec. and Ev. Th., since both show the word “to give”, but cf. da 1. δανείζετε in TP and his qui non

---

2 How obvious appears from W. Bauer, Gr.-Deutsches Wörterbuch, Berlin 1952, p. VIII: “... dass ihre Saatkörner unter die Dornen oder auf den Weg gefallen sind”.

habent 1. μηδὲν ἀπελπὶζοντες cum r\* and et si mutuum dederint alii. . .

in T\* Quispel supposes that Ev. Th. makes the laws found in Ex. 22, 25, Lev. 25, 36-37 and Deut. 23, 19-20, stricter. There it is only said that one is not allowed to give money on interest to a compatriot. Here we find that one has to give without expecting anything back.


Ev. Th. 93: Throw not the pearls to the swine.

Cf. Matth. 7, 6: μαργαρίτας l. μαργαρίτας ὃμοιον cum sy\* pal T\* Chr., Basil. and τοῖς χορφοῖς l. ἐμπροσθέν τῶν χορφῶν cum Tert.

These variants can only prove that somewhere a text existed deviating from the text we accept in our modern editions.


Rec. Lat. IV 35 5: . . . ad coenam . . .

Ev. Th. 64: . . . he had prepared the dinner (δεῖπνον) . . .

Quispel points to Matth. 22, 1-4 where there is spoken of γάμοι.

The deviation he explains from an original ΜΗΝΗΣΥΣ. It seems more likely that Ev. Th. knew Luk. 14, 16-24.


Ev. Th. 22: A city built on a high mountain (and) fortified.

Pap. Ox. I: πόλις φιλοδομημένη ἐπὶ ἄκρον δροὺς ψυχλοῦ καὶ ἑστηριγμένη.

Matth. 5, 14: . . . πόλις . . . ἐπάνω δροὺς κειμένη.

The reading "built" is known from sy\* T\* Aug Hil, and "fortified" we also find in T\*. The variants are interesting, but we can only repeat what we said in 3.


Ev. Th. 40: . . . without the Father . . .

Matth. 15, 13: ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ὀφράνος.

Cf. om. μου in ff\* and Ephrem.

om. ὁ ὀφράνος in Cypr.

It is far-fetched to suppose a basic ΜΟΝ. In Matthew we meet πατὴρ with and without μου (18, 35 and 23, 9).


Ev. Th. 16: Men possibly think that I have come to throw peace upon the world (κόσμος) . . . I have come to throw divisions upon the earth, fire, sword, war (πόλεμος).

1 Quispel uses the Greek text of the Syriac translated by W. FRANKENBERG, "Die Syrischen Clementinen mit Griechischen Paralleltext", in: TU 48, 3 1937.
Matth. 10, 34: μὴ νοµίστητε ὅτι ἔλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· ὦν ἔλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἄλλα μάχαιραν.

Luk. 12, 51: δοξεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενοµένην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχὶ, λέγω ὑµῖν, ἄλλῃ διαµερισµῷ.

Quispel explains the word πόλεµος in Rec. and Ev. Th. from an original בֵּית being both “war” and “sword” in Syriac. But this possibility in the Syriac language does not imply “une tradition, d’origine arameenne, qui ne s’identifie pas avec Q”.

8. Ev. Th. 39: The Pharisees and the Scribes have received the keys of knowledge, they have hidden them. They did not enter and they did not let those (enter) who wished.

Matth. 23, 13: Οὐκὶ δὲ ὑµῖν, γραµµατεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι κλείσετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐµπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑµεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχοµένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.

Luk. 11, 52: Οὐκὶ ὑµῖν τοῖς νοµικοῖς, ὅτι ἔρατε τὴν κλείσα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχοµένους ἐκκυλήσατε.

Cf. The Pharisees and the Scribes l. γραµµατεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι (Matth.) and τοῖς νοµικοῖς (Luk.) in Luk. 11, 53 in D lat.

have received l. ἔρατε (Luk.) cum 1604, cf. Rec. Syr. I 54 7: ὁµαδύκα ἁκάκα the keys l. τὴν κλείσα (Luk.) cum Just q sy ao Te e a.

add. they have hidden them, cf. Θ: εὑρύφατε ἔρατε and εὑρύφατε l. ἔρατε cum D 157 lat sy ao Te e a.

and who wished to enter l. τοὺς εἰσερχοµένους (Matth. and Luk.) cum Hom. III 18 3, cf. in Matth. βουλοµένους l. εἰσερχοµένους cum 1093.

Quispel explains the variant reading λαµβάνειν and αἴρειν from the Syriac word. This Syriac word, like the Aramaic equivalent ἄφεν can be translated by both words. Quispel, however, rightly supposes that an original ἄφεν is more in agreement with the context. But this can not be translated “to take away”. For this reason Quispel writes: “il n’est pas absolument exclu que ἄφεν ait déjà remplacé ἄφεν dans une source, orale ou écrite, arameenne”.

We may relegate this remark to the realm of imagination.

9. Rec. Syr. and Lat. II 28 3 and Ev. Th. 54 read the words “kingdom of Heaven” l. “Kingdom of God” in Luk. 6. 28. This kind of variant reading is quite common in textual tradition.


---

1 Quispel, Clémentines, p. 189.
2 Quispel, Clémentines, p. 190.
76 that the merchant was "prudent". This variant reading is also to be found in the Biography of Rabula.

These examples are very interesting. They show some peculiar readings found in a number of writings which are all of them related with Antioch or Edessa. But none of these variant readings need be explained by extra-canonical influence. They are readily explained by a particular Gospel text in Syria.

We may add to this list four passages where Strecker and Quispel agree that we are dealing with extra-canonical material.


Just., *Dial. 101 2*: εἰς ἑστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὦφρανοις.

Matth. 19, 17: εἰς ἑστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς.


2. *Hom. III 57 1*: γίνεσθε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὦφρανοις δικαίος ἀνατέλλει τὸν Ἱλιουν ἑτερολογεῖ τινὰ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ πονηροῖς καὶ φέρει τὸν ὑπότον ἐπί δικαίος καὶ ἀδίκοις.

We find Luk. 6, 36 together with Matth. 5, 45. The same we find in Just., *Apol.* I 15 13 and *Dial.* 96 3. We have the following variant readings in *Hom.* and Justin from Luk. 6, 36:

ἀγαθοὶ (Just. χρηστοὶ) καὶ οἰκτίρμονες λ. οἰκτίρμονες ὡς λ. καθός cum Just. *Hom.* 700 Or Did Ath Chr ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τ. οὐρ. (Hom.) and ὁ πατ. ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος (Just. *Dial.*)

l. ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν cf., however, ἐκ 483 954 Bas.

ὅς l. ὅτι (Justin partic.) cum 372 latsy T1 Or Ir Tert Hil ἐπὶ πον. κ. ἀγαθ. (Hom.) l. ∞ cum latsy sa Or Tert T1.

We can compare φέρει τὸν ὑπότον with T1: "and makes his rain fall", Aphraates and the Syriac version: ܡܡܓܓܓܓܐܝܝܝܝܐܝܝ. This may be the second part of the reading beginning with "His sun let shine" as in T1 sy and Aphr.

3. *Hom. XVIII 4 2 and Just., *Apol.* I 63 3*: οὖδεὶς ἐγνώ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ ὑδός, cf. Matth. II, 27. The variant reading ἐγνώ I. ἐπιγνώσκω and τὸν πατ. . . . υἱός l. ∞ can be found in ecclesiastical authors.

4. Finally we add the reading only found in Strecker4. Both

---

1 *Quispel, Diatessaron*, p. 100 and *Strecker, o.c.*, p. 131.
2 *Quispel, Diatessaron*, p. 99, and *Strecker, o.c.*, p. 131, but a survey of the entire attestation in *Bellinzoni, o.c.*, p. 8-14.
3 *Quispel, Diatessaron*, p. 99-100, and *Strecker, o.c.*, p. 132, see again Bellinzoni, o.c., p. 25-28.
Hom. XIX 2 5 and Just., Dial. 76 5 have put together Matth. 25, 30 and 25, 41: ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, δὴ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτῶν.

The second part shows some agreement with 25, 41 in D fam. I 22 it ἠτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ μου.

Not all these examples are interesting for textual criticism. The third one might have been taken from an extra-canonical source, but this source probably did not influence the text of the Gospels. Numbers 2 and 4 are very interesting because here passages have been put together by different authors in the same way. This can hardly have come about accidentally. They might have been circulating in this way outside the canonical text, but ultimately it seems probable that the passages originated from the canonical Gospels.

It is this harmonising material which we continuously meet from the time of the Apostolic Fathers onward. Recent investigators like Strecker, Köster and Bellinzoni agree that this material might have been known in an oral form, but that it has come down from canonical Gospels. The variant readings which agree with manuscripts known to us might have already been available in the canonical text of that time, but it is also possible that the oral tradition in its turn influenced the canonical text.

3. The supposed Semitic influence in the Gospel of Thomas and the Witnesses to the Western Text

The explanation of variant readings from a supposed Semitic original has been widely applied. Modern research in this field goes back to A. J. Wensinck and has been continued by M. Black. The evaluation of these variant readings appears to be difficult. Black says that in “‘the Bezan redaction’ more of the primitive ‘Aramaized’ Greek text has been left unrevised than in the redaction... by the Vatican and Sinaitic Uncials”. This would mean that variant readings which show Semitic idiom have a serious claim to be original. But Black says on the same page that in particular “the Old Syriac has been influenced at its source by an extra-canonical and apocryphal Gospel tradition of the sayings

---

2 See KLIJN, Survey, p. 146-150.
of Jesus .’’) 1. This means that Semitic idiom points to a secondary
text, being influenced by and outside-source. Who is able to decide
on the question whether we are dealing with a ‘‘primitive ‘Aramaiz-
ed’’ Greek text’’ or with a reading that ‘‘has been influenced . . .
by an extra-canonical . . . Gospel tradition’’ 2? An other difficulty
is that we cannot always say whether we are dealing with Aramaisms
or the influence of the Syriac language.

In the list given under b. we have pointed to the difficulties
with regard to the supposed influence of an Aramaic original in the
examples 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8. In addition Quispel gives another group
of about 13 cases where the ‘‘tradition araméenne’’ would be
visible 3. We may say that there are none of these which can not
be explained from the Syriac 4.

How careful we have to be can be shown by one striking example.
Guillaumont points to the reading in Pap. Ox 1: νηστεόν τὸν
κόσμον 4. This reading is unusual in Greek. The parallel in Ev. Th. 27

Guillaumont shows that both τὸν κόσμον and ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου
can be found in Liber Graduum. This means that in Syria the legion
circulated in the form it is met with in the Coptic and in the Greek
version of Ev. Th. Guillaumont accepts that the more difficult
reading in the Greek version is the oldest one. He supposed an
original Aramaic ¸šµì but adds: ‘‘Nous n’avons pas d’autre
exemple à alléguer avec un complément; mais elle nous paraît
tout à fait possible’’ 5. The retranslation into Aramaic is purely
guess-work! But Quispel says: ‘‘Guillaumont führt das (sc. τὸν
κόσμον) zurück auf den aramäischen Ausdruck ]מwaves ‘fasten von’’ .
And he goes on: ‘‘Daraus muß man schließen, daß das Thomas-
evangelium eine aramäische Quelle benutzt hat’’. 6 A less prob-
able argument for an Aramaic source is hardly possible to
imagine.

2 Quispel, Diatessaron, p. 115.
3 Cf. Baarda, in: Schippers, o.c., p. 155: ‘‘Het is ons namelijk gebleken
dat de tekst van de Koptische Thomas niet teruggaat op een (West-)Aramees,
maar een Syrisch exemplaar’’.
4 A. Guillaumont, ‘‘ΝΗΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟΝ’’, in: Bulletin de
L’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale 61 1962, p. 15-23.
5 Guillaumont, art. c., p. 21.
6 Quispel, Maharis, p. 21.

Suppl. to Novum Testamentum XXI
4. The Agreement between the Gospel of Thomas and Witnesses to the Western Text

Quispel has drawn up a very interesting list with readings found both in the Ev. Th. and the witnesses of the Western Text. None of these can claim to prove extra-canonical influence on the text of the Ev. Th. or the Western witnesses. These variant readings only prove that the text in some Western witnesses was known in Syria, something we knew already from the Diatessaron.


