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INTRODUCTION

This collection of essays represents a selection of fifty seven articles on textual criticism which I published in various journals and books over the past forty three years.

The introductory section (I) includes articles on the methodology I apply. My approach to textual criticism has been dubbed ‘thorough-going eclecticism’ and it follows the paths laid by George Kilpatrick and, before him, C.H. Turner and A.C. Clark. The first chapter is for a general readership, possibly new to the field; it is a condensed version of the inaugural lecture I delivered at the University of Leeds on the occasion of my appointment to a personal chair as Professor of New Testament Textual Criticism and, as such, was obviously directed to non-specialists. Chapter 2 is related to it; originally it served as an introduction to a specialist conference in Lille on second-century Christianity. In it I focus on how textual criticism can play its part in providing useful insights into that era. Chapter 3 is more narrowly directed by setting out thoroughgoing eclecticism’s guiding principles. That too came from a conference (in 1998 as one of a number of such events sponsored by the Scriptorium Center for Christian Antiquities at Hampton Court, Herefordshire) during which differing text-critical methodologies were explored. I show awareness there of charges made against thoroughgoing eclecticism.1

Thoroughgoing eclectic critics are often misrepresented as having little interest in manuscripts, codicology or palaeography. Kilpatrick and I never subscribed to the opinion, still sometimes to be heard, that we treat manuscripts as mere carriers of variant readings. In practice I have been concerned with the age and character of manuscripts as well as their distinctive readings. It is true that thoroughgoing criticism does not favour a reading merely because it occurs in a “superior” witness or comes from a particular group of manuscripts, nor if it appears in an old manuscript, nor as part of the majority of witnesses.

Nevertheless, the character of a manuscript may often be determinative: a scribe prone to omission or one given to glosses or the expansion of divine names, for example, would be treated with due caution when one is assessing variants of those types.

In any case, all manuscripts are seen as having been used by their original owners as containing the canonical scriptural text, and thus their readings, however maverick a modern critic may brand them, would once have been read as relevant and orthodox. Section II has chapters on some of the popular manuscripts I have examined: P45, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Bezae. Chapter 6 on Bezae came from a conference devoted to a study of that manuscript in Lunel in 1994. Chapter 7 contains my edition of a peculiar Greek-Coptic bilingual manuscript (0205), which is still intriguing: the current registry of Greek New Testament Manuscripts is inclined to link it, falsely in my view, with 0129 0203 and lectionaries 1575 1576. More attention to the interrelationship, if any, of all these registered witnesses is needed.

Two other articles in this section deal with broader topics: the manuscript heritage of Acts and of Revelation, both those being books with distinctive textual characteristics, setting themselves apart from other New Testament books.

Given the prominence accorded papyri witnesses by many Biblical scholars, I have kept my eye open for publications of further New Testament fragments that may be relevant in an apparatus. Articles I have published on recently edited Oxyrhynchus papyri are included here. (Other discussions, some ‘forthcoming’, where I have engaged with their alleged importance, may be seen in my Bibliography.)

Inevitably, articles of this sort in section II need frequent updating as more manuscripts are registered, and in some cases my figures and statistics may sometimes be slightly out of date. For the current state of play with the registered manuscripts the electronic list maintained by the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster needs to be consulted via their website links.

When we turn to section III we reach the kernel of thoroughgoing principles and practice. Subsection A deals with textual variants. We start off in chapter 12 with a sequence of short studies of particular grammatical and stylistic features. The influence of G.D. Kilpatrick lies behind the seven articles reproduced here, ordered by date of the original printing. When first published, they were acknowledged to be based on papers I had inherited as Kilpatrick’s literary executor and on topics we had discussed together. Those were printed with the
approval of his family. They appear again in recognition of his ongo-
ing inspiration. Elsewhere, I was privileged to reproduce many of the
articles Kilpatrick himself had published in a collection that appeared
soon after his death, and references to many of those articles are
found in footnotes throughout the present collection as will be clear
from the index.

Chapter 13 is a sample of interesting variants that display my meth-
odology. Those are ordered by Biblical sequence. Many other earlier
pieces had appeared in a collection I published in 1992. Chapters
14–20 contain a series of longer articles on important text-critical cru-
ces. For example, chapter 16 concerns the endings of Mark, a peren-
nial interest of mine—and indeed of most textual critics. The chapter
here came from a symposium held at Wake Forest, NC to highlight
differing approaches to the problem of the textual traditions at the
end of Mark. The proceedings, which included my contribution, were
assessed by Darrell Bock in a concluding section of the published col-
lection and it is gratifying that he found my approach convincing.

Chapter 17 collects together a number of variation units in Acts
which I discuss in relation to two then recently published books. A
number of these are discussed in relation to Atticism, to author’s style
and to homoioteleuton—all constantly applied topics in my work on
textual criticism. Chapter 18 is related to 17 and also sets out a num-
ber of these text-critical topics and adds to those variants relating to
Semitisms, to the place of the LXX and to orthography in relation
to variants in Acts. Chapter 19 deals with a problem comparable to
the variants at the end of Mark, namely the problem of the endings
to Romans. Again, language and author’s usage are dominant in the
discussion.

Subsection B on exegesis and textual criticism is in many respects
an unnecessary and false division because all the discussions in section
A are concerned with variants found in witnesses that were deemed to
be manuscripts of canonical scripture. No variants should be treated
as instances where one ‘merely’ proves the likeliest direction of change
from an original to a secondary text. There, as in section B, the concern

---

should be to assess the significance of all readings, their meaning and the probable motives for change. The discussion of the ‘meaning’ is, of course, ‘exegesis’ in the jargon of the discipline. In chapter 21 I assemble three studies on Mark 1:45, representing differing angles on a problematic verse. Chapter 22 is a long study of a particularly problematic textual crux, the Parable of the Two Boys in Matthew 21. The study following, on Hebrews 6, uses my text-critical work on language and style to try to resolve another theological crux, the issue of post-baptismal sin. Chapter 23 on marriage in 1 Corinthians 7 contains a number of exegetical and text-critical issues, which I examined many years ago but which I still stand by. Again, I try to base my arguments on language and author’s usage.

Sub-section C brings us to the synoptic problem. Prompted by the stimulating exchanges during the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas’ synoptic problem seminars at its annual meetings, which I regularly attended, I began to examine the rôle of the text printed in many synopses as well as overarching issues of the bias (or otherwise) of published synoptic presentations and, more crucially, my analyses of the decisions reached about the synoptic problem when only one particular Greek text was employed. I was also involved in many of the special conferences convened to assess what is often called the new Griesbach theory propounded by William R. Farmer and Bernard Orchard. Their colloquia reached a climax in a lengthy conference in Jerusalem in 1992. Its proceedings included my piece on the influence of printed editions of Greek synopses on the synoptic problem, included here as chapter 26.

Chapter 24 examines the distinctive text of the synoptic gospels in the synopses edited by Aland, by Orchard and by Greeven and, in the process, notes some corrigenda that were required. In so far as Aland’s Synopsis is concerned many were attended to after its 12th edition, but most of the general points I made then still apply to the later editions. I note that the term ‘Standard Text’ to refer to the Nestle text, and to which great objections were raised in many quarters, was quietly dropped. Chapter 25 came from a SNTS seminar held during the Paris meeting in 1978 and chapter 27 from a series of annual seminars I took part in at the Protestant theological faculty in Montpellier, in this instance during the 1992 session. Both show how judgements made on the interrelationship of the gospels are intertwined with the Greek New Testament text being used. The moral in most of these studies is that workers on the synoptic problem must keep a close eye
on textual variation within each synoptic parallel. Textual criticism is
crucial throughout any scholarly work on the Greek New Testament
but nowhere more so than in the synoptic parallels.

My assessing various printed synopsis editions in section III leads
on to articles on other printed editions of the New Testament in sec-
tion IV. These include some review articles. An analysis of editions has
been an important part of my published work.4 Many of the opinions
I offer here apply to all editions of the various texts. Thus comments
on Nestle26 clearly apply to Nestle27 too. Chapter 29 (a) and (b) deal
with the latest editions of the UBS text (identical with the equivalent
Nestle edition) and 29 (c) considers the need for these two editions of
basically the identical text. Chapter 30 treats of the International Greek
New Testament Project's (= IGNTP) Luke volumes; as the executive
editor who brought those volumes to completion and who saw them
through the press, I found it chastening to reflect on the history of the
project at a conference held at the University of Birmingham in 1999.
Birmingham had by then become the centre of the next project com-
missoned by the international committee, namely the Fourth Gospel.
Under David Parker's leadership, work on John started in 1987 and
is still in progress, now in association with the Editio critica maior
(= ECM) in Münster. (That collaboration between IGNTP and the
Münster Institut is one of the most welcome and healthy developments
in the globalisation of work on matters text-critical. It was unthink-
able a generation ago despite the paucity of qualified workers in the
textual vineyard. The close international links between text-critics of
all hues now forged is the most logical and productive liaison that has
occurred during the lifespan of the articles collected here.)

The IGNTP-ECM partnership will produce an edited text, and we
await this edition with interest. Previous volumes produced under the
aegis of IGNTP (and its predecessor CGNT, the committee for the
Critical Greek New Testament) printed an apparatus using the text of
Westcott and Hort as a running base (for the volumes on Matthew and
Mark) or an edition of the Textus Receptus (for the volumes on Luke).

---

4 Details of my other reviews, not reproduced here, are to be found in the
Bibliography at the end of this volume, notably items numbered 15, 18, 20, 30, 31, 32,
36 in the section of Articles in Refereed Journals and 9, 23, 27, 29, 31, 43, 190, 266 in
the section headed 'Reviews' where my assessments of earlier editions of Nestle, the
United Bible Societies' text (= UBS), Metzger's Textual Commentary and the first edi-
tion of Hodges and Farstad's majority text appear. Some shorter discussions occasion-
ally appear within the ongoing series 'Book Notes' in Novum Testamentum.
Since I delivered that paper in Birmingham it needs to be reported that William Petersen, whose work on the Diatessaron was highly commended, died at a comparatively young age, and it also ought to be noted that Carroll Osburn’s papers relating to his preliminary work on Acts have now been transferred to Münster.

In this section (Part Four) I concentrate on the current achievements of the Editio critica maior and I give this edition prominence by reproducing my articles on ECM at the beginning of the section (chapter 28). Among them I include my reviews of all four of its fascicules containing the Catholic Epistles as well as two assessments; one (chapter 28 (b i)) in the collection of papers from the NOSTER conference of 2001 re-assesses James and 1 and 2 Peter; the other (chapter 28 (b ii)) in the Earle Ellis Festschrift assembles my reactions to the text of James, 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John.

In chapter 31 I turn to the Marc multilingue project with which I have been involved over several years. The chapter sets out the principles and purposes of this work. The project aims to present not an edited text but the history of Mark in Greek and in most of the early versions. My chapter gives samples of the Greek and Latin. The current progress can be accessed at www.safran.be/marcmultilingue.

The volume ends with one additional article (on the canon of the Old and New Testaments) as an appendix. That paper arose from a symposium held at the University of Sheffield in 1995 under the aegis of the British Library. The interconnection of canon and text is well established, hence its inclusion now. The article analyses the most significant manuscripts and identifies the major differences between them in respect of their contents and the sequences of the books. It is argued that the reason why the contents of the separate sections of the New Testament became relatively firmly fixed from an early date was because Christianity used the codex form from its beginnings. For the Old Testament the contents were more fluid. The article draws attention to the differences not only between the Hebrew and Alexandrian canons but also between the often fluctuating contents of Hebrew, Syriac, Latin and Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament. It is shown how the main manuscripts, especially within the Greek tradition, have affected modern printed editions of the LXX. A description of how the varying traditions in Latin and Greek have influenced modern versions is also included here. A perennial question is the extent to which the stability of a text was affected by its acceptance in a canon. As far
as the New Testament is concerned, this is a highly relevant question when assessing the textual history of Jude, Revelation and Acts.

Also in the end-matter is a listing of my published writings. This includes not only books and articles but also reviews. In many longer reviews, especially of reference tools, of editions of the New Testament text and of books about textual criticism, I often include text-critical examples and try to further discussion, inevitably from a thorough-going critical standpoint, thus making some issues raised in such reviews relevant to issues discussed in this book as a whole.

Inevitably, when rereading one’s own *oeuvre*, one tries to detect changes in approach or opinion. One hopes that readers and reviewers will interpret changes in one’s opinions and judgements over the years as signs of progressive thinking rather than as inconsistencies and lapses! Certainly, as time has passed I have adopted a different view of an original text and whether such a thing can be achievable or indeed should be the main aim of a New Testament textual critic. Eldon J. Epp articulated the concern felt about the use of the word ‘original’. I note that many practising text-critics (with the notable exception of those for whom nothing but the Majority text or a form of the Textus Receptus will fit the description, ‘original’ text) side with Epp’s quandary and analyses. I now accept the consensus view that the most that text-critics can hope to achieve is the promotion of the like-liest Ausgangstext, that is, the earliest recoverable form of the textual tradition from which all deviant readings can be traced and that what one is mainly concerned to show is the rich variety of plausible and intelligible readings that existed and which may serve to illustrate the multifarious texts of the New Testament in early Christianity.

Another change is that over the years when I (and others) have been writing on textual criticism there is an increasing hesitation to speak confidently about the history of text-types. Watertight categories, proto-Alexandrian, Caesarean etc. and others to which one would routinely try to assign witnesses are now less used. Once again, it is left to Eldon Epp as the doyen of commentators on matters text-critical to articulate that change and to promote in their stead broader categories, such as the ‘D’ type, i.e. a loose association of manuscripts

---

that cluster around Codex Bezae or the ‘B’ type, that may be used of witnesses that share characteristics with codex Vaticanus. Text-types had already been abandoned by the Münster Institut in their series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften* and are not used by them in their series *Editio critica maior*. Instead, critics are increasingly unwilling to use the old categories, speaking instead now of family allegiances between manuscripts or of clusters in order to group manuscripts which exhibit shared characteristics.

Older articles in this collection and, of course, elsewhere that speak of text-types need adjustment and nuancing to take account of the current consensus that views the conventional categories as defined in Metzger’s handbooks or in Aland and Aland’s *Text of the New Testament* as passé.

Another major point of debate in textual criticism is the rôle or relevance of conjectural emendation. In the past I have been of the opinion that the sheer number and variety of extant manuscript witnesses to the New Testament Greek text and the multitude of early versional evidence obviate the need to have recourse to what often amounted to inspired guesswork to restore the wording allegedly intended by the original author. The inclusion of some earlier conjectures by Biblical scholars and exegetes such as those displayed in the apparatus of the Nestle text were seen as quaint historical museum pieces giving an insight into a now outmoded procedure. While that represents my earlier view I now confess to being less sceptical of allowing such intrusions into a text and am more tolerant of the opinion that on occasion it may be necessary to admit that no one manuscript preserves the wording used by our first century author.

* * *

In preparing these reprints silent corrections have been made to the originals. A post-scriptum has been added to some articles to update information. House-style has been standardised; the original page numbers have been added in the outer margins where appropriate.

---

The professionalism of Koninklijke Brill is gratefully acknowledged. Loes Schouten, Mattie Kuiper, Wilma de Weert and the typesetters are especially deserving of our thanks.

J.K. Elliott
PART ONE

METHODOLOGY
CHAPTER ONE

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT IN THE SECOND CENTURY: A CHALLENGE FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

As is the case with all ancient literatures, the Biblical works have not survived in one immutable, original, inviolate form. Textual critics have to work back from the manuscripts, translations and quotations of those books which we possess. In the case of the New Testament there is a significant gap between the dates of the original compositions and the period in which the earliest, complete, surviving manuscripts begin to emerge. And that gap is the second Christian century. That is the century when most changes occurred to the words that had been composed the century before.

The second century is something of a dark age as far as the history of the New Testament text is concerned, although some attempts to throw light on it may be seen: a conference on gospel traditions in that century took place at the University of Notre Dame, Indiana in 1988;1 another congress on the New Testament text in the second century took place in Lille, in July 2000.2

All the twenty seven books of the New Testament which we find within a copy of the Bible were composed and originally written down ('published' if you wish) in the first century. These Christian writings, which were accepted into the officially recognised and authorised canon of scripture, only achieved that status within Christendom, East and West, in the fourth century. It is certainly an anachronism to use the umbrella title 'the New Testament' before that time, but I hope I may be forgiven for using that title of a period when technically

---


I should speak pedantically of ‘the twenty seven books that were eventually to be accepted as the New Testament’.

Like all literature composed prior to the invention of printing, the New Testament was disseminated by means of hand-written copies laboriously transcribed by trained copyists sometimes working alone, sometimes as part of a scriptorium responsible for the mass production of copies. Some of these new manuscripts may have been written from dictation. Our knowledge of the text of the 27 New Testament books is ultimately dependent on the manuscript copies that have chanced to survive. The original documents in the handwriting of Paul, Mark, Matthew and the other authors have not survived. What is called the autograph copy of their works is not available. We may try to reconstruct it but to do so means we are working from copies of copies of copies, most many generations removed from these autographs, with all the errors that could be and indeed were introduced at each stage—phenomena that we may appreciate from our experience of proofreading.

The New Testament has been transmitted by means of hand-written copies for over three-quarters of its life. Many manuscript copies of the New Testament books have survived: the latest count is some 5,000 manuscripts which contain all or part of the New Testament in Greek (its original language). Add to that figure all those manuscripts in other languages (Latin, Coptic, Syriac and other Eastern and Western languages) into which these books were translated even within the first millennium, and you will appreciate that we have an enormous number of documents. For instance, there are some 10,000 manuscripts extant in Latin. Work on the Greek New Testament needs to be accompanied at least by comparable work on the Latin, Syriac and Coptic, because these three translations are likely to go back to the second century, even if we lack actual second-century manuscripts of them, because later manuscripts in these traditions can often illuminate the forms of the Greek on which all these versions were originally based.

Our colleagues who work in the classics are not as overwhelmed as New Testament textual critics are by so many manuscripts nor do they possess so many copies written comparatively close to the dates of the original compositions as we do. And it is overwhelming. No one scholar can hope to handle even a portion of this evidence. Yet in many ways these Greek manuscripts and the early versions need to be taken into account if we are to be confident that we can establish

The majority of our existing manuscripts have come into the scholarly domain only in the twentieth century. The current register of Greek New Testament manuscripts has grown tremendously in the past 100 years as systematic searches of established collections in Rome, Paris, Athens, Jerusalem, Mount Athos, Oxford, Moscow and London as well as smaller libraries in the middle east and in the former Soviet bloc have been undertaken with the subsequent cataloguing and microfilming of most of the New Testament material. Some other manuscripts have come to light through archaeological excavations, especially in Egypt—and again many of these discoveries have been made only in the twentieth century. Not all these manuscripts are complete New Testaments; in fact, only about sixty of the 5,000 were ever intended to include all twenty seven books. Most contain only one or two of the sections into which the New Testament was conventionally subdivided, Gospels, Catholic Epistles and Acts, or the Pauline letters for instance. Several of the earliest manuscripts are, as we might expect, very fragmentary—in some cases containing very few verses.

It has been estimated that no two manuscripts of the New Testament are identical in all respects. Some differences may be orthographical (mere spelling changes), others grammatical, but in the case of these biblical documents some changes are clearly deliberate and often theologically motivated. Only the invention of printing could guarantee that two or more copies would be identical in all respects. The finding, sifting, classifying and registering of these manuscript sources, the gradual and painstaking reading and collation of these manuscripts, the exhibiting of how and where they differ among themselves, the resolution of the differences, the attempt to explain where the original reading occurs and why the variation came about, and the establishing of a critical printed edition that does justice to these conclusions are the life blood of textual criticism.

I must not give the impression that the whole of the New Testament manuscript tradition is so fluid as to be unmanageable or that there is just so much uncertainty and conscious rewriting that a critic’s task is unworkable. Nor do I wish to imply that New Testament scholars need to resort to conjectural emendation (often necessary when editing classical texts which are typically less well represented in manuscripts than the New Testament). The bulk of the New Testament can
be established with a fair degree of confidence, possibly 90–95 per cent. But in that remaining 5 to 10 percent are to be found variants that are not merely grammatical, orthographical or concerned with such matters as changes in word order. Many of our text-critical decisions concern issues of fundamental importance for the interpretation and meaning of the text, and they often impinge on basic issues for Christian doctrine. The wording of the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew’s Gospel differs within the manuscript tradition; Jesus’ words instituting the Last Supper in Luke’s Gospel are not firmly established; the well-known story of the Woman taken in Adultery, normally printed within John’s Gospel, is absent from some manuscript witnesses. The ending to Mark’s Gospel is disputed; manuscripts deemed important omit the last twelve verses. The verses in Luke 22 about Jesus’ bloody sweat in Gethsemane are not in all our manuscripts. The Parable of the Two Boys in Matthew 21 circulated in three diametrically opposed forms. We can trace these variants to the second century. At Hebrews 2:9 did the author write that Jesus died ‘without God’ or ‘by the grace of God’? The answer depends on which manuscript one is reading. Likewise did Paul confidently tell the readers at Romans 5:1 that ‘we have peace’ or was he exhorting them with the words ‘let us have peace’? The Greek varies in the manuscript tradition. At 1 Cor 15:51 did Paul write that at the end time ‘We shall all die but we shall not all be changed’ or ‘We shall not all die but we shall all be changed’? Those people preparing to meet their Maker may find it nice to know the answer to this!

These are some of the more striking and important variants, but there are very many others of theological importance which show that it was often in those sensitive areas that did indeed touch on matters of theology and Christology where early readers and copyists made changes to defend orthodoxy as they perceived it.

Many modern English versions of the Bible draw attention to these variants in their margins with notes such as ‘Some ancient authorities here add . . .’ or ‘Some manuscripts omit these words . . .’. A scholarly edition of the Greek New Testament has a fuller apparatus criticus; the hand edition we commonly use for teaching contains some 10,000 textual variations in its apparatus. It is this material that a text-critic handles routinely. There are many tasks to be done, but few workers in the textual vineyard worldwide. But it is an area of expertise that is usually appreciated if not always entirely understood by other biblical scholars, especially when they have occasion to consult their testa-
ments and analyze Biblical passages closely or if they write academic commentaries on the New Testament books.

One of the aims of textual criticism nowadays, and one that is being recognised as increasingly important, is to plot the history of and reasons for the deliberate theological changes in the text. To do this requires an appreciation of the theological debates that we can follow to a certain extent in the writings of the Church Fathers. Patristic use of the New Testament has become an ever more important aspect of textual criticism. What is to be read in the textual *apparatus* can often accompany and illuminate what early church historians and patristic scholars are working on, and *vice versa*.

As well as understanding how theological debate and doctrine in the early church affected the transmission of the foundational documents, textual critics can also plot how and why grammatical and lexicographical changes were deliberately introduced. One of my own research interests over many years has been the history of the Greek language, and the way in which the neo-classical (Atticist) revival which flourished from the second century caused learned scribes to improve on the often crude, Semitic, Hellenistic, unGreek expressions used by the original authors. Another kind of deliberate change, affecting particularly the gospels, may be seen in the critical *apparatus*. Many early readers became aware that parallel passages in the gospels differed in their wording; such inconsistencies were disturbing and as a consequence copyists were tempted to eliminate discrepancies by assimilating the parallels and harmonizing the wording. This obviously had the effect of smoothing away differences and many of these changes are readily seen in the manuscript variants. Attempts to reach a solution to the so-called Synoptic Problem, that perennially exciting conundrum about the literary interdependence of the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, are, because of the pervasive nature of scribal emendations, intricately bound up with textual criticism. Textual criticism and the Synoptic Problem go hand-in-hand. This is an area to which I have devoted a fair amount of research time and is one that deserves even more attention by textual critics in the years to come. One fascinating, although possibly only tangential aspect of Synoptic Gospel studies is the suggestion that the manuscript copies of Mark that have come down to us are from a second-century reworking of the original, and that a ‘purer’ Mark can be reconstructed from the words of Mark used by and now found in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. This theory may be worth exploring.
So—many of the alterations in the New Testament text were deliberate and not the maverick aberrations of careless, tired scribes or hack-copyists. There was a continual tendency and temptation to revise the forms in which the original New Testament writings were circulating and increasingly being gathered together. Possibly these revisions resulted in the text-types that have been identified as having emerged in the manuscripts of later centuries.

One of my own main contributions to this vast field has been as the editor who brought to press the work of an international team of scholars who laboured for many years to assemble a full and representative thesaurus of text-critical variants in the Gospel of Luke. This resulted in over 550 quarto pages published by Oxford University Press in 1984 and 1987.3

The assembling of a critical apparatus, in which the variants between manuscript witnesses are displayed, is an activity which because it is verifiable may qualify as ‘scientific’. But textual criticism is often described as an ‘art’ as well as a ‘science’. The ‘art’ refers to the judgements made when assessing the relative merits of readings in order to represent which of several variants is likely to be the original rather than the secondary text. Inevitably it is in the ‘arts’ side of textual criticism, as opposed to the verifiable and scientific side of cataloguing manuscripts and collating readings, where there is most controversy. Nearly all of our textual variants are capable of resolution, but not every proposed resolution meets with universal approval by scholars—that is why there are several Greek New Testament texts on the market all with some differing wording. And this also accounts for some of the differences observable when comparing different modern translations.

Critical judgements can and should be based on objectively defensible principles and criteria. Inevitably it is in such areas where scholarly debate rages. There are those New Testament textual critics (and by extension Old Testament textual critics too) who base their criteria on the alleged reliability of certain manuscripts. Thus you will find one school of textual criticism that favours the cult of particular manuscripts. Another body of scholars favours the ostensibly democratic method of following the majority of manuscripts. My own preferred method has been dubbed ‘radical’ or ‘thoroughgoing’ eclecticism and in many articles I have tried to defend the principles which seek to
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3 See chapter 30 below for an assessment of this edition.
find the original words of the original first century Biblical authors wherever these may happen to be located within the manuscript tradition. The principles that I try to defend and demonstrate are based on the following:

1. An awareness of the individual authors’ language and style in so far as these can be reconstructed from the established usage in undisputed examples in the manuscripts,
2. Our knowledge of the kind of semiticized Greek used by the New Testament writers,
3. An appreciation of the palaeographical changes found in handwritten copying (and here we learn from classical palaeography and papyrology),
4. An awareness of the changes in Christian doctrine particularly in the early centuries that might have been responsible for the deliberate rewriting of the New Testament text in one direction or the other.

These and other criteria are fundamental to a thoroughgoing eclectic approach to textual criticism. They are by no means subjective.

When I first started research along these lines in Oxford working under Professor George Kilpatrick, the then Dean Ireland Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture, who had popularised this approach in New Testament studies, I was confident that among the huge quantity of witnesses which New Testament scholarship has at its disposal the original words of the original writers must have survived and that these could be uncovered, recovered and discovered by this method, and when asked if we could in effect reconstruct the original words of, say, Paul or John from the morass of varying manuscripts I used to reply: ‘Yes, we can’. Perhaps it was the impulsiveness of youthful enthusiasm that made me assert that I could indeed solve every crux, every disputed variation unit, every difference.

But I note that textual criticism, far from being a fossilised or fixed discipline, is on the change. A number of recent publications have shied away from saying that we possess the ability or even have the need to get back to one immutable text. It may be worth discussing if there was ever one definitive, published edition of, say, the Acts of the Apostles in 90 AD: perhaps Luke, its author, issued several differing versions of his own composition. Perhaps we should be alert also to the blurring of literary criticism, which looks for the supposed written and oral sources behind a composition and textual criticism which
traditionally has assumed that we can reconstruct an author’s finished composition.

These are among the issues being debated within the subject nowadays. I am sympathetic to these suggestions because they do justice to each and every single manuscript copy of what became the authoritative canonical text read AND USED by its original owners. It has been said (by Helmut Koester of Harvard) that a ‘used text’ was the worst thing that could happen in a textual tradition, precisely because these living words would be liable to rewriting as a result of on-going reinter pretation. But we can and should make use of the variety because it enables us to plot the likely direction of change in certain variant readings—especially those with a definite theological tendency—and in those cases one may very often be able to pronounce that reading (A) is earlier than reading (B). But we need to remember that for the individual or church or community which read and lived by the words in its manuscript that text, either (A) or (B), was the canonical text. The realisation that the New Testament writings were a living text encourages this historically sensitive approach. We may read church history, Christian doctrine and Christological debate in and from the different manuscripts. A use of manuscripts to establish an original text and to brand all deviations from it as secondary and spurious is to jettison a fund of first-hand evidence of what manuscripts flourished at differing times and places within Christendom, and what these texts actually read. To label the jettisoned readings as mere ‘corruptions’ is to lose sight of their relevance in any reconstruction of the history, use and influence of the New Testament text.

And this is what brings us to the second century. This was an age prior to the establishment of the canon. Once these Christian writings were given an official status then copyists would be less inclined to introduce deliberate change into texts being promoted as holy writ. However in the second century there were no such constraints. It may well be that the second century is the furthest back we can confidently reach in our attempt to plot the history of the New Testament text. New Testament textual criticism has conventionally divided certain manuscripts into text-types, the so-called Western text, the Byzantine text type, the Egyptian and so on, in order to bring some order into the mass of deviant manuscripts by concentrating on broad categories of manuscripts, grouped together because of certain common features. We may be enabled to get behind the extant forms of some such groupings to reach earlier stages in their life and it may be the case that some of those forms did indeed originate in the second century.
The second century was a time when matters such as the relationship of Jesus to God was being debated and when pressures from gnosticism and other movements inevitably caused church leaders to defend what they increasingly began to refer to as the traditional faith. It would be surprising if those debates and movements did not leave their fingerprints on the books about Jesus and his followers, because these books were increasingly being used as the foundation documents of the new faith. It is therefore understandable that many of the deliberate changes which we now see in our extant New Testament manuscripts were introduced during the second century and prior to the time when these writings were declared immutable, authoritative, scriptural—in short canonical.

Textual critics need to be alert not only to the influences on the original authors but also to the contemporary issues that surrounded the second-century copyists. These scribes were reproducing their copies in an environment in which Christian groups of various complexities debated the relevance of the Jewish scriptures, defined church discipline, agonized over eschatology and tried to establish the relationship of church and empire, and wrote apologies addressed to Jews and to pagans. This was a century for church self-definition when we can detect an embryonic proto-orthodoxy amid gnosticism, Montanism, Manichaism, ascetics, Ebionites and other groups, most of whom were affected by, or who claimed to be influenced by, the Christ-event. Textual criticism of the New Testament should never be practised outside church history. The debates and influences of the second century can be detected within the New Testament manuscript tradition. This should not surprise us: it is no wonder that early Christian writings were adjusted to make their wording fit particular party lines.

I shared a broadcast about textual criticism on Deutschlandfunk Professor Barbara Aland of the University of Münster a few years ago. In answer to the reporter’s question if we can reach the original words of the New Testament, I was interested to hear her say that the aim of textual criticism was to attain the Ausgangstext, that is, the form of the text to which our extant fund of manuscripts and their variants can ultimately be traced, but she was quick to say that this Ausgangstext was not necessarily the same as the original text of the original authors. She is one of the editors of the printed edition of the Greek New Testament most commonly used by students, Nestle-Aland 27. This is a critically established text which until recently was being actively promoted as a ‘standard text’, a new textus receptus, by which was meant that the text printed was as close as possible to the
original. I note that that confidence has now gone. In her latest preface to this Greek New Testament she claims only to have produced a ‘working text’ which is open to changes. In fact a recently published edition of the Epistle to James, also prepared under the auspices of Barbara Aland’s institute in Münster, has already introduced certain changes to its Greek text of this epistle.

I have referred to the *Ausgangstext*, the text from which later deviations can be traced. I wonder if we should not now speak in the plural, *Ausgangstexte*, and argue that all the varying text-types of the New Testament could go back to forms already in existence in the second century.

I have been encouraged to reach this conclusion because of work on several fronts, not only on the history of the canon. I give another example: an international project with which I am involved is an Anglo-French attempt to trace the textual history of Mark’s Gospel. The aim here is to plot how the text in Greek, Latin, Coptic and in other versions developed. For the Greek we are producing not an eclectic or critically edited new text but printing out six of the earliest forms in which Mark has been transmitted in the manuscript tradition. We are setting out the actual words of certain key manuscripts displayed with the subjoined variants found in their closest allies. My French collaborator on the Greek text, C.-B. Amphoux of CNRS in Aix-en-Provence is convinced that several of our lines of text-types found now in manuscripts of a later date would have originated in the second century.⁴

* * *

The nineteenth century was the age when our knowledge of the New Testament text was taken back to the fourth century after the discovery of the fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus and the publication of its near contemporary, Codex Vaticanus—the two most influential New Testament manuscripts extant. The twentieth century has taken the quest for New Testament manuscripts and our knowledge of the text into the second century. One result is that many distinctive readings known from fourth-century witnesses are now being located in the manuscripts of two centuries earlier. These resources have been accompanied by other spectacular twentieth-century discoveries—the Persian Diatessaron,

⁴ See Chapter 31 below.
Ephraim’s Commentary on the Syriac Diatessaron, the Nag Hammadi Library (about which more later) and the publishing of better-edited, critical editions of the writings of the church fathers. All these resources enrich the textual critics’ access to the second century.

It is at this point that we ought now to take stock about what we know about the second-century Greek text and the environment in which the manuscripts were copied. We encourage students not to treat the New Testament writings in a vacuum, but to examine them in their Jewish and also in their Graeco-Roman contexts, so that not only is the influence of the Old Testament brought to bear on New Testament exegesis but also that of other types of Christian and pagan literature written in the first and second centuries.

Our oldest complete manuscripts of the New Testament are fourth century, but there are several substantial older sections and fragments that have come to light, mainly in the past 100 years, thanks to archaeological digs in Egypt. One or two of the earliest fragments on papyrus from among the Oxyrhynchus collection have been published only in the past three years. Some ten or so of our early manuscripts have been dated as having been copied in the second century. Two, dated c. 200 AD, contain sizable portions of text; one, now in Geneva, contains most of John’s Gospel, another, now in Dublin, a goodly part of the Pauline corpus. New Testament colleagues will recognise that I speak of P66 and P46. None of our manuscripts belongs to the first century, despite exaggerated claims reported in the press a couple of years ago that a first century fragment of Matthew was housed in Magdalen College, Oxford. What these second-century manuscripts reveal is a very free tradition, that is to say that the bulk of these early witnesses, all of which were inevitably found in Egypt, although not necessarily originally written there, contain a vast number of significant variants previously only known from manuscripts of varying text-types of later dates. Quite how these early papyri relate to each other, or relate to a supposed original or originals, and how they gave rise to the more identifiable text-types of succeeding centuries are questions to exercise textual critics. En passant I note that the history of early Christianity in Egypt still awaits the telling.

Apart from primary witnesses, that is the manuscripts of the New Testament in Greek as well as manuscripts in the early translations, another source of information about the text of the New Testament used by text-critics is the Biblical quotations found in the commentaries, sermons and letters of the church fathers. These ancient Christian
writers often liberally peppered their works with scriptural citations and allusions. A judicious analysis of their quotations can tell us much about which author knew which texts and in which form at known periods and in definite locations. Work on the second-century writers still needs to be systematically analyzed. There are influential figures here such as Justin Martyr, Marcion, Irenaeus and, at one remove, Heracleion. Biblical quotations occur in their works. In so far as Jesus’ words are quoted there we need to examine if these are likely to have come from written sources (as opposed to oral traditions) and, if so, how they relate to our knowledge of the same words from New Testament manuscripts.

Some work has been done on Justin’s scriptural citations. We see that when Justin seems to be quoting from the gospels he combines his sources so that a quotation may be an amalgam of Matthew and Luke. This feature may be comparable to the conclusion reached by some scholars working on the Synoptic Gospels who argue that Matthew wrote his Gospel by amalgamating two earlier written sources, Mark and Q. This amalgam makes it difficult to use Justin as a witness to the New Testament text, although his quotations may well be evidence of an early attempt to harmonise the New Testament Gospels. We have already referred to the fact that scribes often assimilated the text in parallel passages in the gospels. Another way to avoid the embarrassment felt by some Christians that their early documents occasionally contained discrepancies was to merge the four original gospels into a single harmonized account. Justin may show an early form of such a harmony. Later in the second century Tatian has been credited with the production of the Diatessaron, a harmony made out of the four separate gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John hence the Greek name given to it, dia tessaron ‘(one) through four’. The Diatessaron was originally written in Syriac. That Justin inaugurated a similar harmony is not improbable as he had been Tatian’s teacher. Work on the Diatessaron is a highly complex and complicated business but research is progressing.

More needs to be done on Justin’s citations. Work on the other second-century fathers, Latin and Greek, is less developed and we ought to work more systematically on the writings of Marcion and Irenaeus to learn what they can reveal about the Biblical texts and specifically the New Testament text-types which they were using and quoting.
We may even be able to detect if certain textual variants in the apparatus in our Greek New Testament originated with a particular writer. The puzzling place-name ‘Bethabara’, found in some manuscripts at John 1:28, may have come from a conjecture made by the famous church father, Origen. Likewise Origen may also have been the originator of the geographical name ‘Gergesene’ found instead of the name ‘Gadarene’ or ‘Gerasene’ found in many manuscripts at Matthew 8:28 and parallels. Certain other variants, such as the widespread deletion of Jesus’ saying about the man working on the sabbath found in Codex Bezae in Luke 6, or the addition of the request for the Holy Spirit in Luke’s version of the Paternoster found in some manuscripts may have originated, so it has been argued, with Marcion.

Another group of mainly second-century writers are the so-called Apostolic Fathers, writers and writings such as the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, 1 and 2 Clement, the Shepherd by Hermas, and the seven letters of Ignatius. These writings often quote what they call ‘scripture’, by which they mean what we name the Old Testament. They seldom quote Christian words in this same way, and it is unlikely they used a written form of New Testament works. Nevertheless, they occasionally cite words of Jesus, but apparently in a free and paraphrastic way. Their attitude to and use of the Christian tradition, especially where their words parallel the New Testament, may be instructive to textual critics of the Greek New Testament.

Some of these Apostolic Fathers were on the fringes of the New Testament: the letters known as 1 and 2 Clement for instance are found in Codex Alexandrinus—a New Testament manuscript. Barnabas and the Shepherd are found in the fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus following Revelation. Obviously readers of those manuscripts accepted these non-canonical works within their Bible.

One second-century text that has much material in common with the New Testament is the Gospel of Thomas. This is a text that contains 114 sayings of Jesus, some of them close to a New Testament parallel, others quite new and alien. This text, the whole of which is in Coptic, was discovered in the mid-1940s at Nag Hammadi in Egypt in what was in effect the remains of a Gnostic library. (Some portions in Greek had previously been found.) The discovery was made roughly at the same time as the Dead Sea Scrolls were found but news about it was overshadowed by publicity given to the Scrolls. Nevertheless, the Nag Hammadi library contains many manuscripts of texts, most
of which had not been previously known. Its contents tell us much about Gnosticism, a form of belief which in its Christian guise was branded a heresy by mainstream Christians. This movement was very strong in the second century and could have become the dominant form of Christianity not only in Egypt but also in Rome and elsewhere. Until the discovery of this library much of our knowledge of second-century gnosticism was dependent on the counterattacks by writers such as Irenaeus. Just as the use of terms like ‘New Testament’ and ‘canonical’ is anachronistic when applied to the second century, so too are terms like ‘orthodox’ and ‘heretical’: both Gnostic Christians and non-Gnostic would have thought of themselves as orthodox. One never brands oneself a heretic!

This Gospel of Thomas has been subjected to vigorous scholarly examination in the past fifty years. Not being a copy of a New Testament book as such, its readings have not been added to the critical apparatus of the canonical gospels by textual critics, but in any examination of the way in which the sayings of Jesus circulated in the second century we need to subject the forms of those sayings found in the Greek fragments and in the newly discovered Coptic manuscript of the Gospel of Thomas to a comparison with parallels in the New Testament books.

The Gospel of Thomas was obviously read sympathetically by those whose library it was found among even if the Gospel of Thomas as a totality was perhaps not a fully-fledged gnostic creation. Normally this book is labelled as one of the New Testament apocryphal texts.5

These words ‘apocryphal texts’ encourage me now to declare that I have been at work over the past fifteen years or so on the body of extra-canonical early Christian texts known as the ‘New Testament apocrypha’. After Oxford University Press asked me to edit a collection of these texts in an English translation I became immersed in a world of strange texts with names such as the Protevangelium of James and the Apocalypse of Peter. Many of these apocryphal texts are from the second century.

I may perhaps be forgiven for mentioning a couple of other New Testament apocryphal writings, because of their bearing on the text of the New Testament proper. A fragment of the second-century Gospel

of Peter came to light only at the end of the nineteenth century. This fragment tells of Jesus’ passion using a mixture of the wording known to us from the canonical gospels. Although some, mainly American, scholars have recently tried to argue that the Gospel of Peter is independent of the canonical Gospels, in effect a fifth Gospel, most experts would now see it as a mere rewriting of the earlier accounts. The Gospel of Peter may even be yet another attempt to harmonise disparate earlier accounts into a single narrative. Nevertheless, the text of the Gospel of Peter needs to be seen in parallel to the New Testament accounts, and this has already been done in some printed editions of the New Testament gospels when the parallels are set out in five contiguous columns per page.

A similar situation pertains to Egerton Papyrus 2 in the British Library, which are second-century fragments containing gospel-type material. These fragments contain stories that are parallel to, but are not scribal copies of, the New Testament accounts. We may again be looking at an independent apocryphal gospel or a free rendering of oral and/or written New Testament stories. Either way this evidence ought to be considered by those investigating the nature of the New Testament in the second century. Finally I refer also to the three early Jewish-Christian gospels also to be found in a collection of New Testament apocrypha and these display similar characteristics.
CHAPTER TWO

THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE AVAILABLE FOR RECONSTRUCTING THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE SECOND CENTURY

The conference in Lille at which this paper was first published (« Le texte du Nouveau Testament et ses témoins avant 200 A.D. ») was in July 2000, in other words in the closing months of the 20th century. It might seem somewhat perverse that the conference was looking backward to the 2nd century rather than forward to the approaching millennium. But for those engaged on the New Testament manuscript tradition the challenge for our new century is to try to understand better the influences on the church, its texts and its traditions in the period before the canon was fixed—specifically in the period of the 2nd century.

The 19th century was the time when our knowledge of the text and our confidence in being able to establish an older, some would say a more reliable, form of the New Testament text reached back from the Byzantine age to the 4th century. The discovery in St Catherine’s monastery of the Codex Sinaiticus, and the publication of Codex Vaticanus Greek 1209 also of the 4th century were revolutionary for Biblical studies. As far as the text of the New Testament is concerned, these manuscripts had the effect of toppling the Textus Receptus from its pedestal and with it the majority, Byzantine text that had held sway for over 300 years. Westcott and Hort’s The New Testament in the Original Greek published in 1881 was dependent on the recent publication of Codex Sinaiticus (א) and Codex Vaticanus (B). Textual criticism and the printed text of the Greek New Testament have never been the same again. All critical editions of the New Testament in Greek owe a huge debt to the pioneering work of Westcott and Hort, whether or not that debt is acknowledged.