Up to now we have failed to discover any trace of direct influence by extra-canonical tradition on the text of the New Testament. We do not say that it is not possible in the cases we dealt with, but that we have no way to prove it. There are two reasons for our failure. We have an imperfect knowledge of the oldest text in regions where the influence of extra-canonical material on the text can be supposed, and we have an equally imperfect knowledge of the extra-canonical matter itself. For this reason we must now go into the small bits of evidence of what is left of this extra-canonical matter.

This is available in some fragments of Jewish Christian Gospels. We give a list of those passages which show agreement with the canonical text of the New Testament. They are found in Hennecke, where Vielhauer splits up the fragments into three groups, those drawn from


The Gospel of the Ebionites. Written in Greek at the beginning

---

1 G. Quispel, "L'Évangile selon Thomas et le 'Texte Occidentale' du Nouveau Testament", in: VC 14 1960, p. 204-215. In the list we find 84 variant readings supported by Western witnesses. It is striking that 27 of them are supported by sa and bo. This strikingly agrees with the results gained by K. H. Kuhn, "Some Observations on the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas", in: Le Muséon 73 1960, p. 317-323, and W. Schrage, "Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen", in: Beih. ZNW 29 1964. This work clearly shows that the Coptic Ev. Th. was influenced by the Coptic translation of the New Testament. See also Reviews by A. F. J. Klijn, in: NT 7 1965, p. 329-330, H. Quecke, in: Le Muséon 78 1965, p. 234-239, and R. McL. Wilson, in: VC 20 1966, p. 118-123.

The Gospel of the Hebrews. Written in Greek at the beginning of the second century in Egypt. The relation with the canonical Gospels is hard to determine.

From the available fragments Vielhauer ascribes 36 fragments to the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 7 to the Gospel of the Hebrew and 7 to the Gospels of the Ebionites.

The main difficulty in evaluating the agreement between the fragments and the canonical text of the Gospels is our realisation that the Jewish-Christian Gospels apparently used one or more of the canonical Gospels.

1. Epiphanius, Pan. 30 12 4: καὶ τὸ βρόμω μύτῳ μέλι ἁγιόν οὖ ἡ γεύσις ἡ τοῦ μάντα, ὡς ἔγκρις ἐν ἐλαύῳ.

This passage shows agreement with the text of Mark 1, 4 in Tª.

2. Epiphanius, Pan. 30 13 7-8: The passage speaks about the baptism of Jesus in which it is said: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιὸν ἐν εἴδει περιστρέφει ἐν τῷ πνεύμα ὡς περιστρέφει (Mark 1, 10, cf. Matth. 3, 16: ὡς περιστρέφειν καὶ Λουκ. 3, 22), cum Just., Dial. 88 4 and 8 and syº. Next we find ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε ἡ ἐκτὸς ἐστιν . . . ὁ ἀγαπητός cum D a b c f1 Just., Dial. 88 8, Clem Or in Luk. 3, 22. Finally: καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα, cf. Just., Dial. 88 3: καὶ πῦρ ἀνίψθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ; a g1: et cum baptizaretur (g1 add. Iesus) lumen ingens (g1 magnum) circumfulsit (g1 fulgeb) de aqua . . . and Tª Ischoed, Barsalibi, Ps. Cypr., de Rebapt. 17.

3. Jerome, Contra Pel. III 2 4 . . . quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizabar eo . . ., cf. Ev. Th. 104: which then is the sin that I have committed . . . .


---


2 Vielhauer, o.c., p. 103: Gospel of the Ebionites.

3 Vielhauer, o.c., p. 103: Gospel of the Ebionites.


6 Vielhauer, o.c., p. 107: Gospel of the Hebrews.
L’Esprit qui reposa sur lui pendant son baptême... L’Esprit descendit et se reposa que sur un seul...

5. Cod. N.T. 566 ad Matth. 4, 5⁵: ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἦν τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν cum T₁.


7. Cod. N.T. 1424 ad Matth. 11, 25 ³: εὖχαριστῶ σοι

l. έξωμολογοῦμαι σοι cum T₁ v e Marcion Tert (Luk. 10, 21).

8. Jerome, Comment. in Matth. 12, 13 ⁴: Caementarius eram manibus victam qua..., cf. T₁ (c. 87): so that he could not work with it ⁵.

9. Epiphanius, Pan. 30 14 5 ⁶:

a) ίδον ἢ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἐξω ἐστήκασιν

b) τίς μοῦ ἔστιν μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοὶ

c) καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τούς μαθητὰς ἔφη

d) οὗτοι εἶσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφαὶ οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου.

Cf. for a) Luk. 8, 20: ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἐστήκασιν ἐξο, but ίδον a. ἡ μήτηρ cum 999; ἐξω ἐστήκασιν 1. ∞ cum D 213 c e Marcion Bas Acta Arch.⁸

Cf. for b) Matth. 12, 48 and Mark 3, 33: τίς ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ (τίνες εἴσαν om. Mark) οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου, but in Mark om. ἡ in 213 346 543 700 2145; om. μου² in W 291 700; om. μου² in B D arm.

Cf. for c) Matth. 12, 49: καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τούς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔπεν, but om. αὐτοῦ p. χεῖρα cum D 1574 multi; om. αὐτοῦ² in Δ vg Chr; ἔφη l. ἔπεν cum 349 517 954 1675.

---

¹ VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 95: Gospel of the Hebrews.
² VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 96: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
³ VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 96: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
⁴ VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 96: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
⁵ so dat hire nit met en mochte.
⁶ VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 103: Gospel of the Ebionites.
⁷ The plural is in agreement with the words of “Our Father” in sy² (Matth. 6, 10) and many Syriac Liturgies. See also L. E. WRIGHT, Alterations of the Words of Jesus as quoted in the Littérateur of the second Century, Cambridge (Mass.) 1952, p. 92-93.
Cf. for d) Matth. 12, 50: ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτὸς μου ἄδελφος καὶ ἄδελφή καὶ μήτηρ and Luk. 8, 21: μήτηρ μου καὶ ἄδελφοι μου οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ πιστεύοντες, but Ĥ. μήτηρ cum 597 multi; om. μου ¹
12. Origen, Comment. in Matth. XV 14:

a) Dixit . . . ad eum alter divitum: magister, quid bonum faciens vivam? Dixit ei: homo, legem et prophetas fac.

b) respondit ad eum: feci. Dixit ei: vade, vendae omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus, et veni, sequere me . . .

c) Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum . . .

d) Simon, fili Ionaee, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus quam dividet in regnum coelorum.

Cf. for a) Matth. 19, 16-17, Mark. 10, 17-18 and Luk. 18, 18-19, but dixit ad eum l. αὐτῶ εἶπεν (Matth.) cum K Ç W alii, dixit illi in a; add. πλούσιος in Mark in A K M W Θ II fam. 13 georg syhmg arm sa; τί ποιήσας in Matth. in Β L 28 33 157 and τί ποιών in Luk. in ¹ 13 t 209 a aur d f vg.

Cf. for b) Matth. 19, 20-21, Mark 10, 20-21 and Luke 18, 21-22, but ἄποκριθείς εἶπεν l. ἔφη (Mark) in K A D fam. l fam. 13 sy⁸ p and ἄποκριθείς ἔφη in C, cf. also respondit ait in aur b c f and respondit dixit in a ff² q f; feci l. ἐφυλαξάμην (Mark) in fam. l 565 sy⁸ georg arm; omnia quae possides l. σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα (Matth.) in f ff¹ sy⁸; divide l. δόξ (Mark) in k a and fam. 13; om. καὶ ἔξεις . . . οὐρανοῖς (Matth.) in sy⁸.

Cf. for d) Matth. 19, 24, Mark 10, 25 and Luk. 18, 25, but in regnum coelorum l. εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ (Matthew) in Z fam. l 33 lat sy⁸c and (Mark) sy⁸c; intrare per foramen l.— (Matth. and Luk.) in sy⁸c and (Mark) in sy⁸.

We also may refer to Ephrem, Comment. in Diat. XV 1, where a dives asks: Quid faciam ut vivam, and answers: Factum est a me hoc. Aphraates reads: Et diviti illi . . . et ait ei . . . Autem ei homo ille: Haec feci a iuventute mea . . . Vene, vendae omnia quae habes. Aphraates

² Vielhauer, o.c., p. 96: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
omits ἔξεις... οὐράνος and reads Facilius est intrare camelum. It is striking that we find the reading alter divitum. One may suppose that another story about a rich man preceded. In T¹ and Tⁿ this pericope is really preceded by Luk. 12, 13-21 and followed by Luk. 16, 14-15 and 19-31. This means that we have three stories about riches one after the other ¹).


14. Jerome, de vir. ill. 16, cf. In Is. XVIII praef. and Origen, de princ. I, proem. 8: ... non sum daemonium incorporale, see Luk. 24, 39. Also in Tⁿ and Titus of Bostra IV 37⁴.

15. Jerome, Comment. in Matth. 27, 16⁵: βαρβαβαύ l. βαρβαβαύ cum 69 g² syhmg.

16. Jerome, Comment. in Ez. 18, 7⁶: ... inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratur sui spiritum contristaverit. Liber Graduum V 9, VII 1, XI 19, XXVII 6, shows the same reading ?.

From this list a few interesting conclusions can be drawn. First of all it appears that most parallels with Jewish-Christian Gospel-fragments are met with in one or more versions of the Diatessaron (4, 5, 8 and 11). This does not mean that the variant readings were not present in some tetraevangelium. In 7, for example, we have an interesting agreement with Marcion. This last case renders impossible the simple conclusion that Tatian used a Jewish-Christian Gospel. Tatian may have used a Gospel-text which was influenced by Jewish-Christian Gospels. But it is also possible that a particular text of the Gospels both influenced the Diatessaron and the Jewish-Christian Gospels. This possibility provides a very good explanation of those agreements where a number of manuscripts are involved (6, 9, 10 and probably 15). Three parallels can be found only in Ev. Th. and Liber Graduum. We do not exclude the possibility that a Jewish-Christian Gospel or extra-canonical

---

² VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 99: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
⁴ See also KLIJN, Survey, p. 103-105.
⁵ VIELHAUER, o.c., p. 97: Gospel of the Nazarenes.
⁷ QUISEP, Hebrews, p. 374.
Gospel-tradition had a direct influence on these writings (3, 13 and 16) ¹.

Two cases call for our special consideration (2 and 12). Early Christian witnesses show a wide acquaintance with the readings in 2. It is of course possible that both Tatian and Justin were separately influenced by a Jewish-Christian tradition. It seems, however, much simpler to suppose that certain very ancient traditions influenced the text of the canonical Gospels which were used by Tatian, Justin and the Jewish-Christian Gospels. Example 12 shows some very interesting agreements between a Jewish-Christian Gospel and traditions in Syria. Here also the possibility of a particular text of the Gospel having influenced the Jewish-Christian Gospel and the Diatessaron cannot be excluded. But in this case we see that both the Jewish-Christian Gospel and the Diatessaron may bear witness to the same order of pericopes. This can hardly have been brought about accidentally. Here we cannot avoid the presumption that extra-canonical influence is the cause of Tatian’s order of pericopes 1.

From this it appears how difficult it is to prove extra-canonical influence on the text of the Gospels. Even agreement with the fragment of the Jewish-Christian Gospels does not prove this influence. The reason for this conclusion is that we do not know very much of the canonical text of the Gospels in the area where we notice the agreement and that we must not forget that the Jewish-Christian Gospels made use of one or more of the canonical Gospels themselves.

But even if this last difficulty is absent, we cannot draw final conclusions. This is shown by the quotations in Ignatius. Smit Sibinga gives a few examples of passages where Ignatius obviously draws from an extra-canonical source. This was probably the source that Matthew used in composing his Gospel. We cite the following examples 2:

Ignatius, Rom. VI 1: οι βασιλείαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου l.
Matthew 6, 8 τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου cum sy: οι βασιλείαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου l.

1 See also the cumbrous way to show an extra-canonical reading in the Diatessaron-text of Luke 7, 43 in W. Henß, “Das Verhältnis zwischen Diatessaron, christlicher Gnosis und Western Text’”, in: Beih. ZNW 33 1967, and Review by G. Quispel in: NTT 22 1967/68, p. 139-140.