Yet since Westcott and Hort’s day there has been a spectacular increase in the number of manuscripts of the Greek New Testament available to scholars. Some of the manuscripts registered by the likes of von Soden and by Gregory and his followers came into the public
domain thanks to methodical and intensive Handschriftenreisen. The
travels around the libraries, museums and monasteries of Asia Minor,
Greece and the Middle East had of course begun with Tischendorf
and Porphyry (Uspensky), but in the 20th century, thanks to easier
and better forms of transport, many more expeditions were organised.
Photographic plates of manuscripts were taken and microfilms
made. The enterprises undertaken by Hatch, the Lakes, the Library
of Congress and more recently and more extensively by the Institute
for New Testament Textual Research in Münster have resulted in the
cataloguing and classifying—if not the thorough reading—of 5,000
or so continuous text and lectionary manuscripts of the Greek New
Testament now listed in the officially recognised register. Some 95% of
those manuscripts are readily accessible to scholars on microfilm.

But what is important is not so much the sheer numbers of manu-
scripts added to the register over the last 100 years but the fact that
many more witnesses older than the 4th century have been recovered.
This has meant that whereas the 19th century may be dubbed the age of
the 4th century parchments, the 20th century may justly be called the
era of the 2nd and 3rd century papyri. A graph showing the introd-
tion of newly recovered papyri of the Greek New Testament displays
spectacular leaps and bounds. Some recently published Oxyrhynchus
papyri and a newly discovered fragment of Hebrews in Vienna now
bring the highest numbered papyrus to $P_{116}$. Not that all 116 merit
a separate number but we do now have around 100 separate papyri
manuscripts, several dated by their editors as having been written
before 300 A.D.

We note the following manuscripts, dated by the experts as having
been written before 200 A.D.:

$P_{32}$,
$P_{46}$ with its substantial portions of the Pauline corpus,
$P_{52}$,
$P_{4}$ incorporating $P_{64}$ and $P_{67}$,
$P_{66}$, with a good part of the Fourth Gospel,
$P_{90}$,
possibly $P_{98}$
and two or three of the recently published Oxyrhynchus manuscripts,
$P_{103, 104, 105}$. 
Outside the manuscripts on papyrus we could add 0189, possibly a 2nd century fragment of Acts. Helmut Koester\(^1\) was rather too gloomy in stating in 1988 that there is virtually no 2nd century evidence. The important thing to note is that all of the manuscripts which I have listed came to light only in the 20th century.

If we were to extend the scope of this paper to cover the manuscripts dated as 3rd century (and we must always remember that the dating of manuscripts is not an exact science and that at the very least we need to allow a generation’s leeway on either side of the suggested date) there are perhaps 60 or so.\(^2\)

Eldon J. Epp in particular has been assiduous in numerous articles and presentations\(^3\) in drawing attention to the riches of the Oxyrhynchus finds in general and to the importance of the New Testament papyri, but has bemoaned the apparent reluctance of editors of the Greek New Testament to take the distinctive contribution of this category into account in the text of the New Testament itself.

I do not share his concerns as I shall mention shortly, but we need to note that the classifying of these papyri and even their inclusion in an *apparatus* is one thing. The rewriting of the history of the text of the New Testament as a result of our possessing these early witnesses or the understanding of the significance of the varying textual character of these papyri are quite another matter.

My disquiet about the papyri is that they are given undue prominence in our critical editions. Their evidence is usually reported extensively and their sigla stand first in the *apparatus*. All of this is due to the bizarre way in which our 5,000 Greek New Testament manuscripts are divided. One subdivision is in accordance with writing material; another is the form of handwriting; a third subdivision is the function of the text, continuous text or lectionary. This has the effect of separating majuscule papyri from majuscule parchments, and
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gives the unwary the impression that papyri are all earlier than other types of manuscripts. I digress and certainly do not need to labour the problem in the present context, but it does mean that I cannot share Epp’s fascination with the New Testament text that happens to be on papyrus.

One often hears that the 2nd century is a comparative dark age for our knowledge of Christianity—even the Christianity of Egypt—and a dark age for the history of the text. That is unduly pessimistic. Not only do we have the number of early witnesses which I have just outlined but other evidence is available to us. It is now readily recognised that three influential versions, the Coptic, the Latin, and the Syriac started in the 2nd century. Work on these versions in recent decades has attempted to recover that 2nd century base. Early evidence of the use of the New Testament in other 2nd century writings is being examined—more on that later. Stuart Pickering of Macquarie University in Sydney is busy working on a hitherto neglected area, the use made of Biblical citations in non-literary sources; much of this is in 2nd century papyri.

The scholar working on the New Testament text in the 2nd century has many other tools at his disposal. Not only is the Nag Hammadi collection to hand, but the Persian Diatessaron and Ephraim’s Commentary on the Diatessaron in Syriac came to light this century. Better scholarly editions of the Fathers in the Sources chrétiennes and Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller series mean that we are decreasingly dependent on the old editions in Migne.

We need to study further the Biblical text that can be recovered from the work of Celsus, Irenaeus and Justin in as thorough a way as the SBL series on the text of the Greek Fathers demands; this is a desideratum especially as Western and other text-types may now be detected in these early fathers. Some work has already been done on Justin’s New Testament citations, and it seems as if Justin was in effect harmonising Luke and Matthew when he quoted words of Jesus. His method may well parallel the way Matthew a century earlier combined Mark and Q. Whether Justin was consciously trying to assimilate apparently discrepant sources or was treating freely the oral and
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perhaps written sources at his disposal needs to be investigated but all
we need to note now is that his attitude to the text betrays a freedom
that is of relevance if we are to write the history of the New Testament
text in the 2nd century. So that is unfinished business which demands
attention.

That Justin, Tatian’s teacher, was sympathetic to, even an originator
of, a Diatessaronic type of text is not surprising. We may just remark
that the Diatessaron and perhaps Justin’s combining of Gospels are
not our only 2nd century harmonized Gospel texts. The longer ending
of Mark (Mark 16:9–20) may in effect be a digest of Easter accounts
assimilated from several different sources, some of them canonical
Gospels. The apocryphal Gospel of Peter may also have been an
attempt to write a Passion Gospel using and thereby making redundant
the four canonical accounts. Scribes’ attempts to assimilate parallels
within the canonical Gospels are yet another way of attempting to
avoid apparent discrepancies between different Gospel accounts of the
same story or saying.

I extend our trawl beyond Justin and the Church Fathers to the so-
called Apostolic Fathers for we see that they too reveal to us how 2nd
century authors—quite orthodox Christian writers at that—use and
allude to the words of Jesus. Writers and books like 1 and 2 Clement,
the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas and the letters of Ignatius quote
words of Jesus but apparently in a paraphrastic way that perhaps shows
that they were dependent on the oral tradition or were treating the
canonical Gospel text very freely.

And we must not neglect another 2nd century source at our dis-
posal, the Christian apocrypha. In a paper delivered in Geneva in 19956
I investigated if any of the New Testament apocryphal texts had influ-
enced scribes copying the text of the New Testament proper. With one
or two notable and famous exceptions I reported that I had not found
any direct influences. However, work on these Christian apocrypha
may be of significance to the study of the textual criticism of the New
Testament because of the way these apocrypha use or quote from the
literature that became the books of the New Testament canon. Logia
of Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas are an obvious example. Very few of
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6 “The Influence of the Apocrypha on Manuscripts of the New Testament” Apoc-
the logia that have a parallel in a canonical Gospel are exactly the same
as the wording in the New Testament textual tradition.

Other quotations in other apocryphal Acts and Gospels similarly
betray a general freedom in quotations. And again this word ‘free-
dom’ comes to the fore. The fragments known as Egerton Papyrus 2
is another example of a Christian apocryphon with parallels to the
canonical Gospels. Modern printed synopses of the Greek New
Testament now often conventionally present the parallels in these
and other New Testament apocrypha as extra parallels to the canoni-
cal texts. Obviously, as these apocryphal texts are not copies of the
canonical books, text-critics cannot use this evidence as if they were
manuscript witnesses, but what they can and should do is to see how
a particular saying of Jesus (for example) was adjusted in different
retellings. The synoptic parallels reveal their own differences and simi-
larities especially if we are alert to the apparatus criticus; similarly,
the same parallels found in non-canonical sources, apocryphal and in
some cases patristic, usually exhibit still further variations. What all
this tells the textual critic of the Greek New Testament is that we are
dealing with traditions which were transmitted with a relative degree
of freedom in the first one hundred years of their existence. Here again
that word ‘freedom’ is used of the 2nd century. All the important vari-
ants that we can identify in our manuscripts were in existence in the
2nd century. (We shall elaborate that point shortly.) Perhaps originally
there were more in existence. We cannot know. All that one can say is
that there was a flexibility, a diversity in that 2nd century text. Perhaps
that is why we can speak, with the Alands, of a ‘free’ text. Once the
text became more controlled—certainly from the 4th Century—that
freedom disappeared.

These are the sorts of evidence we have at our disposal. We now
need to ask: Why is it important to study the 2nd century evidence?

Is it important in recovering the 1st century originals? Is one trying
to reconstruct a text that helps us recover the wording of the auto-
graphs?

At one time I would certainly have argued that one needs to take
into account all evidence—not only early evidence—because the task
of the textual critic was the recovery of the original New Testament
text. If asked whether our fund of 5,000 manuscripts together with
the versional and patristic evidence enabled us to reestablish the origi-
nal text I always used to answer in the affirmative—and I have writ-
ten extensively along those lines. Now I am less confident that we can achieve that, or indeed if it is the job of textual criticism to do that. I have been persuaded to change my stance somewhat thanks to the writings of Bart Ehrman and David Parker who emphasise that our stock of textual variants may more profitably be harnessed to tell the story of Christian history and the changes in doctrine and Christology.

Variants such as the three forms of the Parable of the Two Boys in Matthew 21, the differing versions of the Paternoster, the accounts of the Institution of the Last Supper in the different New Testament books and the varying textual transmission of those sources, the ways in which Mark’s Gospel or Paul’s letter to the Romans ended may enable us to plot which readings belong to the first century and which are secondary, but we are now shown by the likes of Parker and Ehrman that to use variants merely to select an original text and to brand the secondary readings as mere corruptions is to jettison a wealth of evidence relevant to the history of these texts and their influence. They were living texts, and as Koester reminds us a text that was a used and living text was the worst that could happen to it from the point of view and perspective of those textual critics determined only to establish the presumed autograph.

In general there was an autograph that the original author published, and it was that which scribes reproduced, but in the case of Acts (most probably), Romans (probably) and Ephesians the originally published work was reissued as a revised edition by their authors. For those books, especially Acts, at least we may find it less easy to pronounce which of more than one edition was the original. In any case we admit that the search for one original is less the aim of textual critics than once it was. As an example of this tendency we may quote Koester once again; he investigates whether the ‘original’ form of Mark may be found in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke rather than in manuscript copies of Mark itself.

---

8 *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
10 *Art. cit.* p. 20.
Kenneth Clark was calling the search for the original a ‘retreating mirage’ as early as 1966. More recently another perceptive commentator on matters text-critical, Eldon Epp, has presented a detailed analysis on what this quest for an ‘original’ text means under the title ‘The Multivalence of the Term “Original Text” in New Testament Textual Criticism’, in which he finds several dimensions to the term ‘original’—a predecessor text-form, an autographic text-form, a canonical and then an interpretative form, each of which may be recoverable from our fund of manuscripts. The fluidity in text carries over into a fluidity regarding canon. His paper was originally delivered to the SBL meeting in 1998 in the incongruous setting of DisneyWorld, Florida but has now been published in the more fitting and august pages of the *Harvard Theological Review*.

As most of our deliberate changes are likely to have been made to the text of the New Testament in the 2nd century and before the establishing of the universally recognised canon, those interested in plotting church history in that century have virtually all existing variants of a deliberate character at their disposal to use as material originating in the 2nd century—regardless of the age of the document now bearing that reading. Copyists were less likely to have introduced new readings deliberately into the text once these books were authorized as Holy Writ. Vogels was, in my opinion, quite right to pronounce that all the deliberate alterations to the New Testament text would have been introduced by 200 A.D. It is interesting to note that in the hundreds of new variants that have come to light this century, especially in the early manuscripts, hardly any new variants have emerged that had not been reported in the *apparatus* in von Soden’s or Tischendorf’s editions. Obviously, new orthographical variants have been logged but there are hardly any genuine, new readings in the 2nd and 3rd century witnesses. Some readings previously located in only a few medieval witnesses now benefit from having an early papyrus in support; other

---

readings, deemed to be weakly attested, now have additional manuscripts as allies.

And we ought to add here that it is not only those whose interests are Christological or theological that are catered for by our stock of deliberate changes to the New Testament text emerging from the 2nd century, but those who look to the New Testament in their study of the history of the Greek language. Many variants of a grammatical, orthographical and linguistic nature may be found to have occurred in the 2nd century with the rise of the neo-Atticist movement.\textsuperscript{15} Although it may well be that our evidence is found in manuscripts of dates later than that of the 2nd century, nonetheless it is important to plot such deliberate changes back to this century, and recognise that that is when Atticizing readings began to emerge in the manuscript tradition.

From my own perspective as a so-called thoroughgoing textual critic I recognise the importance of being able to plot the history of variants from the 2nd century. I am less convinced that merely because a reading is found in a manuscript itself of the 2nd century makes that reading more reliable and significant.

Another motive for working on the 2nd century is one that is dear to Christian Amphoux who has regularly argued that the text-types known from manuscripts of a couple of centuries later than the 2nd century can in fact be located in witnesses and events (including deliberate revisions to the text of the Gospels) in the 2nd century. From the 3rd century onwards it is clear that we may assign New Testament quotations in the Church Fathers to certain text-types attested in extant manuscripts. It is instructive to test how far back we can take the evidence. Eldon Epp in his Notre Dame paper\textsuperscript{16} in 1988 argued that certain text-types which he labelled anew ‘A’ (the majority type), ‘B’ (including \textsuperscript{75} and Codex Vaticanus), ‘C’ (\textsuperscript{45}, W and others), ‘D’ (including Codex Bezae) were in existence in the 2nd century. Amphoux would be sympathetic to such a view. The work on the history of the text of Mark ‘Marc multilingue’ a project with which I am


\textsuperscript{16} Art. cit. (supra, n. 3).
proud to be associated, is a way of demonstrating that general thesis. And we have the opportunity to read of the on-going work of the team of ‘Marc multilingue’ in this volume, in chapter 31 below.

Kurt Aland attempted to identify the textual character of certain 2nd Century manuscripts in two articles.\(^{17}\) I attempted in my Lunel paper to see what support distinctively Western readings had in early papyri.\(^{18}\) My results were modest but nonetheless there is such evidence there of early Western-type readings. Neville Birdsell’s piece in the Kilpatrick Festschrift\(^{19}\) worked on the character of two 3rd century manuscripts, \(\mathfrak{P}^{45}\) and \(\mathfrak{P}^{75}\), but his results have a relevance to the 2nd century background to manuscripts such as those. These conclusions need to be set alongside the textual character of the New Testament material in the versions and the Church Fathers.

The 2nd century was the time of the Christian church’s self-definition, when its status \textit{vis-à-vis} the Empire was hammered out. Its relations with the pagan world encouraged apologetic writings—and apocryphal novels. It was an age when the Jewish origins of Christianity were debated, and when the authority of the church was being established and its hierarchical structures developed. This was a century when many who claimed to be Christian promoted the writings and teachings of Gnosticism or Montanism; this was a time of ascetic teachings. It was a century when Christianity in Rome flourished under various banners sporting the names of Marcion, or Valentinus and Justin—and (from the evidence of the New Testament apocrypha) Peter. In this century we have writers like Celsus, and Heracleon but also Irenaeus, whose defence of a proto-orthodoxy is significant. Irenaeus’ defence of the Four-fold Gospel canon was not only exclusive


in that thereby he was excluding apocryphal and Gnostic and recent Gospels but also inclusive in that he was attempting to unify a church previously separated, adhering to the traditions of, say, Alexandria or of Syria or of Rome.

Postscriptum

The current list of Greek New Testament papyri reaches 127 (as of May 2010).
CHAPTER THREE

THOROUGHGOING ECLECTICISM

All modern printed critical editions of the Greek New Testament are eclectic editions, that is to say their editors have selected the text from a number of manuscripts at their disposal. No single manuscript is followed throughout. The printed text thus produced is the creation of the modern editors and does not reproduce in its entirety the actual wording of any one particular manuscript.

In most cases the text in our printed editions follows the reading of the majority of extant manuscripts; where variation occurs certain manuscripts are commonly relied on, typically Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus together with other early witnesses. Whenever these favourite manuscripts are divided over a particular variant, then most editors have to resort to principles based on internal evidence or intrinsic probability before reaching their decision what to print.

The Textual Commentary edited by Bruce Metzger to accompany the 3rd. edition of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament1 and, later, revised for the 4th edition, gives us an insight into the decision-making process in only a small part of the Greek NT, but at least this shows us how its committee functioned. We see that the editors, although basically wedded to the originality of the Westcott and Hort type of text, nonetheless had to cope with several difficult textual problems. Sometimes the text printed is described in the Commentary as the “least unsatisfactory reading”.

What has been said so far shows how the majority of textual critics grudgingly apply principles of intrinsic probability to text-critical problems only when their preferred external evidence is unhelpful or ambiguous. Thoroughgoing eclecticism, by contrast, operates the other way round, that is to say the initial questions asked when variants need to be resolved are: Which reading is in accord with our author’s style

or language or theology? and Why and how did the alternative readings occur?

“Thoroughgoing eclecticism” is one of the names given to the procedure for dealing with textual variation that prefers to debate each and every variant wherever these arise and to reach a decision not only on the reading most likely to represent the original words of the original author but also on the motives why the variant(s) arose. These decisions are reached largely independently of the manuscript support for the variants.

Thoroughgoing eclecticism is not the only term used to define this process. “Rational criticism” was once used but it gives the unfortunate impression that alternatives are less than rational! “Radical eclecticism” is another way of describing the process, but again that may be unfortunate in implying that it is irresponsible and extreme. “Rigorous criticism” has also been coined. In recent years this methodology has been associated with the name of G.D. Kilpatrick, in whose footsteps I proudly walk. Kilpatrick himself preferred the term “consistent eclecticism” and that has much to commend it. It means that there is a consistent application of text-critical principles based on internal criteria and intrinsic probability.

Kilpatrick stands in a line of text critics such as C.H. Turner, A.C. Clark and A.E. Housman and others. Although we are seemingly in a minority among text-critics (itself a minority discipline within biblical studies), many modern scholars seem to respect or follow, sometimes unconsciously, the position we uphold and promote. Many biblical scholars inevitably find themselves confronted with textual variation in their studies. Those who write commentaries regularly address such matters. I note that the recent ICC commentaries on Matthew and Acts pay due attention to matters text-critical and in many instances adopt a reading at variance with current printed Greek testaments and in favour of a reading preferred on internal grounds.

Thoroughgoing eclecticism applies certain criteria to assist its decision-making process. It is not subjective as some detractors might

---

2 Following M.-J. Lagrange, Critique textuelle II La critique rationnelle (Paris: Gabalda, 1935), but what he was advocating is not what is now understood by thoroughgoing criticism.

3 W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., The Gospel according to St. Matthew 3 volumes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97).

erroneously suppose. The criteria are generally principles known to and applied (when forced to do so) by most textual critics. They are indeed the principles that editors look at when a cult of the best manuscripts founders if their favourites disagree. Even the majority text adherents have to look to other solutions to variants when the majority itself is divided. Thoroughgoing critics would broadly support lists of principles such as those found in the Textual Commentary and in many handbooks on textual criticism. I have set out the working principles on several occasions including the 1995 Metzger Festschrift. These include: a recognition that parablepsis can cause the accidental shortening of the text being copied, that scribes were often prone to harmonize parallel texts which seemed to be divergent, and that scribes tended to improve upon perceived breaches of acceptable standards of language.

All such criteria are usually hedged around with qualifying comments such as ‘other things being equal’. For instance, I often wish to defend the principle (at variance with that found in many of the textbooks) that a reading giving the longer text is more likely to be original than a shortened version, and this is based on the argument that scribes often accidentally, but sometimes deliberately, reduced the text that they were copying. Such a principle would not be applied mechanically. One would not defend the originality of a longer reading if its language or style or theology were at odds with the context. (Examples of the reverse i.e. the lengthening of a text, can of course

also be found where it seems that a gloss has been incorporated into
the text being copied, or that there has been harmonizing to a longer
parallel.)

So what is it that makes thoroughgoing critics differ from others
who are prepared to recognize the validity of internal principles?

Put simply, it is that the thoroughgoing critic applies the criteria
in a consistent, thoroughgoing (but not doggedly mechanical) way. In
theory this means that if the arguments on style, usage and other
internal criteria point to a reading that may be supported by only a
few manuscripts then that reading should nonetheless be accepted. In
practice I must now admit that one feels more comfortable with the
favoured reading if it is not found only in a solitary late minuscule
or in only a versional witness.\footnote{C. Landon, A Text Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996 = *JSNT Supplement* 135), is prepared, on grounds of thoroughgoing textual criticism, to promote as original several readings in Jude that have only meagre external attestation.} But we may note that certain read-
ings lacking the support of normally favoured manuscripts are to be
found in even the critical editions themselves, e.g. in UBS\textsuperscript{4} one may
note at random the text printed at Acts 4:33 (supported by \textit{P}\textsuperscript{s} maj.); at
Heb. 7:1 (\textit{C*} maj.); at Heb. 12:3 (the reflexive with \textit{A P 104 pc}); and
at Rev. 18:3 (with 1006\textsuperscript{c} 3239 virtually alone). See also Hodges and

The UBS text still persists in printing a conjecture at Acts 16:12 sup-
ported (perhaps) by some versional evidence.\footnote{Thoroughgoing critics see no reason to resort to conjectures. That the original
text has survived in our 5,000 extant Greek manuscripts and in the numerous ver-
sional manuscripts is a cornerstone of the method. Conjectures seldom achieve schol-
larly consensus. They are a free rewriting of the New Testament and thoroughgoing
critics would not resort to conjecture as a way of removing firm examples of, say, a
grammatical feature that appears to sit uncomfortably within an otherwise coherent
feature in the corpus being examined. By contrast, G.D. Fee, a onetime vehement
opponent of thoroughgoing criticism, is prepared to argue in his *New International
Commentary* on I Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) that the verses com-
monly numbered I Cor. 14: 34–5 are not original to Paul’s letter, but were added later—and that in the face of the fact that there is no manuscript evidence in favour
of the shorter text. (But now see C. Niccum, “The Voice of the Manuscripts on the

If the arguments based on accepted principles lead to the apparent
originality of an allegedly weakly attested reading so be it; I would still
like that reading to be given a fair hearing. And in these days when an increasingly larger representation of Byzantine minuscules are being collated and these collations published\(^\text{11}\) a reading once thought to be read only by a single minuscule may find itself supported now by other manuscripts.

Thoroughgoing textual criticism has been accused of betraying a cavalier attitude to manuscripts, of treating manuscripts as mere carriers of variants or of not appreciating the history of the text. Such criticisms are unjustified. Thoroughgoing eclecticism is alert to the maxim that knowledge of manuscripts must precede knowledge of readings. We would be unwilling to accept the originality of a reading found in a manuscript whose known proclivities made certain of its readings improbable as the original text of the New Testament author. For example, a manuscript with a proven track record for expanding the divine names with a liturgical formula would be an unreliable witness in favour of a variant giving a longer, as opposed to a shorter, form of a divine name. Similarly, a manuscript whose scribe was regularly erratic in its spelling or another whose scribe exhibited conspicuous carelessness in word order would not be relied on when supporting, perhaps uniquely, an orthographical variant or a reading offering a changed sequence of words, even where in other circumstances such a variant might be seen as theoretically acceptable as the original.

We are also alert to the history of the text. Kilpatrick in particular made great play of the history of the Greek language in the early Christian centuries. He was ready to argue that scribes, influenced by stylistic guidelines about what was and what was not considered acceptable standards of Greek, such as those published by the neo-Atticists, would adjust elements in New Testament manuscripts whose Greek did not conform to these standards. He was also fond of recalling Vogels' observation that all the genuine (i.e. meaningful) variants in our *apparatus* were known from before 200 AD—in other words, virtually the whole fund of our known variants was in existence prior to the date of the overwhelming number of extant manuscripts. This is in a sense a negative fact in that it denies the validity of attempts to seek a purer text in older existing witnesses, the bulk of which are not earlier than the 4th century, and it renders external evidence of

\(^{11}\) For example in the series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
secondary importance to internal evidence, but it is nonetheless a
position that does pay due attention to verifiable observations con-
cerning the history of the text. Kilpatrick too was prepared to accept
the broad lines of textual divisions, Alexandrian, Western, Byzantine
and the like, because these are largely irrelevant to attempts to seek the
original text. Codex Washingtoniensis or Codex Bezae are sometimes
the bearers of the original text; likewise the Byzantine text is some-
times correct against the Alexandrian tradition.

I am nevertheless aware of problems in the method. To express it at
its crudest: thoroughgoing eclectic critics when confronted by a vari-
ant look at all the appearances of the feature, grammatical, linguistic,
thological, stylistic and so on, as appropriate; they then sort out the
non-conformist items with the aid of the apparatus; they finally pro-
duce a generalised statement concerning the writer or the problem.
The snag is that conformity is recognised in firm examples, and one
needs to be aware that hitherto unknown variants can suddenly be
produced that make firm instances into new variation units. But, in
reality, the principles seem to yield results. One example I regularly cite
is at Mark 10:1 where our critical texts print συμπορευονται...οχλοι
thereby giving a unique instance of the plural of οχλος in Mark against
forty or so firm instances of the singular. While exegetes dependent
on the printed text may seek possible reasons for this unexpected
plural, thoroughgoing critics will note from a full apparatus the v.l.
συμπορευεται...ο οχλος and will accept it as the original reading here
because it is a text consistent with Mark’s practice, and may argue
that the aberrant plural noun was introduced as a harmonization to
the Maththaean parallel. The manuscripts reading the plural (Sinaiticus,
Vaticanus and the bulk of Byzantine witnesses) and the manuscripts
reading the singular (mainly ‘Western’) are of marginal importance
in the editing of Mark 10:1 if the premises are consistently applied by
thoroughgoing critics.

The oft-heard criticism of deductions such as the above is that the
opposite could also occur, namely that authors are not necessarily
consistent and that Mark, in this example, was as capable of writing
a plural as a singular. In other words, the argument goes that it is
conceivable that scribes, alert to an author’s prevailing characteristics,
restored his text a rigidity not originally there if he noted that the
manuscript being copied moves away from the author’s habitual style.
For this to be put into effect requires our accepting a great perspicac-
ity on the part of a copyist, who, unlike modern scholars, would not
have access to concordances, statistical word lists and grammars which allow us to identify and monitor features of the biblical authors’ styles. I find such reasoning improbable not only in relation to the example given in Mark 10:1 but to other comparable places, although I concede that it is a counter-argument which needs to be kept in one’s sights.

Another example I have used elsewhere\[12\] is at Mark 6:41 where Metzger’s Commentary tells us that μαθητης is more likely to be followed by a dependent genitive than not, and that when variation occurs between the inclusion and exclusion of the possessive, the former is likely to be original. With that reasoning I agree, because various groups and individuals in the early church had their own disciples, but as Christianity developed the word “disciples”, unless further distinguished, tended to mean Jesus’ disciples. Scribes, finding what they would consider to be redundant possessives after the word “disciples” when referring to Jesus’ disciples, often felt able to delete the pronoun, a practice consistent with a general tendency to restrict the allegedly excessive use of post-positional possessives in Koine Greek. There is thus much variation in our manuscripts in this matter. As far as αυτου with μαθηται is concerned, variants occur at, among other places, Matt. 8:21; 15:36; 16:5; 17:10; 19:10; 20:17; Luke 12:22; 20:45; John 20:30. The UBS committee was unprepared to follow its own principle at Mark 6:41 or at these other verses. There the UBS text either omits or brackets the possessive, often because the characteristic brevity of the Alexandrian text commended itself to the committee.

Jakob van Bruggen’s plea that the Byzantine text-type be allowed an unprejudiced hearing when one is assessing textual variation is welcomed by thoroughgoing eclecticism. As far as his examples are concerned, I accept his arguments in favour of the longer text at Luke 24:42. I am less convinced by his arguments at Luke 2:33, 43 where he is favourably disposed to the originality of the readings found in the majority text. (I would consider it more likely—and in accord with the development of the virgin birth tradition—that Luke’s glaringly conspicuous references to Jesus’ father at 2:33, and to Jesus’ parents at

2:27, 41, 43 are original, and that all the variants at these verses are secondary, even if scribes were not always consistent in eliminating other, less obvious, references to Joseph as Jesus’ father elsewhere in the context.) Again we are confronted by questions of who is likely to be the more consistent—Luke or the scribes; and, again, I prefer to grant that a creative author rather than a mere copyist will demonstrate the greater degree of stylistic consistency. But the important point to note is that van Bruggen agrees with the principles of thoroughgoing textual criticism in assessing the variation units along the lines of Lukan style and scribal tendencies. His argument is not predetermined by a defence of a particular text-type; his conclusions merely confirm his observations that the Byzantine text-type may sometimes support the original reading, and that therefore its voice and contribution are worthy of being listened to. I may beg to disagree with some of van Bruggen’s textual decisions—but open debate is encouraged by thoroughgoing eclecticism.

Perhaps I have been too defensive—even negative—about thoroughgoing eclecticism in the light of misgivings that have been readily expressed about the method. I should now end by indicating just five of its positive benefits:

1. It looks at textual problems independently of the manuscript support, and that can be refreshingly open and instructive.
2. It identifies an author’s style, or first century usage, and can help us catalogue distinctive linguistic features, as C.H. Turner did with Mark.14 Such approaches sit comfortably with more recent investigations into narrative and audience-reception theories.
3. It takes seriously transcriptional probability. It makes readers aware of the reasons why and how scribes altered the texts they were copying.

---


4. It not merely seeks the original text, a will o’ the wisp according to some like Amphoux, but, perhaps more importantly, it also tries to find likely motives for the perceived changes throughout the tradition, a view compatible with Ehrman’s\textsuperscript{15} or Parker’s\textsuperscript{16} recent views on the validity of all variants as part of the living text.

5. Evidence is produced before conclusions are drawn over a variation unit.

* * *

Even text-critics unsympathetic to thoroughgoing eclecticism recognise that such investigations enhance our knowledge and understanding of the language, and style of the biblical authors, and of the pressures on scribes that encouraged their changing the text of their exemplars, even if these critics are unwilling to accept the text-critical conclusions which such investigations logically lead them to.

\textsuperscript{15} Bart D. Ehrman, \textit{The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture} (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

PART TWO

MANUSCRIPTS
CHAPTER FOUR

SINGULAR READINGS IN THE GOSPEL TEXT OF PAPYRUS 45

As a hand-written copy P.Chester Beatty I (P45) is by definition unique. Unlike multiple copies of a modern book reproduced by printing manuscripts are distinctive. No two manuscript copies of the Greek New Testament agree in all particulars—idiosyncratic errors and peculiar orthography as well as more significant textual variation separate one manuscript from another.

Although we know that scholars such as Origen\(^1\) and Jerome\(^2\) were occasionally alert to textual differences in the manuscripts they had access to, few ordinary readers and users of the books that came to be known as the Christian scriptures would in antiquity have been in a position to compare their church’s or monastery’s copy of the Bible with another manuscript. Such scholarly exercises would presumably have been possible in an academic centre such as Caesarea or Alexandria. But, in general, multiple versions of the same text would not have been readily accessible. In any case the average Christian was not concerned with the niceties of textual variation—for him it was sufficient to be told that book ‘a’ was approved reading, whereas document ‘x’ was apocryphal.\(^3\) To read Matthew, Mark, Luke or John was all that was important. Those defining the extent of the canon as such did not specify that the copy of, say, Mark had to be the one that contained (or did not contain) the last twelve verses of Ch. 16, for example.


\(^{3}\) As in lists such as those found in the Gelasian Decree, the List of the Sixty Books or the Stichometry of Nicephorus.
Readers and users of the Gospels in a particular ancient Christian community accepted the version of those books, which happened to be in their personal or local copy. We may compare this to a modern situation where Christians hear and accept as canonical the distinctive text of a particular translation of the New Testament being read, be it the AV, RV, or a more recent version. For instance, worshippers at a modern wedding service are likely to hear without questioning in 1 Cor. 13:3 the words ‘...I give (up) my body to be burnt’ or ‘...I hand over my body so that I may boast’ which depends on the translation being read (cf. Good News Bible and REB or NRSV).

Similarly, the users of the Gospel text of P45, the Chester Beatty Papyrus I (= PCBI hereafter), are unlikely to have indulged themselves with a comparison of their manuscript with any differing wording remembered from another manuscript. The copyist of that manuscript (or a predecessor) may of course have consciously altered the wording of the exemplar he was copying from when transcribing this text. Much deliberate alteration took place in effect to assimilate parallel texts, the commonly recognised harmonising of Gospel parallels especially to conform Mark and Luke to the wording in Matthew being the most frequent. (Examples of this cause for textual variation may be seen throughout PCBI.)

We now turn to PCBI. As we read through the remaining pages of its Gospel text we are first struck by the fact that this is a perfectly acceptable copy of these books. It reads well and logically, there being only a couple of places where the sense is obscured by an unusual wording. Readers familiar with the Gospels will identify some places where PCBI supports a reading differing from another text; at other times the alert reader may see a form of words hitherto unknown from other Gospel manuscripts. It is those unique readings that form the basis of the current investigation. I shall concentrate on the distinctive readings of PCBI.

Text critics dub such distinctive readings ‘singular’. I shall also refer to some so-called ‘sub-singular’ readings too, where the distinctive text of PCBI is shared by one or two other manuscripts. ‘Sub-singular’ seems a strange and self-contradicting term but by its use text-critics are pointing to a distinctive text that, probably coincidentally, is shared by another manuscript, usually without their having any recent

---

4 I leave aside the pages of this manuscript containing Acts.
common close ancestry or their ever having been influenced by the other. ‘Singular’ (or even ‘sub-singular’) are dangerous words. What we mean by these terms is that these are readings not found in the bulk of other manuscripts, but we must remember that the vast majority of other manuscripts, especially minuscules, have not been read in their entirety. So, it may be argued, today’s singular reading could tomorrow turn into a reading shared by other recently read manuscripts. That may indeed be a working possibility, but for most practicable purposes we may accept that, as the singular readings of an early manuscript like our PCBI are not shared with other early manuscripts (and most of the manuscripts written up to the 9th. century have been read in detail by modern scholars), they are for the most part unique to that manuscript. The other thing that must be said at the outset is that even if the currently extant fund of manuscripts reveals that a reading in one manuscript is unique, singular and distinctive, that does not of course mean that it was ever thus. The sheer chance of survival may deny our ever knowing if that distinctive reading was once shared (commonly) in its own day. All we may do is to say that of the manuscripts that happen to be extant today we have at this or that verse a text otherwise unattested elsewhere.

Obviously when trying to fit PCBI into the overall picture of the history of New Testament manuscripts, the distinctive readings are only one part of the evidence. One needs of course to see how its text compares with representatives of the generally agreed text-types into which the NT text has been divided, although Epp’s warning that it is somewhat anachronistic to make the text-type of a third century manuscript fit categories of text derived from manuscripts of later centuries is fair.5 One may, however, see which readings it shares with say D or with א or with W or the Majority text. Kenyon6 made a preliminary investigation in his introduction. Others have refined this work.

---


It may be that the conclusion is that PCBI is a ‘free’ text, to use the Alands’ term. But whether it is concluded that the manuscript cannot be classified or could perhaps be an early representative of a particular text-type is not our concern now.

Those who aspire to a so-called thoroughgoing solution to text-critical problems would put into the melting pot the readings of all manuscripts before deciding where the original reading of the original author lies. Those who convince themselves that they know which manuscripts are more reliable than others are obviously prejudiced in favour of readings found in their favourite manuscripts. As far as PCBI and other early papyri are concerned there has been a certain prejudice in favour of their readings especially if B also supports them. We see in our most frequently consulted Greek New Testament (Nestle-Aland) that occasionally PCBI and a few others have influenced the text printed especially if those few others are favoured manuscripts. The papyri have not influenced textual decisions as much as one could have imagined given the early date of many of them but there are places where PCBI and a few allies (notably B) have influenced the ‘original’ text in the modern printed editions, as may be seen in the apparatus of NA e.g. Luke 9:62 [προς αὐτοῦ] where the words are omitted by P75 B and our manuscript. See also Luke 6:34 [εὐτείν]: the verb is also absent from P75 B; Luke 10:35 word order with P75 B; Luke 10:38 αὐτοῦ sine add.; Luke 11:11 shorter text after νοῦς with P75 B At Luke 11:22 our text with P75 and D (against B) omits αὐτοῦ; that reading is not accepted by NA. In general though our manuscript and other early papyri have not influenced modern editors of the Greek NT as much as some would have expected.

I am interested here in trying to appreciate what the original users of PCBI would have read. To identify the singular and sub-singular
readings I have access to modern tools such as printed *apparatus* and collations which readily enable me to see where the readings of PCBI have not been repeated in any other manuscript (or which are different from over 99% of all other known manuscripts).\(^1\) Do those readings make a substantial difference to the type of Gospel text they read, heard and lived their Christian lives by?

The first thing that must be concluded is that the text of this early manuscript, ‘free’ though it may be dubbed, is no aberrant text like Codex Bezae is often said to be. There are no real surprises, no startling deviations or unusual glosses.

There are however a few places where PCBI gives us a shorter text than that found elsewhere. Sometimes the shortening of the text is probably due to the accidental omitting of the words because of an optical reason such as hom. and our scribe like many another is prone to parablepsis.

Occasionally our manuscript has a longer text than any others. We shall look at some of the most significant of these, but, before we do so, I should say something about nomenclature. Words like ‘add’ or ‘omit’ are loaded in favour of the view that we know precisely what the original text contained. That is not certain. All we can note by comparing one manuscript with another is that one has a longer or a shorter text. Nevertheless I do draw attention to the Synoptic parallels because those readings need to be taken into account when assessing the reasons for all types of change within manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels. (We should of course bear in mind that because of its fragmentary nature it is not usually possible to compare many Synoptic parallels within the manuscript itself.)

Among shorter readings PCBI has the following absences:

Mark
6:40 κατα\(\prime\)...πεντηκοντα (absent from the Synoptic parallels)
6:41 πεντε (in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels)
6:41 δυο (in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels)
6:48 της νυκτος (in the Matthaean parallel)

\(^1\) PCBI like most other papyri is regularly cited in the apparatus of modern critical editions, such as Nestle-Aland\(^2\) but not consistently (e.g. Mark 6:37 (word order); 6:39 (omit def. art.); 8:11 (omit ζητουντες παρ’ αυτου); 8:19 (om. τους) are absent from NA\(^2\)).
8:11 ζητουντες παρ’ αυτου (an omission through hom. seems likely here: αυτω...αυτου) but this makes nonsense of the verse
9:25 το ακαθαρτω with W (cf. Lukans parallel)
9:25 αυτω with Θ Fam1

Two other shorter readings in Mark are at 8:38 (where the lacunae in the manuscript make it unlikely that the words λογους and ταυτη could have been there. These variants happen—coincidentally—to agree with the readings in W). The *apparatus* in Kenyon, *Text* does not note these variants.

[126] Luke

In Luke 6 it seems from the space available in v. 48 that our manuscript has a shorter text than in other manuscripts, all of which have either (a) τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν or (b) δια το κολως οικοδομηθαι αυτην after σαλευσαι αυτην. There is a good and clear example of hom. if the exemplar had (b). The readers of this parable in PCBI lack an apparently otiose explanation why the flood failed to shake this house. Thus its readers may gain a rather different impression of the storyteller’s skill than readers of other accounts.

12:2 PCBI lacks και κρυπτον ο ou γνωσθησεται (also probably an omission due to hom. -θησεται...-θησεται) without any significant loss of meaning or sense. (The words occur in the Matthaean parallel.)
12:9 PCBI lacks the verse.

John

Folios 16–17 contain a good portion of John 10–11. Reading through the remains of these chapters in PCBI an observant reader, familiar with a printed Greek New Testament text, would note the absence of και η ζωη at 11:25. Knowledge of this unique reading has had a great impact. Among modern English versions NRSV has this shorter reading in its margin. Barrett’s commentary refers to this variant and he is prepared to argue for the originality of the shorter text.

---

12 PCBI agrees with W elsewhere in this verse in the sub-singular reading και for μετα. Cf also at Mark 9:2 + ο Ιησους with W.
11:7 There is no reference to the disciples after εἰπεν.

As far as longer readings are concerned, we note the following:

Mark
6:47 + παλαι with D Fam13, a reading found in the WH margin (cf. Mark 15:44).
7:5 + κοιναίς χερσίν καὶ ανιπτοῖς, which looks like a conflation of the readings κοιναίς χερσίν and ανιπτοῖς χερσίν. Fam13 has a similar longer text: κοινοῖς χερσίν ανιπτοῖς.
9:19 + καὶ διεστραμμένη (in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels).

Luke
11:15 PCBI reads ἐλαλήσαν οχυροὶ λέγοντες instead of εἰπον cett.
A reading in PCBI which modern critics would dub a conflate reading is the longer reading at Luke 21:24: before τοὺς κορακας the manuscript has τα πετεινα του ουρανου which agrees with the Matthaean parallel.

John
10:34 + εν τη γραφῃ
11:43 + ελθε (apparently) after δευρο.

We may conclude this survey by stating that by comparison with other manuscripts, singular readings in PCBI that offer a shorter text do not generally remove the sense from the passage. We could deduce either that the scribe was responsible from pruning what may have been seen as redundant expressions or that later scribes of other manuscripts added to the short original text (unnecessary) detail.

* * *

Let us now read through more consistently the remains of the Gospel text of PCBI and see what its readers would have encountered that would make their reading and understanding of the text differ from the text encountered by readers of other manuscripts.
Very little remains, but we have parts of chapters 20–21 and (together with the Vienna fragments of folio 2r. in the Austrian National Library Pap. G 31974) parts of 25–26.

In the story of the two blind men in Jericho PCBI has ηκολουθησαν οχλοι πολλοι and no αυτω at 20:29. That makes this reading differ from that in D (and a few others) which also have the plural but with αυτω. The rest of the manuscript tradition has the singular. Commentators may wish to explain the significance of these differences and text-critics may wish to discuss which reading gave rise to the other(s), but all that we wish to do now is to point out that the reading of our manuscript gives a picture (uniquely so it seems) of various groups of people with Jesus. Also in this story at 20:31 PCBI has the aorist εκραυγασαν against the more common εκραζον, εκραξαν (cf. v. 30) or εκραυγαζον. A change of verb could suggest a more sensitive literary style or that a stronger verb was needed to express a louder, more dramatic cry (as μειζον implies). We do however note that the Lukan and Markan parallels to this verse have forms of κραζω. It is not our intention here to pronounce on the originality or secondariness of the different readings but merely to note the distinctiveness of PCBI.

In the verses extant from Mt. 25 in the manuscript in fol. 2r. (not fol. 2v. as shown in the Text volume) there is a higher incidence of the particle και than in other manuscripts (see vv. 42–44). Readers of PCBI here would thus gain a different impression of the author’s style than readers of other manuscripts of Matthew.

In the Vienna fragments of this section at Matt. 26:7 the rare word order αλαβαστρον εχουσα μυρου may, as in many a differing sequence of words, merely be the result of a scribe’s having memorised a run of words which he then transcribes in a slightly different order which does not alter the overall meaning of the passage. [We note many such changes of sequence when comparing singular readings in PCBI with other manuscripts: e.g. Mark 6:37; 9:1 (where ωδε now has a less prominent position); 9:3; Luke 10:35, 38, 41 (to emphasise κυριος perhaps); 11:19, 44; 12:7, 11, 28, 36, 52–53 (where there are many variations in sequence throughout the manuscript tradition); 13:10, 15, 24, 31; 14:5; John 10:18 bis, 41; 11:9, 33.]

---

14 Correction noted in Kenyon, *op. cit.*, Plates p. v.
The extant fragments of Mark are more extensive than those containing Matthew. They contain parts of Mark 6–8 including the stories of John the Baptist’s death, the Feeding of the 5000 and its aftermath, the Qorban question, the Healing of the Deaf-mute, the Transfiguration and the Healing of the Epileptic Boy.

There are some oddities in the Story of the Baptist’s death. The reading αὐτοῦ γυν[αίκα at 6:17 is puzzling. So too is ἡ ρωδιας δὲ which suggests that this proper name is anarthrous. A minor difference at 6:21 is the addition of the preposition ἐν but whether such redundancy implies an original or a secondary reading is an open question. A fuller investigation into the use of prepositions in the manuscript is needed—cf. in this context Luke 14:1 (+ ἐν). At 6:22 is a rare instance when our scribe has provided a correction or maybe an addition above the line of the text. Εἰπεν ο Ηρωδῆς (a singular reading) stands in the text with βασιλεως added above the proper name; that longer text—if that is what is intended—is also a singular reading. Another unique longer reading adds αἰτήσαι at 6:24, presumably to the mother’s otherwise verbless reply.

The observant reader of 7:8 will miss the familiar τὴν παραδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (which balances τὴν παραδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων in v. 5). Readers of PCBI have εντολὴν instead of παραδοσιν which repeats this noun in v. 8a.

In the Healing of the Deaf-mute PCBI has the compound ενεβαλεν at 7:33 instead of the usual simple verb (but cf. επεβαλεν in Fam13).

At 8:12 the generation asks for (αἰτεῖ) a sign in PCBI. Other manuscripts read εἰπεῖ or ζητεῖ. The former parallels Matthew bis. ζητεῖ v.l. εἰπεῖ is in the Lukan parallel.

At Mark 9:6 PCBI (with W) reads λαλεί. This tense seems odd. The imperfect εἶλεί in Θ, λαλήσει in A D fam13, and λαλήσῃ in Byz. make better sense. This verb is preferable to forms of αποκρινομαι (ęb reads απεκριθη pace Kenyon’s apparatus); B reads αποκριθη (printed as the current Nestle text). Its very difficulty may make the PCBI text original.

9:19 ο ΙΗ εἰπεν: the addition of the subject—a singular reading—may be contrasted to Luke 13:12 where PCBI lacks the name 'Jesus', thus showing that we cannot argue that our scribe consistently adds or omits proper names, or that these changes are inspired in one particular direction from the liturgy.
9:23 has given rise to a variety of text forms but our manuscript
with ει δονη is the most compact and is to be understood as a simple
quoted repetition of the words preceding. It gives his rendering of the
verse a dramatic impact.

Luke

Of all the Gospels Luke’s has survived best in PCBI. Seven folios con-
tain extensive portions of Luke 6–7 and 9–14. We can therefore gain
a good impression of the text its original readers accepted as one of
their Christian writings.

9:29: προσευξασθαι (with N*) as in v.28; προσευχεσθαι cett.
9:31 εμελλον—this creates a difficult reading but could it be that it
was one that perplexed the original readers? Certainly all other manu-
scripts have a 3 p.s. (μελλει, ημελλε, εμελλεν).15

An interesting sub-singular reading in PCBI (shared with X) is at
Luke 9:33, which has Peter address Jesus as διδασκαλε. Other manu-
scripts read επιστατε here. The parallels are κυριε (Matthew) and
ραββι (Mark).

9:36 + της εγενετο after και. That verse also lacks ουδεν and the
emphatic αυτοι after και1 in our manuscript.

9:37 της ημερας in PCBI gives a different meaning from ‘on the next
day’ (in various forms of wording) in other manuscripts, but note δια
της ημερας in D.

9:40 αυτον (for αυτο) suggests it is not the spirit but the man (!) who
is cast out (cf. D: απαλλαξωσιν αυτον).

9:48: By placing an article before μεγας our manuscript balances
better ο μικροτερος earlier.

9:50 A difficult reading—ου γαρ εστιν καθ’ υμων ουδε υπερ υμων.
The following verses also reads awkwardly and are also likely to have
confused the readers of this manuscript: 9:52 προσωπου (sine add.);
9:53 προσωπον ην αυτου πορευομενου!

9:62 The sequence of words following ουδεις differs in various manu-
scripts. The sequence in PCBI is shared with only D.

15 On the related issue of the orthography see J.K. Elliott, ‘Textual Variation involv-
p. 249ff.
11:13 πνα αγαθον (with L) against πνευμα αγιον cett.; other readings are αγαθον δομα D; δοματα αγαθα Θ. (cf. 10:21 πνευματι without qualification.) Also at 11:13 note that PCBI has Jesus address God as ο πρ υμον ο ουρανιος (against ο πατηρ [ο] εξ ουρανου); ουρανιος is a hapax in Luke.

11:19 The absence of τα δαμονια is characteristic of our scribe’s having avoided words clearly understood from the context.

11:42 has ανηθον which parallels Matthew. Other manuscripts in Luke have πηγανον, but note Fam13 has both nouns.

12:4 When analysing questions of Lukan style it is to be noted that Luke according to PCBI has πτοηθειε, possibly to avoid an excess number of examples of φοβεισθαι in this context.

13:32 ποιουμαι, a singular reading: the alternatives are επιτελω/αποτελω/αποτελουμαι.

**John**

As far as word-order is concerned our manuscript’s reading ο καλος ποιμην bis at 10:11 instead of the more Semitic order ο ποιμην ο καλος may be significant when one assesses the style used either by the original author or by copyists. Similarly on stylistic grounds we see that PCBI follows the neuter plural τα προβατα with ηκουσεν at 10:8—all other witnesses read a plural form. Our manuscript uniquely has και before καθως at 10:15 thereby reading και seven times in vv. 14–16 (or eight times if we include κακεινα). Note also the use of the relatively uncommon απερ for α at 10:16.

Although not qualifying as a singular or sub-singular reading we note also in the Good Shepherd passage that the shepherd *gives* (διδωσι) his life at 10:11 (with Ν* D) and at 10:15 (διδωμι with Ρδεθ Ν*DW). Most other manuscripts read τιθησι or τιθημι in these verses.

10:39 δε is read instead of και/ουν/anacolouthon (cf. also + δε at John 10:22; γαρ at Luke 11:11). Particles are an obvious area for scribal preferences in a ‘free’ text.

11:4 ο υιος αυτου (against the ‘normal’ reading ο υιος του θεου), possibly to avoid a repetition of του θεου earlier in the verse.

11:43 We merely speculate on the significance of the *v.l.* εφαρκοτες in PCBI with D; και θεασαομενοι cett.

11:52: εσκορπισμενα. All other manuscripts have the form compounded with δι—. The simple verb is found elsewhere in John at 10:45 (a reading extant in PCBI).
11:57 PCBI refers to πρεσβύτεροι. No other manuscript refers to ‘elders’ in this context. The standard reading is ‘Pharisees’ and our manuscript recognises this group at 11:47. Nowhere else in John (outside the disputed Pericope Adulterae) are ‘elders’ mentioned.

**Conclusion**

All manuscripts have their share of singular readings (often nonsense readings) but the meaningful singular and sub-singular readings of this early papyrus manuscript deserve our attention. These distinctive readings—readily culled from a good *apparatus criticus* or from the edition by Kenyon (even though neither source gives every example, as we observed above)—ought not be dismissed as aberrant. All the readings deserve our attention if we are to understand what the readers of as important an early witness as PCBI were confronted with as they heard and studied their Gospels.

**Excursus**

One place in Luke where it would have been of interest to see what a 3rd. century reader would have found in PCBI is the Paternoster. Unfortunately our manuscript is deficient here. At the bottom of fol. 11r. the words visible come from Luke 11, then Kenyon estimates that seven lines are missing from the manuscript: fol. 12r. begins with isolated words from vv. 6, 7. That is a disappointment because the text of the Lord’s Prayer in Luke in some manuscripts has the longer readings paralleling the Matthaean form of the Paternoster (notably in Luke 11:2 + ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις, + γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως εν ουρανοι και επι της γης and 11:4: αλλα ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου). These longer readings are found in manuscripts from the 4th. century onwards. P\textsuperscript{75} of the 3rd. century supports the shorter form of the Paternoster in Luke. A rough calculation of the amount of text contained originally in the lacunae in fol. 11r. suggests (on the basis of the average number of letters per line and the average number of lines per page) that there was space in PCBI for some but not all three of these longer readings (which total c.86 letters in all). But I doubt if we can go further along this line of enquiry with any confidence to reconstruct the missing text here or to pronounce on which form of the Paternoster was known to this 3rd. century witness other than to conclude that its text is unlikely to have been the same as that found in P\textsuperscript{75}. 
Biblical scholars are used to working with the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. We sometimes need to remind ourselves just how unique these manuscripts are.

Both are codices on parchment that originally included the whole of the Bible. Even complete copies of the New Testament are rare: my count is only sixty-one manuscripts out of 5,000 New Testament manuscripts and not all those were originally composed as complete manuscripts; in some cases one of the sections was added by a different and later hand. Then the age of these manuscripts is remarkable—they are our oldest Bibles in Greek. (Their dates will be considered shortly.) The fact that they contain not only the New Testament but the complete Bible in Greek makes these, together with Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus exceptional. Even Latin pandects are rare. The fifty Bibles ordered by Constantine (about which more below) must therefore have been a very high proportion of all the complete Bibles written during the fourth century or, indeed, ever written.

The commonly agreed dates for Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are fourth century; Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus are from the fifth century. Cavallo¹ suggested dates of 350 for Codex Vaticanus and 360 for Codex Sinaiticus—those suggestions by a famed expert ought to be weighed carefully. Kenyon² gives the date as “early fourth century” for both.

We ought to remind ourselves what was happening in the Christian world at that time.

There was a growing consensus about the content of the Christian scriptures—the finally agreed canon was being shaped. It may plausibly be argued that texts like Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus

---

were written precisely as templates to show which books ought to be included within one set of covers, and thus to provide concrete examples of the lists that were being produced by the likes of Athanasius in his 39th Festal Letter of 367. In this letter (written in Alexandria) we have a very early example of a listing of the books of the Old and New Testament. We shall return to that letter soon.

We are informed that the sequence of the New Testament books in the Festal Letter bears a close resemblance to Codex Vaticanus. In the Old Testament the order of the canonical books in Athanasius’ letter agrees with that in Vaticanus, but the form in which the New Testament books appear in the manuscript of Codex Vaticanus agrees with the sequence in only the Greek form of the Festal Letter. In the Sahidic Coptic (and hence an Egyptian) form of Athanasius’ letter Hebrews comes between 2 Corinthians and Galatians. That is close to, but not identical with a form known to a scribe who copied a series of marginal numerations into Vaticanus. This chapter numbering in Vaticanus is illogical because Ephesians begins at number 70 yet follows Romans-Galatians which ends at 58, but it implies that its predecessor, in Alexandria (so it is often argued), had Hebrews (numbered 59–69) after Galatians and before Ephesians, and thus bears comparison with the order in the Sahidic version of the Festal Letter. However, it is not exactly the same. The important point about these numbers is that they are not the work of either of the scribes of the manuscript but were added later, possibly in Constantinople.

Some deduce from these facts that Codex Vaticanus may have been written in Alexandria but, as we shall see below, if Codex Vaticanus shares a common provenance with Codex Sinaiticus, which is certain, the completely different order of not only the New Testament but also the Old Testament books in Codex Sinaiticus must mean that they cannot be from Egypt as Sinaiticus does not share common sequences with Athanasius’ lists. The contents of Sinaiticus also differ

3 Vaticanus has none of the books of Maccabees; Sinaiticus has 1 and 4 Maccabees, Alexandrinus has 1–4 Maccabees. Then there is the different order: B has the poetic books of the Old Testament preceding the prophetic as in the Festal Letter and Codex Vaticanus ends the Old Testament with Daniel, Sinaiticus ends with the poetic books concluding with Job, Alexandrinus also has the poetic books after the prophetic books but ends with Sirach. The textual character of the manuscripts differs both within the manuscript (cf. Vaticanus in Ezekiel and Isaiah), and between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, because the writers of the manuscripts used a variety of different exemplars. See further chapter 32.
from Vaticanus. Thus the argument used to imply an Egyptian origin of Vaticanus based on the Festal Letter cannot be made to apply to Sinaiticus. The Festal Letter may have been reproducing what by 367 had become established practice, at least in Egypt, but it ought to be considered that the letter may be defending the contents of the canon rather than a particular sequence of those contents.4

The different sequences in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, and the different contents alert us to the fact that these were pioneering times when books and collections of books were being gathered together from previously independent and isolated codices to form what was intended to be an authoritative and demonstrable assemblage of books that defined the compass of the Christian canon in Greek.5

About the same time Jerome was at work doing a similar thing for the Latin Bible by assembling previously separate Old Latin texts of the Old Testament and the New Testament (and in his case, of course, by also translating several of them) to form a definitive Bible for distribution to Latin-speaking Christendom, just as Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus could have had the effect of convincing the Greek-speaking churches to accept their library of texts.

The other events that come to mind—and are often referred to in discussions about the provenance of these two manuscripts, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus—are significant:

1. The Emperor Constantine sometime between 331–335 wrote to Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea asking for fifty copies of the Bible for the new churches in his recently founded capital.


5 Athanasius permitted the inclusion of the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas in his list. Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas are included in Codex Sinaiticus suggesting it was written in an area not influenced by Athanasius. Codex Alexandrinus of the following century contains 1 and 2 Clement. Therefore a direct influence of the Festal letter on these early manuscripts seems unlikely, and indeed would of course have been impossible if the dates for the writing of Sinaiticus and of Vaticanus, argued for in this paper, are correct. All we may say is that these sources bear witness to a gelling of ecclesiastical opinion in the fourth-fifth centuries, although the situation remained fluid.
2. The doubtlessly imitative request to Athanasius by Constantine’s son Constans for copies of the scriptures. Athanasius could have acceded to such a request between 23 November 337, after having returned to Alexandria in triumph following his first exile from Trier, and 16 April 339, when he fled from Egypt for his long second exile in Rome. It would certainly have been impossible for him to have found two expert calligraphers in Rome had he already started that second exile, or to have had appropriate texts to hand in Rome for those scribes to have worked from. He could easily have furnished Constans with manuscripts from Alexandria and had them sent to Constans, whose headquarters at that time were probably in Naissus (modern Niš in Serbia) Wherever Athanasius wrote or found the manuscript(s) he makes it clear that he complied with the request and eventually sent them off to Constans.

The records of both events have survived and we note the following points from them. In Athanasius’ case he confirms that he sent these Bibles. As far as Eusebius is concerned, the precise details of the request by Constantine and the processes for its execution and delivery seem historically accurate; his account does not read like an exaggerated fiction encouraged by Eusebius’ hero-worship of Constantine. Devreesse suggested that the supposedly enigmatic τρισσὰ και τετρασσὰ διαπεμψάντων ἠμων (meaning ‘in dispatches of threes and
fours’) was probably an excuse to explain that he (Eusebius) had not been able to fulfil Constantine’s original demand for the fifty Bibles to be sent as a single consignment.

It is tempting to try to discover if the manuscripts referred to in these sources have survived. Are any of our extant codices examples of the manuscripts sent by Eusebius or by Athanasius?

* * *

The recent revival of interest in Codex Vaticanus may justifiably be due to the splendid new facsimile edition. But scholarly circles have also been confronted by a magisterial article by the veteran papyrologist T.C. Skeat that appeared in the centennial number of *JTS*.

In it he argues that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are indeed two sole surviving examples of the manuscripts copied in the 330s to comply with Constantine’s order (even though Skeat argues that Codex Sinaiticus itself was never actually sent, not only because it was a copy full of faults but because its format proved impractically huge to serve as a model). Skeat also argued, as Kirsopp Lake had originally done, that both were manuscripts written in Palestinian Caesarea.

Theodore Cressy Skeat was an assistant keeper at the British Museum in 1933 when Codex Sinaiticus arrived there following its purchase by the British government and people. It was he and his colleague H.J.M. Milne who published the long-lasting and much-quoted *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London, 1938). Then in 1984 he published his article “The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century” in *JTS* 35 pp. 454–65 (reproduced as chapter B3 in *Collected Biblical Writings*).

So, for over a period of nearly sixty years Skeat has been working on and with two of our most famous Greek Bibles, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. And it is his latest thinking on one of these manuscripts that I am promoting here, although lacking his eloquence and depth of learning and experience. The bulk of this paper is based substantially on his 1999 *JTS* piece and on some further thoughts that he has shared with me in the lively exchange of correspondence that we have engaged in for many years.

---

Skeat had sent a draft of that article to the Vatican library in 1996 and had been in contact with the library since that date, so he was somewhat surprised and disappointed that a promotional brochure issued in 2000 by the Vatican to announce the forthcoming facsimile states that Vatican Gr 1209 had been written much later than the 330s and specifies that “Il codice fu probabilmente trascritto in Egitto (italics mine)

The Vatican’s view may be traced to Devreesse who, referring to the Bibles ordered by Constantine, says: “Il est infiniment probable que de ces Bibles de Césarée rien n’existe plus. Le Vaticanus et le Sinaiticus seraient, en tout cas, seuls à considérer, mais leur date est vraisemblablement postérieure au premier tiers du IVe siècle…quant au Sinaiticus, il semble égyptien d’origine”.

The introductory matter to the new facsimile is in three parts each by a different author. In Pierre-Maurice Bogaert’s introduction to the Old Testament we read “on tiendra…pour possible (italics mine) une origine alexandrine et égyptienne de B” and he agrees with the consensus date of the 4th century. Stephen Pisano’s introduction to the New Testament agrees that “It is the most commonly accepted opinion that Codex Vaticanus is Egyptian, and was most likely produced in Alexandria itself”. Commonly held opinions are not by definition correct opinions.

Even though those views are against Skeat’s position we note the authors’ modest and often nuanced opinions about the date and provenance of the manuscript.

In the newspaper Osservatore Romano of Feb. 27th., 2000 an article written by Paul Canart, Vice-Prefect of the Vatican Library, on the occasion of the presentation of a copy of the facsimile to His Holiness, gives Skeat’s JTS article very full and sympathetic treatment. The article notes Skeat’s arguments favouring the provenance of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus in Caesarea and their early dates.

Among Skeat’s persuasive arguments is the constant message that no-one working in this area should forget that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are from the same scriptorium. The common origins of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus have been regarded as axi-
omatic from the days of Tischendorf through Lake to the present and
no responsible New Testament scholar should ignore this fact. Among
his proofs are:

i) The very close resemblance of the colophon design at the end of
Deuteronomy (in Codex Vaticanus) with that at the end of Mark
in Codex Sinaiticus.\textsuperscript{14} [This Skeat identifies as his strongest argu-
ment and one which must be understood and recognised.]

ii) Possibly Codex Sinaiticus shares a scribe with Codex Vaticanus.
Two of their hands may be identical. This is a disputed point
because the re-inking of Codex Vaticanus at a later date (prob-
ably ninth-tenth centuries) makes it difficult to examine carefully
the hand of the original scribes. Tischendorf thought hand D of
Codex Sinaiticus was the same as hand B of Codex Vaticanus but
Milne and Skeat argued\textsuperscript{15} that the closest resemblance was between
scribe D of Codex Sinaiticus and scribe A of Codex Vaticanus and
that, even if they are not the same, “the identity of the scribal
tradition stands beyond dispute”. Cavallo agreed with Milne and
Skeat. However, this is not a point Skeat himself would now wish
to dwell upon.
[We must remember that the colophon designs were not re-inked,
although the lettering was.]

iii) Another relevant consideration is the fact that Vaticanus and
Sinaiticus both end their text of Mark with the same verse. One of
the features of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus is that they,
virtually alone among New Testament manuscripts, end Mark at
16:8 (even though it is plausible that the scribe of Codex Vaticanus
was hesitant to do so).\textsuperscript{16} Sinaiticus does not provide any evidence
for the continuing of the text after verse 8, and did not do so even
before the re-writing of the bifolium, the error which provoked
the re-writing being in the text of Luke 1.

\textsuperscript{14} Parts of the relevant pages are reproduced by Skeat in his JTS piece as Plate 1.
\textsuperscript{15} Scribes and Correctors Appendix I (pp. 87–90) “Scribes of the Codex Vaticanus”
headed “Have B and Aleph a Scribe in Common?”.
\textsuperscript{16} He left an uncharacteristically large space after Mark 16:8 before resuming with
Luke at the beginning of the next column but one. The intervening space would not
actually have sufficed to be filled with the section commonly numbered 16:9–20 but it
is in fact symbolic of the fact that this text has been reluctantly omitted.
If these two manuscripts were among the fifty written for Constantine we need to ask if this shortened text of Mark, ending at 16:8, was a common feature of all of these specially commissioned codices and, if so, why this textual variant did not influence the subsequent manuscript tradition more decisively than the mere addition in a handful of manuscripts of obeli or asterisks or notes alongside vv. 9–20 to the effect that some ancient authorities lacked the passage. As we know, nearly all manuscripts of Mark include 16:9–20. Possibly the other forty-eight or forty-nine copies differed from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus in this regard, or possibly other text types came to dominate the traditions even in Constantinople. Early readers may also have recognised the difficulty of accepting the originality of a text of Mark that terminated in verse 8 in such an abrupt and strange way.

Streeter, albeit in the context of his now generally discredited theories about the Caesarean text-type, notes that when Jerome was in Constantinople (c. 380) he found that the authorities there advocated the text of Lucian—in effect the Byzantine text type—precisely because this included the longer ending to Mark. The discredited fifty copies would then, according to Streeter, have been despatched for use in provincial monasteries and churches. In any case, complete Bibles did not become fashionable until the invention of printing, possibly because such bulky volumes proved themselves impracticable. That may explain why these fifty manuscripts (assuming they resembled Vaticanus at the end of Mark) exerted no influence on other manuscripts over the ending of Mark.

But, the important point of all this is that whatever we say about the provenance of Codex Sinaiticus must also apply to Codex Vaticanus and vice versa. The similarity of their scripts also makes their dates of writing remarkably close to one another. [If two of the hands in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are the same then, of course, that confirms a similar date and place of composition too.]

Obviously when we look at the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus it is clear that they are no mere Abschriften of the same exemplar, or copies one of the other:

---

1. The difference in their contents and the differences in the sequence of the texts have already been referred to but need not militate against a common scriptorium.

2. The texts are not identical. There are many differences apparent when these two manuscripts are collated against each other or against a common base text. This suggests that, if Skeat is right in saying that they were originally composed in compliance with Constantine’s request, the method of production was not the simultaneous mass production of copies from dictation. If Caesarea were the place in which this work was undertaken, individual scribes doubtless used the many manuscripts available. Some of these may well have shared common textual characteristics with Egyptian manuscripts. Zuntz accepts this point in defending the argument that the two manuscripts were written in Caesarea to fulfil Constantine’s request by saying that many different manuscripts would have been assembled for the task and that it would have been unlikely that all the fifty manuscripts would have been copied from the same exemplars in a short duration.

3. The layout differs (three columns per page for the non-poetic books in Codex Vaticanus and four columns per page in Codex Sinaiticus) but such a difference may merely be a result of Codex Sinaiticus having been designed as a larger format book. [That overambitious scale resulted in its having been abandoned as the model for subsequent copies written to satisfy and fulfil Constantine’s request for fifty copies.]

So, the physical differences between the two codices and their differing contents need not argue against their common origin in the same scriptorium.

---


19 Op. cit., p. 44.
Now we turn to the likely provenance of these manuscripts and the case that they were both written in Palestinian Caesarea.

1. Sinaiticus seems to have been in Caesarea in the sixth century when parts of it were collated against a Biblical manuscript used by Pamphilus and Antoninus which, before their martyrdom in Palestine in 309, they had corrected against the Hexapla of Origen. Notes in Sinaiticus at the end of 2 Esdras and at the end of Esther explain this. The sixth century corrections were presumably executed in the library of Pamphilus in Caesarea.

2. Codex Sinaiticus has links with the sixth century manuscript 015 (\(H^{Paul}\)). 015 at the end of Paul notes that this manuscript too was corrected against the copy (in Caesarea) of the manuscript used by Pamphilus.

3. Codex Sinaiticus and Vaticanus share a distinctive chapter division in Acts related to the so-called Euthalian material, found in certain other codices. Euthalian material was associated with Caesarea, and this implies that our two codices spent some time there.\(^{20}\) The Armenian tradition contains Euthaliana and that version also has strong links with Caesarea.

4. More importantly, Codex Sinaiticus has certain readings that are strongly suggestive of Palestinian provenance. The reading \(\text{Ἀντιπατρίδα}\) for \(\text{πατρίδα}\) at Matthew 13:54 suggests that a Caesarean-based scribe erroneously wrote the name of a nearby town. The reading \(\text{Καισαρίας}\) at Acts 8:5 is even stronger evidence that the writer was in Caesarea. There is another similar variant: "\(\text{Ἰππον}\) replaces Joppa at 1 Macc. 14:5. Here the Palestinian scribe may have been thinking of the nearby town Hippos on Lake Galilee.

5. The Eusebian section numbers in Codex Sinaiticus were added by the original scribes (initially by scribe A, then by scribe D, but Luke was never completed), and it is more likely that these were known and copied in the early 4th century in Caesarea than in, say, Alexandria.

As far as Vaticanus is concerned, it was bound in red when the manuscript reached Rome in the fifteenth century, and is so described in the

Vatican Library’s 1475 catalogue (“Biblia. Ex membr(anis) in rubeo”) and in its 1481 catalogue (“In primo banco bibliothecae graece. Biblia in tribus columnis ex membranis in rubeo”). It seems that this leather binding has not survived: had it done so it may have been possible to prove if that type of binding was distinctive and characteristic of fifteenth-century Constantinople. Such a proof would clinch the argument where and when it was covered and where it came to Rome from.

A possible rewarding line of investigation is to link the additions to Vaticanus with a scribe from Constantinople. A recent attempt to identify the fifteenth-century hand as that of a known Constantinopolitan calligrapher, John Eugenikos, has not convinced Canart and we have yet to find our man—further attempts to search for the identity of this scribe continue. Canart in his prolegomenon to Codex Vaticanus in the introductory booklet to the new facsimile states that the “motifs [des bandeaux colorés et les initiales qui marquent le début de chaque livre] sont ceux de la décoration constantinopolitaine du Xᵉ siècle, mais dans un traitement abâtardi et une exécution maladroite qui seraient plus explicables au XIᵉ ou au XIIᵉ siècle, voire plus tard (italics mine)”. So, if Vaticanus was in Constantinople in the fifteenth century and if it also betrays characteristics of tenth- to eleventh-century Constantinople as well, it is plausible that it had been there ever since Eusebius despatched it from Caesarea.

As far as competing places of origin for the composition of the two manuscripts are concerned, the strongest alternative (and the one favoured in the introduction to the new facsimile) is Alexandria. That is often based on the several grounds. These are noted below with counter-arguments attached:

1. The suggestion has been made that Codex Vaticanus was one of the Bibles sent from Alexandria by Athanasius to Constans has already been referred to. But if Vaticanus had been sent from Alexandria to Niš we need to ask how, when and why it got to Rome in the fifteenth century.

2. The text of Vaticanus resembles the text-type of certain third-century Egyptian manuscripts, notably P75. But this need not be a decisive argument in favour of Alexandria and against Caesarea. As Zuntz reminds us,21 Caesarea was a centre of Alexandrian scholarship—the two cities were not so far from each other: we need

think only of the link from Origen through Pamphilus to Eusebius himself. Also to be remembered is the fact that manuscripts older than Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are papyri, which virtually all come from Egypt. We do not have comparable third century witnesses from other places, such as, for example, Caesarea.

3. Hexaplaric influences in Vaticanus such as the addition of obeli and asterisks in Isaiah, Zechariah, Malachi and Jeremiah are sometimes given as evidence of an Egyptian provenance. But they reflect only Egyptian influence that could plausibly have reached Caesarea through the person of even Origen himself.

4. Earlier arguments, by Lake and others, emphasise that certain features of the script of Codex Sinaiticus are Egyptian (the alleged Coptic mu, a cursive xi and a strangely formed omega) but these have been dismissed by no less an authority than Cavallo and by Milne and Skeat as not decisive.

So, the arguments for Alexandria are not watertight. Another of the arguments against Alexandria as the place of writing for Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus is, as we have already noted, the continuing presence of Codex Sinaiticus in Caesarea in the sixth century, a presence which Skeat explains as its having been there since its composition, because it was never completed and therefore not included among the manuscripts sent to Constantine.

As a curiosum we ought to mention a third contender as the place of composition of Vaticanus, namely Rome. This was put forwarded by Hort and by Wettstein but has found little favour. More recently Hahneman has repeated this extraordinary suggestion. Arguments based on alleged Latinisms in the manuscript are not persuasive. In any case it is the essential Greek character of Vaticanus which requires it to have been written in — and then used in, and preserved in — a Greek-speaking milieu. Among these distinctively Greek features are:

1. A Greek autograph by a monk named Clement was written on pp. 238 and 624, possibly as late as the fifteenth century.

---

23 Scribes and Correctors pp. 24–7 and see plate 31.
2. Tremas and iotas were added later, when the manuscript was re-inked.
3. Extended scholia in a twelfth- to thirteenth-century Greek hand were added on, *inter alia* pages 1205, 1206 and 1239.
4. At Hebrews 1:3 there is an amusing note in Greek against the variant reading φανέρων found only in B* B2 (plus coincidentally Serapion): 25 ἄμαθέσθε καὶ κακέ, ἀφες τὸν παλαιόν, μὴ μεταποίει.
5. The text of the manuscript was re-inked (as we have noted earlier). This occurred in perhaps the tenth century or slightly earlier and implies that the text was still being used and read by Greek speakers or readers. Apparently Byzantine scribes continued to use majuscule even for non-liturgical works.
6. In a gloss the word sophia is explained in Greek at the beginning of Proverbs.
7. Section numbers have been added and these are Greek numerals. There is no evidence that a Greek manuscript would have been so treated in a church like Rome that had abandoned Greek by the beginning of the fourth century.

All those points would need to be addressed by anyone with the temerity to propose a provenance such as Rome.

* * *

To conclude we merely summarize Skeat’s views on the later history of the two manuscripts:

**Codex Sinaiticus**

This was not sent to Constantinople. It was abandoned after the format of the Bibles was reduced. It therefore remained in Caesarea. Having been corrected in the sixth century it was sent to the newly founded monastery of Saint Catherine’s on Mount Sinai where it remained until Tischendorf rescued it in the nineteenth century.

---

25 This ought not to be used as an argument in favour of an Alexandrian provenance for Vaticanus.
Codex Vaticanus

The manuscript, having at some stage been neglected and having lost pages, lay abandoned in Constantinople, possibly because its text did not conform to the ecclesiastically approved norm. Then in the fifteenth century it shows signs of having been hastily reconditioned. Among the additions required in the New Testament and written in a cursive hand the Pastoral Epistles were inexplicably left out. But the whole of the codex was rebound and sent to Rome, perhaps in time for the Council of Florence (1438–9). The publicity brochure for the new facsimile admits that “La storia di questo codice resta comunque avvolta nel mistero, fino alla sua prima sicura attestazione presso la Bibliotheca papale, nella seconda metà de secolo XV” but goes on to say “Secondo un’ipotesi piuttosto suggestiva, il Codice Vaticano B giunse in Occidente nell’anno 1438, durante il Concilio di Firenze, come dono dell’ imperatore bizantino Giovanni VIII al pontifice Eugenio IV”. That had been Skeat’s position in his 1984 article in JTS and is also approved of in Canart’s article in the Osservatore Romano, where the hypothesis is described as ‘seducente’—although that seductiveness is described in Canart’s introduction in the booklet accompanying the facsimile as lacking any objectivity.
“Tatsächlich steht D einsam in der griechischen neutestamentlichen Textlandschaft”. So stated Kurt Aland in his influential article “Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament” in the Roca-Puig Festschrift, although he noted that D is not entirely “einsam”: there are some Greek papyri dating from the third century that show some similarities with the D text-type. Those manuscripts belong to the second half of the third century, which is when Aland concludes that the D text-type itself arose. We shall of course be looking at these manuscripts shortly. Our task, however, is to investigate the relation of D with all the early papyri and not just with the ones isolated by Aland.

In another influential article, Barbara Aland investigated the origin of the Western text in Acts, not merely the text of Codex Bezae. These articles by Kurt and by Barbara Aland will be referred to throughout this paper.

Obviously, when investigating the influence of the D text-type we need to look beyond the Greek area and turn to the Old Latin and the Old Syriac. Citations by Irenaeus and others also require close examination in this context. However, the title I have been asked to address restricts my research to the Greek papyri that may be dated prior to the likely composition of Bezae. That means I am not concerned with the development of the Western text, nor with the links between D and the early versions. In any case, Ropes and Hatch among others

---

have ploughed that furrow. Likewise, I am not concerned here with the originality of one reading over another.

These exclusions should have had the effect of making my task light, but that is not so, because the very narrowness of the title means I am responsible for providing only a partial view. However, as long as that is understood, I shall now proceed to my investigation into what is undoubtedly an important, albeit restricted, aspect of the character of D. When Neville Birdsall wrote his magisterial essay “The New Testament Text” in the Cambridge History of the Bible (at a time when only two papyri of Acts had been identified as of a D-type) he concluded: “No full enquiry has been made into the gospels to determine whether we have a Greek text extant which exactly represents that of which Bezae is a contaminated example”. I cannot pretend that what I plan to do here in any sense qualifies as a full enquiry, but it may offer a few pointers and relevant observations. All I have done is to make use of the variants in Nestle-Aland; this is obviously convenient, although not particularly scientific or thorough. It is those variants, supplemented occasionally with variants in the apparatus of UBS, that I quote in the examples cited below. They give a partial picture of how D relates to the papyri, but other investigations suggest it is a proper representation and should allow a correct judgement of where D has allies in the early papyri.

The Papyri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Papyri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd cent:</td>
<td>p52, p90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd–3rd:</td>
<td>p77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd:</td>
<td>p4, p5, p22, p28, p29, p45, p48, p53, p64, p66, p69, p70, p75, p80, p91, p95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd–4th:</td>
<td>p7, p37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th–5th:</td>
<td>p19, p21, p50, p57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th:</td>
<td>p93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.500:</td>
<td>p63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Dates are taken from NA.
There are thus some thirty-seven papyri to be considered if P\textsuperscript{63} and P\textsuperscript{93} are not deemed to be too late.

Early uncials not written on papyrus ought to be considered in a thorough investigation into the friends and allies of D. The earliest seem to be: 0162 third to fourth century (John); 0171 c.300 (Matthew/Luke); 0189 second to third century (Acts); and the Diatessaronic fragment 0212 (third century), but if we include all manuscripts dated to the fifth century or earlier there are some thirty-six such uncials that could qualify. Aland and Aland note only two uncials of the ‘D’ type, namely 0165 and 0171.\textsuperscript{7} 0171 is certainly worth investigating here, and we shall return to it later. 0165 is fifth century and therefore marginal to our interests.

In many of the places where D agrees with the early papyri there is no significance whatsoever in those agreements where D and the papyri agree with the bulk of all other witnesses against a variant which displays a maverick reading of an isolated manuscript. At other times D may agree with the early papyri together with many other manuscripts in a variation unit in which the total number of manuscripts and/or text-types divide. Here it is worth watching to find whether D and the papyri regularly coincide. Obviously the most telling places are where D and an early papyrus stand alone, or virtually alone, against the rest of the manuscript evidence. There are examples of this type, and we shall be highlighting these as we go through, although it needs to be emphasised at the outset that even such examples need not be evidence of a direct link between the papyrus and D or of an obvious relationship.

But first comes the evidence from the five books (the four Gospels and Acts) where we have examples of D together with the papyri.

Matthew

I note that there are a number of places where many of the early manuscripts support D. A short selection follows. (One can easily check the precise details in the apparatus of the printed editions.)\textsuperscript{8}


\textsuperscript{8} D and P\textsuperscript{9} of the third century are not extant at the same places in Matthew. P\textsuperscript{44} P\textsuperscript{73} P\textsuperscript{103} P\textsuperscript{96} are all later than D.
Most of these are not significant and do not tell us much about the relationship of the two. In most cases all that is being recorded in the apparatus is that some manuscripts or a group of manuscripts have a different text and that D, an early papyrus and other manuscripts do not support the aberrant text, e.g.

1) P_{77} at 23:37 with most manuscripts read ορνις επισυναγει against the word order in C W 0102 Maj.\(^{11}\)

2) 11:27 where P_{62}vid P_{70}vid support all manuscripts except N.

But the readings of P_{37} seem more significant. Note the following two readings:

At 26:34 P_{37} D alone omit the preposition in the phrase εν ταυτη τη νυκτι (N.B. the preposition is absent in D from the Markan parallel), and at 26:44 where P_{37} A D K f¹ 565 1424 delete εκ τριτη (although P_{37} unlike D does not delete the second παλιν in the sentence). This latter is a more significant variant and may suggest the longer text was introduced to make the threefold pattern of events in the Gethsemane story more striking and consistent.

Also, the reading of P_{21} at 12:25 may be of more than passing interest. Here the printed text in NA reads ειδως δε. There is one main variant ιδων δε read by P_{21} supported by Ν D 892, and by 0281vid 33 892c pc, which add ο ιησους. The only other variant supported by P_{21}

\[^{9}\text{Textual variants noted are taken from NA}^{27}\text{ or UBS}^{4}\text{ unless otherwise stated.}\]

\[^{10}\text{Note that the major addition in D at 20:28 is not supported by P}^{45}.\]

\[^{11}\text{Maj = the Majority Text (sometimes known as the Byzantine text) comprising the bulk of medieval manuscripts.}\]
in the NA edition is its support for D (and many others) against Β by reading βεελζεβουλ at 12:24. The support of P45 for D (and 1424 with a few others) in reading the phrase ηκολουθησαν… οχλοι πολλοι at Matthew 20:29 against the bulk of witnesses reading the singular may be of significance. Notwithstanding 20:28, in general P45 D stand together in those chapters of Matthew where P45 is extant.

But there are many examples where the papyri listed above disagree with D:

P25 18:33; 19:3
P35 25:22
P45 20:30 (first variation unit in NA27); 26:7
P53 26:34, 36
P70 2:23
P71 19:18
P77 23:30

P64 dated c.200 is not shown in agreement with D at all in NA27. Likewise the fourth century P86 is shown in only one variant at 5:13 and its first hand is against D. Even P37 goes against D at 26:28 in omitting καινης. See also 26:42 where P37 and others read πατερ against D and many others which read πατερ μου. In several places, ignored for the purpose of this exercise, D is unique. There is clearly no significance in such places if an early papyrus is against D—all manuscripts are against D! To include such references would of course distort our statistics.

As I mentioned above, one ought not to be too mesmerized by the writing material of our evidence. The parchment majuscule 0171 dated c.300 needs to be considered and highly significant it is too!12 It is extant in Matthew 10:17–23, 25–32 and displays the following readings that we need to ponder:

---

10:17 εις τας συναγωγας D 0171 only
10:18 ηγεμονον σταθησεσθε D 0171 only
10:23 αλλην D 0171 against ετεραν but some other manuscripts are
with D 0171 here so this variant is less significant.
10:23 εαν δε D 0171 only; καιν in all other manuscripts having the
longer reading here.

But note that 0171 seems to be with א B against D at 10:19 reading
παραδωσιν against the variant παραδωσουσιν.

The full display may be seen in the following table (pp. 85–86). 13

Mark

In Mark a similar state of affairs exists, although only two relevant
papyri are involved: P45 again and the fourth century P88. (P84 is too
late.) P45 agrees with D at, among other places, 8:34 and 8:35. In
verse 34 P45 agrees with D, reading ακολουθεσιν against ελθειν in א
B. Although we are not concerned here with the original reading, it
is tempting to see א B’s text as secondary and due to harmonisation
with the Matthaean parallel. At 8:35 P45 agrees with D with, it seems,
only 28 700 among Greek witnesses in omitting εμου και. This is not
especially important: other manuscripts delete εμου and both variants
reading the shorter text may be due to mere carelessness. 14 The double
expression ενεκεν εμου και του ευαγγελιου is characteristic of Mark
(cf. 10:29). In this second example we are noting a place where P45 and
D depart from Mark’s original reading. This is more likely than that
εμου has entered the text of some manuscripts from the parallels in
Matthew or Luke.