THE DIATESSARON

Smyrn. X 1: οὗ μὴ ἀπολεῖται l.
Matthew 10.42 οὗ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ cum D it sy voc bo
Eph. XVIII 1: ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς l.
Mark 14, 3 αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς in B or κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς in A etc., cum D lat. sy vo sa bo, but cf. Mat. 26, 7.
Smyrn. VI 1: ὁ χωρέων χωρείτω, cf.
Matthew 19, 12 ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω and
Mark 4, 9 ἔχει ὡτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω, but D it syms add. ὁ συνίων συνέτω.

We do not think that these cases are very convincing and we might even suppose that some of the examples are purely accidental. But even if the Western witnesses show agreement with a pre-Matthean text it remains an open question whether these Western witnesses give the original text which was altered in the other manuscripts or whether the Western witnesses were influenced by the pre-Matthean text.

We mentioned our lack of knowledge with regard to the canonical text in the Syriac area. To get some idea of this text we point to two writings: The Epistula Apostolorum and the Gospel of Peter. In both cases we are dealing with a pre-Tatianic text and in both cases we have a text which made use of the canonical Gospels. But in both writings we find the most striking agreement with the text of the Diatessaron and the Old Syriac. For the Epistula Apostolorum we may refer to:

3 (14) lust des Fleisches l. θελήματος σαρκὸς (John 1, 13) cum T
5 (16) lud ihn ein cf. invitatius l. vocatus (John 2, 2) cum b r, see also vs 1 add. mater . . . invita in a ff I
5 (16) Menschengedränge l. ὑγιὸν (Mark 5, 31) and οἱ ὑγιοί (Luk. 8, 45), but “the crowds of the people” in T and turbae hominum in Ephrem.

We do not repeat the numerous examples of agreement with the Gospel of Peter and the Old Syriac text given by the present writer. All of them show that before 150 in Syria a text existed which in many cases showed agreement with Tatian’s Diatessaron.

---

2 See Plooij, Lige Diatessaron, p. 133.
We can be sure that this was the same text used by the composers of the so-called Jewish-Christian Gospels. This text deviated widely from the text which we—for the sake of convenience—call the "neutral text". The reason may be that the text in Syria—and we think in particular of the text in Antioch—grew up in an environment with a lively Gospel tradition. We may suppose a mutual influence of written and oral Gospel traditions. Particularly we may suppose a continuous effort to harmonise and to bring together these traditions, a procedure we know of from our canonical Matthew and Luke. As far as we can speak with confidence of the fragments of the Jewish-Christian Gospels we again and again find harmonisations. The same applies to quotations in the Apostolic Fathers, the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron. It is not the variant readings but these harmonisations and the conflating of verses which strikes us. If we, therefore, give our opinion with regard to the Jewish-Christian Gospels, the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron, we consider all these writings as products of the way in which the Gospel tradition was handled. Because of the way this was done they were bound to bring together what we call canonical matter, viz. our canonical Gospels, and extra-canonical tradition. For this reason we believe that the place of origin of most of the readings in the Western text was a place where Gospel tradition was not limited to written Gospels, but where written and oral tradition had the same rights.

1 A fine example of early harmonisation we find in Did. 1, 4-5 with parallels in Matth. 5, 39 (cf. Luk. 6, 20a); Matth. 5, 41; Luk. 6, 29b (cf. Matth. 5, 40); Luk. 6, 30 (cf. Matth. 5, 42), see H. Köster, "Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern", in: TU 65 1957, p. 227-228. Aphraates IX 6 (Matth. 5, 39; Matth. 5, 41; Luk. 6, 29b) and Liber Graduum II 2 (Matth. 5, 39; Matth. 5, 41; Luk. 6, 29b) are in striking agreement with the Didache. It is not acceptable that the Diatessaron depends on the Didache (cf. G. Dix, "Didache and Diatessaron", in: JTS 34 1933, p. 242-250, and R. H. Connolly, "Didache and Diatessaron", in: idem, p. 346-347). We suppose that an ancient extra-canonical Gospel tradition influenced both the Didache and the early Syriac authors. In this case we also assume that the extra-canonical material is also pre-canonical, see B. Layton, "The Sources and Transmission of Didache 1.3b-2.1", in: HTR 61 1968, p. 343-383.

2 We do not believe that Edessa was a centre of text-corruption. We rather suppose that it was Antioch. Maybe, corruption found its way from this town to Edessa. We reject the adventurous ideas which appear to be popular to-day that Edessa received the Gospel and the Gospel-tradition from Jerusalem, cf. J. C. L. Gibson, "From Qumran to Edessa or the Aramaic-Speaking Church before and after 70 A.D." in: The Annual of the Leeds Univ. Oriental Society V 1963-1965; H. Köster, "ΤΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟ-
With regard to the Diatessaron some work has been done in the field of the Latin offshoot of this work. Quispel notices some agreement between the Diatessaron and the old Saxon poem called the Heliand. This relation had already been noticed a long time ago, but usually one did not go further than pointing to the agreement with the vulgarized Fuldensis and Amatinus. Now Quispel has drawn some instances into the picture where the Heliand is in agreement with Ev. Th. Not all these instances were acceptable to the Germanist W. Krogmann who doubted whether Quispel was dealing with real variant readings. He explained them from a purely linguistic point of view.¹

For this reason it is to be welcomed that a Germanist J. J. van Weringh has taken up the matter.² He deals with 57 variant readings in the Heliand deviating from the Vulgate. “Most of the readings discussed . . . have been selected from a collection brought together at the Theological Seminar of Utrecht State University under the direction of Prof. Dr. G. Quispel . . .”³ At the end of this study the author gives a list in which we can see the support of the different Greek, Latin and Syriac texts of the New Testament and the Diatessaron as represented by the versions in the West and in the East.⁴ From this list it appears that 21 readings are supported by the Dutch Diatessara only, three readings are supported by the Eastern Diatessara only. This means that 28 variant readings are supported by versions of the Diatessaron in both the West and the East. From these we can withdraw two readings because they are supported by syP. Thus the result is that 26 readings can be considered to be in agreement with the Diatessaron. Van Weringh is justified in saying that the Heliand seems to have used

---

² J. J. van Weringh, Heliand and Diatessaron, Assen 1965, also as Dr. Juw Fon Weringha, “Heliand and Diatessaron”, in: Studia Germanica V, Assen 1965.
³ Van Weringh, o.c., p. 46, n. 226.
⁴ Van Weringh, o.c., p. 133-134.
a text which is related with the Dutch versions of the Diatessaron.

With regard to this study we must remark that not less than 29 from the 57 readings come from Matth. 1 and Luke 1 and 2. We do not know what this means, but Pickering has said that the Heliand probably used Pseudo-Matthew 1. If this is true, the influence of the Diatessaron did not come about directly, but by way of a popular account of Jesus' birth.

We do not think that this study gives us new views on the development of the Diatessaron. It was already known and it has been shown again that the Dutch version of the Diatessaron is related to the Diatessaron composed by Tatian and that the Dutch Diatessaron was popular in certain circles in the Church in the Low Countries.

b) The Syriac Translations

Until about 20 years ago F. C. Burkitt's conclusions with regard to the development of the Syriac text were almost generally accepted. The opinion was that Tatian composed his Diatessaron about 170, that about 200, maybe due to Palut, the four separated Gospels were introduced and that finally about 411 Rabbula made a recension of the Syriac text known as the Peshitto. That something must be wrong in this hypothesis was shown by M. Black who pointed to a Peshitto manuscript with many Old Syriac readings and to the quotations in Jacob of Serug († 521) who uses a text akin to the Old Syriac version. But Black still believed that Rabbula had something to do with the birth of the Peshitto 2.

This last idea has been rejected by Vööbus on numerous occasions. He has shown that "Peshitto-readings" are discernable in the Old Syriac text and that "Old Syriac-readings" are found long after Rabbula 3.

3 A. Vööbus, "Investigations into the Text of the New Testament used by Rabbula of Edessa", in: Contrib. of Baltic Univ. 59, Pinneberg 1947; idem, "Researches on the Circulation of the Peshitta in the Middle of the Fifth Century", in: idem 64 1948; idem, "Neue Ergebnisse in der Erforschung der Geschichte der Evangelientexte im Syrischen", in: idem 65 1948; idem, "The oldest extant Traces of the Syriac Peshitta", in: Le Muséon 63 1950.
This means that the text in Syria shows a gradual growth. Vööbus' work has been generally accepted. But some details are still waiting for clarification. For example, in the Life of Rabbula we read that Rabbula "translated by the wisdom of God that was in him the New Testament from Greek into Syriac, because of its variations, exactly as it was". It was Baarda who tried to shed light on this statement, by investigating the quotations in the "Life". Careful reading yielded a number of quotations and allusions from which conclusions can be drawn. The result is interesting. To some extent Vööbus' views are corroborated. In many cases the text is in agreement with the Diatessaron and the Western texts against sy\textsuperscript{op}. This means that the "Life" shows a very ancient text with readings which have been obviously revised in the well known Syriac manuscripts.

But this conclusion does not hold for John. In quotations from this Gospel the text shows some relation with sy\textsuperscript{op}. From this Baarda draws the conclusion that Rabbula made "a more accurate translation of the passages that were important in the christological discussion among the Edessene clergy".


This study is about the only one which appeared on the Old Syriac translations since Vööbus' work 1.

c) Translations Dependent on the Syriac Version

In 1949 it was already known that the Armenian text shows some relations with the Caesarean text and that in the quotations in ecclesiastical authors a text is found more or less in agreement with the Diatessaron. In a special study devoted to the Armenian text Lyonnet concluded from these quotations that it can be accepted that a Syriac text is the basis of the Armenian translation. Lyonnet is incined to suppose a Syriac Diatessaron as underlying this translation 2.

Vööbus doubted whether a Diatessaron was the first Armenian text of the Gospels. He believed that the readings in agreement with the Diatessaron in the Armenian version can be readily explained from a Syriac tetraevangelium with many more Tatianisms than are known in sya and syc 3.

Lyonnet showed that, as in Syria, an Old Armenian text was only gradually replaced by the later Armenian Vulgate. It is impossible to say in accordance with what kind of Greek manuscript the different revisions took place. The Caesarean readings in the Armenian version may be due to a Caesarean Greek manuscript, but they may also be explained by the underlying Syriac text 4.

The Georgian version shows the same picture as the Armenian version. An Old Georgian text (geo1) with many readings agreeing with the Old Armenian and the Old Syriac and showing Syriasm, has been replaced, probably in the sixth or seventh century, by a

---


text (geo²) which was obviously influenced by some Greek text ¹.

Vööbus considers the Ethiopian text to be a mixed text in which we can discern traces of the Old Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Arabic. The Arabic version was, according to Vööbus, influenced by the Syriac and Coptic version ².

It is clear that all these conclusions are only tentative. We are still used to speaking about the Armenian and the Ethiopian translation but our knowledge only rests upon a very limited number of manuscripts. Literally hundreds and hundreds of manuscripts of these secondary translations are waiting to be collated ³.


CHAPTER TWO

EGYPT

Westcott and Hort knew only one text in Egypt: the Alexandrian Text. Witnesses to this text were, for example, the manuscripts C and L and authors like Origen. This Alexandrian text was supposed to be a recension of the "Neutral Text", which was not a local text but the original text, represented by the manuscripts Φ and B. The Alexandrian text was, according to Westcott and Hort, a good text in comparison with the Western Text and the Syrian Text, because in Egypt the "Neutral Text" happened to be the oldest text.

This supposition had already been challenged by the end of last century when Barnard proved that Clement of Alexandria used a Western Text. This raised the question whether the "Neutral Text" really could be said to be the oldest text in Egypt. How this question was answered can be seen in the books of two leading textual critics in the first quarter of this century.

Lake showed that the existence of a Western Text was not only proved by the quotations in Clement but also by the text of the Sahidic version. For this reason he came to the conclusion that Westcott and Hort underestimated the great antiquity of the Western Text. According to Lake evidence shows that the Western Text "existed in the earliest times of which we have any certain knowledge—both in Syriac, Latin, and Greek speaking circles; in the East, in Africa, in Italy, and in Gaul". To these regions he added Egypt. He stated that "the Neutral text in

Alexandria began at some date between Clement and Origen”. And his final conclusion was that “the B text is merely an early form of the Alexandrian text”\(^1\).

Lake thus relegated the \(\text{\$B}\) text to the rank of one of the local texts in the early centuries of the Church. With this opinion the basis of Westcott and Hort’s history of the text is completely undermined.