P88 regularly supports D, as for example at 2:5, 22. But neither of
these places is especially significant. At 2:5 the variant concerns the
perfect αφεωνται with P88 D and others including Maj against the
present αφιενται, so characteristic of Mark. At Matthew 9:2 D reads
the present! Metzger’s Commentary considers the perfect in Mark to
have been introduced from the Lukan parallel (Luke 5:20). 15 At 2:22

14 According to B.M. Metzger’s judgement in Textual Commentary, ad loc. (This
variant is not discussed in the second edition (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies,
1994).
15 Ibid., ad loc.
0171: Matt. 10:17–23, 25–32 (33 supplemented by a later hand)

NA27 0171 (Recto) D

17 ἀνθρώπων παραδοθοῦσιν γιὰ υμᾶς εἰς συνεδρία καὶ εἰς ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστεγώσοντι
18 ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖνο ὁ δεικνύων δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεῖς ὠτὸν δὲ παραδοθῶν υμῖν μὴ μεριμνήσατε ποιῶς
20 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἁρμα τῇ λαλήσατε ὅτι γιὰ υμᾶς ὧν ἔστε οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλῶν
21 εἰς ὑμῖν παραδόθη τε αἰδέλφος αἰδέλον εἰς τὰν αὐτόν καὶ πατὴρ τῇ τεκνίᾳ καὶ εὐαναστάθηται τεκνιᾷ εἰς τὸν αὐτόν καὶ βασιλεύοντι αὐτοῦ
22 καὶ εἰς τὸν παπαν συνελθῆται ὅταν δὲ διακόσιον υμᾶς ἐν τῇ πάλει τοῦτη φεύγετε ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ
23 εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν συνελθῆται ὅταν δὲ διακόσιον υμᾶς ἐν τῇ πάλει τούτῃ φεύγετε ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ

... τὸν αὐτόραθον παραδοθοῦσιν γιὰ υμᾶς εἰς συνεδρία καὶ εἰς ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστεγώσοντι
5 σταθῆσθαι εἰς τοῦ ὑμῶν αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεῖς ὑμῶν μὴ μεριμνήσατε ποιῶς
10 ὑμεῖς ὀτί οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρῶς τὸ λαλῶν εἰς ὑμῖν παραδόθη τε αἰδέλον εἰς τὰν αὐτόν καὶ πατὴρ τῇ τεκνίᾳ καὶ εὐαναστάθηται τεκνιᾷ εἰς τὸν αὐτόν καὶ βασιλεύοντι αὐτοῦ
15 γιὰ τὸν παπαν συνελθῆται ὅταν δὲ διακόσιον υμᾶς ἐν τῇ πάλει τοῦτῃ φεύγετε ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν συνελθῆται ὅταν δὲ διακόσιον υμᾶς ἐν τῇ πάλει τοῦτῃ φεύγετε ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν...
25...ο διδασκαλός αυτού και ο δούλος ας ο κύριος αυτού εις τον αικοδοσο-
τιν Βελέζβουλ επεκαλέσαν ποσο
26 μαλλον τους σικακας αυτος μη
σου φοβήθητε αυτους ουδεν γαρ εστιν
κεκαλυμμενον ο σου αποκαλυψηται
27 και κρυπτον ο σου γνωσθησηται ο λεγω
μην εν τη σκοτια ειπατε εν τα φωτι
και ο εις το σου ακουετε κηρυξατε επι
28 των διαματων και μη φοβεισθε απο
των αποκτηνοντων το σωμα την δε
ψυχην μη δυναμενον αποκτηναι
φοβεισθε δε μαλλον τον δυναμενον
και ψυχην και σωμα απολεσαι εν γεννη
29 ουχι διο στρατιωθα σασαριω πελτατε
και εν εξ αυτων ο πεπειται εις την
30 γην αυν του πατρος ιμων ιμων δε
και τραχεις της κεφαλης ποσατι
31 προσθημεναι εισαι μη σου φοβεισθε
πολλων στρατιωθων διαφερετε ωμες
32 έτης ουν αισθησει ανεφευγεν εν ειμι ει-
προσθησαν των συνθραπιων αισθησισι...
33 έτης δ ου ερνηθησατε με εμπροσθ
των συνθραπων αρνησισει καγα αυτων
εμπροσθησαν του πατρος μου του εν τοις
ουρανους

0171 (Verso)

[... ο διδασκαλός αυτού] και ο δούλος
[ασ οθρεις αυτού εις τον αικοδοσο-
τιν [Βελέζβουλ εκείλαςαν ποσο]
μαλλον [τους σικακας αυτο] [μη]
[ουν φοβήθετε [αυτους ουδεν] γαρ εστιν]
[κεκαλυμμενον [ς ους αποκαλυφθηται]
και κρυπτον ο [ςου γνωσθηση] [ται ο] [Λεγω]
[μΗν εν τη σκοτια ειπατε εν τα φωτι]
και ο εις το σου ακουε [κηρυξατε επι]
[των διαματων] και μη φοβεισθε απο]
[των αποκτηνοντων το σωμα την δε]
[ψυχην μη δυναμενον αποκτηναι]
[φοβεισθε δε μαλλον τον δυναμενον]
και ψυχην και σωμα απολεσαι εν γεννη]

D

...ο διδασκαλός αυτού και ο δούλος
ας ος κυριος αυτού εις τον αικοδοσο-
25 δι των βελέζβουλ κεκαλυμμενο
μαλλον τους σικακας αυτου μη
ουν φοβηθητε αυτους ουδεν γαρ εστιν
κεκαλυμμενον ο σου αποκαλυφθηται
και κρυπτον οςου γνωσθησηται ο λεγω
30 ους εν τη σκοτια ειπατε εν τα φωτι
και ο εις το σου ακουετε κηρυξατε επι
tων διαματων και μη φοβηθητε απο
tων αποκτηνοντων το σωμα την δε
ψυχην μη δυναμενον απολεσαι
35 φοβηθητε δε μαλλον τον δυναμενον
και ψυχην και σωμα συλλαβεται εις γεν
νην ουχι διο στρατιωθα σασαριω πελτατε
και εν εξ αυτων ο πεπειται εις την
γην αυν του πατρος ιμων ιμων δε
και τραχεις της κεφαλης ποσατι
προσθημεναι εισαι μη σου φοβηθητε
πολλων στρατιωθων διαφερετε ωμες
ης ουν αισθησει ανεφευγεν εν ειμι ει-
προσθησαν των συνθραπων αισθησισι...
40 και οι τραχεις της κεφαλης ουκ ερνηθη
προσθημεναι εισαι μη σου φοβηθητε
πολλων στρατιωθων διαφερετε υμες
ης ουν αισθησει ανεφευγεν εν ειμι ει-
προσθησαν των συνθραπων αισθησισι...
45 οι τραχεις δ ερνηθηςατε με ενπροσθ
των συνθραπων αρνησισει καγα αυτων
εμπροσθησαν του πατρος μου του εν
ουρανους

l. 34: αποκτηναι added above the line by a later hand
l. 37: του deleted by a later hand
D and others including Ν B read ρηξει ο οινος against the Majority ρησσει ο οινος ο νεος. These therefore do not tell us much about D and the early papyri. And there are many places where D and Π88 are on different sides e.g. 2:12, 14, 22 (second variation unit in NA27). Likewise, Π45 is against D in readings at 6:45; 7:4 bis, 7–8 (in UBS4), 31, 35 bis etc.

As far as uncials are concerned, only 0212 may be used but because this has a Diatessaronic text it is not clear if it is based on Mark 15:40, 42 or on the parallels in Matthew 27:56–7; Luke 23:49–51, 54 or John 19:38. But if it is closer to Mark, as many editors of the critical apparatus assume, then all we need note is that 0212 is against D (with its unique reading πριν σαββατον) at Mark 15:42.

**Luke**

As we all know, D is more distinctive in the Lucan writings, so we may be on a more rewarding investigation when we turn away from Mark to Luke’s Gospel. Certainly we have a higher number of papyri to look at. There are five: P4, P7, P45, P69, P75. (These are all third century although P7 may be slightly later.) Other papyri containing Luke are either too late for our survey (P3, P42, P97) or (in the case of the fourth to fifth century P82) lack any relevant variants in NA27. Of the five relevant papyri P69 will be worth exploring, since Alands, Text lists it as a ‘D’-type manuscript. But before we turn our attention specifically to that papyrus, let us work our way through the gospel picking out significant variants:

1) 3:36 omit του καιναν(μ) Π75vid D but hom is likely to have created the shorter text independently in both manuscripts.
2) 9:34 επεσκιασαν Π45 D and others including Maj against Π75 Ν B επεσκιαζεν. (P75 Ν B agree with the Matthaean parallel (Matt. 17:5) where the text is firm.)
3) 9:48 omit αυτοις Π45 D 2542 only (cf. omission in the Matthaean parallel (Matt. 18:5); αυτοις in the Markan parallel).
4) 9:48 τουτο το παιδιον το παιδιον τουτο Π75 D f1 579 pc.
5) 9:57 υπαγεν Π45 D pc against απερχη.
6) 10:14 omit εν τη κρισει Π45 D 1241 pc; (cf. 11:31 below).
7) 11:15 βεελζεβουλ Π45 P75 D and many others; (cf. Matthew 12:25 above).
8) 11:24 + δὲ Π 45 Π 75 D W 1241 2542 against almost all other manuscripts (δὲ occurs in the Matthaean parallel, 12:43).

9) 11:29 Π 45 Π 75 Θ B D omit τοῦ προφήτου.

10) 11:31 Π 45 D only omit εν τῇ κρίσει. The words occur in the Matthaean parallel (12:42) and in Mark 11:32 (verse om. D); (cf. 10:14 above).

11) 11:34 παν Π 45 D only; ολον cet. occurs in the Matthaean parallel (6:22). As with the previous example, we may prefer as the original reading the text that makes the parallels dissimilar, but such pronouncements about the original and secondary texts are not germane to our discoveries here—tempting though such judgments are! The combination of Π 45 D alone is what is significant for our present purpose.

12) 12:47 ετοιμασας η ποιησας all manuscripts except L W (ετοιμασας) and Π 45 D pc. (ποιησας).

13) 12:56 πλην τον καιρον Π 45 D pc. against τον καιρον δε Π 75 B.

14) 13:13 εδοξαζεν v.l. εδοξασεν Π 45 D 2542.

15) 14:23 add αυτου Π 75* D.

16) 14:26 Π 45 D and others ψυχην εαυτου against εαυτου ψυχην Π 75 Θ B.

There is no evidence of support by Π 4 for the longer reading by D following 6:4 or by Π 45 for the addition by D at 9:55, or by Π 75 for the significant readings by D in chapters 22–24.

Of these sixteen readings, numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 seem significant. In these D is allied closely with Π 45 virtually on their own some seven times and with Π 75 twice, although as far as Π 75 is concerned we note that in the examples above the reading of Π 75 with others stands against D (and Π 45!) twice. Π 75 supports D also at 5:2 bis, 3, 9; 6:23, 25, 45 but there are many other instances where this manuscript is against D. Π 69, allegedly a manuscript of the ‘D’ text-type according to the Alands’ classification is extant in Luke 22:41, 45–48, 58–61. At 22:58 Π 69* D read ο δε ειπεν against v.l. ο δε πετρος εφη cet., but generally Π 69 does not support D in the other variants displayed in NA 27. For Π 69 see the following table (pp. 90–91).

But Π 69 is a small manuscript and its relationship to D need be no different from that of Π 45 which has extensive remains of Luke (some seven chapters in whole or in part). Thus statistically Π 69 with the four recorded variants (one agreement of Π 69 and D; one reading where Π 69
and D support different readings; and two where P\textsuperscript{69} has an idiosyncratic text) need be little different from P\textsuperscript{45} where we noted readings in which D and P\textsuperscript{45} are very close and a good number where they differ.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16} Aland op. cit. 94 working from the full apparatus of P\textsuperscript{69} notes three agreements of P\textsuperscript{69} and D and eleven where P\textsuperscript{69} is against D. Table from “Alter und Entstehung”, pp. 92–3.
καὶ θεὶς τὰ γονατά προσπυχέτο· λέγων πατέρει εἰς βουλεῖ παρενεγκες τοῦτο τὸ ποτηρίου απ' εἰμιον πλὴν μὴ τὸ ἔθελμα
μου ἀλλα τὸ σον γινεσθω [οὐφθε δὲ αὐτῳ αγγέλος εἰς οὐρανον ενισχυνον ἀυτον'] και γενομένον εν αγγελίᾳ εκτενεσταρον προσπυχέτο και ἐρευνητο ὁ ἱδρος αὐτοις εἰςε θρομβοις εἰμιατος
καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν γῆν' καὶ ἀναστασά ἀπο τῆς προσευχής ελθών προς τοὺς μαθητάς εὑρεν κομμαμενον αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς λυπής
καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοις τι καθευδετε ανασταντες προσευχεθε να μὴ εἰσελθηνε τι εἰς πειρασμὸν' ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλουντος ἐίδου ωκύλος καὶ ὁ λεγομένος Ιουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα προπήχετο αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγεγον τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσας αὐτον
Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἰπεν αὐτῳ Ιουδα φιλήσας τι...
58 εφη καὶ συ εξ αὐτῶν εἰ ὁ ἐν Πέτρῳ
59 εφη αὐθεντε ὑπὲ ἐμι ἑαυτὶ καὶ διάστα-
σις ὥστε ὁρα τὸς ἄλλος τις δι-
ἱσχυριζέτο λεγόν ἐπὶ ἀλλεῖς σ
καὶ ὁστὸς μὲν ἀυτὸν ἦν καὶ γαρ
60 Γαλατῖος εἰπεν ὁ Πέτρῳ αὐθεντε ὑπὲ ὑδία ἰ
λεγίς καὶ παραχρήματι ἐτὶ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ
61 εφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κυρίος ενεβλεπών τὸν Πέτρῳ καὶ ὑπομνησθῇ ὁ Πέτρῳ τὸν ῥημάτος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσας σημερόν . . .

25 εἰπεν τὸ αὐτὸ ὁ ἐν Πέτρῳ
26 εἰπεν αὐθεντε ὑπὲ ἐμι ἑαυτὶ καὶ διάστα-
σις ὥστε ὁρα τὸς ἄλλος τις δι-
ἱσχυριζέτο λεγόν ἐπὶ ἀλλεῖς σ
καὶ ὁστὸς μὲν ἀυτὸν ἦν καὶ γαρ
30 Γαλατῖος εἰπεν ὃ ἐν Πέτρῳ αὐθεντε ὑπὲ ὑδία ἰ
λεγίς καὶ παραχρήματι ἐτὶ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ εφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ στραφεὶς ὁ ἐν Πέτρῳ ενεβλεπών τὸν Πέτρῳ
35 καὶ ὑπομνησθῇ ὅ τῳ λόγῳ τῷ κυρίῳ ὡς εἴπεν αὐτῷ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσας . . .
P₄ supports D at 3:14; 4:1, 29; 5:34; 6:3 bis, 4 among others but, as with P⁷⁵, one finds many readings where the manuscripts stand on different sides of the fence e.g. 3:9; 5:33, 38, 39; 6:1.

P⁷ agrees with D at 4:1, the only example cited in the NA apparatus.

As with Matthew, the link in Luke between D and the uncial 0171 is strong. 0171 contains Luke 22:44–56, 61–4. The following table gives the complete picture:\footnote{Taken from Aland, “Alter und Entstehung”, pp. 84–5.}

NA²⁷

44 [... θρομμοι αιματος καταβαίνοντες
45 επι την γην'] και αναστάτακ απο της προσ-
πευχης ελθον προς τους μαθητάς
ευρέν κοιμωμένους αυτούς απο της
46 λυπης' και ειπεν αυτοις τι καθευ-
δετε αναστατης προσευχεθα την
47 μη εισελήπτει εις πειρασμον' επι
αυτου λαλουντος ιδου εχλος
και ο λεγομενος Ιουδας
eις των διδακα προηχετο αυτούς
και ηγησεν τον Ησιου φιλησαι αυτων

48 Ησιους δε ειπεν αυτω Ιουδα φιλη-
ματι των υιων του ανθρωπου παρα-
dιδοσ' ιδοντες δε οι περι αυτων το
estoμενον ειπαν κυριε εις πατεξωμεν
50 εν μεχαρι' και επαταξαν εις τις εξ
αυτων του αρχ-

[Ησιους δε ειπεν αυτω Ιουδα φιληματι των υιων του ανθρωπου παραδιδοσ' ιδοντες δε οι περι αυτων το εστομενον ειπαν κυριε εις πατεξωμεν εν μεχαρι' και επαταξαν εις τις εξ αυτων του αρχ]

D

50 εκ την γην' και αναστάτακ απο της προσ-
πευχης ελθον επι τους μαθητάς
ευρέν κοιμωμένους αυτούς απο της
55 μη εις πειρασμον εισεληπτε' επι
de αυτω λαλουντος ιδου εχλος και ο
καλομενος Ιουδας Ισκαριωθ
εις των διδακα προηχετο αυτως
και ηγησεν τον Ησιου φιλησαι αυτων

60 γερ σημειον δεδοκει αυτοις ον αν φι-
λησαι αυτως εστιν
ο δε ιης ειπεν τω Ιουδα φιλη-
ματι των υιων του ανθρωπου παρα-
dιδοσ' ιδοντες δε οι περι αυτων το

58 γενομενον ειπαν το και εις πατεξωμεν εν μεχαρι' και επαταξαν εις τις εξ αυτων του αρχ
94 chapter six

λόν τον αρχιερε[ας] καὶ αφείλεν
to oυς [αυτ]ου το δεξιον'

λόν του αρχιερεως καὶ αφείλατο
αυτου το αιτιον το δεξιον' αποκρίθης
de o της εικαν εκας εις τουτον
dk kεκτηκας την χειρα πηντο αυτου και
απεκτητεσθαθι τους αυτου:
eπεν δε . . προς τους παραγε
νωμενους επ αυτον αρχιερεις και

στρατηγους του ιερου και περα
υμενους ας επι ληστην εξηλθατε
meta μεχανων και δικλων' καθ
tημεραν οντος μου μεθ υιων εν
to τερων αυτων κατα τας χει
ρας επ εμε αλλ αυτη εστιν ημων
η ορα και η εξοδους του σκοτους
συλλαβοντες δε αυτων ηγαγον και
ηισηγον εις την αικιαν του αρχιε
ρεως o de πετρος ηκαλουθη
μακροθεν' περιπατησαν δε πυρ
εν μεσα της κυλης και συνεκινουη
ενακθη ο πετρος μεσος

ζητουσα δε . .

61/62 . . απαρνηθε με τρις και εξελθων εξω
63 εκλαυον πικρος' και οι ανδρες οι συν
εχοντες αυτων ενεκαζων αυτω δεροντες
κατε και περικαλυπταντες . .

. . απαρνηθη με τρις
και αι ανδρι[ν] οι συν-
εχοντες αυτων ενεκαζων αυτω δεροντες
και περικαλυπταντες . .

64 . . τρεις
65 απαρνηθη με τη ειδηνε με τας εξω
66 εκλαυον πικρος' και οι συν
εχοντες αυτων ενεκαζων αυτω και περικαλυπταντες . .

3. 79: *εξετισται: o deleted by a later hand
There are spectacular similarities at verses 47 bis, 49 bis, 53 and 54. Let us detail these:

22:47 καλομενος Ιουδας Ισκαριωθ D 0171υδ alone. The other reading in this verse (+ δε) is obviously less telling, because D 0171 have support from a range of other witnesses.

22:49 γενομενον D 0171 pc.
22:53 + το D 0171 only.
(22:54 + αυτο απο D cf. + απο 0171)

But also note the virtually unique reading of 0171 at 22:45 + και and at 22:49 αυτο.

John

Before we turn to the second of the Lukan writings let us complete the survey of the gospels with an examination of the Fourth Gospel.

Fourteen papyri are of the right date although P63 dated c.500 and P93 of the fifth century are marginal. P60 is too late. They are:

P5 third century
P6 fourth century
P22 third century
P28 third century
P39 third century
P45 third century
P52 second century
P63 c.500
P66 c.200
P75 third century
P80 third century
P90 second century
P93 fifth century
P95 third century

Some of these can be dismissed: P80 has no variants shown in NA27 or UBS3 or UBS4. P90 is extant only where the text of D has been supplemented. D is not extant where P63 survives in John 3 but the two are extant in John 4:9–10. Throughout the apparatus no consistent pattern emerges for most of these manuscripts.
P52 (our earliest New Testament manuscript) is very small and is extant only where D has been supplemented.

[177] For the uncials the only sufficiently early manuscript is the third to fourth century 0162, but this survives only in 2:11–22 where D is not extant.

There are several significant readings to which we must turn our attention. It is worth noting that it is P66 that seems to have the greatest affinity with D, although the Alands do not categorize P66 as one of their ‘D’-type manuscripts. It is one of their ‘free texts’. That is a wise decision and should warn us not to expect too much from P66: there are many places where P66 disagrees with D. Nevertheless there are numerous and significant agreements between them.

5:18 P66 D only agree in word order
6:53 P66 D only agree in word order
7:31 P66 Θ D pc agree in word order
9:10 εἰπαν P66 D only
9:19 επιρρωτήσαν P66 D pc
10:10 P66* D pc omit (? through hom) καὶ περισσόν εὑρεῖν
10:16 + δὲ P66 D pc.
10:19 P66 D Maj. + οὖν (against P75 Θ B)
10:20 + οτι P45 D
10:25 omit αὐτοῖς P66 Θ * D
11:6 επὶ τῷ P45 D
11:7 εἰπά P66 D
11:32 omit αὐτῷ P66 D 579 (cf. 10:25 after verb of speech)
11:37 P66 D only agree in word order
11:45 εὐφροσύνες P45 P66 D only
11:51 omit εἰκεῖνον P66 D only
12:3 omit (? through hom) ναρδὸν P66* D only
12:30 ηλθεν P66 D only
15:17 omit ἰνα P66* D only
15:24 omit καὶ P66 D only
16:21 ημερὰ P66 D
17:14 omit (? through hom) καθὼς ... κοσμοῦ P66* D

It will be noted how many of these concern agreement in a variant involving word order. To those we could add comparable readings at 7:35; 8:44, 52; 9:28; 10:32; 11:17; 12:26 where P66 agrees with D and 15:2 where P75 agrees with D. It is certainly striking to see how frequ-
eny P\textsuperscript{66} and D stand together. In a few cases of hom their agreement may be coincidence, but the word order variants where they agree seem particularly important. The message is clear. A fuller collation and analysis into the complete text of P\textsuperscript{66} and D than my current sample allows is required.\textsuperscript{18}

P\textsuperscript{66} and P\textsuperscript{75} do not support the significant readings by D at 5:3 concerning the stirring of the water. Similarly these two papyri do not agree with D in including the pericope of the adulteress.

\textit{Acts}

It is to Acts that we shall devote a major section of this paper—for two obvious reasons. It is the book where D is at its most distinctive, so if we discover any places where an early manuscript shares with D that distinctiveness this would be telling. Secondly, the most recent volumes in the \textit{Text und Textwert} series are devoted to Acts.\textsuperscript{19} That means we have the fullest display of textual evidence available for the Teststellen included there.

The early papyri containing Acts are:

P\textsuperscript{8} fourth century
P\textsuperscript{29} third century
P\textsuperscript{38} c.300
P\textsuperscript{45} third century
P\textsuperscript{48} third century
P\textsuperscript{50} fourth to fifth century
P\textsuperscript{53} third century
P\textsuperscript{57} fourth to fifth century
P\textsuperscript{91} third century

P\textsuperscript{29}, P\textsuperscript{48} and P\textsuperscript{53} contain only portions of Acts where D is no longer extant. P\textsuperscript{33}, P\textsuperscript{41}, P\textsuperscript{56} and P\textsuperscript{72} are too late, although it is worth noting that P\textsuperscript{41} is regularly close to D in Acts 20–21.


P$^9$ agrees with D at 4:34, 36 with many others; the two disagree at 4:33; 5:3. P$^{57}$ agrees with D and others at 4:37. This also is not very significant, because many other manuscripts are in support too. P$^{93}$ is shown against D at 2:47–3:1 and with D at 2:31.

We need to look at P$^{45}$, P$^{50}$ and especially P$^{38}$. The following passages seem significant:

5:37 omit παντες P$^{45}$ D only (cf. verse 36)
7:17 επηγειλατο P$^{45}$ D E
8:26 αναστας πορευθητι P$^{50}$ D only
10:28 + ανδρι P$^{50}$ D only
10:30 νηστευων (και) την ενατην (τε) προσευχομενος P$^{50}$ D
11:12 omit μηδεν διακριναντα P$^{45}$ vid D only (cf. μηδεν ανακριναντα P$^{74}$)

But it is in Chapter 19, where P$^{38}$ is extant, that the most spectacular similarities are shown. Boismard-Lamouille describes the manuscript as an “excellent temoin du TO (i.e. Texte Occidental) dans une section oü les variantes sont nombreuses et importantes”.21

19:1 P$^{38}$ D contain the long addition θελοντος δε του Παυλου κατα την ιδιαν βουλην πορευεσθαι εις Ιεροσολυμα ειπεν αυτω το πνευμα υποστρεφειν εις την Ασιαν διελθειν δε τα ανωτερικα μερη ερχεται εις Εφεσον (cf. 18:21 δει με παντως την εορτην την (ημεραν) ερχομεν ποιησαι εις Ιεροσολυμα D Maj (!))
19:2 λαμβανουσιν τινες P$^{38}$ P$^{41}$ D*
19:3 ελεγον P$^{38}$ D
19:5 Χριστου εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων P$^{38}$ vid D 614 only
19:14 εν οις και υιοι Σκευα (Ιουδαιου) τινος (αρχιερεως) ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι εξορκιζειν τους τοιουτους και εισελθοντες προς (τον) δαιμονιζομενον ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες παραγγελλομεν σοι εν Παπει αης Ιησου αης Παυλος (ο αποστολος) κηρυσσει εξελθειν P$^{38}$ D only

20 Barbara Aland, ‘Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft’, deals fully with these three early “Western”-type papyri and concludes that these tend in the direction of a Western-type text (i.e. a D-type text) but that the main Western type redaction did not emerge until the second half of the third century.

21 Boismard and Lamouille, p. 21.
To balance the picture it must be pointed out that $P^{38}$ seems to have unique readings at 19:2, 3 and that it reads against $D$ at 19:4.

As for the early uncials, 0189 of the second-third century supports $D$ in readings at 5:10, 18 but there the situation is that all the early manuscripts stand together against the reading of the majority of manuscripts, and in other variation units displayed by NA$^{27}$ 0189 is against the reading of $D$, e.g. at 5:8, 12, 16.

As we have the *Text und Textwert* volumes on Acts to hand we can broaden our search away from the NA$^{27}$ apparatus to the exhaustive apparatus there. What do we find?

There are 104 *Teststellen* in the Acts sample. The selection of *Teststellen* identifies 31 singular readings by $D$ confirming Aland’s observation in the volume that $D$ is “völlig isoliert”. There are no *Teststellen* for the portions of text where $P^{29}$, $P^{53}$ and $P^{57}$ are extant. That means only five papyri of the right date are involved: $P^{8}$, $P^{38}$, $P^{45}$, $P^{50}$ and $P^{91}$.\(^{22}\) The following is a list of the *Teststellen* (giving the sequence number) where one of these papyri is cited:\(^{23}\)

18. (4:33) $P^{8} = \text{Maj. against } D$ (+ Χριστου)
22. (5:34) $P^{45}$ against $D$
23. (6:8) $P^{8}$ $P^{45} = D$ (χριστος)
24. (7:11) $P^{45}$ against $D$ (but both omit γην)
25. (7:17) $P^{45} = D$ E 1884 only (see above)
27. (8:18) $P^{45} = D$ Maj. (το πνευμα το αγιον)
37. (10:30) $P^{50} = D$ (see above)
38. (10:32) $P^{45}$ (shorter text) against $D$
40. (11:2) $P^{45}$ against $D$
41. (12:3) $P^{45}$ against $D$ but $D$ has a unique reading
45. (12:33) $P^{45}$ against $D$ (unique reading)
51. (15:23) $P^{45}$ against $D$ (unique reading)
55. (16:33) $P^{45}$ unique reading
56. (16:35) $P^{45}$ against $D$ (unique reading)
57. (17:13) $P^{45}$ against $D$ (D* unique reading)

\(^{22}\) $P^{91}$ is illegible for the two *Teststellen* where it is extant.

\(^{23}\) One needs to remember that in these volumes minute differences are recorded and that only where there are exact agreements are manuscripts listed together.
67 and 68 and 69. (19:1–2, 3, 14) P38 has unique readings, although in Teststelle 69 P38 and D virtually agree in the distinctive longer text.24

P8 appears relatively high in the Ergänzungsliste in relation to D (67%) but in the Hauptliste the percentage agreement is only 50%. Numbers need to be high in both listings before one can begin to investigate family dependence. As a result of the statistics thrown up by the Teststellen Kurt Aland, the editor of the Text und Textwert volumes, writes on D within the tradition of only Greek manuscripts: “05 hat im griechischen Bereich keine Nachfolge gefunden, der Codex Bezae hat in der Folgezeit keine Wirkung geübt. Mit ihm ist ein Höhepunkt einer Entwicklung erreicht, die gleichzeitig mit ihm abbricht”25 and “Der Text von 05 bedeutet den Höhepunkt des ‘paraphrasierenden Textes’ der sich in der Frühzeit unabhängig voneinander entwickelt… als Unterabteilung der letzten gennanten Kategorie” [i.e. the ‘free’ text].26 We do not always find ourselves in agreement with Aland’s assessment of the history of manuscript tradition, but here in the case of D what he says of the influence of D is undoubtedly true, even though it has allies outside the Greek field and support from a couple of minuscules, notably the thirteenth century 614 or even the twelfth century 2412. He is also correct in his comments on D’s predecessors. Aland was speaking of Acts. Our own assessment confirms that the same is true for the Gospels too.

D seems not to have been the representative of a type of text that gained or maintained influence in the Greek church. That of course need not diminish our regard for this manuscript as a witness to an important text-type or rule it out of court for its eligibility to preserve on occasion even uniquely the original text. Even the Alands in their textbook admit that D, when it supports early tradition, has a genuine significance.27 D is a milestone along the path of the New Testament textual tradition. Its place in the history of the text is recognised in the history of Mark’s Gospel currently being compiled by C.-B. Amphoux and myself; in our presentation of Mark’s Gospel the text of D will stand as one of the separate lines of text we are printing. (See chapter 31.).

---
24 This is the longer reading at 19:14 discussed above.
26 Ibid., p. 719.
27 Alands, Text, p. 110.
Seventy years ago J.H. Ropes in the third volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity* Part 1 indicated that one of the *desiderata* awaiting further research was the origin of the readings in D (especially the non-Western readings). Some progress has been made in that direction. We began by quoting Kurt Aland who argued that the D text-type (in distinction to the Western text as a whole) originated in the third century. Our enquiry does not contradict that. Our investigations here also confirm Birdsall’s statement that “D cannot be identified with any entity of the second century *tout simple*; if Western text means the text of Codex Bezae then it is not to be found in the second century.” There may be some unfinished business in this direction dotting some ‘i’s and crossing some ‘t’s, but we can add little to those judgements.

Our investigation may be said to have been negative in its results. The increased number of early papyri has not yet enabled us to point to any significant corpus of Greek material that seems to have been a precursor of the D-type text. Only P38 and 0171 deserve some recognition in this context. But these manuscripts survive in only sixty five verses and these may be labelled, to use Barbara Aland’s preferred designation, “proto-D” manuscripts. Nevertheless, research that has negative results is often valuable to colleagues working in the field of the applied sciences and medicine. I hope the generally negative results in this paper will also be seen to have some positive benefit. All we can do is to repeat Ropes’ words: “It must not be forgotten that the basis of the ‘Western’ revision was a text far more ancient than any manuscript now extant”, and it is here that we conclude with those words of seventy years ago ringing in our ears.

**Postscriptum**


---

A GREEK-COPTIC (SAHIDIC) FRAGMENT OF TITUS-PHILEMON (0205)

CHAPTER SEVEN

The MS. numbered Or. 1699 II x in the University Library in Cambridge is part of the Thompson donation. It consists of a bifolium written on parchment. The folios have been flattened out so that one sees the verso of folio 2 with the recto of folio 1 and, on the other side, the verso of folio 1 adjoining the recto of folio 2. The colour of one side of the parchment differs from the other. Erosion has taken place. The original dimensions were probably 32 cm. × 22.5 cm. The contents (most of the last two chapters of the Epistle to Titus and the whole of the Epistle to Philemon) are remarkable because of the way that the two languages, Greek and Sahidic Coptic, are recorded. Each page contained two parallel columns with 35 lines of 12–13 letters on average. On the recto proper of the first folio the first column and the first seven lines of the second column contains Titus 2: 15b–3:7 in Greek. At this point the Coptic text begins with Titus 2:11 and continues throughout the rest of the MS. to the end of Philemon. The impression is that one scribe was responsible for the whole.

The Greek in the MS. represents but 15% of the total. It is unlikely that we have here a genuine bilingual MS. in the making because of the lack of further Greek in the other folio where we might reasonably expect to see it. What seems to have been intended was the production of a Coptic text of Paul’s letters. Since the top and bottom margins of the folios are missing, it is not possible to say if there were pagination numbers that might have indicated the size of the volume from which this bifolium was once a part. As it is, what has survived is probably the end of a collection of the Pauline epistles.

Our problem is: Why is there an intrusion of a section of Titus in Greek? The nature of the errors suggests that the text was copied, not dictated. If the copy was made in a scriptorium, it is possible that not all the scribes would have been able to read intelligibly.

One factor which may have facilitated the accidental copying of a portion of Greek into a MS. intended to be monoglot Sahidic is the
close similarity between the written forms of the two languages, the Coptic alphabet being modelled on the majuscule form of the Greek. For a scribe copying mechanically, it would not have been impossible to continue for some time reproducing a Greek text (from his bilingual exemplar) in the belief he was reproducing Coptic.\(^1\) Possibly what happened is that on an earlier page, now lost, he finished his copying of Titus in Coptic at chapter 2 verse 10. On resuming his task at the beginning of a new page he started copying the Greek text. Seven lines down the second column he noticed the error. Rather than take a new sheet of parchment, or create a palimpsest, he went back to where he had finished the Coptic beforehand and proceeded to copy from the Coptic in the exemplar at Titus 2:11 beginning at the point where he abandoned the intrusive Greek. Thereafter he continued correctly copying the Coptic of Titus and then the whole of Philemon ending on the last page of the two folios. It is noticeable that no attempt was made to expunge or delete the Greek. Two modifications of the above explanation are a) our folios were identified as flawed and excluded from the bound copy for which they were intended (and a correctly transcribed monoglott Sahidic text substituted) and b) the error was not made by the scribe who wrote Or 1699 II x but was a much earlier error that he followed slavishly.

Whatever the history of this peculiar text, what we have is a fragment that contains Greek and Sahidic Coptic, but it is not truly a bilingual MS. as conventionally understood. Nevertheless it merits inclusion in the register of NT Greek uncials where it has the number 0205. It is not included in the apparatus of any printed Greek New Testament to my knowledge,\(^2\) although the apparatus in Nestle 26 at Philemon 2 may be referring to the Coptic text of our MS. when it records the support of one Coptic MS. in support of ἀδελφῇ. The Alands\(^3\) allocate 0205 to their Category 2 MSS., meaning a MS. of special quality but distinguished from their preferred Category 1 because of the contamination of Byzantine text-type readings. But this seems unwarranted.

---

\(^{1}\) It is significant that in the first proofs of this article the typesetter printed the Greek text in the manuscript in Coptic letters!

\(^{2}\) See my A Survey of Manuscripts used in Printed Editions of the Greek New Testament (Leiden: Brill, 1987). In stating erroneously there that the MS. was lost I was relying on K. Aland, Kurzgefasste Liste p. 53.

The *apparatus* below shows that 0205 does not agree with Byzantine readings at Titus 3:1,5,7.

The consensus of scholarly opinion is that the MS. is 8th century, but Professor J.M. Plumley of Cambridge, whose help in the preparation of this article I gratefully acknowledge, prefers an earlier date (7th or even 6th century) because of Coptic palaeographical reasons, including the use of the square M. In the Coptic it is noteworthy that Greek uncial M is used throughout the Coptic text although not in the superscription or ascription to Philemon where we find Coptic mu. Such an early date would be compatible with the absence of distinctively Byzantine readings in the Greek.

The textual *apparatus* following the diplomatic transcript excludes purely orthographical variants, of which there are some in the Greek (e.g. εαυτου, αναγενωσεως Titus 3:5) as well as in the Coptic. There are some obsolescent spellings in the Coptic (e.g. Philemon 13: $\gamma\lambda\theta\iota\pi\iota$ which encourages a date earlier than that of sa 4 [7th century] which reads $\gamma\lambda\theta\iota\iota$).

Supplementary text has been added in square brackets in the transcript where the original is deficient. At Philemon 18 the text is assumed to read $\alpha\gamma\alpha\iota\tau\iota\kappa\iota$ with sa 4 against Horner and M.

The photographs of the MS. are reproduced here with kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library. I also wish to thank the Rev. J.I. Miller and Dr. Belinda Wassell in the preparation of the transcript and *apparatus*.
Figure 1: 0205 fol. I recto
Figure 2: 0205 fol. I verso
Figure 3: 0205 fol. II recto
Figure 4: 0205 fol. II verso
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Column One</th>
<th>line no.</th>
<th>Column Two</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>[ΜΗ∆ΕΙΣ ΣΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΦΡΟ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ΑΣ ΠΛΟΥΣΙΩΣ ΔΙΑ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>ΝΕ[ΙΩ ΥΠΟΜΙΜΗΝ]Η</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ΠΗΥ ΧΥ ΤΟΥ] ΣΤΣ ΗΜΩΝ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΚΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ[Σ ΑΡΧΑΙ]Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΙΝΑ ΔΙΚΑΙΩΘΕΝΤΕ[Σ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΣ ΥΠΟΤΑΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΤΗ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ ΧΑΡΙΤΙ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΕΣΘΑΙ ΠΕΙΘΑΡΧΕΙΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΚΑΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟΙ ΓΕΝΗ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΠΡΟΣ ΠΑΝ ΕΡΓΟΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΘΩΜΕΝ ΚΑΤ ΕΛΠΙΔΑΣ[Α]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΕΤΟΙΜΟΥΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΖΩΗΣ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ΕΙΝΑΙ ΜΙ∆ΕΝΑ ΒΛΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΑΤΕΧΑΡΙΣ ΓΑΡ ΠΙΝΝΟ[Σ]</td>
<td>2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΦΗΜΕΙΝ ΑΜΑΧΟΥΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΤΕ ΠΕΝΩΤΗΡ ΟΤ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΕΙΝΑΙ ΕΠΙΕΙΚΕΙΣ ΠΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗΙΕΒΟΛ ΠΡΩΙΕ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΑΝ ΕΝΔΕΙΚΝΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΗΝΙΙ ΕΣΞΕΒΩ ΡΑΗ</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΠΡΑΫΤΗΤΑ ΠΡΟΣ ΠΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΖΕΚΑΣ ΕΝΑΝΚΩ ΡΣ[ΩΝ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ΤΑΣ ΑΝΟΥΣ· ΗΜΕΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΙΝΙΝΤΨΑΤΕ ΤΗΝ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΓΑΡ ΠΟΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΕΠΙΘΨΙΑ ΝΚΟϹ[ΙΙ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΑΝΟΗΤΟΙ ΑΠΕΙΘΕΙΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΚΟΗΝ. ΝΤΙΝΩΝΓΡΙ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΠΛΑΝΩΜΕΝΟΙ ΔΟΥ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΙΝΙΝΤΨΙΡΗΤΩΝ ΝΙ[Η]</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΛΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ ΕΠΙΘΥ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΙΝΙΝΤΨΙΚΑΙΟϹ ΝΙ[Η]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΜΙΑΙϹ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΟΝΑΙϹ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΙΝΙΝΤΨΕΒΗϹ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑΙϹ ΕΝ ΚΑΚΙΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΙΝΙΝΠΕΙΔΨΝ ΕΝ[ΩΝ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΦΘΟΝΩ ΝΙΑΓΟΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΨΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΡΗΤΕ Ν[ΕΠΑ]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΤΕΣ· ΣΤΥΓΗΤΟΙ ΜΙ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΙϹ ΝΙΙΑΚΑΡΙΟϹ ΝΙ[Η]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥϹ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΩΝΕΒΟΛ ΡΙΠΕ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ΟΤΕ ΔΕ Η ΧΡΗΣΤΟΤΗϹ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΙΟϹ ΝΙΙΗΝ ΡΗΝΟ[VΣ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΚΑΙ Η ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΙΨ ΡΕΝΘΨΙΡ ΡΕ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΕΠΕΦΑΝΗ ΤΟΥ ΣΤΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΕΧΗ ΝΑΙ ΝΤΑΨΗΤΑ</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΗΜΩΝ ΘΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΞ ΕΡ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔΨ ΝΑΡΟΝ ΖΕΚΑϹ ΕΨ[Ε]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΓΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΔΙΚΑΙ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΡΘΑΠΟ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΥΝΗ Α ΕΠΟΙΗϹΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΙΨ ΝΙΙΙ ΑΨΗ ΡΗΤΒ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΜΕΝ ΗΜΕΙϹ ΑΛΑΑ ΚΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΡΙΠΕ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΤΑ ΤΟ ΕΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΛΕΟϹ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔΨ ΧΑΡΑΡ ΡΟΤΑΝΔΑϹ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΕΞΩΣΕΝ ΗΜΑϹ ΔΙΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΤΩΤΟΨΗΤ ΡΗΡΨΧΑΨ[Γ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΛΟΥΤΡΟΥ ΠΑΙΛΙΝΤΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΨΘΒΟΣ ΕΝΑΝ[ΟΤ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΕΣΙΑϹ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΓΕΝΩ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΨΘΒΟΣ ΕΝΑΝ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΕΩ΢ ΛΙΝΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΝΟΤΨΨΘΒΟΣ ΕΝΑΝ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΦΡΟΝΗ ΠΙΝΟΚ ΠΑΡΟ[Ω]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Column One line no.</td>
<td>Column Two Verse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fol. I verso: Titus 3:1–13 (Coptic)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Column One</th>
<th>line no.</th>
<th>Column Two</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>πΣΩΕΙΚΟΣ ΜΗ ΔΙΝΗ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ΝΩΤΗΣΙΝ σΟΝ ΣΕΟΥ</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ΧΡΗΣΤΗΣΕΙΝ ΣΕ ΕΙΔΟ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΤΟ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ΧΡΗΣΙΜΟΙΤΗΤΗΣ ΤΗΡΗΣ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ΤΑΚΛΗΡΗΣ, ΕΙΔΟ ΣΕ ΟΙΝΟΥ</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fol II recto: Titus 3:13–15; Philemon 1–10 (Coptic)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Column One</th>
<th>line no.</th>
<th>Column Two</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[ἀλεὶ Πηνοκ ἗ς]</td>
<td>10-18</td>
<td>[οὐραθ ἡ ὁρὰτακ ἐρ]</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[πομπηρε] να[ἱ ἐντ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ὁ Πηνοκ ἐρῷ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νακ ἄνθησας [πιπ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[πε] ΠΕ[ταθοῦσ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οὐκείον, τε[ι] ὅτα γε</td>
<td></td>
<td>ΠΕ[ταθοῦσ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ἄ]ἐκκακοῦ χαρόκ.</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>[ἡ] ἔκκακοῦ χαρόκ.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐρ σειρά τε παί ἐς</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἡ] ἔκκακοῦ χαρόκ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ημᾶς</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἡ] ἔκκακοῦ χαρόκ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐνεδίαλπε εἰς ὅ</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἡ] ἔκκακοῦ χαρόκ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λας ἄσσα[ἴ]ταταν</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] ἐς [ς] ἄταται</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο[ς] ὡς [ς] κατα</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σταρ ἅλλα εἰς</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ἐ] ὑποτάμως ὅτε σφ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[π] ιοκ [ς] [ς] [ς] [π]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ν] ἔκκακον γαρ ἄταγονος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ν] ἔκκακον γαρ ἄταγονος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[κ] ἄταγονος] ἔς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[κ] ἄταγονος] ἔς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[κ] ἄταγονος] ἔς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[κ] ἄταγονος] ἔς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ς] [ς] [ς] [ς] [ς]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[κ] ἄταγονος] ἔς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Apparatus

This is not a full collation; only variants of special interest have been included. The references in the apparatus to the Coptic text are:


M = Pierpont Morgan MS. 569. See Thompson op. cit.


fol. I’

3a    αρχαις: + και D-KP 81 Byz
28a   α: ων C-D Byz
5b–6b γενηθωμεν: γενωμεθα 01-D Byz
11b   εεφεσω: εετεσω sa 4
13b-14b ΦΠΙΠΙΟΠΙΜΙΑ : ΦΠΙΠΙΟΠΙΜΙΑ Horner
24b   ΠΕΝΣΩΘΡ : τωρ M

fol. I’’

24a–25a εβολ γηγενεψησε αι: εβολ ανσγηγενεψησε αι sa 4 : εβολ γηγενεψησε αι M
35a   ΠΕΝΣΩΘΡ : ΠΕΝΣΩΕΙΣ M
11b   τηρηγηρα: εερηγηρα sa 4, Till 59

fol. II’

2a    τηνοοοταγε: τηνοοοτε M, Horner
14a–16a τεξαρικ τιωτην τηρτ ια : om. sa 4
23a–24a ιτε πεζε : ιπεζε Till 60
19b   εαρ : om. Till 60
26b   εσσιταί : εσσιται sa 4: εσσιταί Horner

4 There are many lacunae in the text of M between lines 12b and 24b.
26b–27b  Νοτπαρησία : Νοτνο6 Παρησία sa 4, M : Νοτνο6 Παρησία Horner

34b  Δε : om. M.

fol. II'

6a–7a  Τενοσ Δε ευο : [Τενο]σ Δε ηο M Horner

13a  Γαςθη : Γαςθη sa 4

35a–1b  Νονον Ἐντρωβ : Νονον Ἐντρωβ M :

2b–3b  εροϊ Ανοκ πατλος om. Horner

5b  Νάκ : om. M

11b  Φίτον : Δε εἰκετόν M

16b–17b  Πιος : Πιος M

25b  Ιη Άρκος : Άρκος Horner

25b–26b  Αρῆω Αρίσταρχος : Ιη Άρίσταρχος M :

26b–27b  Ιη Δικας : Δικας Horner

27b–28b  Ναμπργωβ : Ναμπρ[α]ξωβωτος Ιη Ναμπργωβ Horner
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE GREEK MANUSCRIPT HERITAGE
OF THE BOOK OF ACTS

The latest register\(^1\) of Greek New Testament manuscripts enables us to identify manuscripts that contain the Acts of the Apostles (either in part or in its entirety).

The facts and figures that emerge follow. (I use the conventional divisions of MSS., i.e. 1. those written on papyrus; 2. parchment MSS. in majuscule letters (uncials) and 3. those written in minuscule script (cursives):

- Papyri: Total = 13
- Uncials: Total = 32
- Cursives: Total = 567
- Grand total of continuous-text MSS. = 612

Details are set out in the following table. These lists give the officially recognised numbers of all MSS. that contain Acts complete or in part. The sign «+» links two MSS. previously registered as separate MSS., but where subsequent investigation has identified their being separated parts of the same. Usually the lower number is preserved, but in their latest work on Acts\(^2\) the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster has now subsumed 252 under 464\(^3\)! The sign «=» links two MSS. This indicates that the same MS. was (unnecessarily) registered twice, with different numbers. Again, the prevailing number is usually the lower, but 2466 = 2294 is an exception: that MS. is to be known by the higher number. (In three instances a minuscule MS. was originally given a number in the lectionary system: 921 (\(l565\)), 1885 (now incorporating \(l1414\)), 2652 (\(l1306\)).

---

\(^1\) K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1994) = *ANTF* 1 (hereafter = *Liste*). This list gives details of the contents, dimensions and current location of all MSS.

\(^2\) K. Aland, *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften Neuen Testaments* III, 1 (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1993) = *ANTF* 20 pp. 684–6 (Hereafter = *Text und Textwert*.) The *Verzeichnis* in that volume has been adapted for the following list.

\(^3\) *contra Liste*\(^2\) where 252 subsumes 464!
I have not included lectionaries. Liste² has c.582 lectionaries identified as \( l^b \) (= “Apostolos”, i.e. Acts and letters) or \( l^a \) (= lections from the gospels and the Apostolos). I have not been able to check if all these MSS. actually contain readings from Acts, and several of these lectionaries are incomplete. NA²⁷ includes \( l1575 (l^b), l249 (l^{a+}), l44 (l^{a+}) \). UBS⁴ lists 40 lectionaries that include readings from the Apostolos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents*</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P⁵⁹</td>
<td>Act 26:7–8, 20</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P³⁸</td>
<td>Act 18:27–19:6, 12–16</td>
<td>C. 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P⁴⁸</td>
<td>Act 23:11–17, 23–29</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P⁵⁰</td>
<td>Act 8:26–32; 10:26–31</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P⁵³</td>
<td>Mt 26:29–40; Act 9:33–10:1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P⁵⁶</td>
<td>Act 1:1, 4–5, 7, 10–11</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P⁵⁷</td>
<td>Act 4:36–5:2, 8–10</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* † denotes that the MS. has gaps; P denotes that the MS. is incomplete; K denotes that the MS. also contains (patristic) commentary; e = gospels; a = Acts and Catholic letters; p = Paul; r = Revelation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H014 a†</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>0304 aP (Act 6:5–7:13)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L020 apt (vac. Act 1:1–8:10)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P025 apr†</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ044 eap†</td>
<td>VIII/IX</td>
<td>5 eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049 ap†</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>33 eap†</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056 apK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>35 eapr</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057 aP (Act 3:5–6, 10–12)</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td>38 eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066 aP (Act 28:8–17)</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>42 apr†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076 aP (Act 2:11–22)</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
<td>43 eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077 aP (Act 13:28–31)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>51 eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093 aP (Act 24:22–25:5)</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>57 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095 aP (Act 2:22–28, 45–3:8)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>61 eapr</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+[0123]</td>
<td></td>
<td>62 ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096 aP (Act 2:6–17; 26:7–18)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>69 eapr†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097 aP (Act 13:39–46)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>76 eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0120 aP (Act 16:30–17:17, 27–29, 31–34; 18:8–26)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>81 ap†</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0140 aP (Act 5:34–38)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>82 aprK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0142 apK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>88 apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166 aP (Act 28:30–31)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>91 aprK†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0175 aP (Act 6:7–15)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>93 apr†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0189 aP (Act 5:3–21)</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>94 aprK</td>
<td>r:XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0236 aP (Act 3:12–13, 15–16)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>97 ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0244 aP (Act 11:29–12:5)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>101 apK†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0294 aP (Act 14:27–15:10)</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
<td>102 ap</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103 apK</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104 apr</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 apr†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122 eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131 eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133 eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141 eapr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142 eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>eapr XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>ap XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>apr† XIII/XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>eapr† X</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>apr† XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>apr XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>eapr e: XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td>ap XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>apr† ap: XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>ap XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>eap† ap: XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>eap XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r: XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>aK XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ap† XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>aPK XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e: XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>aPK XIII/XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ap: XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
<td>apr XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ap† XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>apr† XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>eapr 1357</td>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>eapr XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>apr† 1111</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>eap XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>eapr XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>ap† XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>eapr eap: XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r: XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>aPK XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>ap† 1358</td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>eapr† XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>ap X</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>ap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>eap XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>eapP XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>eap 1278</td>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>eapr XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>eapr XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>356</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>aprK XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>(see 464)</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>aprK XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>ap XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>apr† XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>ap XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>eap XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>eapr XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>ap† XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>aK X</td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>ap XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>apP† XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>ap† XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>aprK† XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>ap† XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>aPK XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>aprK†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>apP(K)</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>apK†</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>apP</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>apK†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>aP:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+[252]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act Jas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII-XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>apK†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1515/16</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>eaP†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>eaP†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>+[2164]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>aK†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>eaprPK†</td>
<td>1454?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>aprPK†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>aP‡</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act†</td>
<td></td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>ap:1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>[595]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>apK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>[2618]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>eap†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>[2165]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>eap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>eaP†</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>apPK†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>aK†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>apP</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>[1352a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>eaP‡</td>
<td>X/XI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[2163]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>[2327]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>apK</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV/XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384 eapr</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398 eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404 eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405 ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409 eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>eapP†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424 eapKr</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XI+XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>eapP†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433 eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>eapK</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448 eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456 eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482 eap</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>a† ? Act</td>
<td>XIII–XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503 eapr</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508 eap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509 eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518 ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521 eap</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522 ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524 apK</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526 aP: Act Jas</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548 eap†</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563 eapP†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573 eap†</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594 eap†</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595 eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597 eapr</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598 eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599 eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609 eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610 ap</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611 apr†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617 eapr</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618 eapP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619 eapP</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV+XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626 eap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628 eap</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636 eap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>apP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>ap: XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>r:XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>arK†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>aKP: Act</td>
<td>1158?</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>aprK†</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>apP</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+[2349]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>aP: Act</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>= [2556]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>a†</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X/XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>=1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>aP: Act</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>aP: Act</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>a†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>aP: Act</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>+ ![1414]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>aP: Act</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>aK</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>aprK</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>eapr†</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+[2162]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2221</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>ap(r)†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>aK†</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>apPK</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV/XV</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
<td>2249</td>
<td>ea†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2261</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>apP</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+[1944]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see 2288)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>(see 2466)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>aP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2088</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(see 1359)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>apPK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(see 1795)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2137</td>
<td>eaP</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>apr†</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>eapP</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>eap†</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see 1891)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>aP†</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see 1352)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>apr(K)</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>aP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see 712)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2464</td>
<td>aP†</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see 928)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2175</td>
<td>eapP†</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>=[2294]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>apP†</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2194</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>2483</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>ap†</td>
<td>1311/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The centuries in which the MSS. were written appear in the following list. If palaeographers offer varying dates I have accepted the earliest date. A MS. number followed by «a» indicates that this MS. contains Acts but not the Catholic epistles. ?a signifies that, although Acts survives without the Catholics, the MS. is very small and we have no clue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2488</td>
<td>eaP XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>ap XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2492</td>
<td>eap XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2494</td>
<td>eapr 1316</td>
<td></td>
<td>2712</td>
<td>ap XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2495</td>
<td>eapr† XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>aprP† XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>ap XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>eap† XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2502</td>
<td>eap 1242</td>
<td></td>
<td>2723</td>
<td>apr XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505</td>
<td>ap† X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>ap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2508</td>
<td>eap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>apPK 1227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2511</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>eaP 1558/59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2516</td>
<td>eap† XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2746</td>
<td>ap† XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2523</td>
<td>eap 1453</td>
<td></td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>apP† XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541</td>
<td>ap XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>eap XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2544</td>
<td>ap XVI/XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>aprK XVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2554</td>
<td>eapr 1434</td>
<td></td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>ap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>ap XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>aP†: Act XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2570</td>
<td>apP XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>aP†: Act XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2576</td>
<td>apPK 1287</td>
<td></td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>apP† XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2587</td>
<td>ap XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>eap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2618</td>
<td>(see 927)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>ap† XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2619</td>
<td>arP XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>ap XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2625</td>
<td>aprP† XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>ap XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2626</td>
<td>apr† XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>aK XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2627</td>
<td>ap† 1202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2652</td>
<td>ap XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[=1306]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2653</td>
<td>eap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>aP†: Act XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2671</td>
<td>aP: Act 1233</td>
<td></td>
<td>2833</td>
<td>aP†: Act XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>ap 1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=2306d]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2675</td>
<td>ap† XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2848</td>
<td>aP: Act XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691</td>
<td>eap XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>apr XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2696</td>
<td>ap XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2853</td>
<td>ap X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about its original contents: it could have once contained the Catholic epistles. «x» preceding the number indicates that the MS., although once registered, is now lost or known to have been destroyed (perhaps by fire or war). There are 29 such MSS. Numbers in brackets denote MSS. that contain a partial text in Acts.

2nd.C.: 0189a? (= 1)
3rd. C.: \(P^{29}a\ 38a\ 45{\text{a}}\ 48{\text{a}}\ 53{\text{a}}\ 91{\text{a}}\ 4 (= 6)
4th. C.: \(P^{8}a\ 50{\text{a}}\ 57{\text{a}}\ 01\ 03\ 057{\text{a}} = 6\)
5th. C.: \(P^{56}a\ 02\ 04\ 05a\ 048\ 076{\text{a}}\ 077{\text{a}}\ 0165{\text{a}}\ 0166\ 0175{\text{a}}\ 0236{\text{a}}\ 0244{\text{a}} = 12\)
6th. C.: \(P^{33,51}a\ 08a\ 066{\text{a}}\ 093\ 0294{\text{a}} = 5\)
7th. C.: \(P^{74}096{\text{a}}\ 097{\text{a}} = 3\)
8th. C.: \(P^{41}a\ 044\ 095{\text{a}} = 3\)
9th. C.: \(014{\text{a}}\ 020\ 025\ 049\ 0120{\text{a}}\ 0304{\text{a}}\ 33\ 1424\ 1841\ 1862\ 1895\ 2464 = 12\)
10th. C.: 056 0140a? 0142 82 175 221 307 436 450 454 456 457 602 605 619 626 627 920 1066 1073a 1611 1720 1735 1739 1756a (x1760) 1829 1845 1851 1871 1874 1875 1880 1891 (2125\(^{3}\)) 2505a 2853 (= 37)
11th. C.: 35 42 81 (91) 93 x101 104 133 142 177 181 x241 250 256 302 312 314 325 398 424 437a 451 458 459 462 464 466 469 506 517 547 606 607 617 623 624 635 638 639 641 699 712 796 901 919 945 1162 1175 1243 1244 1247 1270 1277 1311 (1384) 1448 1521 1668 1724 1730 1734 1738 1828 1835\(^{9}\) 1837 1838 1846 1847 1849 1854 1870 1888 1904 2138 2147 2344 2385 2475 2587 2723 2746 2833?a (= 82)
12th. C.: 1 3 43 57 88 97 103 105 110 122 189 203 226 242 319 321 323 326\(^{7}\) 330 337 378 421 431 440 452 (463\(^{8}\)) 610 x611 x612 x613 618 625 632 637 656 808 876 909 910 911 916a 917 922 927 [46] 1058 1115 1127 1240 1241 1245 1315 1319 1359 1360 1390 x1425 1433 1490 1505 1526 1573 1595 1646 1673 1718 1737

\(^{4}\) P\(^{38}\) and P\(^{48}\) seem to support the distinctively «Western» text of Acts, most prominently to be found in D 05.
\(^{5}\) Cursive 2125 completes the missing portions of uncial 014.
\(^{6}\) This MS. is ar, the r section having previously been registered as 2004—that number should appear as p only.
\(^{7}\) Dated 10th. C. in Nestle-Aland\(^{37}\).
\(^{8}\) To be deleted according to \textit{Liste}\(^{3}\).
1740 1743 1752 1754 (1764a) x1795 (x1799\(^9\)) 1853 1863 1867 1868 1872 1885 1887a 1889 1893 1894 1897 x2115 2127 2143 2191 2194 x2233 2242 2243 2289 2298 2401 2412 (x2448) 2541 2570?a 2625 2671?a 2712 2778?a 2805 2815 2818 2829a

(= 107)

13th. C.: 5 6 38 51 94 141 172 180 204 206 218 234 263 309 327 328 x339 365 383 384 390 441a 455a 460 468 469 479 483 496 536a 567 592 601 614 665 676 757 823 912 914 941 997 999 1069 1070 1072 1094 1103 1107 1108 1110 1149 1161 1242 1251 x1287 1292 1297 1352 1398 1400 1404 1456 1501 1509 1525 1563 1594 1597 1609 1642 1706?a 1717 1719 1722 1727 1728 1731 1736 1742 1758 1759 1780 x1785 1827 1839 1843 1850 1852 1854 1857 1858 1860 1864 1865 1873 x2093 2180 x2225 2374 2400 2404 2423 2483 2492 2502 2516 2558 2576a 2627 2696 2713 2733 2772 (= 115)

14th. C.: 18 62 76 131 201 209 216 223 228a 254 255 257 308 363 367 386 393 394 404 425 429 453 x480 489 498 582 603 604 608 621 628 629 630 633 634 (644) 680 794 824 913 921 928 935 959 986 996 1022 1040 1067 1075 1099 1100 1102 1106 x1109 1248 1249 1354 1382 1409 1503 x1518 1524 1548 1598 1599 1618 1619 1622 1637 1643 1678 1723 1725 1726 1732 1733 1741 1744 1746 1747 1753 1761 1762 1765 X1766\(^{10}\) x1809 1831 1832 1834 1842 1856 1859 1877 1886 1890 1892 1896 1899 1902 2005a 2080 2085 2086 2175a 2200 x2249 2261 2279 2303 2356 2431 2441 2466 2484 2494 2508 2511 2626 2653 2675 2705 2716 2731 2774 2797?a 2799 2803 2849 (= 130)

15th. C.: 69 102 149 205 205\(^{abschrift}\) 322 x336 385 400 432 444 467 616 636 642 664 801 886a 1003 1105 1247 1250 1367 1405 1482 1508 x1522 1610 1617 1626 1628 1636 1649 1650 1745 1750 1751 1757 1763 1767 1830 1876 2131 2201 2221 2288 2352 2495 2523 2554 2652 2691 2704 2816 2848a (= 55)

---

\(^9\) The MS. is known to have been burned according to *Liste*\(^2\) and *Text und Textwert* III, 1, where it should be signalled as such in the *Verzeichnis* with the figure (2).

\(^{10}\) This MS. is lost according to *Text und Textwert* III, 1 p. 15 but *Liste*\(^2\) locates it in Sofia.
16th. C.: 61 90 296 522 1652 1702 1704 1729 1749 1768 x1833a 1861
1883a 1884a 2009a 2218 2255 2378 2488a 2501 2544 2737a
(= 22)
17th. C.: 956a 1101 1721 1748 1869 1903 2136 (2137a) 2473 2674
2776 (= 11)
18th. C.: 1104 2619a (= 2)

The date of the following three lost MSS. is not known: x1246 x1796?a
x2088 (= 3)

Most MSS. are not found in the critical apparatus of printed editions. NA27 gives special attention (i.e. its category I) to all 13 papyri,
to uncial 01 02 03 04 05 08 044 048 057 066 076 077 095 096 097 0140
0165 0166 0175 0189 0236 0244 0249 and to cursive 33 and 1739.
«Consistently cited witnesses» of their second rank are: 020 81 323
614 945 1175 1241 1505—all are pre—12th. C. Their «frequently cited»
MSS. are: 6 36 104 189 326 424 453 1704 1884 1891 2464 2495.

Bilingual MSS. (in one case trilingual) containing Acts are: P41 g c;
05 g l; 08 g l; 256 g arm; 460 g l arab; 628 g l; 629 g l; 2136 g slav;
2137 g slav.
(g = Greek; l = Latin; c = Coptic; slav = Old Church Slavonic; arm =
Armenian; arab = Arabic.)

Contents

There are 612 MSS. containing Acts. (Text und Textwert lists only 607
MSS. containing Acts 0304, 205abschrift 2848 2849 2853 are not included)

Some NT MSS. are complete (see Appendix 1) some contain only
Acts (or Acts and Catholics). Others combine Acts (usually plus the
Catholics) with p, or with ep, or with pr, or with r, or with e. (p =
Pauline Corpus with Hebrews; e = Gospels; r = Revelation.) One may
speculate about the motive why certain combinations of books were
reproduced in one MS.

a: The following contain a which normally means a = Acts + c = Cath-
olics but in practice most «a» MSS. now contain only Acts: 11 papyri,
20 uncial, 29 minuscules (41 «a» MSS. now lack the Catholics,—very
few found in the chronological list above appear without a query. The
only MSS. among them that seem to have included a alone without
c are 08 437 1764 1796 1833 1883 1884 1887 2848) (= 60)
ap: 5 uncial, 250 minuscules (441 455 1756 2005 2009 2505 2570 2576 2778 lack c) (= 255)
eap: 2 uncial, 145 minuscules (228 2175 2737 lack c) (= 147)
eapr: 3 uncial, 59 minuscules (886 lacks c). See Appendix 1 below. (= 62)
apr: 1 uncial, 75 minuscules (= 76)
eap: 2 papyri, 1 uncial, 7 minuscules. (P45 33 05 536 956 1073 2137 2488 lack c) (= 10)
ar: 2 minuscules (2619 lacks c) (= 2)

The conventional division of MSS. into eapr is not helpful. In so far as "a" covers Acts and the Catholics we need to take care that a MS. said to contain "a" actually includes Acts. It will be seen from the above that there are 63 NT MSS. which are classified as "a" MSS. and which lack the Catholics. These are listed in the chronological table above with a or ?a after the number. The division eapcr would be more useful. Liste for instance does not enable us to isolate all the MSS. that contain only Acts. Similar ambiguity may result from MS. listings in printed Greek New Testaments too.

56 "a" MSS. (including 2847—not in Text und Textwert) contain c but not a. This ambiguity explains some—but not all discrepancies—regarding "a" MSS. in the Alands’ Text particularly (c), (d) and (e) below. Sometimes the differing totals may perhaps be explained by the fact that the Alands had access to fewer MSS. when their Text volume was being prepared in the early 1980s: the judgement might explain the differing totals in (a), (b), (f).

a) The Alands draw attention to 273 MSS. containing ap (8 uncial + 265 minuscules); we have 5 uncial + 250 minuscules (= 255). 4 uncial and 16 minuscules have c not a—018 0209 0285 0296 356 422 615 622 918 1523 1836 1840 1848 1881 1882 2197 2318 2357 2527 2736.
b) The Alands note 2 uncial + 147 minuscules = eap. We have 2 uncial + 145 minuscules. 2310 1661 720 1495a are c.

---

c) 2 papyri, 1 uncial, and 8 minuscules = ea according to the Alands (even though we might have expected them to give a total of 9 minuscules including 197ea (actually ec) and 832ea (actually ec)). Our list has 2 papyri, 1 uncial and 7 minuscules.

d) The Alands identify 3 ar minuscules; we noted 2. They obviously included 2186ar which is in fact cr.

e) The Alands refer to 18 papyri, 29 uncials and 40 minuscules as Apostolos MSS. alone. We note 11 papyri contain Acts alone: another 7 «a» papyri do not contain Acts. We also count 9 «a» uncials and 7 «a» minuscules that lack Acts. (Incidentally 10 «a» papyri, 18 «a» uncials and 13 «a» minuscules do not contain c. P74 is the only «a» papyrus to contain Acts and the Catholics.)

f) eapr. The Alands have 3 uncials and 57 minuscules (including 205ab); we have 3 uncials and 59 minuscules—see Appendix I.

There is no dispute with the other categories (apr; ear): the Alands say 75 cursives have apr; we give 76 because we included the recently registered 2849.

This survey is concerned only with the continuous-text Greek MSS. that contain Acts. Acts, however, survives in many important early versions, and these of course also need to be taken into account in editing the text or plotting the influence and early history of the book. The Old Latin version in particular is an important source for the so-called Western text of Acts; many Old Latin MSS. are close to the Greek text represented in D 05. Acts is also represented in early Syriac and Coptic MSS.—especially important is the Middle Egyptian.

The earliest Father to cite Acts explicitly seems to have been Irenaeus. (His citations show close allegiances to the «Western» text). Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian quoted Acts in the 3rd Century. Eusebius, Athenasius of Alexandria, Lucifer of Cagliari and Cyril of Jerusalem cited from Acts in the following century.

The allegiances of the MSS., versions and citations of Acts are beyond the scope of this paper, as too is the quest for the original texts of Acts (Alexandrian and «Western»).
Appendix 1

Manuscripts containing the whole of the New Testament (eapcr) are as follows:

01 02 04
18 35 61 69 141 149 175 180 14 201 205 205\textsuperscript{abschrift} 209\textsuperscript{14} 218 241 242 296
339 367 386 498 506 517 522 582 664 680 699 757 808 824 922 935 986
1040 1072 1075 1094 1248 1384 1424 1503 1597 1617 1626 1637 1652
1668 1678 1704 1780 1785 2136 2200 2201 2352 2494 2495 2554

Appendix 2

Sequence.

The normal order of the gospels in Greek MSS. is Mt Mk Lk Jn. The so-called Western order, found in 05 W X Go Sy (p) OL is Mt Jn Lk Mk. The following sequences are known from versions or catalogue lists:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Mt Lk Mk Jn
  \item Jn Mt Lk Mk
  \item Mk Mt Lk Jn
  \item Mk Lk Mt Jn
  \item Jn Mt Mk Lk
  \item Mt Mk Jn Lk
  \item Mt Jn Mk Lk.
\end{itemize}

These final three have the effect of putting Luke and Acts together but only this last sequence is found in a Greek MS (888)\textsuperscript{15}.

Postscriptum

205\textit{ abschrift} is now renumbered 2886.

---

\textsuperscript{13} Adjustments to my Survey p.xiii are: delete 886, add 1040 1248.

\textsuperscript{14} 80 eapcr need not qualify as a complete manuscript: e was written in the 12th C, acpr in 1273; 209 likewise was written at different times: 209 eap in the 14th C, r in the 15th C.

Those who work on the text of the Book of Revelation often have recourse to the valuable apparatus compiled by H.C. Hoskier. The numbers he assigned to the different Greek manuscripts he collated or cited are to a large extent, but not entirely, the same as those used by Tischendorf in his eighth edition or referred to in the Prolegomena. Although Hoskier in his second volume (pp. 11–21) provided a conversion table from his numeration to that of Scrivener, Tischendorf (= ‘Gregory old’), Gregory (= ‘Gregory new’), and von Soden, this is by no means entirely accurate, and in the case of the ‘new’ Gregory system there are many queried references that have been clarified since Hoskier’s day.

Occasionally in the *apparatus criticus* of modern Greek New Testaments and in other writings the old Hoskier numbers are to be found. As the mixing of differing classifications can be confusing, the subjoined handlist provides a complete list of all the manuscripts included by Hoskier.

In Part One below, Table I gives the conversion from Hoskier to Gregory. Table II gives the conversion from Gregory to Hoskier, which is of special help if one wishes to make use of Hoskier’s valuable remarks about each manuscript in his first volume, or the generally accurate collations in his second volume. In Part Two below are given the conversions for those cursive where the Hoskier number differs from that found in Tischendorf’s eighth edition.
### Table I

#### Uncials (including papyri)

| Hoskier | Gregory |
|---------|---------|---------|
| א | 01 |
| A | 02 |
| B | 046 |
| C | 04 |
| E | 051 |
| F | 052 |
| P | 025 |
| P. Oxy. 848 | 0163 |
| P. Oxy. 1079 | P18 |
| P. Oxy. 1080 | 0169 |
| P. Oxy. 1230 | P24 |

#### Cursives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>429b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1918b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskier</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Hoskier</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>205\text{abs}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63\text{a}</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>112\text{a}</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>115\text{a}</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>116\text{a}</td>
<td>2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>117\text{a}</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>743+2419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83\text{a}</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1795\text{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>131\text{a}</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>133\text{a}</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>134\text{a}</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1352$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>195$^{19}$</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>922$^{16}$</td>
<td>196$^{20}$</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>197$^{21}$</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>198$^{21}$</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>199$^{21}$</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2329$^{22}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155A</td>
<td>2350$^{17}$</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2352$^{24}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2595$^{25}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2436$^{26}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>2305</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>213$^{27}$</td>
<td>2259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168$^{18}$</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>217$^{28}$</td>
<td>2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>223$^{29}$</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>224$^{29}$</td>
<td>1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>238$^{32}$</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230A = 224</td>
<td></td>
<td>243$^{33}$</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231$^{30}$</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234$^{31}$</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235$^{31}$</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>248$^{34}$</td>
<td>2116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236$^{32}$</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1248(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the above manuscripts the following are (according to Hoskier) copies of printed texts: (Hoskier numbers) 118, 168, 235, 247. His 57, 108, 141 are also possibly copies.

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>205$^{abs}$</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>339$^a$</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Hoskier</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Hoskier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1352\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1424\textsuperscript{21}</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1668\textsuperscript{31}</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1685\textsuperscript{21}</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1760\textsuperscript{21}</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1775\textsuperscript{32}</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(886\textsuperscript{12}</td>
<td>117)</td>
<td>1785\textsuperscript{19}</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>(see 2040)</td>
<td>1795\textsuperscript{13}</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>155\textsuperscript{4b}(155B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1857\textsuperscript{14}</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248(!)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Hoskier</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Hoskier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870$^{15}$</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872$^{15}$</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903$^{33}$</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918$^{6}$</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(2063$^{11}$)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>63$^{7}$</td>
<td>2072$^{18}$</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>112$^{9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 ($=911$)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2087$^{5}$</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2091</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>225927</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211441</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211644</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2305</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2186</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>(2349 = 1795)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2196</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>155A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>20235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>21728</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two

For those cursives where the Hoskier numbers differ from both the Gregory system and also the Tischendorf numeration, the following three-fold conversion tables are provided. They occur in the numerical sequence of (a) Gregory; (b) Hoskier; (c) Tischendorf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205abs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(866)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(886)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2063)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2091</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>205&lt;sup&gt;abs&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Hoskier</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>205\textsuperscript{abs}</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table V (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>(116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Endnotes


2. C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Editio Octavo Critica Maior, vol i and ii (Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869–72); vol. iii, *Prolegomena*, by C.R. Gregory (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894). It is to be noted that Hoskier did not collate every manuscript of Revelation available to him.


4. E.g. Souter at Rev. 1:10 (146); 1:14 (8, 200); 1:15 (200); 2:8 (166, 222); 5:17 (105) and Merk at Rev. 1:6 (24); 6:1 (217); 13:3 (38) and possibly at 19:6 (67) unless 767 (i.e. 2067) is intended.

5. Not a text.

6. This incorporates Gregory 866b (= Hoskier 115; Tischendorf 114). See Hoskier i. 388.
Copy of 62 according to Hoskier.

Hoskier claims Hort had collated a few chapters of Revelation before the bulk of this manuscript was destroyed by fire.

Copy of 103.

See above, Hoskier 39.

Not a continuous text manuscript, only a commentary. See also K. Aland Materialen zur neustamentlichen Handschriftenkunde, chap. I 'Korrekturen und Ergänzungen zur Kurzgefassten Liste' (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1969), p. 12 (= ANTF 3).

Not a text.

Not 2324 (as predicted incorrectly by Hoskier, i. 440). 1795 incorporates 2349.

Ignored by Hoskier.

Not available to Hoskier.

Not 1380 pace Hoskier, i. 515.

Not 2325 (ii. 17). Copy of 155 (i.e. 155B) = Gregory 1824.

Not used by Hoskier.

Not used by Hoskier.

Cf. Hoskier 129.

Not used by Hoskier.

Not 2321 which is a gospel manuscript (ii 19).

Not 2322 which is a gospel manuscript, (ii: 19). B.M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971) at Rev. 18:3; 19:13 refers to 2321 and at Rev. 13:10 to 2322 (cf. also Souter, Sigla, p. xviii). Hence my confusion in reviews (see R. Borger, Th.R. 52 (1987), pp. 50 f.)

Not 2323 (ii. 19).

This is not 598 (Hoskier, ii. 20). 598 = Venice Marciana 494 formerly Gr. 331 (fol. 1–58), and does not contain Revelation. 2595 = Venice S. Marco 331 (fol. 248–63).


Not used by Hoskier.

217 = copy of 172.

One is a copy of the other according to Hoskier.

Neglected by Hoskier because the manuscript contains only the opening verses of Revelation.

Neglected by Hoskier.

Only a fragment.

The first four and a half chapters are a copy of the Aldine edition.

Inaccessible to Hoskier.

Gregory 2419 is cited in Hoskier as ms. 123 with no distinction between this portion and the remainder of 123 (= Gregory 743).
CHAPTER TEN

THE DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION

The latest edition of the definitive register of Greek New Testament manuscripts\(^1\) lists about 5000 manuscripts divided into the conventional, although somewhat arbitrary, categories of papyri, uncials, cursive and lectionaries. One obvious unique feature of Revelation is that, because of the history of the canon, readings from this book are not included in the orthodox churches’ lectionary calendar and hence there are no lectionaries containing Revelation.

When we turn to the continuous-text manuscripts—papyri, uncials and cursive—we see that there are relatively few manuscripts that contain the entire New Testament canon. I count only 61 such manuscripts: see Appendix 3. Mostly what was produced was only a section of the canon, the gospels or the Pauline corpus for example. The majority of our surviving manuscripts happen to be gospel books.

303 manuscripts contain the Book of Revelation. Some manuscripts contain only Revelation, some contain other portions of the New Testament alongside Revelation. The proportions are as follows:

(a) 61 eacpr (3 uncials; 58 cursive (minuscules) including 205\(^{abschrift}\)).
   Note that (i) 1248 does contain r: Liste\(^1\) stated that this manuscript lacked r, and (ii) 1040 eacp has been added to this category of complete manuscripts because it seems to incorporate the manuscript listed as 2041 r; this relationship has been suggested in Liste\(^2\).
(b) 1 eapr (1 cursive (886) which lacks the catholic epistles).\(^3\)
(c) 76 acpr (1 uncial; 75 cursive)
(d) 3 cpr (cursive)
(e) 10 er (cursive)

---

\(^1\) K. Aland (ed.), Kurzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, second edition (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1994) = ANTF 1 (hereafter Liste\(^2\)).

\(^2\) 886 has sometimes been listed as a complete NT manuscript. Hoskier 1 p. 259 is not prepared to accept that the manuscript contains a proper text of Revelation at all! Nor is it in Schmid.
Six papyri contain parts of Revelation. That figure accords with comparable support in other parts of the New Testament. When we turn to the category of uncials on parchment, Revelation is poorly represented in our surviving manuscripts. Only 11 uncials contain this book. As Adela Yarbro Collins notes in her article “Book of Revelation” in the Anchor Dictionary of the Bible the latest Nestle edition of the critical Greek text of the New Testament claims to include all the uncials among its constantly cited witnesses in its critical apparatus of Revelation: for other books only a selection is regularly cited.

For Revelation the figures are as follows:

(a) Papyri

P 18 Rev 1:4–7 (3rd–4th C)
P 24 Rev 5:5–8; 6:5–8 (4th C)
P 43 Rev 2:12–13; 15:8–16:2 (6th–7th C)
P 98 Rev 1:13–20 (? 2nd C)

(b) Uncials

01 4th C eapcr
02 5th C eapcr
046 10th C r

---

3 K. Aland and B. Aland, The Text of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and London: Brill, 1989) (=A&A Text) refers to 5 papyri (P 98 was not then known to them), of which 4 are fragmentary; in fact all are fragmentary!

4 A&A Text p. 78 says there are 7 uncials with Revelation of which 3 are fragmentary. The true figure seems to be that 6 are fragmentary.
The distinctiveness of the Greek manuscripts

052A 10th C (Rev 7:16–8:12)
0163 5th C (Rev 16:17–20)
0169 4th C (Rev 3:19–4:3)
0207 4th C (Rev 9:2–15)
0229 8th C—palimpsest (Rev 18:16–17; 19:4–6)

(A = manuscripts whose texts agree with Andreas’ commentary—see further below)

The bulk of our witnesses are cursives (see Appendix 1). Another feature of the manuscript inheritance for the text of Revelation is that editors are dependent to a large extent on these medieval manuscripts and have few early texts to use.

It is interesting to note that some of the manuscripts that contain r and another portion of the NT have Revelation by a different hand: 180 (acpr added to the 12th C e in the year 1273), 181, 209 (a century or more separates the writing of Revelation from the rest of the manuscript), 429 (likewise), 1857 (likewise), 1140. 1668 eapc is an 11th C MS. to which a paper copy of Revelation was added in the 16th Century. It is not clear why these additions are not allocated another number, as is the case with 60 and 2821: 2821 is the new number assigned to 60 r—previously 60 er was seen as one manuscript. The gospel section only is now catalogued as 60 e.

All this suggests that the decision to expand a codex by adding Revelation was an afterthought, although in the case of 94 apcr the part with r is 12th C on parchment, bound with a 13th C manuscript on paper. Also 2004 pr has r dated 11th C; this part of the manuscript is now to be catalogued as part of the 11th C 1835 ac (the Pauline section of 2004 is from the 12th C).

Let us now look at the dates of the surviving manuscripts. The oldest fragment seems to be P98 in Cairo, which is dated to the 2nd C. P47 is 3rd C. P18 is usually dated 3rd–4th C. The oldest complete text is 01 Β (4th C). Other 4th C manuscripts are P24 0169 0207. The remaining early manuscripts are:

4th–5th C P35
5th C 02 04 0163
6th–7th C P45
8th C 0229
9th C 025 and cursives 1424 1841 1862 (the oldest cursives with Rev).
Dates of later manuscripts, for which only the total numbers are given, now follow. (If there is controversy and two dates are given in Liste² I have taken the earlier date):

[119] 10th C 3 uncial; 11 cursives
11th C 36^5
12th C 27
13th C 31
14th C 60
15th C 56
16th C 41
17th C 14
18th C 5
19th C 2

We see a significant number of late manuscripts—some written well after the invention of printing. H.C. Hoskier’s monumental two-volume work,⁶ in which he analyzed the text of some 200 cursives containing Revelation, gives the opinion that some of these late witnesses were copied from printed editions anyway. Among them he lists 296 1668 1894 1903 2049 2066 2072 2075 2116 2136.

Paper gradually superseded parchment. The oldest manuscripts of Revelation on paper are 13th C (there are eight from that century). Manuscripts on paper were quite common in the 14th C (we have some 35); paper manuscripts were usual in the 15th C. All subsequent manuscripts from the 16th–19th C are on paper.

While looking at the categories of manuscripts of Revelation it may be worth recording that manuscripts on Patmos include eighty New Testament MSS. at St John’s Monastery and one (cursive 2639) elsewhere. Those in the monastery include three uncial 022 0150 0151 and 35 lectionaries. It is interesting to see that only two manuscripts on Patmos contain Revelation—2080 2081!

In addition to Hoskier’s encyclopedic work, another indispensable reference work on the text of the Apocalypse is Josef Schmid’s two-part Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Apokalypse-Textes.⁷ His work

---

⁵ All manuscripts from this date onwards are cursives.
⁶ Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse (London: Quaritch, 1929).
drew attention to another distinctive feature of this Biblical book: the frequent addition of commentary with the text. Mostly the commentary is that by Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia, written 563–614. In fact another distinctive feature of Revelation is that, unlike most parts of the New Testament, where the majority of medieval witnesses belong to the Koine or Byzantine text-type, here the later manuscripts generally divide into a) the Koine text-type and b) Andreas’ text-type.

Schmid enumerates 83 witnesses (including uncial 025 051 052) which he calls Andreas manuscripts. Not all the manuscripts actually contain the commentary (e.g. 35 88 205 205^{abschrift} 209 632). Another 13 manuscripts have an abbreviated form of the commentary. Fifteen manuscripts give a group of scholia abstracted from it and a few other manuscripts have notes taken from it. All the cursives are shown in Appendix 1 below with A following the number in the list, regardless of the extent of the Commentary contained in the manuscript.

Aland’s *Liste* refers to other manuscripts of Revelation that contain a commentary: here any commentary or scholia are by another father. Sometimes ‘K’ in the *Liste* refers to: a) the earliest surviving commentary—that by Oecumenius, written in the early 6th C (2053 2062 and its duplicate 1824 as well as the sister manuscript 2350); b) Arethas, whose commentary, written in the 10th C, follows a Koine text although his commentary is based on that by Andreas (91 2075 2077); c) Maximus the Peloponnesian, who wrote a commentary in 1798 A.D. (2114 2402). The following manuscripts contain other, sometimes unidentifiable, commentaries or scholia: 886? 911 (= 2040) 919 1775 1776 1859 2035 (pace Hoskier who thought the commentary was Andreas’; it is in fact a Greek translation of the 14th C Italian commentary by Federigo de Venezia) 2072 2116 2351 2402 2403 2408 2419 2434 2594 2638 2743 2759.

Modern scholarship, especially since the time of von Soden and Hoskier, has recognised that in broad terms there are four main text-types in Revelation: 1) AC Oecumenius 2057 2062 2344, 2) א Andreas, 3) Koine, 4) P^17 ר. These differ from the text-types identified in the rest of the New Testament and is another mark of this book’s unique textual history. Another distinction is that, according to Schmid, all

---

*Manuscripts such as these do not have ‘K’ (= Kommentarhandschrift) following the contents in *Liste*. The commentary by Andreas and the commentary of Oecumenius are both to be found in 1678, 2058 and 1778.*
these types can be traced back to at least the 4th C and, unlike the rest of the New Testament, there is no ecclesiastically approved text of Revelation. The main differences in methodology and even in ideology between editions favouring the Textus Receptus and those favouring Westcott and Hort (to simplify the characteristics of the two main sorts of our printed testaments) are less clear cut in Revelation.

As far as the use made of the manuscripts in our printed editions is concerned, we turn first to the Patriarchal edition of 1904. Antoniadis’ preface indicates that he used 24 manuscripts in editing Revelation. Of these 14 can readily be identified: 1626 1704 1732 1733 1734 1740 1854 1857 1859 1870 1872 2076 2084 2258. His Koutloumousiou 83 is now identified as cursive 1860—but this is a manuscript lacking Revelation!

The most popular modern ‘critical’ edition, Nestle-Aland uses all six papyri, all uncials except 052 (which is listed in its appendix, but does not appear in its apparatus), and the following cursive: 1006 1611 1841 1854 2030 2050 2053 2062 2329 2344 2351 2377. Other manuscripts appear subsumed beneath the sigla M (manuscripts containing the Andreas commentary) and (manuscripts of the Koine text-type). Generally speaking, this edition favours—although by no means exclusively—the text of A C Oecumenius. In other parts of the New Testament Nestle-Aland favours א and finds AC inferior witnesses.

The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text (edited by Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad (Nashville, Camden, New York, 1985) in an extensive discussion in its Introduction pp. xxi–xli justifies its preference for Hoskier’s Koine group. Its text is based on readings from those manuscripts (some seventy three cursive and uncial 046). This Introduction gives examples why it, in contrast to NA, finds many of the distinctive readings of AC inferior.