Streeter, the other famous textual critic, had to evaluate the same data. He also pointed to the Western readings in Clement and the Sahidic version. He does not deny that Western readings existed in Egypt. He even has an eye for these readings in the manuscript \(\text{\$}, \text{L}, \text{C} \text{and } 33\). He goes so far as to say that actually not one “Alexandrian Manuscript” has escaped the influence of the Western Text. But, unlike Lake, he supposed that this text entered Egypt during a second stage after a time during which a \(\text{\$B}\) text alone was used. According to Streeter, the Western Text might have been introduced by Roman christians. It is true that Clement, the oldest known author in Egypt, used a Western text, but this can be explained by his sojourn in South Italy\(^2\).

We may say that in 1930 these two opinions existed:

1. The Alexandrian Text with \(\text{\$B}\) is secondary and is the result of the revision of a text akin to what is known as the Western Text (Lake).

2. The Alexandrian Text goes back to a text which is best preserved in B. It is a genuine Egyptian text which was influenced by Western readings at a later stage (Streeter).

A few years later \(\text{P}45\) was discovered. The manuscript had to be evaluated in the light of the existing types of text. But Kenyon who published the papyrus with an introduction, admitted that the manuscript did not show any decisive preference for one of the well known types of text, the Neutral, the Alexandrian, the Western or the Byzantine\(^3\). This conclusion could have led to the question whether the classical division of manuscripts is in accordance with the true history of the text. For here was a manuscript which did not fit into anyone of these types. This possibility, however, was immediately not thought of.

---

The reason for this steady adherence to the well known grouping of texts was probably the discovery of a new type of text, the Caesarean Text, to which P45 seemed to belong. Kenyon wrote: “it is clear that the papyrus has a strong affinity with the group which has of late years been identified . . . with the text of Caesarea” 1.

P45 had been added to an existing type of text. The discovery of the papyrus did not make it necessary to change anything in the generally accepted division of the manuscripts into five groups. Because P45 has been assigned to the text of Caesarea, it was no longer even necessary to take it seriously with regard to the history of the text in Egypt!

This last statement held good as long as one believed that the Caesarean Text was the result of a revision which took place in Caesarea. But investigations into the text have shown that the text has to be divided into two groups: a pre-Caesarean Text consisting of P45 2 W fam. 1 28 and fam. 13 and the Caesarean Text proper consisting of Θ 565 700 Origen, Eusebius syg the Old Georgian and the Old Armenian 3. The pre-Caesarean Text was supposed to have had its origin in Egypt 4.

This division posed the question how P45 and the other members of the pre-Caesarean Text had to be fitted into the history of the text in Egypt. The question could have been satisfactorily answered if we had only known something about the origin of the pre-Caesarean Text. We can only say something about the origin, if we know something about the character of a text. And here we hit on the real difficulty of this text: nobody can describe what kind of text the Caesarean really represents. The general opinion can best be given by quoting some words written by Metzger: “The special

1 Kenyon, o.c., p. XV.
4 See Metzger, Caesarean Text, p. 63, and idem, Text, p. 215: “The Old Egyptian text which Origen brought with him to Caesarea may be called the pre-Caesarean text”. 
character of the Caesarean text is its distinctive mixture of Western readings and Alexandrian readings'. It appears that the number of readings in the Caesarean Text which can not be found in any of the other types of text is very small.

This phenomenon immediately raises the question whether this Caesarean Text should not be explained by the influence of an Alexandrian Text on a Western Text or a Western Text on an Alexandrian Text. This alternative view starts from the supposition that these two texts existed at an early date. It is also possible to suppose that originally a text existed with readings now discernable in different types of text. In that case we are not dealing with a "mixed text" but with a pre-recensional text or a "wild" text with all the readings still present in one text which have been distributed over a number of texts at a later stage.

These possibilities remind us of the difference between Lake and Streeter. In general scholars seemed to be inclined to suppose a pre-recensional text at the basis of the Alexandrian ².

Since 1949 the investigation into the Caesarean Text has been directed to the quotations from early Egyptian and Palestinian authors.

The results are interesting because the quotations in Origen ³ and Eusebius ⁴ show the same picture as the text of an early papyrus like P⁴⁵. Side by side we find quotations agreeing with Alexandrian, Caesarean and Western manuscripts. Generally speaking the quotations in Origen show a tendency to support the Alexandrian Text and in Eusebius the Western Text. Nowhere,

---

¹ METZGER, Text, p. 215.
however, do we see these authors consistently following one of the well known types of text. A change occurs, however, when we check the quotations in Athanasius 1, Didymus the Blind 2 and Cyril of Jerusalem 3. Here we meet agreement with the Alexandrian type of text.

The results of all this can be found in the text-books, where the manuscripts from Egypt and the quotations in Egyptian authors are usually divided into four groups: the Western (Clement), the Alexandrian (K B C L etc.), the Caesarean (P45) and the Byzantine (later manuscripts) 4. This division is not satisfactory because it is based on a similarity of readings only. We do not wish to maintain that this similarity is often of only the remotest character, but we must state that this division does not answer vital questions about the chronological or material relationship between these types of text. This means that this grouping does not tell us anything about the most important question of the history of the text in Egypt.

Thus the investigation into the text of Egypt threatened to end

4 See Metzger, Text, p. 214-216, and J. H. Greenlee, Introduction, p. 117. The only one who has tried to offer a fresh division of the manuscripts is M.-E. Boismard. One of the main characteristics of the oldest text and the quotations in the earliest ecclesiastical writers is, according to Boismard, its shortness, see M.-E. Boismard, "A Propos de Jean V, 39. Essai de Critique Textuelle", in: RB 55 1948, p. 5-34; Idem, "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristiques", in: idem 57 1950, p. 381-408; Idem, "Lectio Brevior Potior", in: idem 58 1951, p. 161-168, and Idem, "Problèmes de Critique Textuelle concernant le quatrième Évangile", in: idem 60 153, p. 347 371. This short Text can be found in Tatian, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac version, the Georgian, Persian and Ethiopian version. Apart from this group Boismard supposes a group called B represented by B, Origen, C W L 33 sa and bo and K partially. Next he points to a group called SD which is to be found in D and K partially. Finally we have a group called C, the Caesarean Text. Boismard has distributed the Western witnesses over two groups: the old versional text and the KD-text. The relation between K and D is evident, cf. B. Botte, "Un Témoin du Texte Césaréen de quatrième Évangile: I 253", in: Mém. Bibl. A. Robert Travaux de l’Institut Cath. de Paris 4 1956, p. 466-469. We doubt, however, whether any grouping of manuscripts gives satisfactory results.
in a dead-lock, until the question was reopened by the discovery of two new papyri:

P66 (Bodmer II). This papyrus of the Gospel of John was edited in two parts. In 1956 V. Martin published chapters 1 to 141 and in 1958 chapters 14-212. In 1962 followed a "Nouvelle Édition augmentée et corrigée" with a photographic reproduction by V. Martin and J. W. B. Barns3. In a number of articles corrections have been added to these publications by Barns4, Boismard and Roux5 and Aland6. The manuscript has been dated about 2007.

P76 (Bodmer XIV-XV). This papyrus of the Gospel of John chapters 1 to 15 and Luke chapters 3 to 24, has been edited by V. Martin and K. Kasser8. The manuscript has been assigned to the third century.

The outward appearance of the two manuscripts is quite different. P66 was written by a scribe who tried to produce a faithful text. He does not hesitate to correct his errors, both during his copying of the text, and also after finishing the manuscript. This second correction may have been done by an other person who apparently made use of a manuscript different from the copy from which the scribe originally took the text.

The scribe of P76 was careful and accurate. He copied his text

5 M.-E. Boismard, "Papyrus Bodmer II. Supplément de Jean ... 1962", in: RB 70 1962, p. 120-133.
faithfully without correcting his errors, indeed without needing to correct errors.

Again textual critics had to fit these manuscripts into the existing groups. This could only be done by comparing these papyri with other manuscripts. The greatest resulting surprise was that P75 appeared to show a text which is in very close agreement with B. This means that we can say with Martini who studied the relation between B and P75 that the archetype of P75 and B must go back to a time “non più tardi della fine del secolo II”.

This conclusion can not be doubted. In addition to this it agrees with what we have learned in the study of the oldest extant scrap of Papyrus, P52, which also has a “Neutral Text”. The two papyri demonstrate that in the middle of the second century, may be even earlier, a text like B was in use in Egypt.

This conclusion means that we can no longer maintain that this text was the result of a recension produced in the third century. It is also impossible to say that this text originated after Clement of Alexandria, just because he used a Western Text. Now it is certain that even before Clement a text like B was in use.

The character of P66 is much more difficult to define than that of P75. Aland noticed a relation with P45. This does not mean that P45 and P66 have much in common. It only means that in the two manuscripts we find the same “mixture” of readings coming from different types of text. Birdsall has shown that P66 can not be fitted into the classical division of text. He supposes that P66 belongs to an area in which such types were not yet clearly distinguishable.

Birdsall is quite right, but we can only evaluate a manuscript by comparing it with other manuscripts or types of text. Birdsall himself can not avoid saying: “We might utilize some such terms as ‘proto-Caesarean’ for P45 and ‘proto-Alexandrian’ for P66”. To this statement he adds that this “does not explain in any wise how the papyrus texts come to be what they are, but indicates that

---


the later text have, by some process of recension not yet traced in
detail, been derived from the textual material which we sample
here or in citations such as for example made by Clement of Alexan-
dria” ¹. This is rather vague but we get the impression that Birdsall
wants to say that the “mixed” or “wild” texts like P⁴⁶ and P⁶⁶
were the basis upon which by way of a recensional choice the
Alexandrian Text was composed. Here we are back with Lake’s
opinion we referred to above.

Boismard’s conclusions differ from those of Birdsall. He argues
that P⁶⁶ bears witness to two types of text existing in Egypt.
These types are called B and SD. Type B has a representative in
the manuscript B. Type SD is a Western Text which has not been
influenced by the Diatessaron. According to Boismard we find
in P⁶⁶ readings of both types ².

We may say that research has been dominated by the contro-
versy we meet with in Birdsall and Boismard. For example,
Collwell draws a conclusion similar to that of Birdsall when he says
that “The ‘Beta texttype’ ” must be considered a “‘made’ text
... produced in part by the selection of relatively ‘good old MSS’
but more importantly by the philological and editorial know-how
of Alexandrians” ³. Against this opinion we find H. Zimmermann
drawing the following conclusion: “Man hat damit zu rechnen, dass
der sog. Westliche Text schon in so früher Zeit (sc. 200) in Ägypten
vorhanden ist und in den dort verbreitenen ‘neutralen’ Text
eindrängt” ⁴. Klijn also argued that a Western Text existed in
Egypt alongside a B-text ⁵.

¹ See Birdsall, o.c., p. 10.
See for groups created by Boismard p. 36, n. 4
³ E. C. Colwell, “The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manu-
scripts”, in: Mélanges Willoughby, ed. A. Wikgren, Chicago 1961, p. 128-138,
p. 137; cf. also C. L. Porter, “An Analysis of the Textual Variation between
Pap⁵⁸ and Codex Vaticanus in the Text of John”, in: Studies in the History
and Text of the New Testament in honor of K. W. Clark by B. L. Daniels
XV (P⁷⁸) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus”, in: JBL 81 1962, p. 363-376;
⁴ H. Zimmermann, “Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die
Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums”, in: BZ n.F. 2 1958, p. 214-243,
p. 223.
⁵ A. F. J. Klijn, “Papyrus Bodmer II (John I-XIV) and the Text of
Finally we refer to the conclusions of Kieffer. They are based upon a study of the variant readings in John 6, 52-71. According to him P⁶⁶ represents a "texte sauvage" and B is the product of a "recension". This is roughly the opinion of Birdsall. Kieffer, however, cannot deny that P⁶⁶ has already been influenced by a recensional text and says: "il semble utiliser concoitement un ms 'sauvage' et un ms recensé" ¹. But this means that the recensional text must go back to a date in the middle of the second century.

With this last variation the opinions are quite clear: some consider P⁷⁵-B to be a kind of "Neutral Text" which existed side by side with the Western Text; others believe that P⁷⁵-B is the result of a revision based upon manuscripts like P⁴⁵-P⁶⁶. We see that things have not changed very much since the time of Lake and Streeter.

In this state of affairs it seems necessary to go into the problem again. First of all we mean to draw attention to the corrections in P⁶⁶. Next we want to look for the relation between k B, P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁶⁶.

In P⁶⁶ we find corrections after the scribe having made: itacisms, leaps forward, leaps backward, omission of letters, harmonisations, phonetic slips and nonsense readings.

The corrections are of several kinds. We find:

1. errors deleted by a) erasure  
    b) diagonal lines  
    c) dots above the word or letter

2. insertions  a) above the line  
    b) in the margin ².

In some cases we can see clearly that the scribe corrected himself. We find, for example, in 1, 15 that he wrote χαινchurch. This would have been a nonsense reading. The scribe erased the letter ρ and continued to write χραγγελ. This resulted in: χαλυ.εψραγγελ. Rhodes describes this kind of correction in the following way: "In each case the scribe has deleted an error and proceeded with a corrected form of the text, but without any crowding of letters ³.

¹ R. KIEFFER, Au delà des Recensions?... p. 222.
³ RHODES, art. c., p. 272.
It is conceivable that the scribe corrected his text in accordance with the copy he was using. This is almost certain in the case of nonsense readings. But how are we to evaluate corrections of good Greek readings which are also attested in the manuscripts? We give the following examples:

3, 3. λεγω υμιν \(\rightarrow\) λεγω . . . σοι.
The word υμιν has been erased and the scribe goes on with σοι. The reading υμιν is to be found in 597 and 713.

4, 23. In the word αυτω the letter ω has been erased and replaced by ου. So we have the word αυτον. The word αυτω can be found in ΝΧ and 124ο.

10, 38. εν αυτω \(\rightarrow\) εν. το \(\pi\rho\). But the reading εν αυτω can be found in Κ multi.

We can assume that the scribe corrected himself while copying the original manuscript. But we notice that in some cases readings have been changed which can be found in the manuscripts. Are we to suppose that he was using another copy apart from the one he used as a basis of his work? If we reject this idea—and I believe that the assumption is far-fatched—we must accept that the scribe spontaneously created variant readings which are found in other manuscripts as well. This would mean that to draw genealogical relations based upon common variant readings is not always a trustworthy procedure 1.

The additions between the lines and in the margins raise further difficulties. The scribe may have added them during his work either from the original copy or from another copy. But they could also have been added by a corrector from another copy. Generally speaking it appears that the latter assumption is the better one. The reason for this is that most corrections can be found in de manuscripts.

Thus, we may say that a second copy has been used for the correction of the manuscript. Before we go into the question whether we can make out what kind of manuscript it was, we must remind ourselves that we only know a small number of the readings in this second copy, because we may be sure that not all the differences

1 COLWELL, Scribal Habits, p. 370: “The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us”, p. 370/1; “Hort has put genealogical blinders on our eyes that keep us from recognizing the major role played by scribal corruption”.
between the original and the second copy have been noted in the manuscript.

All this means that research into the corrections has to be hedged with all kinds of precautions. This has not always been done. Klijn was the first one to take notice of the corrections. He showed that a number of the corrections are in agreement with the text of B. He concluded that the text of B had some authority for the corrector.

This is of course a conclusion which is not the whole truth. If we notice that corrections are in agreement with readings in B we can only say that the corrector has been attracted by readings in some manuscripts which are also found in B. If we are going to investigate corrections we have to ask according to what principles a corrector made his alterations and not in the first place according to which manuscript.

Birdsall had already stated that the corrections showed a tendency to smoother Greek. In a later inquiry Fee concluded: "A close look at the readings of P66c, irrespective of what other MSS have the same reading, seems roughly to suggest one principle of choice: in almost every instance the reading of P66c is smoother or more intelligible Greek."

This conclusion is corroborated by a number of corrections of the same type. We have collected the following examples:

a) Addition of the article

| 1,46 φιλείπτος | 1,46 φιλείπτος | K A W Θ pl. | o φιλ. | B pc. |
| 2,25 ανθρωπος | 2,25 ανθρωπος | Or | του ανθρ. | cet. |
| 3,19 οῖ | 3,19 οῖ | 472 | οῖ το | cet. |
| 3,36 ἀλλα | 3,36 ἀλλα | — | ἀλλ' η | omnes |
| 4,12 μιοι | 4,12 μιοι | — | οἱ μιοι | omnes |
| 6,10 ανδρες | 6,10 ανδρες | D W fam. 1 al. | οἱ ανδρες | cet. |
| 7,22 πατερον | 7,22 πατερον | — | των πατ. | omnes |
| 8,25 ΙΣ | 8,25 ΙΣ | P78 B 476x | ΙΣ | cet. |
| 10,36 ΙΣ θυ | 10,36 ΙΣ θυ | P46 (vid.) Κ W | ΙΣ του θυ | cet. |
| 11,35 ΙΣ | 11,35 ΙΣ | ΡΧ | ΙΣ | cet. |
| 12,9 υχλος | 12,9 υχλος | cet. | ο υχλος | W 1010 |
| 12,12 πολυς | 12,12 πολυς | cet. | ο πολυς | Θ |
| 12,16 ΙΣ | 12,16 ΙΣ | cet. | ΙΣ | K D W pm. |
| 13,21 ΙΣ | 13,21 ΙΣ | cet. | ΙΣ | C K D Θ pl |

1 Klijn, Papyrus . . .
b) Addition of a personal pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,22</td>
<td>τίς</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>su τίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>εἰμι</td>
<td>Ps P75 Νc C W al.</td>
<td>εἰμι εγώ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,42</td>
<td>ἡγαγεν</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>οὐτος ἡγ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,20</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>καὶ σοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,33</td>
<td>μαρτυριαν</td>
<td>omnes</td>
<td>μαρτ. αυτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,52</td>
<td>δουκι</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>δουκι υμω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,37</td>
<td>ερχεσθω</td>
<td>Νx D b e</td>
<td>ερχ. προς με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,46</td>
<td>πιστευετε</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>πιστ. μοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,30</td>
<td>καὶ ειπεν ο ἀνθρ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ο ανθρ. κ. ε. αυτοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,29</td>
<td>εδοξεκεν</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>εδοξεκεν μοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,12</td>
<td>μειζονα</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>μειζ. τουτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,14</td>
<td>εγω</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>τοτο εγω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,17</td>
<td>γνωστει</td>
<td>Ν B W 597 a</td>
<td>γνω αυτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,34</td>
<td>τουτο</td>
<td>P460 Νx D 474 sa a aur</td>
<td>κ απ τοτο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) Addition of a personal pronoun in the genitive with possessive significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>αδελφοι</td>
<td>Ps B Ψ L pc.</td>
<td>αδ. αυτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,60</td>
<td>μαθητοι</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>μαθ. αυτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>αδελφην</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>αδ. αυτης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,41</td>
<td>οφθαλμους</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>οφθ. αυτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,26</td>
<td>πατηρ</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>πατ. μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,31</td>
<td>κοσμου</td>
<td>D W pc.</td>
<td>κοσμ. τουτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,10</td>
<td>αγαπη</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>αγ. μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,25</td>
<td>νομο</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>νομ. αυτον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) Addition of the word ουν

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,48</td>
<td>ειπεν</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ειπεν ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,52</td>
<td>ειπον</td>
<td>lat sy8</td>
<td>ειπον ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,30</td>
<td>οι δε ζητουν</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>εζ. ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,40</td>
<td>οιλου</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>οιλ. ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>σου ηνωκηθησαν</td>
<td>P76 B K pm (sed ∞)</td>
<td>ουν ην. σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>έιπεν</td>
<td>P46 e sy8 bo</td>
<td>ειπεν ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>εποιησεν</td>
<td>13 sypal b</td>
<td>επ. ουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>και εξηλθεθεν</td>
<td>BAL 33 al.</td>
<td>εξηλθουν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EGYPT

43
The frequency of these and similar corrections leads to the conclusion that they are intentional. The witnesses to the corrected and uncorrected readings do not show any uniformity. From this list it is, therefore, absolutely impossible to gather from which kind of manuscript the corrections were made. We must further remind ourselves that many of these corrections probably have not been made with help of another manuscript and that the agreement is purely accidental 1.

This does not mean that we are completely in the dark with regard to the manuscript used by the corrector. It remains remarkable that we find a number of variant readings in the first hand which have been corrected in accordance with non-Western manuscripts. The most striking are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2,11</th>
<th>πρωτην αρχην εποιησεν</th>
<th>q f εποιησεν αρχην</th>
<th>cet.</th>
<th>6,64 om.</th>
<th>εποιησεν αρχην</th>
<th>cet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,12</td>
<td>ἦν περὶ αὐτου</td>
<td>D e ἦν περὶ αὐτοῦ πόλις</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8,53 om.</td>
<td>D a οςτις</td>
<td>cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,30</td>
<td>om. αὐτοις</td>
<td>D b c d fr² e</td>
<td>και εἰπεν αὐτοις</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>και αδέλφος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,54</td>
<td>om.</td>
<td>syg</td>
<td>πολιν</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>μυροι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,16</td>
<td>εμνησθησαν</td>
<td>W b c e fr²</td>
<td>τοτε εμνησθησαν</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td>12,40</td>
<td>μη νοησωσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,17</td>
<td>om. ἐνα</td>
<td>D e ἐνα</td>
<td>cet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These corrections are important because we cannot say in all cases why they were made (but cf. 9,30 and 11,2). It is obvious that the corrector used a manuscript with less typical Western readings than were to be found in the original copy 2. This does not mean that the manuscript was identical with, for example, P⁷⁶ of B. It might have been a manuscript like the copy of P⁷⁶ itself with readings which can be found both in Western manuscripts and in those of the B-type 3.

Even though some corrections are of the B-type we cannot

---

1 This makes us afraid to emphasize the importance of the reading δ πρωθ-πῆς in 7, 52, cf. E. R. SMOOTHERS, “The Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II”, in HTR 51 1958, p. 109-122.


3 RHODES, art. c. p. 281, supposes that the manuscript was of a “Caesar-ean colouring”.

say that the way P66 has been corrected shows that P-B75 is the final development of an original "wild" text. It is impossible to conclude that P75-B is a gradual growth. So far we have only found manuscripts with a higher or lower percentage of readings supported by D it sy or P75-B.

Our second approach to the text of Egypt is an inquiry into the relation of Ν, B, P45, P66 and P75. All of them have the following passages: John 10, 7-25; 10, 32-Π, 10; Π, 19-33 and Π, 43-56. We first looked for those passages where Ν and B disagree. Next we checked which of the three papyri supported Ν or B. To get a clear picture we left out readings found in Ν or B only. We also left out readings in Ν or B which have none of the three papyri in support. This means that we are not going into the following readings:

a) Readings found only in Ν

11,4 αλλ’ ινα δοξασθη l. om. αλλ
11,43 ομ. ος
11,43 εκραγαζεν l. εκραγαζεν

b) Readings found only in B

10,7 λεγω υμιν l. ιν
10,23 ιησους l. ο ιησους
10,24 εκυκλευσαν l. εκυκλευσαν
10,25 ιησους l. ο ιησους
10,32 πολλα εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα
11,24 εν τη αναστασει l. εν τη αναστασει
11,52 αλλα ινα l. αλλ’ ινα

c) Readings where the three papyri do not always follow Ν or B

10,11 Ν ταυτην την εντολην ελαβον
B ταυτην εντολην ελαβον
P45 ταυτην ελαβον εντολην

10,32 Ν πολλα εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν
B πολλα εργα εδ. υμ. καλα
P45 πολλα εργα εδ. υμ. καλα
P75 πολλα καλα εργα εδ. υμ.

10,39 Ν εξητουν οου
B εξητουν
P45 εξητουν

10,39 Ν αυτον
B παλιν αυτον
P75 αυτον παλιν

P75 cum P45 and P66

1 G. D. Fee, Codex Sinaiticus . . ., demonstrates the Western character of chapters 1, 1-8, 38 in Ν. Afterwards it shows a "sudden lack of singular agreements with D" (p. 42).