The following manuscripts containing only r are found in one or more of the following printed editions (Bover-O’Callaghan, Merk, Souter, BFBS, UBS, Nestle Aland, Vogels): 1773 1775 1778 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2033 2034 2036 2037 2038 2039 (2041) 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2073 2074 2075 2076 2078 2081 2082 2083 2084 2087 2091 2196 2254 2256 2258 2259 2286 2302 2305 2329 2351 2377 2432 2814.
The following manuscripts that contain Revelation alongside another portion of the New Testament do not occur in the apparatus of any printed edition. (Minor exceptions are noted.) Those marked with an asterisk are listed in NA27 in their category M (= majority) and as such it is arguable that they may have been considered in Revelation; no other edition refers to them. (C indicates that the manuscript is a complete NT but seems not to have been used in any printed edition in any part of the NT): 205abschrift 632* 757* 824* 886 935 (Merk only) 986 (Merk only) 1064 1140 1248* 1328* 1503* 1551 1617* 1652C 1668C* 1685 1719 (Souter only) 1733* 1740* 1745* 1746* 1757* 1771* 1780C 1785C 1795 1857 1864 1865 1870* 1903 1948* 2136C 2201C 2323 2431* 2494* 2619* 2624 2626* 2643 2656 2723* 2776 2794 2847 2849. The following manuscripts containing only r seem not to have been used in the apparatus of printed editions: 1774 1776 1777 1806 1824 2024 2025 2032 2035 2036abschrift 2052 2072 2077 2079 2114 2116 2350 2361 2402 2403 2408 2428 2429 2433 2434 2435 2436 2449 2493 2594 2595 2638 2648 2663 2664 2667 2672 2681 2743 2759 2821 2824 2843 2845 2846 2855.10

My searching through the critical apparatuses and my work on the Liste are now at an end for the time being. I may perhaps be allowed to reiterate the couplet added by the lazy scribe of cursive 2050. Having written out Revelation, or at least part of it—in the manuscript he seems to have deliberately missed 14 chapters and jumped from the end of 5 to the end of 19—he then added:

\[ \text{où̃sper} \ ξένοι χαίρουσι πατρίδα βλέπειν οὕτω καὶ οἱ γράφοντες τέλος βιβλίου. \]

Appendix 1

These are the 286 cursives containing Revelation (A after the number signifies that the text agrees with Andreas’ commentary):

18* 35*A 42*A 61* 69* 82*A 88*A (1:1–3:13) 91* 93* 94*A 104* 110* 141* 149* 172*A 175* 177* 180* 181*A 201* 203* 205*A 205abschrift*A 209*A 218* 241* 242* 250*A 254*A 256* (Greek-Armenian bilingual) 296* 314* 325* 336* (missing) 337* 339* (destroyed by fire) 367* 368*


[Manuscript numbers enclosed in square brackets are said in Liste2 to be manuscripts whose inclusion as proper New Testament manuscripts in a strict sense is doubtful for varying reasons, some of which are given above].

11 Ox Bodl Barocc gr 212 fl08–130 contains the commentary of Andreas but no text.
Hoskier knew of the following manuscripts:
Papyri: P\textsuperscript{18} P\textsuperscript{24}
Uncials: 01 02 04 025 046 051 052 0163 0169
Cursives: asterisked in the list above.\textsuperscript{12}

Appendix 2

These are the 126 or 127 cursives containing only the Book of Revelation:

1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1788 1806 1824 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 [2041]\textsuperscript{13} 2042 2043 [124] 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2081 2082 2083 2084 2087 2091 2114 2116 2196 2254 2256 2258 2259 2286 2302 2305 2329 2350 2351 2354 2361 2377 2402 2403 2406 2419 2428 2429 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2449 2493 2594 2595 2638 2648 2663 2664 2667 2669 2672 2681 2743 2759 2814 2821 2824 2834 2845 2846 2855

Appendix 3

Manuscripts containing the whole of the New Testament (eapcr) are as follows:\textsuperscript{14}

01 02 04 18 35 61 69 141 149 175 180\textsuperscript{15} 201 205 205\textsuperscript{abschrift} 209\textsuperscript{15} 218 241 242 296 339 367 386 498 506 517 522 582 664 680 699 757 808 824 922 935 986 1040 1072 1075 1094 1248 1384 1424 1503 1597 1617 1626 1637 1652 1668 1678 1704 1780 1785 2136 2200 2201 2352 2494 2495 2554


\textsuperscript{13} 2041 r + 1040 eapc = 1040 eapcr.

\textsuperscript{14} Adjustments to my Survey p. xiii are: delete 886, add 1040 1248.

\textsuperscript{15} 180 eapcr need not qualify as a complete manuscript: e was written in the 12th C, acpr in 1273; 209 likewise was written at different times: 209 eapc in the 14th C, r in the 15th C.
205ab is now renumbered 2886; 2036ab is now renumbered 2891.

To the papyri containing Revelation add P115 that contains substantial portions of Rev 2, 3, 5, 6, 8–15 (see Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXVI (1999)).

In addition to those manuscripts containing only Revelation from the New Testament the following lists supplement the figures given in the article:

b) 78 minuscules (plus majuscule P.025) contain a/cpr: 42 82 88 91 93 94 104 110 172 177 181 203 250 254 256 314 325 336 337 385 424 429 432 452 456 459 467 468 469 616 617 620 627 628 632 911 919 920 1140 1611 1719 1728 1732 1733 1734 1740 1745 1746 1757 1760 1769 1795 1828 1841 1849 1852 1854 1857 1862 1864 1865 1870 1872 1876 1888 1893 1894 1903 2080 2344 2431 2625 2626 2716 2723 2776 2849 2138

c) 1 minuscule (886) contains eapr not c

d) 10 minuscules contain er (seen possibly as an unusual pairing, combining two Johannine writings):
   792 1006 1014 1328 1551 1685 2643 2656 2794 2323

e) 2 minuscules contain ea/cr:
   368 743

f) 4 minuscules contain a/cr:
   1859 2619 2847 2186

g) 7 minuscules contain pr:
   1771 1955 1918 1957 1934 1948 1835 + 2004

Hybrid Manuscripts

More work needs to be done on describing the contents of manuscripts containing Revelation (particularly those containing only Revelation from among canonical texts). Again, this may say something about how this manuscript was regarded and used, especially by a Greek church that only belatedly accepted Revelation into its canon and which excludes readings from Revelation in its ecclesiastical lectionary. The following writings occur in manuscripts that also contain only Revelation from the New Testament canon:16

---

046 (Gregory of Nyssa) 2023 (Gregory of Nazianzus) 2025 (Job, Justin Martyr, *Exhortation to the Greeks*) 2027 (Basil, Maximus the Peloponnesian, Theodoret) 2030 (Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Peter of Alexandria) 2050 (ascetic sermons, writings by Chrysostom and other works) 2054 (Life of St Elias and Life of St Gregory the Armenian) 2055 (Dionysius the Areopagite, Basil, *Contra Eunomium*) 2059 (Dionysius the Areopagite) 2060 (Chrysostom) 2070 (Treatises of Isaac the Syrian, Song of Songs with the commentary of Psellus) 2078 (Chrysostom, John of Damascus) 2329 (Hippolytus on Daniel). The following manuscripts also contain non-Biblical material: 2015 2016 2017 2018 2020 2022 2024 2038 2042 2048 2049 2051 2052 2054 2056 2069 2074 2077 2083 2196 2428 2434 2436 2493 2663.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

RECENT OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

A) SIX NEW PAPYRI OF MATTHEW’S GOSPEL

*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Volume LXIV edited by E.W. Handley, U. Wartenberg, R.A. Coles, N. Gonis, M.W. Haslam, and J.D. Thomas (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1997), ISBN 085698129X (= *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* 84), contains the *editio princeps* of fragments numbered 4401–4441. We are concerned here with the six fragments numbered 4401–4406, containing parts of Matthew’s Gospel in Greek. They are introduced and edited by Professor J. David Thomas of the University of Durham.

Details about the contents and age of the manuscripts are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4401</td>
<td>Matthew 3:10–12; 3:16–4:3*</td>
<td>3rd C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4402</td>
<td>Matthew 4:11–12, 22–23*</td>
<td>3rd–early 4th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4403</td>
<td>Matthew 13:55–56; 14:3–5*</td>
<td>Late 2nd–early 3rd C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4404</td>
<td>Matthew 21:34–37, 43, 45(?)*</td>
<td>Late 2nd C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4405</td>
<td>Matthew 23:30–34, 35–39</td>
<td>Late 2nd–early 3rd C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of these new papyri are relatively early; previously we knew of twelve papyri and five parchment MSS. of Matthew dated by scholars to pre-400 A.D. Five of those papyri are, in Thomas’ view (p. 1), not later than the mid third century: P1, P45, P53, P64+67+?4, P77. We may perhaps suggest adding to his list P70, a papyrus of Matthew also possibly dated to the mid third century.

All the new papyri are from codices.

---

1 Asterisks in the list apply to verses not previously found in Greek on papyrus. Matthew 3:10–12 is in Coptic in the bilingual (Greek-Coptic) MS. P56. Matthew 4:23 occurs in P. Oxy 1077, an amulet.
4401–4404 = P\textsuperscript{101}–P\textsuperscript{104}; 4406 = P\textsuperscript{105}. 4405 is another part of a leaf already published as P. Oxy 2683 (= P\textsuperscript{77}).\textsuperscript{2} Thomas (p. 6) alerts us to the possibility that 4403 may also be another part of the same codex.

4406 was used as an amulet: a piece of string is still attached to the papyrus.

As is usual in this series, each text is introduced, is edited and furnished with full critical notes. Photographs of one side of each papyrus appear on one plate (Plate I) at the end of the volume. The other sides are shown in Plate II.

This short article merely highlights the variants in these fragments that have a relevance to our printed critical apparatus. I identify either new readings that could be added to NA\textsuperscript{27} or evidence for existing variants that may be supplemented by the addition of these newly published fragments. In all instances Thomas’, often cautionary, notes need to be taken into account.

3:10 εις: προς 4401\textsuperscript{vid}—a unique reading.
3:11 υμας βαπτιζω: add 4401 to Ν B W.
3:11 Οmit οπισω μου 4401—a unique reading. There is no Greek evidence, but it may well be that the words were absent from D. (The Greek column is missing but d omits the words.) NA\textsuperscript{27} shows the omission by a d sa\textsuperscript{mass} Cyp; (Thomas adds Hilarius).
3:11 βαστασαι: κυψας λυσαι 4401\textsuperscript{vid} (in agreement with the Markan parallel, Mark 1:7).
3:16 ως: add 4401 to D 983.
3:16 Οmit και: add 4401\textsuperscript{vid} to Ν* B.
3:17 ηυδοκησα: add 4401 to Ν* C L P W.
4:1 Οmit o: add 4401\textsuperscript{vid} to B Δ 700.
4:2 μη μερας: 4401—a unique reading in Greek; cf. later in the sentence 4401 and Ν D 892 support the order τεσσερακοντα νυκτας.
4:3 ο πειραζων ειπεν αυτω: add 4401 to Ν B W f f\textsuperscript{13}.
4:22–23 Several variants are possible here, but MS. 4402 is so lacunose that no reconstruction should figure in an apparatus.
13:55 Ιωσης: add 4403 to Κ L W.
14:4 Οmit αυτω: add 4403 (a “guaranteed” reading, according to Thomas (p. 7))—to 565 pc.

\textsuperscript{2} 4405 adjoins a few lines of 2683 and helps confirm or contradict assumptions made about the contents of the lines when 2683 was published. In 1.10 (Matt. 23:34) read εγω; 11.25–26 read επισυναγειν with Ν* or (better) επισυναξαι, as in the Lukan parallel, Luke 13:34.
21:44 Because of the tentative reconstructions, little can be used confidently for text-critical purposes, but Thomas is inclined to the view that 4404 did not contain Matthew 21:44 (that is, in support of the reading of D 33 OL), although he warns (p. 9) that “. . . it (is) hazardous to use this papyrus as evidence in support of the omission of the verse”.

23:30 P77 is already (correctly) in the apparatus of NA27 in favour of the sequence κοινωνοι αυτων (with C L).

23:34 Omit και (before εξ αυτων): add 4405 (P77) to B W f1 f13 (v.l. και εξ αυτων: C D L maj.).

23:37 See fn. 2. Add v.l. επεισυναξαι: 4405 (P77)—a unique reading.

23:37 τα νοσσια αυτης: add 4405 (P77) to א B D W.

23:37 ορνιξ επεισυναξει: 4405 (P77)—a unique reading. All other MSS. of Matthew have the Attic ορνιϚ but in the Lukan parallel, Luke 13:34, v.l. ορνιξ is read by B D W. The sequence has the support of C B D, but C W maj. read 2, 1 (P77 is shown in the apparatus of NA27 for the v.l. concerning word order.)

23:39 Possibly 4405 (P77) supports ερημος (as shown in NA27), but it seems to omit either οικος or υμων.


28:3 ως: add 4406 to B D f1 892.4

28:4 εγενηθησαν: add 4406 to B C* D.

3 Possibly αὑτης is to be understood.

4 Thomas is uncertain if 4406 reads ως or ωσει at Matt. 28:4. Merely because 4406 has ως unambiguously in 28:3 is no guarantee that our scribe is consistent. Manuscripts L and W, for example, exhibit one form in 28:3 and the alternative in the verse following.
B) FIVE NEW PAPYRI OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The latest volume of Oxyrhynchus papyri contains the editio princeps of five New Testament fragments, four containing the Gospel of John and one a portion of the Epistle of James. The John fragments (P. Oxy. 4445, 4446, 4447, 4448) have been edited by W.E.H. Cockle; the James fragment (P. Oxy. 4449) has been edited by R. Hübner. As is usual in these publications, the transcript is accompanied by an introduction and textual and palaeographical notes. Supplementary text in the transcriptions has been taken from Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece 27th edition (= NA27); the apparatus criticus has been assembled from NA27, Tischendorf, Jülicher IV and the IGNTP volume on the papyri of John. Photographs of both sides of these five papyri are published on Plates II and III, and Plates IV and V.

The International Greek New Testament Project published an edition of all the papyri containing the Fourth Gospel known in 1995. At that time there were twenty three (counting P 44 as two separate MSS., P 44A and P 44B). With the four new Oxyrhynchus fragments the total number of papyri containing John rises to twenty seven, of which nine are certainly from Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. 208 + P. Oxy. 1781 = P5; P. Oxy. 1228 = P22; P. Oxy. 1596 = P28; P. Oxy. 1780 = P39; P. Oxy. 3523 = P90, and the new MSS.). The contents, age and Gregory-Aland numbers assigned to the new fragments of John are as follows:

P. Oxy. 4446. John 17:1–2; 11. Third century. (= P107)

---


These are among the earliest witnesses to this gospel.

The fragment of James (P. Oxy. 4449) has been assigned the Gregory-Aland number P100. It contains James 3:13–4:4; 4:9–5:1. P. Oxy. 4449 is dated third or fourth century and is the oldest surviving MS. containing these verses of the epistle. All of its readings are already familiar to us as this papyrus was included at the last minute in the first fascicule of Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior IV (= ECM).3

This review article indicates the extent to which the new fragments of John and of James may influence our printed apparatus.

The following readings seem to be confidently read. (I ignore most of those suggested readings that are not secure and which, if placed in an apparatus, would need to be suffixed with vid. An important exception is at 1:34 (sec.).) I include a selection of the MS. witnesses cited in the volume.

1. P. Oxy. 4445

John 1:30 υπερ with P5, 66, 75, B C* W5
1:31 εγω ηλθον with C* 157 pc.
1:32 om. λεγων with Ν* and Lvt(e) only
1:32 ως with most MSS. including P75
1:33 εαν: a unique reading. All printed editions consulted by the editor read αεν; none notes the existence of v.l. εαν
1:34 εορακα with P75 et al.; against εωρακα in Ν A B C et al.
1:34 Probably our papyrus supports the reading ο εκλεκτος with Ν* alone among Greek witnesses according to NA27, although the editor knows of “a few minuscules”. The rest read ο υιος
1:41 om. ουτος. There seems to be no space for ουτος. If this deduction is correct, then this is a unique reading by our papyrus, although there is possibly support from Lvt(b e)
1:42 ηγαζεν with P66, 75 B
1:42 om. τον before ιησουν—another unique reading
1:42 εμβλεψας with P66 B against P75 et al. εμβλεψας δε and W5 pc και εμβλεψας

1:42 οἰκεῖῳνυ with P66,75 Ν B* against οἰκεῖον Α B maj.
1:45 om. τον before οἰκεῖον with P66,75 Ν B
1:46 ναζαρεθ against P66 Ν A B (ναζαρεθ)
1:46 και against Ν pc. Lvt(a b e) (om. και')

In general, P. Oxy. 4445 supports the early papyri, Ν and B, although not slavishly so. It is therefore a characteristic early Alexandrian witness.

2. P. Oxy. 4446

John 17:1 In the lacuna following επι[αρας] the available space does not allow for τους οφθαλμους αυτου in full. The editor suggests αυτου might not have stood in this papyrus. If so, P. Oxy. 4446 would agree with Lvt(aur b e) Lvg om. suos
17:2 δως with W L against readings found in Ν*, Ν, or B maj.
17:2 α[υ]τωι with Ν* W 0109 against the reading αυτωις of P66 Ν B
17:11 An addition is found after ερχομαι in ll. 2–4 of which only a little remains. The editor suggests the reading [ουκετι ειμι ε]ν τω [κοσμω και εν] τω [κοσμω ει]μι reminiscent of the long reading of D Lvt(d r1) cf. Lvt(c), although he admits that this addition is not certain. The papyrus does not seem to support the long reading found in D after σου.
17:11 ο εδοκος with Ν W against the readings of P60 B, and of D* and of D1

[The agreements with W and the disagreements with Ν and P66 are noteworthy.]

3. P. Oxy. 4447

There are many ambiguities in the decipherment of this small and lacunose scrap, but the support of this MS. may be added to the following v.ll. in an apparatus:
John 17:24  ο] δεδω[κς with P60 Κ Β Δ al. against ους δεδωκας A C L maj. on the assumption that the preceding πατερ (or πατηρ) was written out in full

17:24  εδοκας with B K N against δεδωκας in Κ Α C D pler.

18:3  Spacing prevents this MS. supporting και εκ των φαρισαιων of Ν*2 D L or και των φαρισαιων of B. Thus P. Oxy. 4447 seems to agree with Ν1 A C W in reading και φαρισαιων

18:4  δε with Κ Β W fam. 1 (against ουν Π60 Α B)

18:4  εξελθων ειπεν. The nu indicates the reading supports Κ Α C2 maj. rather than εξηλθεν και λεγει in Β C* D

4. P. Oxy. 4448

This is the first papyrus to contain verses 21:24–25. (P59 fragment XII contains 21:18–20, 23, but as P59 is one of the Nessana MSS. we may state that P. Oxy. 4445 is the first from Egypt to contain this chapter: it is certainly our oldest witness to the verses.)

John 21:18  αλλοι with P59 Κ Β Ν (and therefore plural verbs following) against MSS. supporting singular verbs following αλλος

21:20  om. δε (after επιστραφεις) with A B C W against + δε Π59vid Κ

21:23  τι] προς σε[ε supporting Ν1 A B C* W against Ν* C2vid (om. τι προς σε) and D (προς σε)

5. P. Oxy. 4449

With the exception of James 4:3 (sec.) only readings relevant to the apparatus in Nestle-Aland27 are included: a full apparatus is of course now to hand in ECM.

James 3:14  om. αρα against Α Π (add αρα)

3:14  τη καιρα with A B C (Κ pc read plural)

3:16  om. και (after εκει) with B C, against Κ Α (om. και)

3:17  Spacing suggests om. εργων against C (add εργων)
3:17 και (before ανυποκριτος) with K L against Ν A B (om. και)
4:2 om. και before ουκ εχετε with A B against Ν (add και)
4:3 αιτειτε1 (om. δε) with Ν A B
4:3 αιτειτε2 with 69 631 (pace Hübner OP 65 p. 24) and therefore a reading unique in majuscules—all other MSS. read αιτεισθε
4:4 om. μοιχοι και with Ν* A B
4:9 μετατραπη[τω] with Β P against μεταστραφτω in Ν A
4:10 του κυριου with Λ 049 056 maj. against Ν A B (om. του)
4:11 η κ[ρ]εινων (for και κρινων) with Ν A B al.
4:12 om. ο (before νομοθετης) with Β 74 Β P against Ν A maj. (+ ο)
4:13 ποιησομεν with Β P against ποιησομεν in Ν A
4:14 γαρ1 with Β 74 Ν2 A maj., but Hübner points out that, with the omission by Β. Οxy. 4449 of η before ζωη, its sequence [ποια] γαρ ζωη is unique among Greek witnesses.4

The text of Β. Οxy 4449 could now be added to Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus 1 Die Katholischen Briefe (= ANTF 6) and to Text und Textwert 1 Die Katholischen Briefe (= ANTF 9, 10A, 10B, 11).

We congratulate the editors of these fragments, and the editorial board of The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, for presenting this material to us with the clarity and precision we expect in this distinguished series. I note only one typographical slip in the material examined here: on p. 11 read altlateinischer.

---

4 Hübner may be correct (OP 65 p. 25) that Β. Οxy. 4449 did not follow Ν in omitting ατμις γαρ εστε later in this verse, but in view of other variants (e.g. by Β, or by 33 shown in NA27) his reconstruction of the missing words in James 4:14 in line 17 is not necessarily correct.
C) SEVEN RECENTLY PUBLISHED NEW TESTAMENT FRAGMENTS FROM OXYRHYNCHUS

The series, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri (= OP)* has in three successive volumes (LXIV, LXV, LXVI) substantially increased the number of published Greek New Testament papyri. As a result the highest numbered papyrus is P115.

The latest volume, LXVI, publishes the *editio princeps* of 6 papyri and one parchment manuscript (numbered P110–115 and 0305 respectively in the Gregory-Aland listing). The Gregory-Aland numbers are now conveniently printed in the subheadings to each new manuscript described here. *OP* LXVI\(^1\) contains texts from Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, Hebrews and Revelation. Although most are small fragments, one of the mss. of Revelation contains a significant amount of text. We are very grateful to the editors of the series for having introduced so many New Testament fragments recently.

The new texts are:


4498 (= P114) illustrated on plates 1 and 2. 3rd century. Hebrews 1:7–12. Text is found on only one side but the editor suggests the fragment is from a codex; two other mss. of Hebrews come from a roll (P12 P13) although their other sides contain writing. Edited by W.E.H. Cockle.


---


\(^2\) It is strange that these illustrations are interrupted by the illustrations of P. Oxy. 4501 and 4502 as plates 9 and 10!


As is usual in OP, the texts are carefully set out with introductory comments by the editor, and with explanatory notes. The photographs are clear although it would be helpful to have references to the extent of the text given alongside the illustrations.

I shall again attempt to identify readings in the new manuscripts which could appear unambiguously as witnesses in an apparatus criticus.

1.) \( P^{10} \)

Matt. 10:14 \( \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \eta \chi \omicron \mu \nu \omega \nu \) a unique reading. All other witnesses read \( \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \eta \rho \chi \omicron \mu \nu \omega \nu \).

Matt. 10:14 \( \pi \omicron \lambda \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \eta \kappa \omicron \mu \eta \varsigma \) om. \( \eta \kappa \omicron \mu \eta \varsigma \) B maj.

Matt. 10:14 om. \( \varepsilon \kappa \mu \alpha \xi \alpha [ \tau \epsilon ] \) with D lat.

Matt. 10:14 \( \varepsilon \kappa \mu \alpha \xi \alpha [ \tau \epsilon ] \). A unique reading; all other witnesses read \( \varepsilon \kappa \tau \iota \nu \alpha \xi \alpha [ \tau \epsilon ] \).

Matt. 10:14 \( \alpha \rho \omicron \) : another unique reading. All other mss. read \( \varepsilon \kappa \) or have no preposition.

Matt. 10:25 \( \varepsilon \kappa \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) (or \( \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \)) \( \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \zeta \varepsilon \beta \omicron \omicron \). Yet another unique reading: all other Greek mss. have the order 2,1.

2.) \( P^{111} \)

Luke 17:12 \( \alpha \pi \eta \nu \tau \iota \sigma [ \alpha \nu ] \) with \( P^{75} \) A B maj against \( \upsilon \pi \eta \nu \tau \iota \sigma \sigma \sigma \) \& 063 fam\(^1\) fam\(^{13}\).

Luke 17:22 \( \tau \omicron \varepsilon [ \iota \theta \omicron \mu \mu \eta \varsigma \varsigma \omicron \varsigma \) with D fam\(^{13}\) 157 against \( \omicron \tau \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \iota \theta \omicron \mu \mu \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma \) (or \( \omicron \tau \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \iota \theta \omicron \mu \mu \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma \)) with \( P^{75} \) \& A B pler. But later in the same verse \( \omicron \upsilon [ \omicron \iota \theta \omicron \mu \mu \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma ] \) is read \( \omicron \upsilon \omicron \iota \theta \omicron \mu \mu \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma \) with \( \omicron \upsilon \) A D.

\(^{3}\) Those readings requiring a superscript \( vid \) after the ms siglum have not been included here.
3.) \( P^{112} \)

Acts 27:6 βρα[δυπλοουντε]ς εν δε ικαν[ας ημεραις. This seems to be a unique reading: all other witnesses support the word order 2,4,3,5,1.

4.) \( P^{113} \)

No readings to be added.

5.) \( P^{114} \)

Heb 1:9 the words σον o Θ̅Ϲ̅ are visible, which suggests a unique reading: all other witnesses read σον after θεος.²

Heb 1:12 + ος μα]τι[ον with \( P^{46} \) \( A \) \( B \) against om. with \( D \) \( K \) \( L \) \( P \) \( Ψ \) maj.

6.) \( P^{115} \)

On the basis of his preliminary investigations, the editor is of the opinion that his ms. belongs to the AC Oecumenius type of text. In a private communication D.C. Parker, whose advice on the New Testament texts is acknowledged by the editors in their Preface, has calculated on the basis of 165 places of variation that \( P^{47} \) differs from \( P^{115} \) in 79 (with lacunae in 34 of the 165); \( Ξ \) differs in 84; \( A \) differs in 56; and \( C \) in 43 (with lacunae in 28 of the 165).

Among the papyri \( P^{115} \) has the most substantial portions of Revelation after \( P^{47} \), which contains nearly 8 chapters. There are relatively few papyri containing this book (\( P^{98} \) 2nd century is the oldest followed by \( P^{47} \) 3rd century; \( P^{18} \) 3rd–4th century; \( P^{24} \) 4th century; \( P^{85} \) 4th–5th century; \( P^{43} \) 6th–7th century cf. 0169 (4th century); 0207 (4th century); 0163 (5th century); 0229 (7th–8th century and 0308 (see below). \( Ξ \) is the oldest complete text of Revelation.

Rev 8:5 βρον[ται κα[ι φω[αι κα[ι α]σ[τραπατ] with \( Ξ \) 046 against 1,2,5,4,3 \( A \) 052 or 3,4,1,2,5 \( P \) maj\( A \) or 1,2,5 1006.

---

² The sequence of these nouns in this ms. is unique at Rev 11:19 (see OP LXVI p. 32 re lines 202–203) and cf. also Rev 4:5.
Rev 8:13 α]ετοιν with Ν A 046 majκ against αγγελου P majκ.
Rev 9:3 α]υτοις with Ν 046 against ανταις Α maj.
Rev 9:20 δυναται with P85 Ν A C against δυναται P47 majκ.

Rev 10:9 βιβλαρ]διον with P85 A C against βιβλιον P47 Ν; βιβλαριον A*; βιβλιδαριον maj. On the strength of the reading ] διον here the editor is prepared to read βιβλαριδιον in his reconstructions at verses 2, 8, 10; his notes on 10:8 (at line 127 page 30) state that βιβλιον would be too short for the space (but see notes on line 108).

Rev 10:10 εγε[μ]σθη with Ν* C against επικρανθη in P47 Α.
Rev 11:3 περιβεβλημ]ενοι with Ν C against περιβεβλημενοις Ν* A 046.
Rev 11:12 φοι]νην μεγα[λην . . . λεγουσαν with Α majκ against φοινης μεγαλης . . . λεγουσις P47 Ν C.
Rev 11:15 λ]εγουσαι with P47 Ν C majκ against λεγοντες Α 046 majκ.

Rev 12:3 πυρ]ρος μεγα[ας or πυ]ρος μεγα[ας with P47 Ν C 046 against μεγας πυρρος or μεγας πυρος read by Α P 051 2351.
Rev 12:4 ἐστικει probably intended to be the pluperfect ειστηκει, a tense that commends itself in this context (cf. Rev 7:11 ειστηκεισαν). This unique reading stands against both εστηκεν read by P47 Α 046 and εστηκει read by C.

Rev 12:9 ο]ς ο μεγας ο αρχαιος with 1006 against 3,4,1,2,5,6 A C and 3,4,2 Ν and 1–4 P47.
Rev 13:8 εν τ[ω] ante βιβλιατω with Ν C A maj against om. def. art. with Ν* C.
Rev 13:18 χι[ς (i.e., chi, iota, stigma used as numerals) with C (and mss. known to Irenaeus) against the numeral 666 with P47 Ν 051 maj.
Rev 14:6 κοτοι[κουντας with Α 051 against καθημενους P47 Ν C.

---

5 In NovT 12 (1970) pp. 391–8 I investigated on p. 396 the variant readings for the various diminutive forms of βιβλος in “Nouns with Diminutive Endings in the New Testament” and favoured the originality of βιβλαριδιον, a form known only in the NT according to Liddell-Scott, in Rev 10:2, 8, 9, 10 against the variants βιβλιον, βιβλαριον, βιβλιδαριον (being, perhaps, an attempt to rewrite the diminutive with an ending known from classical writers), and even βιβλιδιον. In NA27 βιβλαριδιον occurs 3 times (all in Rev 10) and βιβλιον 22 times, including Rev 10:8 (The non-diminutive form βιβλος occurs only twice (Rev 3:5; 20:15), appropriately of the Book of Life.
7.) 0308

Rev 11:16 καθηνται θημενοι with A 051 majA against καθηνται P47 2 Ν C or οι καθηνται Ν* majK.

Rev 11:17 + και (after ην) with P47 Ν* C against om. 2 Ν A maj.


* * *

As usual we commend the editors, printers and publishers for their care in preparation and presentation and their clarity in displaying the inevitably complex details. On pages 20–21, however, the line numbering has gone astray. From line 10 to line 222 move the figures up one line.
D) FOUR NEW PAPYRI CONTAINING THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR THE APPARATUS CRITICUS

[674] The latest volume of The Oxyrhynchus Papyri¹ contains the editio princeps of four previously unpublished fragments of John’s Gospel 4803–4806. These have been registered by the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster as P¹¹⁹–¹²². Thus we now have 118 separate papyri containing parts of the New Testament,² 31 of which contain the Fourth Gospel. Fifty one New Testament papyri have come from Oxyrhynchus and many of these have been published quite recently.

Volume LXXI contains introductions to all four papyri and to each one separately. As is usual, there is a transcription with accompanying textual and palaeographical notes. There is a photographic plate of each side of all four papyri. Each comes from a codex.

The dates of the newly published fragments are:

4803 third century
4804 fourth century
4805 third century
4806 fourth-fifth century?

Because of their early date it is expected that readings from these witnesses will appear in the critical apparatus of the Nestle text and in other editions. Their fragmentary and lacunose character obviously means that their editor, Juan Chapa, has had to reconstruct much of the missing wording. If spacing permits a guaranteed reading, then the evidence can be presented in an apparatus with the conventional superscript vid following the ms. siglum. In the following survey I indicate all places where the inclusion of the variants read by the new witnesses may be added with certainty (because the reading is legible) or with near-certainty if the editor’s reconstruction is plausible. It must be left to a further enquiry to assess the textual affinities and allegiance of these papyri.

---
² The following numbers have been superseded as they belong to another previously registered number. P¹⁴ P¹⁶ P⁶⁷ and probably P³⁴ (=P⁴).
1. POxy 4803 = P^{119}

John 1:21–28; 38–44

[Other papyri containing parts of this chapter are P^{5} P^{55} P^{59} P^{66} P^{76} P^{106}.]

1:25. αὐτῷ]ὴν τί οὖν. This visible text shows that this ms. omits καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ with P^{vid} Lvt l.

1:26. Not surprisingly, the papyrus conforms to the normal spelling of the name Ἰωάννης.

1:26. βαπτίζω υμᾶς has been conjectured here by Chapa (see P^{120} below).

1:26–27. τὸν οὐκ οἶδατ[ε]. The spacing does not allow a reconstruction οὗτος εστιν with G Ψ or αὐτός εστιν before (ο) οπίσω with A C c maj. Thus P^{119} supports P^{66} P^{75}.

1:27. Spacing does not allow for the addition after ερχομένος of the longer reading (+ (ος) ἐμπροσθέν μου γεγονέν) found in A C c fam13 maj from John 1:30. Thus the shorter text agrees with P^{5} P^{66} P^{75} Β C *.

1:27. οὐκ εἰμὶ εγώ is visible making P^{119} agree with P^{66c} B fam13. The εγώ is not omitted (see below P^{120vid}) with P^{vid} P^{66+} P^{75}. εγώ οὐκ εἰμὶ is read by A Θ fam1 maj.

1:27. The initial letter of α[ξιος is visible, showing that our ms. (like P^{120}) does not support ικανος, read by P^{66} P^{75}.

1:42. Chapa offers a suggested restoration of the missing words in this verse after α]υτὸν π[ρὸς that agrees with P^{66*} P^{75} P^{106} Β but it is only speculative. The letters visible make it unlikely that P^{119} supports either καὶ before ηγαγεν with Α Θ maj or οὗτος before ηγαγεν with P^{66c} G fam1.

2. POxy 4804 = P^{120}

John 1:25–28; 33–38; 42–44

1:26. There is no λέγων before εγώ. This means P^{120} agrees with P^{75} fam1.

1:26. Chapa restores by adding υμᾶς after βαπτίζω with N Α Θ 063 086 vid 565 1424 and P^{119} (see above).

1:26. P^{120} omits δὲ with P^{59} P^{66} P^{75} Β. Thus it cannot support μεσος δὲ υμῶν (as in A C^{2} W supp Θ maj) found in the reconstruction of this verse in P^{119} offered by Chapa.³

³ Chapa p. 51. 7 could have referred to the omission of δὲ by P^{120}. 
1:27. P₁²⁰ reads οἵπισو with P₆⁶ P₇⁵ C* maj and does not agree with om. o by Ν* B.

1:27. There is no support here for the v.l. adding before (ο) οἵπισω either οὕτως εστίν with G Ψ or οὕτως εστίν read by A C C* N* fam13 28 maj. Similarly P₁²⁰ does not agree with the reading οὕτως εστίν ον εἰμιν found in S. See P₁¹⁹ above.

1:27. P₁²⁰, like P₁¹⁹, does not support v.l. + (ος) εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν after ερχομενος in Α C C* fam13 maj.

1:27. αξιος is read here. Like P₁¹⁹ P₁²⁰ does not support ικανος read by P₆⁶ P₇⁵.

1:27. P₁²⁰ definitely omits εγώ immediately before αξιος with P₅ P₆⁶* P₇⁵ Ν C. P₁²⁰ therefore differs from P₁¹⁹ in this. (The spacing does not allow εγώ ουκ ειμι found in Α Θ fam1 maj.)

1:28. The α visible before εγενετο in the fragment suggests that P₁²⁰ does not agree with P₆⁶ Ν* (εγενετο εν βηθανια). (Spacing precludes the α being the final letter of ταυτα.) The place name in P₁²⁰ cannot be determined. It could be βηθανια, βηθαραβα or βηθαβαρα, although Chapa is inclined to accept βηθανια. εν βηθανια εγενετο is read by P₇⁵ A B C; εν βηθαβαρα εγενετο by C² K Π; εγενετο εν βηθαραβα is read by Ν².⁴

1:34. P₁²⁰ reads ο νιος ο. The article (if that is what it is) after νιος is not attested by other manuscripts. Could it have read ο νιος ο [εκλεκτος]? But even that is a unique reading—although Ν* reads ο εκλεκτος instead of ο νιος. The final omicron is however not very clear.

1:35. Spacing suggests P₁²⁰ omits παλιν with P₇⁵ Ψ.

1:36. There are several alternative readings in this verse, and it is not clear which v.l. P₁²⁰ supports, except to affirm that it does not add ο αιρων την αμαρτιαν τον κοσμου after ο αμνος του Θεου at the end of this verse found in P₆⁶* C* 892* 1241.

1:43. Our manuscript does not read Ὁ Ἰησοῦς before ἐξελθεῖν. F G H Θ read Ὁ Ἰησοῦς at this point. Most manuscripts have Ὁ Ἰησοῦς following αὐτῷ later in the verse.

3. POxy 4805 = P121

John 19:17–18; 25–6

[The other papyri containing parts of this chapter are P60 P66 P90.]

19:17. The visible text ἐβραστὶ ὁ λόγος obviously means that our manuscript does not support δὲ after ἐβραστὶ found in L Ψ 33.

19:18. Two interesting features in this verse are:

a) the spacing seems to require ἑσταυρωσαν to have been written as a staurogram, as in P66;

b) an alpha is visible before εντευθέν. No plausible restoration presents itself for what could have been read here.

19:25. Although the text is not very clear, the reading Κλοπα rather than Ἐλωπα suggests itself. The spelling Κλοπα is found in H Ψ Ω 69. Chapa does not refer to that reading; he raises the possibility that Κλεοπα may have originally been read here.

19:26. IC is clear (as a nomen sacrum). Chapa is not strictly correct to say here (p. 11) that IC is omitted by Ξ* and introduced by Ξ†. The omission by Ξ* is of the opening phrase that contains IC, and thus is not a straightforward omission of only IC.

19:26. οὖν is clear. Thus this manuscript does not agree with Ξ* which reads δὲ.

4. POxy 4806 = P122

John 21:11–14; 22–24

[There are three other papyri that have parts of this chapter: P59 P66 P109.]

21:11. εἰς is visible and thus this manuscript supports Ξ A B C rather than ἐπὶ, found in D fam1 maj.

---

5 Chapa wrongly cites maj in support of this reading.
6 Chapa p. 11 ignores P66.
21:13. P\textsuperscript{122} reads ερχεται ΙΗΣΙ και λ[αμβανει with B D W. There is no support for either ερχεται ουν ο Ιησους with A Θ maj or ερχεται ο Ιησους found in Ν L Ψ fam1.\textsuperscript{7} 

21:13. P\textsuperscript{122} reads καὶ διδοσιν and thus is not in agreement with ευχαριστησας εδωκεν in D Latin (mss.). \textsuperscript{8} 

21:14. The manuscript reads εφανερω[θη τοις μ[αθηταις and agrees with L and W only. Other manuscripts have (ο) IC after εφανερωθη. Chapa merely notes en passant that W does not read Ιησους here, despite his earlier note that D.C. Parker encourages us (correctly) to identify the link between this manuscript and W. We cannot of course know if P\textsuperscript{122}, like L, had o IC after μαθηταις as the leaf breaks off here. 

21:22. There is no support here for the v.l. + μοι before εξηλθεν found in C\textsuperscript{2} Θ Ψ maj. 

21:23. Spacing does not allow for the reconstruction (αδελφους + και εδοξαν supported by D. 

21:23. P\textsuperscript{122} reads εκεινου, a singular reading being a unique error. 

21:23. δε σωτο is visible after ειπε\textsuperscript{v} and therefore P\textsuperscript{122} supports Ν C and W and does not agree with και ουκ ειπεν σωτο found in A (D) Θ Ψ maj. 

21:23. Chapa suggests that spacing allows P\textsuperscript{122} to read + τι προς σε with most manuscripts (but note that 565 Ν* and, apparently C\textsuperscript{2}, omit). 

Postscriptum

Since these articles were published papyri registered as 123, 124, 125 and 127 have been published in the series The Oxyrhynchus Papyri volumes LXXII (2008), LXXIII (2009) and LXXIV (2009) and papyrus 126 in Papiri greci et latini 15 (2008).

\textsuperscript{7} Plus C according to NA accepted by Chapa but contra Swanson who claims C has neither ουν nor o: The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, The New Testament in Greek IV The Gospel according to St. John vol. 2 The Majuscules (Leiden: Brill, 2007) (= New Testament Tools Studies and Documents 37) has ερχε [3–4] implying that C could have read either ουν or ουν o. 

\textsuperscript{8} Chapa incorrectly has και ευχαριστησας εδωκεν.
PART THREE

STUDIES AND PRAXIS

A. Textual Variation

(a) Short Studies
When we examine these two words we find that they seem to inter-change meaning and often textual alternatives. Can we find any guide to settle text and meaning?

The starting point in our inquiry is the remark of the second century A.D. grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus, ἐρωτῶ σε νῦν ἐν ᾧ ἰσῷ τῷ παρακαλῶ σε, λιτανεύω, ἱκνοῦμι: in the Hellenistic Age ἐρωτᾶν meant «to request» rather than «to question». With this agrees its one certain instance in Mark 7:26. It exists as a variant at 4:10, 8:5, but at both places the meaning is «question» and we should probably read ἐπερωτᾶν. In Mark ἐπερωτᾶν always means «question» and with the instances above occurs some twenty seven times. Mark’s usual word for request is αἰτεῖν.


In Luke, according to our printed editions, the use of ἐρωτᾶν looks more irregular. Its meaning is open to doubt at 4:38, although one could translate «made request to him about her...». At 9:45 it means «question» as it does at 19:31, 20:3, 22:68, 23:3, but there are variants: the variant by CDKII at 9:45, ἐπερωτήσωση, is probably right. The variant ἐπηρώτησεν at 23:3 by ADLW may also be right. At 20:3 ἐπερωτήσω we is read by DY 713 pc at 22:68 by fam. 13 pc and ἐπερωτάω at 19:31 by one cursive (579) which is a ms. of some significance. Thus in Luke ἐρωτᾶν seems to mean «request», the compound «question».

[205]
The distinction between the two verbs prevails in the Pauline Epistles. ἐρωτᾶν means «request» Phil 4:3, 1 Thess 4:1, 5:12, 2 Thess 2:1 and ἐπερωτᾶν «question» at 1 Cor 14:35. ἐπερωτᾶν Rom 10:20 «ask for, seek» occurs in a LXX quotation. ἐρωτᾶν 1 John 5:16, 2 John 5 means «request».

This brings us to John where with two exceptions ἐρωτᾶν alone occurs in both senses, «request» and «question». At 9:23 we should probably read ἐρωτᾶν with ADL. At the other exception 18:7 «question», ἐρωτᾶν is read by 33 397 Or and Cyril in his commentary though not in the lemma.

In Matthew there is less consistency, ἐπερωτᾶν (seven times) is «question» except at 16:1 «request» but there is a v.l. ηρωτησαν εχθρωτησαν. ἐρωτᾶν is 'request' at 15:23 but 'question' at 16:13; 19:17; 21:24 (v.l. ἐπερ- D pc). See also v.ll., concerning αἰτέω e.g. Mk 10:35. (ἐρωτήσαμεν in D et al.).

There is one further consideration that we should keep in mind. ἐρωτᾶν «request» is Hellenistic. ἐρωτᾶν «question» should probably be regarded as an Atticism. When therefore we have to choose between ἐπερωτᾶν and ἐρωτᾶν in the sense of «question» in the New Testament, we have to allow for the possibility that ἐρωτᾶν is an Atticizing correction. This will apply to the variations mentioned earlier in this note.

On the other side we may put the appearance of παρακαλεῖν as a variant to ἐρωτᾶν «request». This happens at Lk 7:4 (A Maj) 8:37 (Θ), Acts 10:48 (D), 16:39 (D). We may also note Mk 1:40 παρακαλῶν] ἐρωτῶν D and Rom 16:17 παρακαλῶν] ἐρωτῶ D Lat.

If the Attic ἐρωτᾶν «question» was to be encouraged, the Hellenistic ἐρωτᾶν «request» was to be displaced and παρακαλεῖν was at hand to replace it. See also v.ll., concerning αἰτέω e.g. Mk 10:35. (ἐρωτήσαμεν in D et al.).