2 A list of these deviations can be found in H. C. Hoskier, Codex B and its Allies, Part II, London 1914.
Finally we have—on this and the opposite page—43 readings where the three papyri follow $\textit{N}$ and B. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>$\text{o ihsous}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11,22</td>
<td>$\text{autheis}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11,25</td>
<td>$\text{eitev de}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8 om.</td>
<td>$\text{om}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$\text{dowosin}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$\text{de mouthis}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$\text{dowm}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$\text{akouswosin}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$\text{elgev ouv}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$\text{egetev de}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$\text{emurosou}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$\text{om}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$\text{apekheri}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$\text{om}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$\text{o ihsous}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$\text{tov ymiv}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$\text{emive}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$\text{eppetere}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$\text{om}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$\text{maria}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$\text{maria}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$\text{ioudivian}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$\text{osia ean}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$\text{marth}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$\text{egho epistuwn}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$\text{eipousa}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$\text{marian}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$\text{maria}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$\text{lazar}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$\text{kat exilhien thev}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$\text{autois o ihsous}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$\text{omve} \text{ve}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$\text{mfermi}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$\text{elevag}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aeth arab c d $\text{P}^2$ vg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 10, 7 ἰδεσος</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ὁμ.</td>
<td>G L K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 8 πρὸ εἰμοι</td>
<td>Κ* A D L W fam. 13 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10 ζωὴν</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 11 τίθησιν</td>
<td>cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 12 ο μισθωτός</td>
<td>G L W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 15 τίθησιν</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 16 ἀκουσουσίν</td>
<td>x?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 20 εὐληγὼν δὲ</td>
<td>x x x K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 22 ἐγενέτο τοῦτο</td>
<td>L W 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. εὐ τοῖς ἰεροσολύμοις</td>
<td>x x A L K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 23 τοῦ σολομον . . .</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 24 αὐτόν</td>
<td>x x cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. εἴπε</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 25 ἀπεκρ. αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 33 οτι καὶ</td>
<td>x x cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 34 ἰδεσος</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. εὐ τ.ν. ὑμῶν</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. οτι εἴψω εἰπα</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 36 υ. τοῦ θ. εἰμι</td>
<td>Α L Θ K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 38 καὶ εἴμοι μὴ πιστεύητε</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ένα γωτε ε. γινωσκήτε</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 40 εἰς τὸν τοπὸν ὅπου</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. τὸ πρῶτον</td>
<td>x x cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. εἴμενεν</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 41 οτι</td>
<td>x x x x cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 11, 2 μαριαμ</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 3 αι ἀδ. πρὸς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>x x K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 7 οὐδ. πάλιν</td>
<td>x x cet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 19 μαριαμ</td>
<td>x C D L A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 22 οσα ἀν</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 24 η μαρθὰ</td>
<td>Χ* D L Θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 27 εγὼ πιστεύω</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 28 εἰπάσα</td>
<td>Χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 31 μαριαμ</td>
<td>Χ* D K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 32 μαριαμ</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 43 λάζαρε</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 44 εξήλθ. ο. τέθν.</td>
<td>x x W Χ* L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. ἰδεσος αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. αὐτὸν ὑπαγεῖν</td>
<td>x x Χ* L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 50 συμφερεῖ</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 54 εφαρμ</td>
<td>x x x K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. 56 εὐληγὼν</td>
<td>x x cet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these 43 readings we find the following agreements:

| N + 45 | 19 × | B + 45 | 24 × |
| N + 66 | 14 × (2 × 66²) | B + 66 | 31 × (2 × 66⁰) |
| N + 75 | 9 × | B + 75 | 33 × |

These results are striking. P⁴⁵ appears to be related to N and P⁷⁵ with B. P⁶⁶ is somewhere in-between, but it shows many readings supporting B¹.

The same result is gained in the following summary:

| 45 + 66 + 75 | with N 4 × |
| 45 + 66 + 75 | with B 18 × |
| 45 + 66 | with N 7 × |
| 45 + 66 | with B 3 × |
| 45 + 75 | with N 1 × |
| 45 + 75 | with B 2 × |
| 66 + 75 | with N 0 × |
| 66 + 75 | with B 8 × |

It is striking that 45 + 66 support N 7 times, but that 66 + 75 do not support N at all.

Next we see the papyri do not generally support in cases where the manuscript is supported by D lat sy Θ fam. 1 and fam. 13 ². In cases where N shows “Western” readings the manuscript is supported by P⁴⁵, as in 10, 11; 10, 34 and 10, 40 or by P⁶⁶ as in 10, 15 (with P⁴⁵) and 10, 25 but never by P⁷⁵. B shows one “Western” reading supported by P⁷⁵ (11, 44).

Finally we see how almost all cases where N and B disagree one or more of the papyri support one of these manuscripts ³.

Nobody can deny that an “Egyptian Text” existed. This text is clearly visible in P⁷⁵-B. Besides readings of the B-type we notice readings of the D-type. Most Egyptian manuscripts show a mixture of these readings. With regard to the three main papyri we see that P⁴⁵ has most Western readings and P⁷⁵ most Egyptian readings.

We cannot avoid the conclusion that in Egypt originally two types of text existed.

---

³ We already find the same result in Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 57: “The notable fact, however, is that whenever one or more of these authorities (sc. later Egyptian texts like L C 33) desert B to give a Western reading, almost always there are others of them found ranged in support to B”.

It is impossible to say which of these two types is the older. However, we do not believe that one of these must be proved to be the older. It is conceivable that the two texts existed side by side. This would explain why these two types are still discernable in later manuscripts. It is possible and credible that the two texts where used in two different parts of the Egyptian Church. Maybe the Church was divided between a group of Christians living in the towns and an other group living in the country. But it is also possible that the two parts consisted of Gentile- and of Jewish-Christians.

It would be very attractive to suppose that Jewish-Christians received the Gospel and the Gospel text from Antioch or Syria. In that case we should have a very good explanation why we notice agreement between the Syriac versions and readings in Egyptian manuscripts and in particular in the Sahaidic translation.

The origin of P78-B is still a problem. We are, however, obliged to say that the text in these manuscripts must not be considered an uncorrupted representative of the original text in the Gentile Church of Egypt. It certainly has been revised. We think that this revision was different from the revision in the Western type. The Western type was revised because it originated in a place where oral tradition was still available. This sometimes resulted in drastic rewriting and additions. In the Gentile Church one had to rely upon the written Gospels. Revision was only possible in matters of language and style.

It hardly needs to be added that the existence of these two types is the best explanation of the Caesarean Text. This text

---

1 Cf. W. H. C. Frenz, "The Gospel of Thomas: is Rehabilitation Possible?", in: JTS n. S. 18 1967, p. 13-26, p. 23: "... Christianity in Egypt presents two quite different faces. First, there is the school of Alexandria... On the other hand, there was the Christianity of the smaller towns and later of the Egyptian countryside..."


Suppl. to Novum Testamentum XXI
consists of manuscripts with readings taken from the two early texts in Egypt.

If the above is true, we must say that Egypt has known no recension of the text. This means that if we were to discover a new manuscript it would be wrong to evaluate it according to its relation to one or another recension. We should have to evaluate it according to its relation to one of the two clearly distinct and original types of text in Egypt.
CHAPTER THREE

ROME, GAUL AND NORTH AFRICA

From the textbooks it appears that no unanimity exist with regard to the Old Latin version. Taylor divides the manuscripts into an African (e k), an European (a b) and an Italian (f q) text. Greenlee calls the Old Latin “Itala” and speaks about the uncertainty as to whether the “Itala” represents one or several translations. Metzger gives some more information and says that the Latin text has its origin in North Africa and that not long afterwards translations were made in Italy, Gaul and elsewhere. All of them agree that the Old Latin version shows a Western Text. Nobody, however, goes into the questions how to explain the relation of this text to the Old Syriac. It seems as if most of the important studies which appeared before 1949 have been forgotten.

The best survey we know, of what happened before 1949 is by Metzger. The burning question regarding the agreement between the Old Latin and the Old Syriac is clearly expounded. Some have supposed that the Old Latin version originated in Antioch and that this accounts for the agreement between the Old Latin and the Old Syriac. Others have accepted the idea that Tatian composed his Diatessaron in Rome and that this Diatessaron in its turn influenced the Syriac tetraevangelium. Finally some scholars have supposed that the Syriac Diatessaron was translated into Latin and that in this way the Latin text was influenced by genuine Syriac readings.

In the same article Metzger deals with the name “Itala”. It comes from Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana II 15 22. Augustine speaks about a particular text of the Latin Bible, but it is absolute impossible to understand what kind of version he is referring to. For this reason we had better abandon this expression. Finally

---

1 Taylor, o.c., p. 27-28.
3 Metzger, Text, p. 72-75.
Metzger points to the difficulty of dividing the Latin version into an European and an African text, since the representatives of the two texts show as many glaring disagreements as striking agreements among themselves.

This survey shows how many questions have yet to be solved. Therefore, it is to be regretted that during the last twenty years not many articles and books have been published on the Old Latin text of the Gospels. We may be sure, however, that there will be a change in the near future. The *Vetus Latina Institut der Erzabtei Beuron* has published so many important editions of the text of the Pauline Epistles and the General Epistles and they have been accompanied by so many important studies on the text of the Epistles that we look forward with the greatest expectation to the publication of the work on the Gospels and Acts.

Meanwhile we cannot do more than go into what has been published on the text in the Western part of the early Christian world.

Whoever wishes to study the text of the Latin version, has also to go into the Greek text right at the beginnings of Christianity in the West. Undoubtedly the Church of Rome, Gaul and North Africa was a Greek speaking community at the beginning. This appears from such authors and writings as I Clement, Justin Martyr, Marcion and Irenaeus. Of these the text of I Clement can be left out of consideration. This means that we have to deal with the three remaining authors. Inquiry into their texts is, however, seriously hampered because all of them come from the East. Therefore, we do not know whether they show a genuine Roman text. With this reservation we must now go into recent investigations into their texts.

The text of Justin has been thoroughly investigated by Bellinzoni. In his study, however, special attention has been paid to the question whether Justin used other sources apart from the canonical Gospels. Hardly anything is said about the manuscripts used by

---


3 Bellinzoni, *o.c.*, p. 000.
Justin. This question comes to the fore in a study by Massaux. He arrives at the conclusion that the text of Justin shows a close agreement with the Latin manuscript h.

Marcion’s text raises particular difficulties for us. It is known only from quotations in Tertullian’s Adv. Marcionem. The question has been raised whether Tertullian quotes from a Latin or a Greek text. It has even been questioned whether Tertullian himself used a Latin or a Greek New Testament. At the moment the matter seems to have been settled. Higgins who again went into the problem, came to the conclusion that the quotations taken from Marcion show a clear agreement with the Old Latin usage in the European branch and the quotations taken from Tertullian’s New Testament show agreement with the usage in the African branch. This seems to show that both Marcion’s text as known to Tertullian and his own text were in a Latin translation.

Marcion’s text has been thoroughly investigated by Blackman. The agreement between each individual Old Latin manuscript and Marcion is listed. The result is that Marcion does not show a particular agreement with any one Old Latin text, but the general impression is that Marcion’s text belongs to the Western Text as it is manifested in the Old Latin version.

This is of great significance. It could be proof that Marcion used a Greek text which is the basis of the Old Latin. However, another possibility exists: Marcion could have influenced the text of the Latin version. This very old problem has been dealt with by Blackman but he denies that Marcion exercised any extensive influence on the Latin version. In addition to this we believe that this supposition is unacceptable because in the Old Latin text we do not notice any particular difference in the character of the text between Luke, the Gospel used by Marcion, and the other Gospels.

Nothing has been published about the text of Irenaeus as far as it concerns his quotations from the Gospels. With regard to the

---

3 E. C. Blackman, Marcion and his Influence, London 1948, p. 135-159. Blackman goes into the question whether Marcion’s text shows marked agreement with the Old Latin manuscript e as has been suggested, but this idea has to be rejected.
4 See Blackman, o.c., p. 157.
text of Paul, it has been shown again that the Latin translation of Irenaeus faithfully renders the original Greek text 1.

In the Western part of the Christian Church the oldest authors used a Western Text which shows a close affinity with the Old Latin version. This conclusion makes it very difficult to explain the agreement between the Old Syriac and the Old Latin from a common influence of the text of the Diatessaron only. Justin and Marcion wrote their works well before the Diatessaron was composed. If, however, anyone still wishes to posit the influence of the Diatessaron on the Latin text, he has to minimise the significance of Marcion as a witness to the Western Text. In his study of the Codex Colbertinus Vogels shows himself to be an advocate of the influence of the Diatessaron on the Latin text 2. In his "Handbuch" he says of Marcion: "Als einem 'Zeugen' für den Bibeltext können wir Marcion gegenüber gar nicht zurückhaltend genug sein" 3. At the same time one has to avoid too great a division between the African and the European branches of the Latin version 4. The main problem of positing a significant influence of the Diatessaron on the Latin version seems to be that this influence must be dated after the year 170. By that date a Latin translation of the New Testament must have already been in existence for some time 5.