From this survey of New Testament usage we can see the development in meaning of ἐρωτᾶν and the intrusion of ἐπερωτᾶν. An investigation of these words in the LXX and in the Shepherd of Hennas would yield similar results.

Postscriptum

Re 12a I deal only with the verb but note that at 1 Peter 3:21 we have the noun ἐπερωτησία. See F.W. Danker, Concise Greek-English Lexicon
2009) who describes the noun as “A rare word, perhaps best understood in sense of pledge”.

It is unlikely that at baptism a convert believed he was accepted as forgiven. Rather, a convert appealed to God for a good conscience. The verb is likely to mean a request (appeal) to God.
B) THE POSITION OF CAUSAL "ὍΤΙ" CLAUSES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

These clauses normally follow their main clauses. This rule is uniformly true for Matthew, Mark, Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, Jude, 1–2 John. There are no instances in 2 Peter and 3 John.

There are two passages which may seem to be exceptional in Luke–Acts: Lk 19:17; Acts 13:34. At Lk 19:17 the accepted interpretation reads: «Well done, good servant; because you have been faithful in a very small matter, have authority over ten cities.» But we can revise the punctuation as follows: «Well done, good servant, because you have been faithful in a very small matter. Have authority over ten cities.» This requires a colon or full stop after ἐγένου. The asyndeton with the imperative ἵσθι is usual, cf. Mt 2:13; 5:25; Mk 5:34; 1 Tim 4:15.

At Acts 13:34 there are differences of reading and interpretation. ὅτε in D 255 614 2412 gig Hil emphasizes our difficulty. This difficulty involved in the tense of ἀνέστησεν is that, as the text stands, it can naturally be held to say that at or after the Resurrection of Jesus, God pronounced the saying from Is 55:3. The reading ὅτι in the sense of «that» eases the difficulty, but, if we translate it «because» or read ὅτε «when», the full force of the difficulty returns. In view of this we should probably either read ὅτε as the harder reading or ὅτι in the sense of «that» as in the Revised English Bible of 1989. If we accept the suggestions for this passage and Lk 19:17, Luke–Acts has no example of causal ὅτι preceding its main clause.

Causal ὅτι nearly always follows its main clause in the Pauline Epistles. The two exceptions are Rom 9:7; Gal 4:6. At Rom 9:7 ὅσοι is read by dem vg (DFRU) Or Aug, Arm. As ὅτι replaces ὅστις at Jn 8:53 in Π 66* D a it may be argued that it replaces ὅσοι here. If we may leave this possibility open, there is another. The commentators have to assume an ellipse at verse 6 οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι («it is not the case that»). We may assume another ellipse at οὐδ ὅτι «nor are they Israel because», i.e. οὐδ´ (Ἰσραήλ) ὅτι. We can then put a full stop after Αβρααμ, and the verse will run: «Nor are they Israel because they are the seed of Abraham. All are children, but etc.» The Apostle goes on to distinguish two kinds of children, the children of the flesh and the
children of the promise. What he has to say relates not to all children but only to the children of the promise. With this punctuation and interpretation, causal ὅτι follows its main clause.

At Gal 4:6 there is a difference of interpretation among commentators. The majority according to H.D. Betz’s Hermeneia commentary wish to translate «because» but some prefer to suppose an ellipse. This second course avoids causal ὅτι before its main clause and we can for example translate «To show that you are sons he has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts» (again cf. the Revised English Bible).

The supposition of causal ὅτι before its main clause in these two passages enables us to avoid two ellipses in an author given to ellipses, but requires us to admit two exceptions to the rule supported by at least fifty examples in Paul that causal ὅτι clauses follow their main clause.

In Revelation there are forty or more examples of causal ὅτι following its main clauses but there may be four exceptions, 3:10, 16, 17; 18:7.

At 3:10 there are alternative punctuations. The printed editions put a full stop before ὅτι ἔτηρήσας, but it is possible to put a comma here and a full stop before καγώ. The rendering of the passage will be: «And know that I have loved you, because you have kept the word of my endurance. I will also keep you.» Here «I will also keep you» connects with verse 9 ἰδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτούς («Behold I will make them»).

There is one other possibility to be considered. For ὅτι Α arm have καί and 1678 1778 2020 2080 have καὶ ὅτι. καὶ for ὅτι would solve our problem but we will notice later a difficulty in this solution.

At 3:16 οὕτως ὅτι there is apparently no alternative interpretation. οὕτως is omitted by 2019 2042 2051 Ambst Aug Sal sa eth and by implication by all other Latin witnesses. This omission would make it possible to join ὅτι χιλιαρός εἶ κτλ. to the preceding sentence. There is however a palaeographical explanation of the omission, as can be seen from ζεστοCΟυτοCΟτι. This species of homoioteleuton would easily account for the omission. With this explanation our last chance of attaching this causal ὅτι to the preceding sentence disappears. Nor does any other interpretation of ὅτι suggest itself.

At 3:17 ὅτι λέγεις can be attached to the previous verse. The fact that μέλλω σε ἐμέσαι already has one causal ὅτι connected with it need cause us no difficulty. At 15:4 we have three examples of causal ὅτι consecutively in the same sentence. We may therefore regard this instance of causal ὅτι as dubious.
18:7 is also uncertain. The διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of verse 8 may seem to favour the connexion of causal ὅτι with what follows, but at 7:15; 12:12, the other instances of διὰ τοῦτο in Revelation, it connects with a preceding main clause. Further, to connect 18:7 with what goes before makes good sense.

If at 3:16 we have one firm example and at 3:10, 17; 18:7 three dubious examples of causal ὅτι coming before its main verb in Revelation, in John we have some six instances to consider, 1:50; 8:45; 15:19; 16:6; 19:42; 20:29. Only 15:19 seems at all doubtful. Here D with some other support reads ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε for ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστε. This is tautologous but we are dealing with a writer who does not shrink from tautology. We have a following διὰ τοῦτο, but in John too διὰ τοῦτο does not necessarily connect with a preceding causal ὅτι. At 1:30f it clearly does not. We may then admit the possibility that 15:19 is not an instance of causal ὅτι preceding its main clause, but that, if we accept the reading of D, it follows its main clause.

Causal ὅτι was not popular with scribes and some manuscripts avoid it in various ways at the following passages: Mt 14:5 (ἐπεί); 23:10 (γάρ); Mk 1:27 (om.); 6:2 (om.); 8:24 (om.); 11:18 (γάρ); Lk 17:10 (om.); Jn 1:16 (καί); 12:41 (ὀτε); Gal 3:13 (γάρ); Jas 1:23 (om.); 1 Pet 5:8 (om.); Rev 22:10 (γάρ). We have noticed readings which avoid ὅτι at Rom 9:7; Rev 3:10. They may be due to the same tendency to eliminate causal ὅτι.

"Ὅτι «for» at the beginning of a sentence inevitably refers to what precedes. We have treated examples of this as examples of causal ὅτι throughout the New Testament.
In the Koine τε was steadily falling into desuetude, but the various uses of τε did not become uncommon or obsolete at the same rate. Three such uses can be discerned. First is what may be called «free τε», where either a single τε is used in the sense of «and», or a series, τε.. τε meaning «both . . . and». Next there is the phrase τε καί, or τε. . . καί «both . . . and» and thirdly, οὔτε, μήτε, εἴτε singly or repeated.

The word seems to have gone out of use in this order. Free τε is least common. There is one doubtful instance at Mt 28:12 (v.l. om. D et al.), none in Mark, none in Luke and none in John. Acts has many, about 100 according to A.C. Clark.¹ There are a few instances in the Pauline Epistles: Rom. 1:26, 2:19, 7:7 (v.l.) 14:8 (4), 1 Cor. 4:21, Eph. 3:19. Hebrews has several: 1:3, 6:2, 5, 9:1, 12:2. None of the other works have this usage.

τε...καί is commoner. It occurs at Mt. 22:10, 27:48 (v.l.), Lk. 2:16 (v.l.), 12:45 (v.l.), 15:2 (v.l.), 21:11 (2) (v.ll.), 22:66 (v.l.), 23:12, 24:20 (v.l.) and about 60 times in Acts. The Pauline Epistles have Rom. 1:12, 14 (2), 16 (v.l.), 20, 27 (v.l.), 2:9, 10, 3:9, 10:12, 1 Cor. 1:2 (v.l.), 24, 30 (v.l.), Phil. 1:7. The formulae of the type Ἰουδαῖος τε καὶ Ἕλλην are responsible for Rom. 1:16, 2:9, 10, 3:9, 10:12, 1 Cor. 1:24. Hebrews has 2:4 (v.l.), 11, 4:12 (v.l.), 5:7, 14, 6:2, 4, 19, 7:3, 9:2, 9, 19, 10:33, 11:32(2), fifteen instances in all. There are two examples at James 3:7: Rev. 19:18 is doubtful.

οὔτε and μήτε survive little better. Matthew has οὔτε at 6:20, 12:32, 22:30. Marcan examples are cited at 5:3, 12:25, 14:68: all should probably be rejected as secondary. In Luke there is 14:35, 20:35 and in John 4:11, 21, 5:37, 8:19, 9:3. Acts has surprisingly few: 2:31 (v.l.), 15:10, 19:37, 24:12, 25:8, 28:21, not more than six instances. The Pauline Epistles give Rom. 8:38, 39, 1 Cor. 3:7, 6:9 (v.l.), 10 (v.l.), 8:8, 11:11, Gal. 1:12 (v.l.), 5:6, 6:15, 1 Thess. 2:5, 6, perhaps nine examples. Next there are James 3:12 (v.l.) and 3 Jn. 10. Revelation gives 3:15, 16, 5:4, 9:20, 21, 21:4, six examples. For μήτε we have the following details:

Mt. 5:34, 35, 36, 11:18, Lk. 9:3 (not 7:33) Acts 23:8 (v.l.), 12, 21, 27:20, 2 Thess. 2:2, 1 Tim. 1, 7, Heb. 7:3, James 5:12, Rev. 7:1, 3.

We can now draw up a comparative table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>free τε</th>
<th>τε...καί</th>
<th>οὔτε, μήτε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>– ?</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1–8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>c. 100</td>
<td>c. 60</td>
<td>8–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline epistles</td>
<td>8–9</td>
<td>10–14 + 6</td>
<td>9–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13–15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 John</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral epistles</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table probably gives us a good picture of the use of this particle before Atticist influence began to affect Greek writers. Free τε was almost out of use even in writings like Luke, the Pastorals and James. If we leave Acts aside for the moment, it is rare in the Pauline Epistles and used more freely only in Hebrews...τε...καί is a little more common. For example, it occurs in Matthew, appears eight times in Luke and twice in James. The range of writings which use οὔτε, μήτε is even wider, including John, Revelation and 3 John, in addition to the books which have τε...καί.

These data give us some indications about the style and the pretensions to style of the various writers. First it is clear that Acts is eccentric. In this book the use of τε has become an extravagant abnormality, and must be treated accordingly. It is noteworthy that οὔτε and μήτε have not shared in this extravagance, a feature perhaps comparable to the fact that Hebrews does not use οὔτε at all and μήτε only once. Apart from Acts, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, James and Luke, make the most use of the word. Its appearance in John and Revelation is modest, and it is not part of the language of Mark or the Pastoral Epistles, except for μήτε once. Of all the writings concerned we would naturally rank John, Revelation, the Pastorals and Mark together, as making the slightest claim to a good Greek style, and this grouping is supported by the evidence of τε.
The New Testament reserve in the use of the word has one important consequence. More work is thrown on to καί and on to οὐ...οὐδέ. We have to remember for example that for most of the new Testament καί...καί is the only way of expressing «both...and», οὐ...οὐδέ is used where earlier οὔτε...οὔτε would have been preferable.

In looking through an apparatus we notice many passages where it is uncertain whether τε is to be read or not: v.l. in the above lists means some mss. avoid τε. Does our examination of the use of the word as a whole in the New Testament suggest any principle in dealing with doubtful cases? Apart from the fact that the particle is going out of use there is one other event to keep in mind. From the time of Hadrian onward, Greek writers and writings were subjected to an intensive Atticising influence. In keeping with this, Attic features were inserted into the New Testament writings where they were originally lacking. Information about the use of τε in Greek writers who were trying to Atticise, can be derived from the indices to W. Schmid, *Attizismus*, and details about the use of τε in Longus, from G. Valley, *Über den Sprach-gebrauch des Longus*. We shall then be wise to reject doubtful instances of τε as being due to Atticist correction if other things are equal. To this there is one exception, Acts. Here the writer has carried his cult of τε to such an excess that the frequent presence of the particle must have been an irritant to any Greek reader, even if he were trained in Atticist schools. In this book the tendency seems to have been for scribes to cut down the author’s exuberance at all costs.\footnote{No account is taken of εἴτε. It is frequent in the Pauline Epistles. Otherwise it occurs only at 1 Pet. 2:13, 14.}
D) ΚΑΘΩΣ AND ᾽ΩΣΙΕΡ
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Καθώς in the New Testament

A) Καθώς in the Gospels and Acts

In Mark (8 instances) and Matthew (21:6, 26:24, 27:10 v.l., 28:6) the καθώς clause follows the main clause. The only instance where this rule is in question is at Mark 1:2.

In Luke the καθώς clause usually follows the main clause: 1:2, 55, 70, 2:20, 23, 5:14, 6:36, 11:1, 19:32, 22:13, 29, 24:24, 39. There are four exceptions (6:31, 11:30, 17:26, 28) where the καθώς clause precedes. In each of these, the main clause is introduced by an expression which refers back to the καθώς: 6:31, καὶ...όμοιως; 11:30, οὖτως; 17:26, οὖτως; 30, κατὰ τὰ αὐτά. None of these four instances introduces a biblical quotation.

In John there are nineteen passages where the καθώς clause follows the main clause: 1:23, 5:23, 6:31, 58, 7:38, 10:15, 26 v.l., 12:14, 13:34, 15:10, 12, 17:2, 11, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23, 19:40. The καθώς clause precedes at thirteen places: 3:14, 5:30, 6:57, 8:28, 12:50, 13:15, 33, 14:27, 31, 15:4, 9, 17:18, 20:21. At 3:14, 12:50, 14:31, 15:4 καθώς is resumed by οὖτως at the beginning of the main clause, at 8:28 by ταῦτα, at 13:15, 33, 15:9, 17:18, 20:21 by καὶ and a pronoun and at 6:57 by καί. At 5:30 καθώς ἀκούω κρίνω the clauses are so short that no resumptive word is needed and at 14:27, οὖ καθώς, a resumptive word would be misleading. Further where καθώς precedes it does not introduce a biblical quotation.

G.D. Kilpatrick has argued in JTS XI (1960), pp. 340–342, for the following punctuation at Jn 7:38: no full stop after πινέτω, and the quotation beginning with Ποταμοί. καθώς appears to introduce a scriptural quotation and there is no resumptive word following, two considerations that favour the punctuation adopted.1

---

At Acts 2:4, 22, 7:42, 44, 48, 15:8, 14, 15, 22:3 the καθώς clause follows the main clause. At 7:17, 11:29 it precedes but with no resumptive word following. In neither passage does καθώς introduce a biblical quotation.

The following rules emerge from this survey. Normally καθώς clauses follow their main clauses. This rule is followed without exception in Matthew and Mark and least regularly in John. For all five books the figures are fifty three observances against nineteen exceptions. In thirteen of the nineteen exceptions in the following main clauses an expression resumes the preceding καθώς. The two exceptions in John are explicable, the two in Acts are not, although it might be of significance to note that at Acts 7:17 we have an example of καθώς de tempore.

Further, none of the nineteen exceptions introduces a quotation from Scripture though there are several instances of καθώς following a main clause introducing a quotation, Luke 2:23; John 6:31, 12:14; Acts 7:42. This reinforces the argument in favour of the punctuation of John 7:38.

We may now return to Mark 1:2. The two considerations which determined the punctuation at John 7:38 operate here also. The rule that καθώς clauses follow the main clauses knows no other exception in Mark. Further καθώς in Mark 1:2 introduces a quotation, and, as we have seen, καθώς introducing a quotation always follows and never precedes its main clause. For these reasons we adhere to the punctuation which joins Mark 1:2f to Mark 1:1 and places a full stop at the end of Mark 1:3.

B) *Καθώς in the Epistles*

The usage of καθώς in the Epistles is similar to but not identical with that of the Gospels and Acts. For analysis the Pauline Epistles and the remainder, including Ephesians and the Pastorals, are treated separately.

a) *Pauline Epistles*

Usually the καθώς clause or phrase follows the main verb: Rom. 1:13, 17, 2:24, 3:4 v.l., 8(2), 10, 4:6 v.l., 17, 8:36, 9, 13 v.l., 29, 33, 10:15 v.l., 11:8 v.l., 26, 15:3, 7, 9, 21; I Cor. 1:6, 31, 2:9, 4:17, 5:7, 8, 2, 10:6, 7, 8, 9, 10 v.l., 33, 11, 12, 18, 13:12, 14:34, 15:38; II Cor. 1:14, 3:18 καθώςεσπερ v.l., 6:16, 8:5, 15, 9:7, 9, 11:12; Gal. 2:7, 3:6, 5:21; Phil. 1:7, 3:17; Col. 1:6(2), 7, 2:7; I Thess. 1:5, 2:2, 5, 13, 14, 3:4, 4:1, 6, 11, 13, 5:11;
II Thess. 1:3, 3:1. The references marked with * contain Old Testament quotations.

καθώς precedes at Rom. 1:28; I Cor. 11:2, 15:49*; II Cor. 1:5*, 4:1, 8:6*, 9:3, 10:7*; Phil. 2:12; Col. 3:13*; I Thess. 2:4, 4:1. At the passages marked with an asterisk καθώς is resumed by a suitable expression such as οὕτως.

The figures are: καθώς subsequent sixty eight of which twenty two introduce biblical quotations: καθώς preceding twelve of which five are resumed and none introduce biblical quotations. These figures are comparable with those for Luke and Acts and avoid the rigour of Matthew and Mark and the irregularity of John.

We may notice a tendency for καθάπερ, καθά, to appear as variants to καθώς in the manuscripts. Phrynichus condemned καθώς and these variants may reflect a tendency to improve the style. The principal passages concerned are marked with v.l. in the lists.

b) The Other Epistles

Ephesians has ten instances of καθώς, all subsequent: 1:4, 3:3, 4:4, 17, 21, 32, 5:2, 3, 25, 29. The only instance in the Pastorals, I Tim. 1:3, precedes. Otherwise it follows at Heb. 4:3*, 7*, 5:4 καθάπερ v.l., 6*, 8:5, 10:25, 11:12; II Pet. 1:14, 3:15; I John 3:2, 3, 7, 23; II John 4, 6; III John 2, 3, seventeen instances of which three introduce biblical quotations. It precedes at Heb. 3:7, 5:3*; I Pet. 4:10; I John 2:6*, 18, 27, 3:12, 4:17*, eight instances of which four are resumed in the main clause. It is noteworthy that the figures for subsequent and preceding καθώς are more nearly equal in the Johannine Epistles, eight to five, a state of affairs similar to that in the Fourth Gospel.

2. ὡσπερ in the New Testament

The commonest use of ὡσπερ in the New Testament is in the conjunction of two parallel members, be they clauses or phrases. In this construction the member with ὡσπερ precedes and the second member is often introduced by οὕτως. In the Pauline Epistles we find ὡσπερ...οὕτως at Rom. 5:12, 19, 21, 6:4, 19, 11:30, 12:4 v.l., καθάπερ, I Cor. 11:12, 15:22, 16:1; Gal. 4:29. At I Cor. 8:5 the ὡσπερ clause is followed by a clause beginning with ἀλλὰ and at II Cor. 8:7 by one beginning with ὅνα.

Exceptions occur at I Cor. 10:7; I Thess. 5:3. At I Cor. 10:7 ὡσπερ introduces a quotation. We would have expected καθώς but καθώς has
been used in the preceding clause. For ὡσπερ, ὡς is read by C D* K P 81 181 pl Marcion2 and may well be right, as ὡς introduces a quotation at Rom. 9:25. 1 Thess. 5:3 is the one certain exception in the Pauline Epistles. The ὡσπερ clause follows the main clause from which the verb has to be supplied in the ὡσπερ clause. ὡσπερ follows always in Heb. 4:10, 7:27, 9:25, and at Rev. 10:3. At Heb. 4:10, 7:27 the verb has to be supplied from the verb of the main clause.

At John 5:21 (ὡς ἢ), 26 (ὡς ἢ* D W Eus) Jas 2:26 we have the ὡσπερ...οὕτως construction. It appears at Luke 17:24 also, but at Luke 18:11 we should read ὡς. At Acts 2:2, 3:17, 11:15 ὡσπερ follows. At 2:2 a noun has to be supplied from the main clause and ὡσπερ is equivalent to «like,» but at 3:17, 11:15 a verb is wanted.

Matthew has both construction, ὡσπερ...οὕτως at 12:40, 13:40, 24:27, 37 and following ὡσπερ at 6:2, 7, 18:17, 20:28, 25:14, 32. ὡσπερ has its own verb at 6:2, 20:28, 25:32 and the verb of the main clause has to be supplied at 6:7. At 18:17 ὡσπερ is equivalent to ὡς «like.» 25:14 has no main clause: either it has to be supplied or ὡσπερ has to be taken in the sense of «thus.»

Authors seem to prefer either καθώς or ὡσπερ. καθώς alone occurs in Mark, Ephesians, Pastorals, I–II Peter, I–II–III John. ὡσπερ alone in James and Revelation. καθώς predominates in Luke (seventeen against one), John (thirty-two against two), Acts (twelve against three), Pauline Epistles (eighty against fifteen of which one is doubtful), Hebrews (nine against three), but ὡσπερ in Matthew (ten against four). ὡσπερ approximates in meaning to ὡς and καθώς. There seems to be no substantial difference between ὡσπερ...οὕτως and καθώς...οὕτως. ὡσπερ with a noun differs little if at all from ὡς.

Postscriptum

See further chapter 14.

---

2 At I Cor. 10:7 τινες αὐτῶν ὡσπερ (or ὡς) is omitted by F G f g. This would be more likely to happen if the ancestor of these manuscripts read καθώς τινες αὐτῶν ὡς γέγραπται like D*. 
There are innumerable sayings attributed to Jesus in the New Testament, in the apocrypha and in other sources, patristic and non-Christian. But how does the New Testament refer to the body of Jesus’ sayings? In this essay we shall examine two nouns from the standpoint of Mark’s gospel that seem to describe Jesus’ proclamation. The nouns are λόγος and εὐαγγέλιον. It is commonly thought they are capable of bearing the same meaning, namely “Christian teaching.” We shall look at both of them in turn and we shall see that there has been a change in the meaning, introduced by the church—a revolution in vocabulary visible even within one gospel.

First λόγος.

Among the many dictionary definitions of the word λόγος in the New Testament are “declaration,” “speech,” “the subject-matter,” “revelation.” Which if any of these fits Mark’s usage and which if any is a description of Jesus sayings?

It seems to me as if λόγος is used in Mark in basically two senses: (1) “saying” or “utterance,” and (2) “the Christian message.” The word occurs 24 times in Mark. We can eliminate the occurrence in 16:20 as part of the longer ending and therefore not written by the same author as the rest of the gospel.

In two places in our printed texts λόγος is not firm in the MS. tradition: at 8:38 ἦς has no space for the word λόγος and it is missing in W k Sah. There is a possibility that the noun is secondary. (The saying would then be concerned with Jesus and his followers. λόγος may have been introduced into the MS. tradition from the Lukan parallel.) At 14:39 the phrase τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών is not found in D and certain Old Latin MSS. Again, the shorter text is likely to be original, and the longer text due to assimilation to the Matthaean parallel (Matt 26:44). If one does decide to read the phrase in 14:39, λόγος would have a meaning compatible with Mark’s usage elsewhere (i.e. Jesus’
utterance), as we shall see below. The usage in 8:38 (if the longer text is read) would refer to Jesus’ teachings in general, but that is not a meaning characteristic of Mark, unless 13:31 can be brought in as support—see further on that verse below.

Several of the firm occurrences are in the interpretation of the parable of the sower (4:14, 15bis, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20). That interpretation is commonly understood to be a Christian addition to the original words of Jesus, which arose from the church of Mark’s day. λόγος here may be seen as equivalent to εὐαγγέλιον. The interpretation follows the introduction (4:11), in which what it is that is to be revealed is the “mystery” of the kingdom of God. The timing of the kingdom’s arrival is unlikely to be that mystery. The mystery of the kingdom is more likely to be the manner of its inauguration in the person of the messiah. To have that aspect of the messiah’s work so described is compatible with our understanding of the messianic secrecy in Mark’s retelling of the story of the ministry in Galilee. The message is messianic in the sense that it tells of the reception of Jesus, who is the inaugurator of the kingdom as its messiah. The early church knew from its experience that that message was often rejected and choked or brought persecution—hence the interpretation of the parable in those terms.

Seven instances elsewhere in Mark refer to an utterance in the immediate context. Unlike the references in the parable of the sower, these seem to reflect the earliest stratum of Marcan usage. They are:

5:36 λόγος = the statement that the ruler’s daughter is dead (v. 35)
7:13 “word of God” = the citation from the Law in v. 10
7:29 λόγος = the woman’s reply in the preceding verse
9:10 λόγος = Jesus’ command to silence in v. 9
10:22 the saying of Jesus in v. 21 is what dismayed the man
10:24 λόγοι = the words of v. 23
11:29 λόγος points forward to the question in the next verse

To these we may add an eighth example (13:31 λόγοι) which, on the basis of the usage we have just identified, is unlikely to refer to Jesus’ teaching and authority as a whole but to the immediate context, namely particular eschatological prophesies in the chapter. It may also be correct to add 8:32 as a ninth occurrence of λόγος in the sense of “utterance,” the reference here being to the prediction of suffering in v. 31. In that verse παρρησίᾳ seems obtrusive if its meaning is “publicly,” because Jesus is dealing with his disciples. (Matthew and Luke omit the sentence, possibly because they were both aware of the difficulty.) According to
Bauer, παρησίᾳ can mean “boldly,” “confidently” in which case λόγος can clearly refer to the preceding prediction and should not be understood as a reference to Jesus’ public teachings. In this context it would be strange if Peter were rebuking Jesus for his overall “message.”

On the basis of the preceding examples, the implication of λόγος at 12:13 is that the Pharisees and the Herodians wish to entrap Jesus not in general conversation but with one of his own specific statements (not given in the context).

“The Christian message” is the meaning in the interpretation of the parable of the sower, “utterance” is the sense of most of the other passages we have looked at. We need now to turn to 1:45; 2:2; 4:33. The section 2:1–3:6 stands as a literary unit with its sequence of controversy stories; also in it are to be found explicit messianic statements (2:10, 28) so we may expect a different usage for λόγος in 2:2. λόγος here could perhaps refer to a specific utterance of a particular body of teaching but it is more likely to mean “the good news of the kingdom,” “the messianic saving event” and thus serve as a résumé of Jesus’ teaching. It may even bear the meaning “the Christian message” or even “the gospel” as it does in, say, Acts 4:29, 31; 8:25; 11:19; 13:46.

At 4:33 the identical form is found as in 2:2 (ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον) but there is a textual problem in the phrase.1 If original, λόγος again seems to be the message about the coming kingdom, or even “the Christian gospel.”

In 1:45 λόγος occurs in conjunction with διαφημίζειν, a verb that is not used elsewhere by Mark. (It occurs twice elsewhere in the gospels, both times in Matthew.) The meaning of λόγος is often considered to mean the “event” or “story,” which the leper told. But as I have tried to argue in more than one place,2 Mark 1:45 should not be interpreted as belonging to vv. 40–44. The story of the healing of the leper ends with

---

1 At 4:33 our oldest witness Ὑ is fragmentary, but it looks as if the space available is too small for all the words of v. 33 to fit. πολλαῖς may not have been present: that word is absent from several other witnesses including C W f. αὐτοῖς is absent from D 565. τὸν λόγον is not present in Old Latin MSS b c e. It may be worth bearing in mind that Ὑ could be added to that latter testimony in which case the originality of λόγος in the verse is less strong. On that argument Ὑ could have read παραβολαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς although the reading παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει would have the same result.

the command to silence, a command that is obeyed like all such commands, cf. the two stories set in the Decapolis (Mark 5:20; 7:36). There are too many problems in linking v. 45 to the preceding story. αὐτόν in v. 45 is not strong enough to imply a change to “Jesus” as the subject of δύνασθαι. ὁ δὲ at the beginning (if it is not ὦ ἔξελθων with the particle interposed) always implies a change of subject in Mark, but the contrast is not with Jesus, the subject of λέγει in v. 44, but with the leper in v. 40. It would be against Marcan practice to have a stranger preach outside the Decapolis: κηρύσσειν is what the Baptist does (1:4, 7) or Jesus (1:14, 38–39) or the apostles (3:14; 6:12; 13:10; 14:9 [16:15, 20]). If κηρύσσειν were to be part of the leper’s activity, then the meaning would not be the preaching of the gospel message—the meaning required would be “relate.” And, as it parallels διαϕημίζειν τὸν λόγον, λόγος would have to bear a meaning (“story”) that it does not have elsewhere in Mark (although Matt 28:15; Luke 5:15; 7:7 have that meaning). So, on various counts, the story of the leper must run from v. 40 to v. 44 only. That is how Matthew understood the climax and conclusion of the pericope (Matt 8:1–4 has no parallel to v. 45). Verse 45 on that argument would be related to vv. 38–39. Jesus intends to preach in vv. 38–39; the consequence of his activity is described in v. 45. These verses would thus “sandwich” 40–44 in the way that other Marcan stories are interrupted by an intervening episode (like 6:6b–13 and 30ff., or 11:12–14 and 20ff., or 14:1–2 and 10–11). This is perhaps one further dramatic juxtaposition. Thus we may conclude that λόγος once again is likely to have a meaning similar to 2:2 and perhaps 4:33, namely a particular body of Jesus’ teaching about the coming of the kingdom.

The meaning suggested for 1:45, 2:2, and 4:33 seems to belong to a later stage in the development of Mark’s gospel compared to the meaning in chapters 5–16 “utterance.” λόγος in its meaning of Jesus’ teaching about the kingdom is a creation of Christian theology, and may be compared to the coining of the noun “baptist.” A similar shift in the New Testament is seen in the change in the use of “Lord” meaning God to “Lord” referring to Jesus. The changing meaning of λόγος within Mark is yet another example of the Christianizing of traditional vocabulary.

Even though λόγος in Mark 2–4 represents a later stratum, εὐαγγέλιον throughout Mark seems to maintain its original pre-Christian meaning except in 1:1.
There are 76 occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in the New Testament, most of which are to be found in the Pauline Epistles. Only 12 are in the gospels: 4 in Matthew, the rest in Mark. εὐαγγέλιον occurs in Mark 1:1, 14, 15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9, and there is one occurrence in the longer ending at 16:15. We shall return to 1:1 later, but the meaning there is different and seems to belong to Mark’s redaction. This suggests that 1:14 (on Jesus’ lips) is the first non-editorial reference to εὐαγγέλιον in Mark. The meaning is “the divine plan” and it is significant that on this first occurrence εὐαγγέλιον is qualified. The noun is followed by the dependent genitive [τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ]. Elsewhere εὐαγγέλιον is used absolutely although some MSS (A C ˜) add τοῦτο after τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in 14:9.

At 1:15 we have πιστεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ; at 10:29 ἐνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; but it is the occurrences at 1:14; 13:10; 14:9 that demand attention because the verb governing εὐαγγελίον in these three is κηρύσσειν, and this verb helps us locate the meaning and significance. The verb εὐαγγελίζομαι does not occur in Mark—κηρύσσειν does this work. But it is worth noting that in Luke 4:17–19 where Jesus, quoting from Isa 61 states that the “good news proclaimed” (using the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι) and foretold by the prophets is God’s deliverance and restoration of Israel at the last—it is a divine action, not a messianic one that is preached.

In the Septuagint εὐαγγελίζομαι is used of divine action by God not the messiah (e.g. Psalm 39:9; 67:11; 95:2; Joel 2:32; Nahum 2:1; Isa 40:9; 60:6; 61:1–2). Luke’s usage is similar. If these passages speak of salvation it is God’s salvation. Similarly in Mark εὐαγγέλιον is not a messianic term (with the possible exception of 1:1 to which we return below). In the epistles εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs (1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12; 9:13; 10:14; Gal 1:7, etc.) but such a phrase is not Marcan. Mark’s meaning is different. For Paul εὐαγγέλιον has become Christian. The noun has developed in meaning. But Mark, either because of his fidelity to his sources or through a conscious archaizing, uses the noun in its older, Jewish, Old Testament sense even though he, of course, wrote his gospel later than Paul’s writing of the epistles.³

³ Mark deliberately avoids calling Jesus “Lord” in its divine sense and calls Jesus by the simplest title, because he is conscious that to do otherwise would be to use post-Resurrection language of the ministry. (If we think Mark too unsophisticated a writer
How is κηρύσσειν used? We may learn from the concordance that, with the exception of 1:7, Mark has κηρύσσειν followed by a direct object (e.g. at 1:4, 14; 5:20; 13:10; 14:9) or by a ἵνα clause (at 6:12), or used absolutely (1:38, 39, 45, where πολλά is likely to be adverbial; 3:14; 7:36). (There is no example in Mark of κηρύσσειν followed by the dative as there is in the rest of the New Testament.)

Apart from preaching the εὐαγγέλιον how else is κηρύσσειν used in Mark? In 1:4 it is used of John’s call to repentance (cf. 6:12). In 5:20 it is used of the demoniac’s proclamation that Jesus had healed him. (Likewise I suspect this meaning occurs in 7:36 as well: the people “preach” that Jesus had healed the deaf-mute.) If 1:45 has the leper as subject of ἠρξατο then this example of preaching would be connected with healing too—but, as we have seen, the subject of ἠρξατο is more likely to be Jesus, in which case the preaching is equivalent to his spreading the εὐαγγέλιον.

In 1:7 the verb κηρύσσειν introduces the Baptist’s warning. Here recitative λέγων depends on κηρύσσειν and direct speech follows. That makes the usage here somewhat different. But there is textual uncertainty over the originality of κηρύσσειν. D and some Old Latin witnesses read ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, and that reading has a good claim to originality.

... to distance himself from the subject matter in order to preserve or create the verisimilitude, then I suppose one must consider Mark’s archaic usages an indication of his fidelity to his primitive—even pre-Resurrection?—sources. I prefer to think Mark was capable of telling his account of the ministry in as restrained a way as possible. Only the occasional anachronistic elements obtrude, such as the meaning of λόγος as the Christian message. In this context we may consider the textually uncertain words “Son of God” in 1:1. If the longer text is original to Mark, his intention may well have been to show that Jesus Christ, the Son of God was confessed by the Jewish title “Christ” mid-way through the gospel with Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi, a title that was in all sorts of ways inadequate as a description for Jesus in this gospel as is clear even within the story at Caesarea Philippi where the sequel has Peter compared with Satan for misinterpreting Jesus’ distinctive mission. Mark later has Jesus confessed by the second of the two titles found in the longer version of the opening verse. Towards the end of the second half of the gospel the centurion at the foot of the cross recognises Jesus as the Son of God, a title favoured among gentiles. (Compare the different words on the centurion’s lips in the Lukan parallel. This shows the uniqueness of those words for Mark.) Despite this argument, I think the words “Son of God” are secondary in Mark 1:1 and are more likely to be a later, scribal addition, motivated by pious considerations and perhaps influenced by the liturgy, rather than that the longer words were accidentally omitted by careless copyists.

4 The noun “kerygma” is not found in Mark, although it occurs in the gospels twice (in Q).
So, the verb κηρύσσειν is, in general, used in contexts of healing, repentance, and εὐαγγέλιον. How is εὐαγγέλιον used in Mark?

The first thing to note is that it is not followed by a possessive—Jesus does not promote himself as the agent of the εὐαγγέλιον. At 10:29 he distinguishes himself from the gospel. A similar difference occurs in some MSS at 8:35. The noun does not occur on another’s lips nor in summaries of the remarks of others.

Matthew agrees with Mark: εὐαγγέλιον and κηρύσσειν occur in Matt 4:23; 9:35; 24:14 where the phrase “gospel of the kingdom” occurs; and 26:13 “this gospel.” Matt 4:23 and 9:35 depend on Mark 1:13, 39; Matt 24:14 depends on Mark 13:10; Matt 26:13 parallels Mark 14:9. (There are no Matthaean parallels to Mark 1:1; 8:35; 10:29.)

So far, εὐαγγέλιον in Mark seems to refer to divine action. 1:1 is an exception.

**Mark 1:1**

The late meaning of εὐαγγέλιον as “a gospel book,” the sense in which we commonly use it, may well have originated in this verse, but such a meaning would not have been Mark’s intention. It was only when a Christian had knowledge of and access to two or more gospels that names or titles would have to be used to differentiate them. It may well have been that Mark’s writing was referred to by its opening words, as was the Hebrew practice. Thus it would be “The beginning of the εὐαγγέλιον” book. By extension all comparable literature became known as εὐαγγέλιον books.

But leaving that speculation aside, we note that ἀρχή in Mark is always a temporal expression. This implies that the chronological start of the εὐαγγέλιον of Jesus Christ (equally valid here as a subjective or as an objective genitive) had begun.

This meaning may make us take εὐαγγέλιον in 1:1 in a different sense from that in the rest of the gospel. In addition there are several peculiar features in this verse.

---

(a) Only here in Mark do we find the title “Jesus Christ”. This phrase occurs for certain in other gospels only at Matt 1:1; John 1:17; 17:3.
(b) Elsewhere in Mark, as we have seen, εὐαγγέλιον occurs only with reference to Jesus’ sayings (or as a résumé of Jesus’ teaching).
(c) Also it is a rare use of a sentence without a verb (if we punctuate with a full stop at the end of the verse).

Because of its differences is the verse likely to be a title? Many would be attracted to such a suggestion, especially as ἀρχή is anarthrous, but there are snags. First Mark does have some verb-less sentences (1:3 (LXX); 1:11 [v.l.: om. ἐγένετο]; 13:8), so 1:1 is not unique. Secondly, as I tried to indicate in an article in *Filología Neotestamentaria*, building on the initial research by G.D. Kilpatrick, καθώς in Mark introducing a quotation follows a main clause (as is the case in Mark 4:33; 9:13; 11:6; 14:16, 21; 15:8; 16:7 and also in the rest of the NT e.g. Luke 2:23; John 6:31; 12:14; Acts 7:42; Rom 1:17; 1 Cor 1:31). That rule obliges us to dispense with the full stop at the end of verse 1, and thus prevents our reading 1:1 as a title.

Where then do we end the sentence that begins in 1:1? If a full stop is to be placed at the end of v. 3 then vv. 1–3 are a unit, and v. 4 is a fresh start. The arrival of the Baptist in the section beginning at v. 4 is shown to be the fulfilment of the prophecy in the introduction. We may paraphrase vv. 1–3 “The beginning of the good news in the life of Jesus Christ is what is written in Isaiah…,” where ἀρχή is the first of a series; this temporal meaning is consistent with Mark 10:6; 13:8, 19. The events run from John to the empty tomb. But the link with the verses following is that the beginning of the εὐαγγέλιον was the coming of John. Verses 1–3 lead up to v. 4 but are not part of it. The first three verses are Mark the editor speaking: it is an introduction. He is using the language of 65 A.D. Before he starts the narrative in v. 4 where he consciously aims to use language befitting the pre-Easter setting of the events, Mark as editor uses the language of devotion (including the title Jesus Christ) and the later, Christian, use of εὐαγγέλιον. In 1:1 we thus find the most developed meaning of εὐαγγέλιον in the New Testament, a development that eventually lead to its use to describe a literary genre.

---

C.H. Turner preferred to put the full stop at the end of v. 4.\footnote{In “Notes on Marcan Usage IV,” reprinted in The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark, ed. J.K. Elliott, (=Novum Testamentum Supplements 71) (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 23–24.} He took vv. 2–3 as one of Mark’s parentheses (like 2:15, 22; 12:12; 13:14; 14:36). On this line of reasoning Turner, following Origen, understood the verb following ἀρχή to be ἐγένετο in v. 4, \textit{i.e.} the beginning of the εὐαγγέλιον about Jesus was John’s preaching in the wilderness. But it is abnormal to find Mark’s parentheses separating subject and verb. Turner’s proposal also ignores the rule about καθώς, a feature of Marcan usage that did not enter his “Notes.” So we may reject that proposed punctuation.

Our examination of just two words in only one gospel convinces us that Christianity, while drawing on the language, ideas and background of the Old Testament, succeeded in revolutionising not only theology but also basic vocabulary.

\textbf{Postscriptum}

See further chapter 14.
Readers of the Greek New Testament are so used to formulae like ἀποκριθεῖς εἶπεν that it is surprising to learn that the passive aorist ἀπεκρίθην etc. in the sense of to answer or to reply to a question¹ is not good Greek. But that is the case, as may be seen from the pronouncements of the Atticist grammarians and lexicographers, Ammonius² of the 1st–2nd centuries and Phrynichus³ of the 2nd century. Ammonius in De Adfinium Vocabulorum Differentia 67 states: ἀποκριθῆναι καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι διαφέρει. ἀποκριθῆναι μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀποχωρισθῆναι, ἀποκρίνασθαι δὲ τὸ ἐρωτηθέντα λόγον δοῦναι cf. Phrynichus, Eclogae 78 (= Rutherford 86), Ἀποκριθῆναι· διττὸν ἁμάρτημα, ἔδει γὰρ λέειν ἀποκρίνασθαι, καὶ εἰδέναι, ὅτι τὸ διαχωρισθῆναι σημαίνει, ὁσπεροῦν καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, τὸ συγκριθῆναι, τὸ εἰς ἑν καὶ ταὐτὸν ἔλθειν. εἰδὼς οὖν τούτο ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἐρώτησιν ἀποκρίνασθαι λέγε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαχωρισθῆναι ἀποκριθῆναι.

The aorist ‘answered’ in the New Testament is nearly always ἀπεκρίθην etc. but readers of the Nestle text will be surprised to come across a few exceptions where the majority of our mss. read ἀπεκρίνατο. However there are variants, which allow us to avoid printing these unexpected examples of the aorist middle:

A1. Matt 27:12 v.l. ἀπεκρίνετο D Lat b d ff h q r¹ r² vg (mss.)
A2. Mark 14:61 v.l. ἀπεκρίνετο 470 Origen (contra Celsum); ἀπεκρίθη D
A5. John 5:17 v.ll. ἀπεκρίνετο Ν; ἀπεκρίθη D W; respondens Lat ff²
A6. John 5:19 v.l. ἀπεκρίθη D N W 33 185 713 726 1071 1180 1200
A7. Acts 3:12 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαὸν v.l. ἀποκρίθεις δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς D Lat d. There is

¹ The verb is used more freely at e.g. Mark 9:5 ἀποκριθεὶς; 9:6 ἀποκριθῇ v.ll. ἐλάλει, λαλεῖ, λαλῆσε, ἀπεκρίθη; Matthew 26:63 v.l. om.
³ Eitel Fischer, Die Ekloge des Phrynichos (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1974).
additional Latin evidence here which seems to imply a text at least partly resembling that of D: see e.g. Lat b vg (ait) or Lat d g dixit and Lat h (et dixit (after populum)).