This means that we are still looking for an acceptable explanation of the agreement between the Old Latin and the Old Syriac versions. This agreement can be traced back to the earliest days of Christian-

---

3 Vogels, Handbuch, p. 144.
4 Vogels, Evangelium Colbertinum, p. 177. But the division seems to be an established fact, see G. W. S. Friedrichsen, "The Gothic Text of Luke in its relation to the Codex Brixianus (f) and the Codex Palatinus (e)", in: NTS 11 1964/65, p. 281-290, and J. Mizzli, "The Latin Text of the Gospel Quotations in St. Augustine's 'De Diversis Quaestionibus LXXXXIII Liber Unus'", in: Augustiniana 12 1962, p. 245-290, see also Idem, "The Latin Text of Matt. V-VII in St. Augustine's 'De Sermon Domini in Monte'", in: Idem 4 1954, p. 450-494, in which it is said that Augustine's text was "a composite or mixed structure which discloses on examination undoubted traces of having undergone considerable revision under the influence of Italian and more especially European MSS" (p. 275).
ity in Rome. It might be that it has something to do with the origin of the Roman Church. This Church probably originated among Jews who were evangelised by other Jews. Did they come from Antioch? At any rate, if we look at Marcion, Justin and Irenaeus we see that these important Christians came to Rome from the East. For this reason we believe that there was ample opportunity for a text which was used in the East to have been imported into the Church of Rome.
CHAPTER FOUR

ACTS

In recent years the text of Acts has moved into the centre of interest on account of some important discoveries:

1. Codex 15 in the Cathedral of Léon (siglum: l) with a text dating from the seventh century. The parts with an Old Latin text are 8, 27-II, 13; 15, 6-12; 15, 26-38. Other parts contain a Vulgate text: 14, 21-15, 5; 15, 13-25; 15, 39-17. B. Fischer who published the text came to the conclusion that the parts with an Old Latin text show some relation to the Liber Comicus (t) 1.

2. A Coptic Manuscript of the 4/5th century (siglum: copG in Epp 2), but ox 14 in the list of the Coptic New Testament Manuscripts kept by the “Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung” 3. From this text Pederson gave some passages in an English translation which contain Western variant readings. The text shows a remarkably close relationship to D 4.

3. A Palestinian-Syriac fragment from Khirbet Mird (siglum symSK in Epp 5), dated about 600. It contains the fragments 10, 28-29 and 32-41. It shows some agreement with D 6.

Manuscript 1 proves again that the Old Latin text had many Western readings. These readings are to be met with in a great number of manuscripts. They found their way from Latin into the vernacular languages of Western Europe 7. Much more impor-
tant is ox I4. This manuscript shows that there is evidence of a Western Text in Coptic. It means "that the 'western' text of the Acts of the Apostles from the fifth to the seventh centuries was known not only in Greek, Latin and Syriac, but also in the Coptic language and, therefore, in the most important Verkehrssprachen of the Mediterranean area". We must recall, however, that the existence of a Western Text in Egypt was already known from the papyri P41, 29, 38, 41, 48 which contain fragments of Acts1a. The manuscript symsK is the first discovery to demonstrate that a Western text of Acts was known in the Palestinian-Syriac language also.

For this reason the last discovery calls for our special attention. It gives us a fresh insight into the history of the text in a particular area of the Church.

The origin of the Palestinian-Syriac version "has been much disputed". As far as Acts is concerned many fragments were already known in this language before the discovery of symsK. These fragments, Ropes thought, were "doubtless made from the current Greek text". Duensing and Black who both studied a fragment (Acts 21, 14-25) of a manuscript with the title Codex Climaci Rescriptus published by Agnes Smith Lewis in 1909, came to the conclusion that the agreement between the fragment and the Peshitto points to a relation which cannot be clearly defined. Finally, we note that Vööbus supposed the influence of an Old Syriac text on the Palestinian-Syriac.

---

1 Haenchen-Weigandt, art. c., p. 481.
3 Perrot, art. c., p. 544.
8 Vööbus, Early Versions . . . , p. 130.
This last opinion Perrot considers to be corroborated by the text of sy msk. After a very learned discussion he comes to the conclusion: “Le texte du fragment ne dépend pas de la Peshitta ni de la Philoxénienne. La Peshitta et la Philoxénienne ne dépendent pas non plus du texte christo-palestinien. Le texte du fragment est plus proche du texte occidental que la Peshitta ou la Philoxénienne. But Perrot also writes: “les versions syriaques, chacune à leur manière, ont des points de contact avec la version palestinienne. Ce fait postule impérieusement l’existence d’un texte de base qui explique ces multiples accords. Et ce texte fondamental doit être proche du texte occidental. N’est-ce pas le cas justement de la vieille Syrienne?

In what follows we wish to go into Perrot’s question. For this reason we divide the variant readings in the fragment into the following three groups:

1. The fragment is striking for its numerous singular readings:

10,28 ἐόθεν οὖν ἔδειξεν

32 ἐπεξεργάζεται

33 ἐξακούσας οὖν

37 om. ἐκήρυξεν

38 om. ἅγιον

om. πάντας

39 καὶ ὑπὸ l. καὶ

2. The Fragment shows a great number of readings found only in syP and syP phi:

10,28 ἐστὶν in syP phi

29 post ἔοιμι ἐστὶν cum syP phi

33 l. οὖν, cf. ἔοιμι in syP

34 ... ἐστὶν l. οὖν ... ὅθεν cum syP

37 ἐστὶν l. ὅθεν cum syP

38 ἐστὶν l. Ἰησοῦν cum syP

39 ἐστὶν l. Ἰησοῦν ... ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ cum syP

3. All Western readings are supported by syP except:

10,33 add. παρακαλῶν ἔδειξεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς cum vgadd p, sa syP phi ox 14 add. ἐν τάξει, cum D,

34 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ πέτρος καὶ εἶπεν l. ἄνωθεν ... εἶπεν cum Ephr., comm. Acta

41 add. ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα cum D E sa alii Ephr

1 Perrot, art. c., p. 539.

2 Perrot, art. c., p. 540.
This means that the evidence for dependence on an Old Syriac text is not very strong. The Fragment contains a number of typical Western readings, but these are usually supported by syP. We might say that this fragment shows a text like syP with some more Old Syriac readings than are found in the text of the Peshitto as known to us.

This caution is required not only by the evidence of the text in the fragment, but also because of our very limited knowledge of the Old Syriac text in Syria.

The main witness of this text is Ephrem's commentary on Acts which remains only in an Armenian translation 1. Recently this evidence has been supplemented by Kerschensteiner who collected the very small number of quotations from Acts in early Syriac writings 2.

It is interesting that three of these quotations agree with parts of the newly discovered fragment. We have already mentioned the reading 10, 35 where symsK is supported by Ephrem's commentary on Acts. The other two are:

\[10,35 \quad \text{ἐν πάσιν ἔθνεσιν ἔν παρθεὶ ἔθνει} \quad \text{cum} \quad \text{symmsK} \quad \text{Aphr (sed ἀποκτήθη)}\]
\[10,41 \quad \text{ἀπόφημα τεσσαράκοντα} \quad \text{cum} \quad \text{symmsK} \quad \text{Ephr, comm. Diat, comm. Acta, catena D E sa gig t vgedd}\]

These last two readings can, however, not be considered as Old Syriac readings.

From this we might conclude that in Syria an Old Syriac text existed. It is certainly true that the text current in Syria influenced the Syro-Palestinian version. The fragment of Khirbet Mird does not, however, show with complete certainty whether it has been influenced by a pure Old Syriac text or an already revised text yet with some Old Syriac readings remaining.

Much of the research of the last twenty years has been devoted to the question whether the Western Text is a recension or whether we are only dealing with a great number of variant readings from various dates and places. This question probably arose from two important works on Acts by Ropes 3 and Clark 4. Their results

---

1 ROPES, o.c., p. 380-453.
3 ROPES, o.c.
were totally different. Ropes almost completely rejected the Western Text ¹ while Clark completely accepted it. From this it seemed that one was obliged to consider the Western Text as an entity which had to be taken or rejected as a whole.

Ropes, however, was not quite clear in his ideas about the origin of the Western Text in Acts. He does not offer a choice between "a recension" and "an accumulation of miscellaneous variants". Although he speaks of a recension it is one spread over a period of "fifty years after the book passed into circulation" ². One wonders if it is still possible to speak of a "definite rewriting" in these circumstances. One should rather speak of a period in which it was still possible for "wild texts" to come into being. But in spite of this Ropes believed "that a definite 'Western' text whether completely recoverable in its original form or not, once actually existed" ³. He goes further and says: "the 'Western' text, once produced, was liable to modification and enlargement" ⁴. This raises the questions how we can distinguish between the "modification" and the original "rewriting" and what is the difference between a "rewriting" over a period of fifty years, as Ropes supposed, and "later modifications".

The problem could be solved if we only possessed a manuscript with a "pure" or "homogeneous" Western Text. An other way to solve the problem would be by looking for one leading tendency in the Western Text which clearly shows that the variant readings originated in one basic viewpoint.

Everyone agrees that the first possibility is out of the question. A "pure" Western Text does not exist. The main representative of this Text, Codex D, is itself a "mixed text". It is to be regretted that Pederson was led to believe that 014 showed the original Western Text as he stated in the title of his article on this manuscript: "An early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An unrevised Version of the ancient so-called Western Text" ⁵.

Epp fastened on this title and said: "a full assessment of cop⁶

---

¹ Ropes accepted the Western readings in 20, 15; 21, 1 and 27, 5.
² Ropes, o.c., p. VIII.
³ Ropes, o.c., p. VIII.
⁴ Ropes, o.c., p. VIII.
⁵ Petersen has some strange ideas about the history of the text. He speaks of the Western "recension" which "was all but universally displaced by the revised text of the neutral and Alexandrian recension", see art. o.c., p. 226.
should shed at least some light on the longstanding question of the homogeneity of the Western text" \(^1\). In order to answer the question he compared the Coptic manuscript with D. One positive result stands out clearly: some readings formerly known only in D and thus suspected of being introduced by the scribe of D, are supported by ox 14. They appear to be "real" Western readings. Also some readings in Western witnesses with a mixed text are supported by ox 14. But this means no more than that a few readings can no longer be called "singular". At the same time the number of singular readings has been increased because some are now to be found in ox 14 only. Epp says that of the "some 250 variation-units" in ox 14 "40 to 50 are unique". Epp is justified in asking "can a revision (or better, a recension) tolerate this ratio of unique readings and still be a recension?" \(^2\).

About two years later Haenchen and Weigandt investigated the text of ox 14 again \(^3\). They criticize the words of Petersen that ox 14 is "the earliest completely preserved and entirely unadulterated witness of the Western text". According to Haenchen and Weigandt even ox 14 is a "mixed text". They point to 2, 41:

\[
D \text{ πιστεύσαντες}
\]
\[
cet. \text{ ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον}
\]
\[
ox 14 \text{ (and syheli): ... who received his word in gladness and believed, were ...}
\]

This reading shows that even ox 14 has been influenced by both the Western and the Egyptian Text. Next they point to the corrections in Old Testament quotations which show that they were made according to a Coptic translation of the Old Testament.

However, it is still premature to say a final word with regard to ox 14 since the text has still to be published. But we can say already that even ox 14 is not a "pure" Western text of Acts. This means at the same time that we doubt whether such a "pure" Western Text ever existed.

Another approach to the problem is by an investigation into the character of the variant readings in the Western Text. The first step in this field was taken by Menoud in 1951. He pointed

\(^2\) Epp, art. c., p. 212.
\(^3\) Haenchen and Weigandt, art. c.
to anti-Jewish remarks, the emphasis on universalism, frequent mentioning of the Spirit and alterations in the name of Jesus. This work has been continued, along different lines sometimes, by Epp, Thiele, Hanson and Wilcox.

In these studies one points to particular tendencies which have caused the variant readings in the Western Text. It appears that hardly anything has been added to the list given by Menoud. Only Wilcox pointed to Semitisms in the Western Text. If we leave this out of consideration we must say that these tendencies do not point to a particular time or a particular place. They are to be expected in texts where scribes where free to make alterations. Epp realized this difficulty and for that reason he looked only for anti-Judaic tendencies in Codex D. He rightly states: "If the present study of Codex Bezae in Acts is to contribute to knowledge of the 'Western' text as a whole, it is necessary, as previously stated, to differentiate between readings which can reasonably be assumed to be ancient and part of the genuine 'Western' tradition and those which may have come into the tradition at a later time—in some cases perhaps at a date almost as recent as the date of Codex Bezae itself". Of course, It still has to be proved that a "genuine" Western Text existed. According to Epp a genuine Western reading has to be supported by D it sy. Epp, however, does not work with this criterion. He keeps to the readings on D. This,

6 Wilcox, arrives at the same conclusion as Black, Aramaic Approach . . ., viz. that Semitisms were "confined to one manuscript or group of manuscripts, frequently D (and its allies)". He also points to the difficulty of this phenomenon because here "primitive material can have survived unrevised (although we must remember that some such Semitisms may be due to Semitic-thinking scribes)", see p. 185.
7 EPP, Tendency, p. 27.
8 EPP, Tendency, p. 28.
however, meant that his conclusions are very cautious. He says that his study “admittedly leaves unanswered many of the traditional text-critical questions regarding the ‘western text’” ¹.

Epp’s study was cautiously limited. Hanson draws much more general conclusions from the variant readings. He notices that readings show a tendency to make the text clearer. He does not like to say that all those improvements are the work of an interpolator, but they are “a single phenomenon” ². He rightly says that the Western Text “may indeed be composite and contain contributions made by several textual traditions” ³. But this again does not prevent Hanson from speaking about an “interpolator” who tried “to bring its (sc. Acts) thought into line with the thought of his day and milieu” ⁴.

We believe that Hanson wishes to emphasize the homogeneity of the Western Text in Acts. This appears from his supposition that the interpolator lived in Rome. He gives three reasons for this:

a) D magnifies the part of Peter. This comes to the fore in readings like I, 23 ἔστησαν δύο l. ἔστησαν δύο cum D-gig and II, 1-2 διὰ ικανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησε πορευθῆναι l. ἀνέβη D syobel ox 14.

Already J. H. Crehan had pointed to the important place of Peter ⁵. Epp, however, believed that “it is easier to see in the D-text an intention to stress the importance of the apostles in general” ⁶.

b) D shows that the interpolator was surprisingly well informed about the family of the Herods. Hanson points to 24, 27 with the reading: ἐν τῇ ἡρῴδει διὰ Δρύσιλλαν in 614 2147 syobel.

Hanson agrees that these proofs are “faint and uncertain” ⁷, but the matter is settled by

c) 28, 16 ὁ ἐκατόναρχης παρέδωκεν τοῖς δέσιμοις τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ

According to Hanson we have here a technical term which “creates a strong presumption that the man who wrote it was well acquainted with the different functions of the officers of the Praetorian Guards at Rome” ⁸.

---

¹ Epp, Tendency, p. 171.
² Hanson, Provenance, p. 216.
³ Hanson, Provenance, p. 217.
⁴ Hanson, Ideology, p. 286.
⁶ Epp, Tendency, p. 163.
⁷ Hanson, Provenance, p. 222.
⁸ Hanson, Provenance, p. 223.
Thus we see that finally Hanson's idea only rests on one reading.

One wonders whether this is enough to argue that the Western interpolator lived in Rome, especially because this last reading is not specifically Western. It is found in some Western witnesses and also in the Byzantine Text.

The riddle of the Western Text in Acts has not been solved. We do not believe that anyone succeeded in finding a "pure" or "original" Western Text. And the reason is that such a text did not exist. Western readings are spread over a number of manuscripts and they probably originated in a number of places over a number of years. This, however, does not mean that all these studies which tried to go into this subject, were in vain. On the contrary, it is once again shown that the Western readings are very old and many are of a particular significance. In a great many cases they are deliberate alterations. This means that they are recognizable and that many can be rejected as a whole when we try to discover the original text. Haenchen in particular pointed to variant readings in the Western Text which can be grouped together.

All this, however, does not make the recovery of the original text of Acts an easier task. Just because we concluded that the Western Text is not a clear cut recension, so we have to judge each separate reading on its merits. The eclectic method for Acts propagated

---


by Williams, Dupont and Kilpatrick seems to be the right procedure to restore the original text. Admitting the soundness of this procedure we nevertheless have to say that this method arrives at such varying results that we wonder whether editors of Greek texts and translations can safely follow this road. The subjective element seems to play too great a part as soon as we have to judge variant readings on internal grounds alone.

---

CHAPTER FIVE

THE WESTERN TEXT

It is still customary to divide manuscripts into the four well known families: the Alexandrian, the Caesarean, the Western and the Byzantine.

This classical division can no longer be maintained. This has been shown by such manuscripts as P^46 and P^66 which can not be assigned to any of these texts. It is said that these manuscripts show a distinct common character with Western and Alexandrian readings more or less equally distributed over their text, but this very character makes it impossible to fit them into either the Western or the Alexandrian family.

A second drawback of this division is that manuscripts are classified according to a supposed geographical origin. This goes back to a time when one supposed that local texts were based on local recensions. Now we know that each separate region had its own individual history and that in that history drastic recensions did not play any part. All changes are the result of a gradual development.

If any progress is to be expected in textual criticism we have to get rid of the division into local texts. New manuscripts must not be allotted to a geographically limited area but to their place in the history of the text.

In this history we notice the following stages:

1. The most ancient witnesses to the Gospel tradition are the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. Their text shows that in their time oral and written tradition were used side by side. Oral and written tradition, written and written tradition and oral and oral tradition were freely combined and harmonised. This followed a pattern known from the beginning of Christian tradition. It is this pattern followed by Matthew when he combined and harmonised Markan and other traditions to make a new “life of Jesus”.

From the Apostolic Fathers and later authors we see that this genuine Christian way of dealing with traditional material did not come to an end once the canonical Gospels had been written. It
was continued, now with help of these written Gospels. The extent of this work depended on the quantity of oral traditional matter and the importance which was attached to it. We may assume that very old christian communities with venerable and ancient traditions would be more inclined to preserve these traditions than a Church which heard the Gospel after the written Gospels had already become more or less the only authority in matters of Gospel tradition. This means that generally speaking the very old Jewish-Christian communities must have possessed the oldest traditions.

In communities with a venerable treasure of Gospel tradition written Gospels were bound to be influenced by that tradition. And even if they were not directly influenced by that tradition, the written Gospels would not be held in the same esteem in these places as in places where they were the only source of Gospel tradition. But this did not always happen in the same way. We may ask how long one can go on adding traditional material before it can no longer be recognized as the original Gospel. The author of Matthew for example, added so much to Mark that we speak about a new Gospel. In its turn the same happened in Matthew which was worked up in such a way that later ecclesiastical authors spoke of the resulting writings as Jewish-Christian Gospels. But there are a lot of possibilities between a rewriting as found in the Jewish-Christian Gospels and some simple additions to the original draft.

We can be sure that in particular parts of the Church this work of adapting, combining, rewriting and harmonising went on for a long time. We might even go so far as to argue that Tatian's Diatessaron is the climax of this process. This might be called the last effort to combine disparate Gospel tradition into one writing. In other parts of the Church, however, this way of dealing with tradition was resisted: the fourfold Gospel was accepted as the way in which the Gospel tradition had to be accepted.

In communities where no venerable tradition existed the written Gospel escaped from the rewriting we have described above.

We do not possess Gospel manuscripts dating from this period which lasted in Edessa till about 150. But this does not mean that numerous readings in later manuscripts do not reflect this original state of affairs. We only have to point to the agreement between Justin and the Old Latin, Marcion and D, to readings found in the
Diatessaron, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac. All these witnesses of course differ in many ways, but just for this reason we are repeatedly struck by their equally many agreements.

At the present time we know that readings in this group of witnesses are of the same antiquity as readings found in P75-B. We have drawn the conclusion that we are dealing with two clearly different texts of Egypt. The P75-B text must have come to Egypt at a very early date and at a time before it could be influenced in such thorough way as the "Western Text".

Going back to the text we meet in D, the Old Latin and the other witnesses we call "Western", we notice that agreement is sometimes striking. We cannot explain this agreement by the influence of Tatian. "Western" readings are known long before Tatian, as we learned from the Gospel of Thomas. Their origin must go further back into history and it must be looked for in a particular centre of Christianity. Otherwise it is impossible to understand how similar readings can be found in the East and in the West, Rome, Edessa and Egypt.

We cannot suppose any other place than Antioch as the origin of these readings. Antioch must have had a venerable treasure of tradition. Here we may suppose a Jewish-Christian community where Gospel tradition was handed down. Here we have a town which could have had relations with a place like Edessa. It is from this town that we may suppose that Christianity was brought to the Jewish communities in Rome and Alexandria. We can easily imagine Antioch as a melting-pot of Gospel tradition and as a distributor of expanded Gospels.

2. The second stage in the history of the text is the period in which the Church accepted virtually only the four Gospels. We earlier pointed to Edessa as one place where this happened only at a later date. During this period we notice a rapid influence of one text upon another. This is clearly to be seen in Egypt where the "P75-B Text" was influenced by the "Western Text" and the other way round so as to produce such texts as P45, P68, and numerous other mixed texts. During this time the Syriac Diatessaron was translated into Latin introducing a fresh source of corruption into the Latin version of the Gospels. It was the time when secondary translations were made like the Armenian and Georgian based upon Syriac and Greek Gospel texts. This is the time when a tetraevangelium was introduced in Edessa from the West.
During this time many typical additions, found in the original text of Antioch, must have been corrected in accordance with a text like in P75-B. This did not happen because people knew that the latter text was "better", but only because it was a text of the Gentile Christians whose influence was growing more and more at the expense of the Jewish Christians.

3. The third stage in the history of the text shows an intensified work on the text. Gradual, but persistent work on this text resulted in the Vulgate, the Peshitto and the Byzantine Text.

This reconstruction of the history of the text does not raise any problems for us. It is obvious that textual corruption started right after the autographs had been completed. For, the Gospels were written in a region where Gospel tradition was well known and this tradition will have influenced the written Gospels.

More difficult is the existence of a text like P75-B. It is impossible to imagine that this text was made from a Western manuscript. The text can only be explained if we accept that it has been withdrawn from the influence of oral Gospel tradition at a very early date.

From all this it is clear that it is very difficult to decide whether a quotation in an early writing which has a parallel in the New Testament has been drawn from the oral tradition or from the New Testament. We may even say that in the light of textual history the question does not even arise because a clear-cut division between written and oral tradition was not made. In certain regions the same applies to the division between what we call apocryphal and canonical Gospels. The so-called Jewish-Christian Gospels must have gradually grown out of the conflation of oral and written tradition.

Again we are not justified in speaking of Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition whenever we are referring to oral tradition. We certainly agree that much of the oral tradition circulated among Christians who belonged to the Jewish people. But that was not because they were Jews but because the further we go back into history of the Church the more we are brought face to face with the Jewish origin of Christianity. Therefore, we do better to speak of early Christian oral tradition.

Then we have to decide in what way we should evaluate manuscripts and quotations. If we are dealing with late witnesses it remains

---

advisable to make a collation against the textus receptus or, if we are dealing with versions, against the Vulgate or the Peshitto. Early manuscripts and quotations must be collated against P²⁷⁵-B. This is, as we know, a text which escaped the “Western” peculiarities and it is a text which is partially responsible for many mixed texts. After such a collation we shall not be able to say more than that a manuscript is more or less related to P²⁷⁵-B. Readings which disagree with P²⁷⁵-B can be compared with manuscripts like the Old Syriac, the Old Latin and the Diatessaron.

Finally it is necessary to say something about the reconstruction of the original text. As far as we know, textual history does not offer us any evidence that one manuscript or type of text shows the original text. We may say that P²⁶⁵-B escaped an important amount of corruption, but that does not mean that it has not been corrupted at all. As we stated above ¹, it is conceivable that P²⁷⁵-B has been linguistically corrected. Particularly in cases where we have to choose between a “Semitism” in the “Western” witnesses and a good Greek reading in P²⁷⁵-B we probably aught to follow the “Western” reading. The same applies in cases where P²⁷⁵-B shows atticsisms. On the other hand harmonisations and additions to make intelligible reading in the Western Text have to be rejected. This means that we have to judge readings on internal considerations, but without neglecting the origin of the different manuscripts. We believe that the present alternative between “the eclectic method” and the following of a particular “good” manuscript or text is a fallacy. The “eclectic method” would need to be followed only if we did not know anything of the history of the text. But we do know something about these things and we know what influences come to bear upon the manuscripts and the groups of manuscripts because of their historical background. This we have to take into account when we choose a particular reading.

¹ See p. 49.
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