From the above note the four occurrences of the imperfect ἀπεκρίνετο as a variant (A1 A2 A4 A5). The imperfect occurs nowhere else as a firmly established reading. Often an imperfect was altered by scribes to an aorist. If that has happened here then the original text is the imperfect (which makes perfectly good sense in all these passages); later copyists then altered this either to the ‘inaccurate’ aorist passive or to the aorist middle (as a stylistic improvement). At A6 v.l. reading the passive may well be original. The D-text at Acts 3:12 (A7) may also be original and fits in well with the usage of Luke–Acts.

That stylistic improvements were made may be seen at the following places:

B1. Mark 15:3 πολλὰ v.l. + αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο W N Σ U Δ fam. 13 33 517 565 1071 al. Lat vg (mss.) cf. Lat a c. This addition may derive from Matt 27:12 where many mss. read ἀπεκρίνατο.

B2. Mark 15:5 ἀπεκρίθη v.l. ἀπεκρίνατο G f 1 f 13 f 33 579; ἀποκρίθης λέγων D 565. (This last reading may well be the original.)

B3. Mark 15:9 ἀπεκρίθη...λέγων v.l. ἀπεκρίνατο...λέγων 33 579; ἀποκρίθης λέγει D 565. (This last reading may well be the original.)

B4. John 12:23 ἀποκρίνεται P66 P75 etc.; v.l. ἀπεκρίθη Θ fam 13; ἀπεκρίνατο A D Ψ 0250 fam 1 Maj. Here ἀπεκρίθη looks like a correction to avoid the historic present and the middle aorist would be a correction of the passive aorist.


A careful scrutiny of a full apparatus (such as that in von Soden or Tischendorf) may yield more examples of the aorist middle as a variant for the passive. All the changes above that read the aorist middle are secondary, including the longer reading at B1.

Variant A3 (at Luke 3:16) deserves further consideration. Here ἔπιγνος τὰ διανοήματα αὐτῶν εἶπεν may be thought by many scholars to be merely a paraphrase, which we are often told is a characteristic of

---

the text of D. But we ought to observe that the reading by D here fits the context: we see from v. 15 that John is already named as the subject. Secondly, the phrase is Lukan cf. Luke 5:22 ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν (also see Mark 2:8), even though instead of διαλογισμοὺς there we have here διανοήματα (which recurs in early Christian literature only at Luke 11:17). On the other hand the expressions ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων (and ἀπεκρίθη λέγων) do not recur in Luke nor in Matthew and only as a v.l. at Mark 15:9, which we argued above is unlikely to be the original reading. We may therefore conclude that at Luke 3:16 D agrees with Lukan style and that the other reading conflicts with the usage of the Synoptic Gospels.5

Within the New Testament we may note from our concordances how often the passive aorist ἀπεκρίθη etc. occurs. I count some 200+ examples, a figure that can be increased if we add instances where v.l. ἀπεκρίθη etc. should be restored (as at Mark 5:9; 7:6; 8:28; 9: 12, 38, 39; 10:5, 20, 29, 38; 11:29, 33; 12:17, 24; 13:2, 5; 14:20, 29, 62; Luke 13:23 (D); 18:42; 20:24, 34; 23:43 (D); John 9:37; Acts 21:37).

The usage of the NT is also that of the LXX (not surprisingly), although we note that the aorist middle occurs without a variant at Ezek 9:11 and at I Chr 10:13. It occurs as a v.l. at Ex 19:19; III King 2:1; Job 40:2 (7). Otherwise all forms of the aorist are passive. (There is one perfect at III King 2:30).

Readers of Josephus, however, observe that he uses the middle forms of ἀποκρίνομαι throughout and are thus surprised at Antiq 9:35 to find a stray instance of the passive.

Goodspeed’s Index to the Apostolic Fathers reveals that the aorist passive is normal. The Martyrdom of Polycarp, however, has two examples of the aorist middle at 8:2; 10:1 but not of any other form of the verb. (Hermas, Mandates 11:3 bis, 8, 13 has four instances of the present, which does not occur elsewhere.)

5 Other places (among many) where the reading of D may represent the original are Acts 4:19 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης (sic no article) ἀποκρίθηνες where the variant in D ἀποκρίθηνες δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης not only correctly avoids the article found in the other mss. before Πέτρος but, more significantly, has the singular ἀποκρίθηνες which conforms to the NT practice elsewhere where a verb that precedes a compound subject whose first member is in the singular is itself in the singular (cf. Mark 1:36 v.l.; 3:31 v.l. and Acts 5:21 (against a ‘correction’ by B); 14:14; 16:33. Cf. G.D. Kilpatrick, ‘An Eclectic Study of the Book of Acts’ in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thompson (eds.) Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R.P. Casey (Freiburg: Herder, 1963) pp. 64–77 reprinted in J.K. Elliott (ed.), op. cit. pp. 358–69.
In the Greek Bible and the Fathers the aorist passive is the established form. Only in the Martyrdom of Polycarp and in two passages in the LXX as they now stand do we have the middle.
G) NEW TESTAMENT LINGUISTIC USAGE

Each of the NT authors has his own characteristic style and usage in matters of grammar, vocabulary, and word order. Attempts have been made in recent years, not only in grammars of NT Greek but also in numerous articles and monographs, to isolate and describe some of the distinctive features of several of the writings in the canon. These but seldom take into account the critical apparatus to the printed testament. All too often decisions are reached, rules of usage catalogued, and apparent exceptions to these “rules” noted without taking textual variation into the picture.

The following short studies try to isolate three features of NT usage—the position of ἐκεῖνος in the Gospels and Acts, the position of the dative of αὐτός in John, and the expression πρός με/ἐμε in the NT as a whole. These three serve as examples to show how the use of concordance and text alone—essential though these are in the description of grammatical features in the NT—needs to be supplemented by the evidence of the manuscripts.

For such study I acknowledge the pioneering work of C.H. Turner, who in the 1920s contributed a series of articles to the Journal of Theological Studies on Markan usage.¹ I also acknowledge the work of G.D. Kilpatrick, who followed in Turner’s footsteps, and with whom I discussed many aspects of NT style, including the topics below.

**ἐκεῖνος in the Gospels and Acts**

*Matthew*

1. pronominal (total: 4 + 2):
   13:11; 17:27; 20:4; 24:43; κἀκεῖνος is always pronominal: 15:18; 23:23
2. adjectival:
   a. follows its noun (total: 34 + 8 v.ll.):²

¹ These are reprinted in J.K. Elliott, The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark (Leiden: Brill, 1993) (= Supplements to Novum Testamentum 71).
² As the 8 variants include the demonstrative in a position compatible with Matthew’s practice in the 34 firm examples, a strong case could be made for accepting as original those variant readings adding the demonstrative, but note that under 2b different conditions may apply at 3:1 or 24:38 in a set phrase following ἐν. In the case of 27:63 the sequence article + noun + demonstrative is to be preferred.

b. precedes its noun:
   (i) \( \dot{e}n + \dot{h}m\epsilon\rho\alpha \) sing. 7:22; 22:23; but cf. 13:1
   \( \dot{e}n + \dot{h}m\epsilon\rho\alpha \) plur. 3:1 v.l.; 24:19; cf. 24:38 v.l.
   \( \dot{e}n + \kappa\alpha\imath\rho\omicron\zeta \) 11:25; 12:1; 14:1
   \( \dot{e}n + \acute{o}r\alpha \) 8:13 v.l.; 10:19; 18:1; 26:55
   (ii) \( \acute{a}p\omicron + \dot{h}m\epsilon\rho\alpha \) 22:46, but not \( \acute{o}r\alpha \); cf. 9:22; 15:28; 17:18

Mark

1. except for 7:20 (q.v.), the variant \( \dot{e}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota \) at 4:20 and for \( k\acute{a}k\acute{e}\iota\nu\iota \) at 12:4, 5, \( \dot{e}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota\zeta \) is not used pronominally; contrast Pseudo-Mark 16:10, 11, 13 (bis), 20, where it is so used

2. demonstrative adjective:
   a. follows its noun (total: 9 + 1 v.l.):
      3:24, 25; 6:11 v.l., 55; 13:19, 24a, 32; 14:21 (bis), 25
   b. precedes its noun:
      (i) (total: 7):
      \( \dot{e}n + \dot{h}m\epsilon\rho\alpha \) sing. 2:20; 4:35
      \( \dot{e}n + \dot{h}m\epsilon\rho\alpha \) plur. 1:9; 8:1; 13:17, 24a
      \( \dot{e}n + \acute{o}r\alpha \) sing. 13:11
      (ii) 4:11 \( \dot{e}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota\zeta \) \( \dot{d}e \) \( \tau\omicron\iota\zeta \) \( \acute{e}\zeta\omicron \) (the alternative would be \( \tau\omicron\iota\zeta \) \( \dot{d}e \) \( \acute{e}\zeta\omicron \) \( \dot{e}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota\zeta \))
      (iii) 12:7 \( \dot{e}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota \) \( \dot{d}e \) \( \acute{o}i \) \( \gamma\epsilon\omicron\omega\rho\gamma\omicron\iota \) (but D lat read \( \acute{o}i \) \( \dot{d}e \) \( \gamma\epsilon\omicron\omega\rho\gamma\omicron\iota \), a reading that may be original)

Luke

1. pronominal (total: 2 [+ 3 v.ll.] + 4):\(^3\)
   8:32; 9:34 v.l.; 12:38 v.l.; 18:14 v.l.; 19:4; \( k\acute{a}k\epsilon\iota\nu\iota\zeta \) is always pronominal: 11:7, 42; 20:11; 22:12

\(^3\) Again, the problem of the variants may be resolved by a comparison with the firm examples. At 18:14 the longer reading by D is not consistent with 2a below.
2. *adjectival:*
   a. follows its noun (total: 19 + 3 *v.ll.*):
      
      2:1; 4:2; 6:48, 49; 9:5; 10:12b, 31; 11:26; 12:37, 43, 45, 46; 14:21
      
   b. precedes its noun:
      (i) ἐν + ἡμέρα sing. 6:23; 17:31
         ἐν + ἡμέρα plur. 5:35; 9:36; 21:23
         ἐν + ὥρα 7:21
         (N.B. ἐκεῖνος *after* ἡμέρα in the phrases ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ in 10:12a and ἐν τοῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις in 2:1; 4:2)
      (ii) others: 12:47; 13:4; 20:18

   Acts

1. *pronominal:*
   

2. *adjectival:*
   a. follows its noun (total: 15 + 1 *v.l.*):
      
   b. precedes its noun:
      (i) ἐν + ἡμέρα sing. 8:1 (ἐκεῖνος follows ἡμέρα in 2:41 *v.l.*)
         ἐν + ὥρα 16:33
      (ii) κατὰ + καιρός 12:1 (ἐκεῖνος follows καιρός in 19:23)

   John

1. *pronominal:*
   a. before the verb (total: 26 + 2 *v.ll.*):
      
      κάκείνος always before the verb (total: 5 + 1 *v.l.)*: 6:57; 7:29; 10:16; 14:12; 17:24; 19:35 (*v.l.* ἐκεῖνος)

---

4 An original ἐκεῖνος could easily have been omitted accidentally through homoioteleuton; the same is true of ἐκεῖνο at 17:9 and ἐκεῖνον at 20:1.
b. after the verb (total: 19 + 5 v.l.):

2. adjectival:
a. follows its noun (total: 12 + 1 v.l.):
20:19; 21:7, 23
b. precedes its noun (total: 8):
(i) ἐν + ἡμέρα 5:9; 14:20; 16:23, 26
   ἐν + ὥρα 4:53
   ἐν + νύξ 21:3
(ii) ἀπὸ + ἡμέρα 11:53
   ἀπὸ + ὥρα 19:27
(iii) in 7 out of 8 instances where ἐκεῖνος precedes its noun, not merely does the demonstrative precede its noun but the whole phrase precedes the verb; the exception is 5:9: ἦν δὲ σαββάτου ἐν ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, where ἦν ἐκεῖνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ is omitted by D, which would give a sentence like 13:30: ἦν δὲ νύξ or 18:28 ἦν δὲ πρωί; the strangeness of the longer text inclines me to favour the reading of D here (the presence of οὖν prevents resolving the problem by repunctuating: ἦν δὲ σαββάτου. ἐν ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐλεγον...)

Conclusions

1. pronominal:
a. κἀκεῖνος is always pronominal
b. the authors differ concerning pronominal ἐκεῖνος, which is apparently unknown in Mark but common in John, where (against the dominant practice) it precedes the verb more often than not; it occurs in Matthew, Luke, Acts, but not as often as in John

2. adjectival:
a. adjectival ἐκεῖνος as a rule follows its noun
b. the exceptions are similar; ἐκεῖνος precedes the noun in the following phrases:

---

5 This is a particularly interesting variant, being a choice between ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνος τοῦ σαββάτου and ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη τοῦ σαββάτου. Johannine usage here suggests the latter is likely to be original even (or especially) with ἡμέρα (cf. 1:39, 20:19).
Mark: ἐν ἡμέρα (sing. and plur.) and ἐν ὥρα
John: ἐν ἡμέρα (sing.), ἐν ὥρα, ἐν νύξ, ὀπὸ + ἡμέρα, and ἀπὸ + ὥρα
Luke: ἐν ἡμέρα (sing. and plur.) and four other phrases
Matthew: ἐν ἡμέρα (sing. and plur.), ἐν καιρός, ἐν ὥρα, ὀπὸ + ἡμέρα
Acts: ἐν ἡμέρα (sing.), ἐν ὥρα, and κατὰ + καιρός

**Position of αὐτῷ, αὐτῇ, and αὐτοῖς in John, when the Pronoun does not depend on a Preposition**

αὐτῷ

1. usually immediately after the verb:
   1:22 (οὖν +), 25, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46 (bis), 48 (bis), 49, 50, 51; 2:10, 18; 3:2, 3, 9, 10, 26, 27; 4:9 (οὖν +), 11, 14 (bis), 17, 19, 25, 33, 50 (bis), 51, 52, 53; 5:6, 7, 8, 14, 20, 27; 6:2, 7, 8, 25, 30 (οὖν +), 65, 68; 7:52; 8:13 (οὖν +), 19 (οὖν +), 25 (οὖν +), 29, 31, 33, 39, 41 (οὖν +), 48, 52 (οὖν +); 9:7, 10 (οὖν +), 26 (δὲ +), 34, 35, 37 (v.l. δὲ +), 38, 40; 10:13, 24, 33; 11:8, 12, 20, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34, 39; 12:2 (οὖν +), 6, 16, 18, 34, 13:3, 6, 7, 8 (bis), 9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27 (οὖν +), 28, 29, 36 (bis), 37, 38; 14:5, 6, 8, 9, 21, 22, 23; 16:29; 17:2 (bis); 18:5, 20, 23, 25 (οὖν +), 30, 31, (οὖν +), 33, 34, 37 (οὖν +), 38; 19:3, 7, 9, 10 (οὖν +), 11, 32; 20:6, 15, 16, 25 (οὖν +), 28, 29; 21:3, 5, 15 (bis), 16 (bis), 17 (4×), 19, 22, 23

2. after other words:
   1:6; 3:1; 8:29; 9:9; 12:13

3. before the verb:
   7:26; 10:4; 12:29

αὐτῇ

always immediately after the verb:

2:4; 4:7, 10, 13, 16, 17, 21, 26; 11:23, 25, 31, 33, 40; 20:13, 15, 16, 17, 18

αὐτοῖς

always immediately after the verb:

1:12, 26, 38, 39; 2:7, 8, 19, 24 (ἐκαυτὸν +); 4:32, 34; 5:11, 17, 19; 6:7, 20, 26, 29, 31, 32 (οὖν +), 35 (δὲ +), 43, 53 (οὖν +), 61, 70; 7:6 (οὖν +), 9, 16, 21,
45, 47 (οὖν +); 8:12 v.l., 14, 21 (οὖν πάλιν +), 21, 23, 25, 28 (οὖν +), 34, 39, 42, 58; 9:15, 20, 27, 30, 41; 10:6 (bis), 7 (οὖν πάλιν +), 25, 28, 32, 34; 11:11, 14, 44, 46, 49; 12:23, 35 (οὖν +); 13:12; 15:22; 16:19, 31; 17:2, 8, 14, 22, 26; 18:4, 5, 6, 21, 31 (οὖν +), 38; 19:4, 5, 6, 15, 16 (αὐτόν +); 20:2, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21 (οὖν +), 22 v.l., 22, 23, 25; 21:3, 5 (οὖν +), 6, 10, 12, 13

Principles governing position

In the main all forms occupy the same position in the sentence. They come immediately after the verb or other word on which they depend. Οὖν intervenes between them and the verb some 27 times, ἀλλὰ perhaps thrice. At this point agreement ceases. Αὐτῷ comes before its verb thrice, αὐτῇ and αὐτοῖς never. On the other hand αὐτῶ preceding πάλιν at 9:26 and 21:16, but πάλιν precedes αὐτοῖς 8:21 and 10:7. Αὐτῶ precedes ἐμαυτόν at 14:21, but ἐμαυτόν precedes αὐτοῖς at 2:24. Αὐτόν precedes αὐτοῖς at 19:16.

The three instances of αὐτῶ before the verb remain a problem. At 10:4 αὐτῶ is contrasted with ἀλλοτρίῳ at the beginning of 10:5 and this may account for the forward position here, but no such explanation is available for 7:26 or 12:29.

Note on the textual evidence

Words like πάλιν or αὐτῶ are often textually insecure. The variants at the crucial passages are as follows:

2:24 ἐαυτόν Ρ66 Θ Ρ Γ Δ Π οντόν Α* Β Λ 700
8:21 αὐτοῖς πάλιν 053 517 713 1424 al a c q πάλιν omitted Ν 0141
9:26 πάλιν Ρ66 A Θ X Γ Δ Λ omitted Ρ75 Ν Β D W
10:7 πάλιν αὐτοῖς Ν D Λ Μ Θ U Γ Δ αὐτοῖς πάλιν Α Π Λ Υ πάλιν omitted Ρ45 Ρ66 Ν W 0141 αὐτοῖς omitted Ν B 21:16 πάλιν before λέγει Ν C W Θ πάλιν omitted D ξ ε

The longer text is reasonably firm at 8:21 and 9:26. There is a general tendency for scribes to omit πάλιν and the various forms of αὐτός. This
leaves us with the variant at 2:24 and the variations in order at 8:21; 10:7 and 21:16. The evangelist, like other NT writers, uses the uncontracted reflexive ἑαυτόν and not the Attic αὐτόν, which is probably intended by αυτόν at 2:24. Πάλιν αὐτοῖς at 10:7 is compatible with 8:21 (v.l.) and should probably be read here as the original text. Πάλιν λέγει at 21:16 likewise is probably the original reading—altered because of its apparent awkwardness.

πρός με or πρός ἐμέ in the New Testament

Blass-Debrunner-Funk §279 states that in oblique cases the accented form of the first-person singular pronoun is used in NT Greek (as in Classical Greek) to denote emphasis and contrast. In the NT, however, there are exceptions after πρός, but the printed editions do not give a consistent picture.

While there is no undoubted example of πρός ἐμέ in the NT, the manuscripts are unanimously for πρός με at Matt 3:14, 11:28; Luke 6:47; John 5:40; Acts 22:10, 26:14; and Titus 3:12. At Matt 3:14 πρός με is emphatic, and so we cannot distinguish between πρός ἐμέ emphatic and πρός με unemphatic. It is probable that position rather than accentuation provided the means of emphasizing in this phrase. ἐμέ is supported by the following manuscript evidence in the passages listed:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>19:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>9:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John  | 6:35  | 8 B D (deest 66)
|       | 6:37a | all except L Λ Π (με)
|       | 6:37b | 66 8 D E K Λ Θ 047 440 1207
|       | 6:44  | 8 D E M U V A Θ 047 471 461 2145 |
|       | 6:45  | 8 B D Θ 1675 Or
|       | 6:65  | 8 C   |
|       | 7:37  |   B   |
| Acts  | 11:11 | 8 1765 |
|       | 22:8  | 8 A B |
We should probably regard ἐμὲ in all these instances as a correction to the grammarians’ rules. It is printed in the text of NA27 at Luke 1:43; John 6:35, 37 (bis), 45; and Acts 24:19.

From this evidence it is clear that Alexandrian manuscripts have frequently suffered this kind of correction. On the other hand the so-called Byzantine texts are remarkably free. Only at John 6:37 had ἐμὲ penetrated both Byzantine texts and the Textus Receptus.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

SPECIFIC VARIANTS

A) O ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩΝ AND MARK 1:4

In printed editions of the Greek New Testament\(^1\) John the Baptist is named in two different ways in Mark’s gospel. At Mark 6:25 and 8:28 he is ὁ βαπτιστής whereas at 6:14, 24 the form ὁ βαπτίζων is found. In the rest of the New Testament only baptistēes is used.

Mark as a writer is normally insensitive to repetition and it is unlikely he varied his vocabulary for stylistic effect. Thus it is strange to find two titles for John in this gospel. It would be difficult—especially in view of the printed text of 6:24 and 25—to argue that the change in vocabulary is due to Mark’s adoption of two different sources, the first of which referred to John by one title, the second by the other. The explanation for the alternatives in the printed text lies elsewhere.

There are textual variants at each point in the text where the name “Baptist” occurs in Mark:

6:14: βαπτίζων Sin ABC fam\(^1\) and most minuscules

βαπτιστής DSW Theta fam\(^1\)\(^3\) (except 124) and a few other minuscules

6:24: βαπτίζοντος Sin BL Delta Theta 565 1596

βαπτιστοῦ ceteri

6:25: βαπτίζοντος L 700 892

βαπτιστοῦ ceteri

8:28: βαπτίζοντα 28 565

βαπτιστήν ceteri

In view of the prevailing tendency to call John βαπτιστής in Matthew, Luke and later Christian writings\(^2\), it is likely that the direction of change

---

\(^1\) Such as Souter, BFBS, Merk, Nestle, UBS, von Soden, Tischendorf, NEB Greek New Testament and Westcott and Hort.

\(^2\) ὁ βαπτιστής is used only by Christian writers, with the exception of Josephus Ant. 18:116 where he is referring to John.
in the text of Mark is away from an original βαπτίζων. βαπτιστής was introduced into the text by later scribes possibly because of assimilation to parallels at Matt. 14:2, 8, 16:14 and at Luke 9:19. Mark used βαπτίζων throughout as the designation for John. This represents the form of John’s name before Christian tradition coined the noun βαπτιστής to describe him. 3

Mark’s constancy in this regard may help us solve the textual problem at 1:4. There are four main variants in this verse:

a) βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καί AKPW Pi and the bulk of the minuscules
b) ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καί Sin L Delta
c) ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ B 33 892 and some Coptic mss.
d) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ βαπτίζων καί D Theta 28 and the bulk of Latin mss.

Variant a) is the reading followed by UBS1, von Soden, Nestle17, Merk7 and the AV; b) is followed by Tischendorf8, Souter, Tregelles (καί bracketed), the RV and RSV; and c) by WH, most editions of Nestle and the NEB.

Reading c) is the one which explains the origin of the other variants. This reading also conforms to Markan usage. John is here described as ὁ βαπτιστής. Once ὁ βαπτιστής became the normal title for John, the participle would be interpreted as a true verbal form. Thus in readings a) and b) καί has been added to make both βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων dependent on ἐγένετο. In a) the definite article before βαπτίζων has been removed, thus preventing the participle being read as a substantive. This process is developed still further in d) where the two linked participles stand closer. Reading b) represents a half-way stage between a) and c) in which ὁ governs both βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων but this does not conform to Markan usage, where καί would be possible only if ὁ were absent.

This variant at Mark 1:4 is one of the few listed in the very select critical apparatus in the UBS Greek New Testament. 4

---


note on this variant found in B.M. Metzger’s companion volume to the third edition of this text\(^5\) is instructive in showing us the methods used in establishing this text. According to Metzger the text of the forthcoming third edition of UBS is to read (ὁ) βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ, that is a combination of variants a) and b). UBS\(^1\)–\(^2\) follow variant a) only. ὁ albeit bracketed, seems to have been added in order to reflect the reading of Cod. Sin.—a manuscript which has greatly influenced the editors of the UBS text.

Metzger’s note claims that the original καὶ was omitted by some scribes because ὁ βαπτίζων was taken as a title, but as we have seen, this is precisely what it was for Mark. Metzger has failed to recognize Markan practice. His note therefore should be seen as a caution against relying on the readings of the so-called “best” mss., or on the weight of ms. support, rather than on the style and usage of the New Testament author himself.

In accepting reading c) as original, ἐγένετο can be taken as a verb with a force of its own (“John the Baptist appeared in the desert preaching . . .”) which conforms to Markan usage elsewhere, e.g. 9:7 (cf. v.l. at Mark 1:39 ἦλθε κηρύσσων and to New Testament practice, e.g. John 1:6, 1 John 2:18 (cf. Rev. 3:2 “become watchful”, not “be watchful”), although ἐγένετο κηρύσσων could be seen as periphrastic (“John the Baptist was preaching in the desert . . .”). This use is also paralleled elsewhere in Mark (e.g. at 9:3). Probably the former translation should be accepted here, as there is some significance in the context in John’s appearance in the desert as the fulfilment of the prophecy in the preceding verses.

A subsidiary argument in favour of our taking reading c) as original may be found in C.H. Turner’s comment that baptizing was not done ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ but ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ (Mark 1:5, cf. Matth. 3:1:6, Luke 3:3) and that therefore ὁ βαπτίζων in 1:4 has to be a title.\(^6\)


Grammars such as Moulton-Howard-Turner¹ and Blass-Debrunner-Funk² inform us that πλήρης in Hellenistic Greek is generally indeclinable only when followed by a dependent genitive, and that when it is not followed by a genitive it is declinable. Although both grammars indicate that textual variation between the indeclinable and declinable forms often exists in the New Testament manuscripts when this word occurs, they do not draw conclusions as to which is likely to be original.

Given the basic rule of thumb that whenever variation occurs in New Testament manuscripts between a Classical and a Hellenistic form the latter is likely to be original (other things being equal), we will accept the Hellenistic indeclinable form of πλήρης and argue that the declinable forms were introduced by scribes influenced by Atticism.³

The same rule could be applied to the LXX, where in over half of the 70 occurrences of πλήρης (outside the nominative singular masculine or feminine where of course there is no problem) the indeclinable form is found in some manuscripts. C.H. Turner in 1899 collected together some examples of non declinable πλήρης in literature outside the LXX and NT.⁴ These include Epiphanius Haer. 51:16, MS. B of the Acts of Pilate (ed. Tischendorf in Evangelia Apocrypha 1853 p. 253 and 1856 p. 272) and Charles’s edition of the Greek fragment of the Book of Enoch XXVIII, XXXI. Other examples of indeclinable πλήρης can be located showing standard Koine practice.

Our main concern is with the New Testament occurrences. In Luke–Acts πλήρης occurs without variant at Luke 4:1; 5:12; Acts 6:8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; 13:10; but these are all nominative singular masculine

or feminine. All are followed by a genitive. In the oblique cases variants occur. At Acts 6:3 πλήρεις (agreeing with ἄνδρας) occurs in most MSS. but the indeclinable form is found in A E P H 88 431 915 1133 1316 1827 1829 1838 etc. and is followed by a dependent genitive. Similarly at Acts 6:5 πλήρης (read by most MSS.) and πλήρη (read by BC5 5 383 623 1611 1827 etc.) both exist and a dependent genitive follows. In both verses we should print the indeclinable form as being in keeping with Hellenistic usage. At Acts 19:28 πλήρης occurs in AEL 33 1518 but the declinable form is read by most MSS. Again a dependent genitive follows. Πλήρης should be accepted as original and should appear in our printed editions. As far as Mark is concerned, the only evidence of this adjective followed by a dependent genitive is at 8:19 where Β C L et al. have πλήρεις and A F G M et al. read πλήρης. As above, the indeclinable form is likely to be original. At Mark 6:43 most MSS. read πληρώματα against the reading πλήρεις of AD N Γ Θ Π Σ Φ 118 157 565 780 et al. The former is likely to be original. The variant could have been introduced by assimilation to 8:19.

All the examples so far would support our opening statement.

The remaining five occurrences of πλήρης in the New Testament are at Matthew 14:20; 15:37; Mark 4:28; 2 John 8; and John 1:14 (which will be discussed later). At Mark 4:28 and 2 John 8 variants exist between the indeclinable and declinable forms:

Mark 4:28 πλήρης – pl.
πλήρεις – C* D Σ W 472

2 John 8 πλήρης – pl.
πλήρεις – L

N. Turner\(^5\) states that variants exist also at Matthew 14:20; 15:37; giving the indeclinable form, but no known MSS. have come to light reading πλήρεις at either of these places. In a private communication Turner has admitted the statement in his Grammar is incorrect.

Given the development of the Greek language, scribes are more likely to have altered the indeclinable form πλήρης to the declinable than the reverse. Thus we will again read πλήρης at Mark 4:28 and 2 John 8. As far as Matthew is concerned, we note that he alone of the New Testament authors uses the declinable form. Our opening

sentence dividing this problem into whether πλήρης is followed by a genitive or not is therefore unnecessary. The only division of usage is between Matthew and the rest of the New Testament.

A further variant at Mark 4:28 is of relevance and interest here. Aland’s apparatus in his Synopsis gives us the following variants:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{πλήρης σῖτον} & \quad - \text{pl. (inc. Α A)} \\
\text{πλήρης ὁ σῖτος} & \quad - \text{D W} \\
\text{πλήρης σῖτος} & \quad - \text{B} \\
\text{πλήρης σῖτον} & \quad - \text{C* pc}
\end{align*}
\]

Our attempts to decide which of the above is likely to represent what the original author wrote are helped not only by the decision to accept πλήρης as original but also by the gender of the noun. Σῖτος was normal in Hellenistic Greek\(^6\) whereas Attic writers used the neuter. Haplography of sigma may have encouraged scribes to write the declinable form. The text most likely to represent the original is πλήρης σῖτον\(^7\) (πλήρης σῖτος is less likely in the context).

One further occurrence of variants involving πλήρης remains. This is at John 1:14 which is important for exegesis. Πλήρη is read by D and πλήρης by the majority of MSS. If πλήρης (which is likely to be original) is nominative then it must stand at the beginning of a parenthesis and refer back to ὁ λόγος. No doubt many scribes read it as such, hence this form was allowed to stand in the vast majority of MSS. But as we have seen, all New Testament authors (except Matthew apparently) used πλήρης for all cases. If it is indeclinable in John therefore—as we would argue—then it can agree with τὴν δόξαν, with λόγος, with αὐτοῦ, with μονογενοῦς or with πατρός. This freedom of

---


\(^7\) It is interesting to note that Hort (in Westcott and Hort, New Testament: Appendix p. 24) argues for the originality of πλήρης σῖτον with C vid. and two lectionaries only!
interpretation has been recognised in both ancient writers and versions and in modern commentaries and translations. The Curetonian Syriac for instance takes πλήρης with either δόξαν or μονογενοῦς, not λόγος; the Palestinian Syriac on the other hand takes it with either πατρός or μονογενοῦς. Irenaeus (adv. Haer. V xviii 2) seems not to have taken πλήρης with λόγος, Origen similarly (in Contra Celsum VI 77) seems to have understood πλήρης with some noun other than λόγος. Athanasius (de decretis Nicaenae synodi 15), Cyril of Alexandria (Commentary on St. John) and Theophylact (Commentary on the Four Gospels) connected πλήρης with δόξαν. All were aware of this indeclinable use of πλήρης.

Among modern writers and commentators Barnabas Lindars acknowledges that “full” can agree with “his”, McGregor says that πλήρης is to be understood as an accusative agreeing with “glory” (this certainly is how D understood the verse). The Valentinians also adopted this interpretation. Sanders and Mastin prefer to take πλήρης with λόγος. Bultmann says that πλήρης is clearly not predicated by δόξα (for it is the Revealer who is being described), and is either related to the dominating term ὁ λόγος (which is especially likely if vv. 14b and 16 are read together) or taken with αὐτοῦ and used without inflection. Modern translations similarly show this breadth of interpretation.

Within the compass of this grammatical note all that need be said at this juncture is that in John 1:14 πλήρης ought not to be read only as a nominative, but being an indeclinable adjective can stand with any case. The solution to the translation must be sought on exegetical grounds: the case of πλήρης does not bind the interpretation.

---

8 For full details see C.H. Turner (op. cit.).
Is Jesus described at the end of the Johannine Prologue as ‘God’ or as ‘Son’? This well-known text-critical problem is drawn to many Bible readers’ attention by its being included in the marginal notes to many a modern version. Also, it is thoroughly debated in learned commentaries. The textual evidence is clearly set out in modern critical editions of the Greek New Testament. The apparatus does not need repeating in extenso here, suffice it to say that the issue boils down to whether the original reading was ‘God’ with or without the article as read in our earliest surviving witnesses (P66 P75 Sin B C) or ‘Son’ with the majority of manuscripts. The Patristic writers know both readings, and some fathers sometimes use the form with ‘God’ sometimes the form with ‘Son’ when citing this verse in their writings. Note that the reading ‘Son’ is also ancient, being known to Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian, and is behind the Latin and Syriac versions. The reading ‘God’ at John 1:18 is especially interesting because it is found virtually exclusively in the Alexandrian tradition. We are not dealing, as we sometimes are, with “Maj.” versus the rest; here it is “Alex.” alone against other readings.

Metzger’s Textual Commentary, that first port of call for many scholars to help them resolve textual cruces, shows here that although the majority of its editors favoured ‘God’ one signed a dissentient comment in favour of ‘Son’. Members of the Majority Text Society presumably support ‘Son’ here, read as it is by the bulk of the Byzantine witnesses and thus follow a reading known to and used by a large swathe of Christian tradition, especially now by Orthodox communities.

The internal arguments are well rehearsed. ‘Son’, we are told by commentators, seems to be required by the following clause and that it fits Johannine style (Jn 3:16, 18 and cf. 1 Jn 4:9). But that may make it the ‘easier’ i.e. the secondary reading introduced by scribes. ‘God’ is certainly the harder reading and one may understand why in certain quarters at certain times readers objected to Jesus being described as the only-begotten God, especially as this uniqueness seems to be contradicted in the context. But the author of the Fourth Gospel may have deliberately returned to ‘God’ at the end of his Prologue to balance the introductory line where the Logos is described as God, and is identified in v. 14 as the begotten Son.
On the other hand it may have been that some scribes, reflecting the theological concerns of their communities and determined to enhance Jesus’ status, altered an original ‘Son’ (with all the subordinationist baggage that title carries) to ‘God’, thereby affirming his divinity and deity.

Two minor points are often raised but may be summarily dismissed. One states that stylistically conscious scribes may have bridled at a text that repeated ‘God’ in the sentence and thus altered the second occurrence. Another minor comment refers to the ease with which careless scribes could have misread the abbreviated form of ‘God’ as ‘Son’ or vice versa. Arguments having recourse to the claim of carelessness do not help us here, especially as in this case the change could have been made in either direction. Carelessness and change encouraged by stylistic considerations are unlikely to have played a part in what is an obvious and theologically sensitive sentence.

If we cannot resolve the variant using internal or external criteria what is to be done?

Theologians traditionally expect textual critics to pronounce categorically on the originality and secondariness of every variant in the New Testament. That expectation is unrealistic and unachievable. Several readings seem impervious to satisfactory resolution, whatever one’s methodological proclivities. In any case it may perhaps be a better function of textual criticism if it alerts readers to the sheer variety of viable options in a text that has had a theologically rich history. Most theologically sensitive readings reflect early Christological debate and thus bear valuable historical testimony. If the results of textual criticism promote only the supposed original reading, the danger is that the secondary readings are jettisoned as flawed and spurious. We thus forget that all readings were once used as canonical by the owners of each manuscript. The pious who had a manuscript of Mark that ended at 16:8 would consider their text canonical, just as another owner whose manuscript ended at 16:20 would also cherish its text as the canonical word of God.

We may compare that to owners of an English version of the Bible, who will regard its text as representing the canonical scriptures. Those favouring the KJV, for instance, accept its text at Acts 9:5–6; 10:6; Rev. 22:19 (not to mention the Comma Johanneum!) without realising that its eccentricities here are the product of early printed editions’ including bogus readings from the Latin.

The dilemma of what to do with apparently unresolvable problem cases has encouraged me to suggest—most recently in the Delobel Festschrift in relation to the complex textual tradition of the Parable
of the Two Boys in Matt 21:28–32—that sometimes it may be wisest to print all the viable alternatives, without favouring any one of them as the original.\(^1\) To do this at John 1:18 would invite readers to explain both differing meanings of the verse and thereby to appreciate the complex history revealed in the transmission of this gospel.

I leave readers to consider this proposal and to assess the logistics of applying such a suggestion. I note that the new Miinster series Editio Critica Maior occasionally signals (by means of a bold dot) words that are offered to readers as equally acceptable alternative readings. Is that the way forward?

\(^{1}\) Reprinted as chapter 22.
This short note is designed to give added support to those commentaries1 which favour καυθήσομαι at 1 Cor 13:3 by presenting some neglected arguments for this reading. The United Bible Society’s Greek New Testament lists three main variants in this verse:

καυχήσωμαι (read by P46 Ν A B 33 1739* et al.)
καυθήσωμαι (read by K Ψ 181 326 1739c et al.)
and καυθήσομαι (read by CDG 81 436 1985 et al.)

Most of the commentaries are content only to discuss the advantage of one reading over another on grounds of interpretation and meaning, and consequently discussion of how and why the variants arose is usually neglected. The points listed below are attempts to remedy this deficiency.

In favour of καυθήσομαι

a) An often neglected point is grammatical. Classical usage always follows ἵνα with the subjunctive (or optative). This is generally true of Koine Greek also, but in the New Testament there are several occurrences of ἵνα + future indicative e.g. at Mt 12:10, Lk 14:10, 20:10, John 7:3,17:2, Act 5:15, 21:24, 1 Pet 3:1 and frequently so in Revelation. In Paul ἵνα + future indicative occurs at 1 Cor 9:15, 9:18, Gal 2:4, Eph 6:3, Phil 2:11 and 1 Thess 5:10. At all these places textual variation occurs reading the aorist subjunctive.2

The future indicative is likely to be original in all the above and should appear in the printed editions. Many scribes motivated by classical standards have ‘corrected’ the New Testament text by eradicating the future indicative after ἵνα. At 1 Cor 13:3, the ‘incorrect’ future

1 καυθήσομαι is favoured by Barrett, Robertson and Plummer, Allo and by Lietzmann. Hering prefers καυχήσομαι, which is also read by the United Bible Society’s Greek Testament. Souter reads καυθήσομαι.
indicative \textit{καυθήσομαι} would encourage scribes motivated by neo-
Atticism to alter the text.\textsuperscript{3}

The reverse, i.e. a change to the future indicative, is explicable only
on the ground of orthographical carelessness, but the fact there is no
known v.l. \textit{καυχήσομαι} might suggest scribes did not indiscriminately
write ‘\textit{o}’ for ‘\textit{ω}’ or ‘\textit{ω}’ for ‘\textit{ο}’.

b) \textit{καυθήσομαι} is also a difficult reading insofar as the 1 p.s. passive
seems to be unexpected following τὸ σῶμα. Some scribes avoid this
difficulty by reading \textit{καυθήσεται} (1877 2492 2138). Others may have
altered the verb to the more readily explicable \textit{καυχήσωμαι}. The 1 p.s.
\textit{καυθήσομαι} can be explained by interpreting τὸ σῶμα μου almost, as
a reflexive i.e. ‘If I give myself to be burned . . .’.

c) \textit{καυθήσομαι} creates difficulties in interpretation as can be seen
in those commentaries which favour this reading. The problem of the
precise meaning may have caused some scribes to substitute the popu-
lar Pauline verb \textit{καυχάομαι}. ‘Even if I give my body to be burned’ can
however be interpreted as the ultimate or superlative act of charity.
In giving this as an example Paul is not necessarily to be interpreted
literally: martyrdom or even self-immolation are not in mind at this
period.

d) Possibly some scribes avoided \textit{καυθήσομαι} because they took the
reference to Paul’s offering his body to be burned literally and not as
an hypothetical example. They thus altered the text, because they were
aware that Paul did \textit{not} die by burning.

e) The change from \textit{καίω} to \textit{καυχάομαι} is more probable than that
change from \textit{καυχάομαι} to \textit{καίω}. Both are New Testament verbs, but
\textit{καυχάομαι} may have been introduced into the text by scribes through
assimilation to e.g. 2 Cor 11:18. There is no obvious reason why
\textit{καυθήσομαι} would be introduced to the text if \textit{καυχήσωμαι} were the
original reading.

f) \textit{παραδῶ} τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα \textit{καυθήσομαι} reflects Daniel 3, which
may have influenced Paul.

---

\textsuperscript{3} For a discussion of this tendency see G.D. Kilpatrick: ‘Atticism and the Text of
the Greek New Testament’ in \textit{Neutestamentliche Aufsätze}—Festschrift for J. Schmid
as Chapter 2 in J.K. Elliott (ed.), \textit{The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual
 AGAINST καυχήσωμαι

a) The motive of self-glorification makes the addition of ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω unnecessary as it is obvious that ἀγάπη is not the guiding principle behind such a motive.

b) Similarly the adversative δὲ is less meaningful if καυχήσωμαι is read. δὲ is an adversative in verses 1 and 3.

c) If καυχήσωμαι is read, παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου stands on its own, but παραδίδωμι τὸ σῶμα is a far from explicit expression. The nearest equivalent in the New Testament is παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα at John 19:30 but this is not instructive here. For the words to be meaningful, the verb would have to be stretched to bear a meaning it has nowhere else in the New Testament. παραδίδωμι in Paul is not used in isolation but is usually followed by explanatory clauses or words e.g. at Rom 1:24, 26, 28, 8:32, Gal 2:20, Eph 5:2, 25. It is perhaps conceivable that those scribes who wrote καυχήσωμαι understood παραδίδωμι τὸ σῶμα in the Gnostic sense of renouncing the body but this is not paralleled in the New Testament.

 AGAINST καυθήσωμαι

This variant marks a half-way stage between καυχήσωμαι and the original reading. Scribes concerned to remove an occurrence of ἵνα + future indicative have here created a rare instance of a future passive subjunctive. There is no firm example of this form in the New Testament although some MSS. read ἐκφευξώμεθα at Heb 2:3 and κερδηθήσωνται at 1 Pet 3:1.4

The above evidence suggests that καυθήσωμαι is most likely to be the original reading at 1 Cor 13:3. It can be seen that the variants are attempts to ‘correct’ the difficulties which scribes recognized in this verb. It will also be seen, however, that the difficulties in the variant readings are even greater than in the word Paul used.

4 See Blass-Debrunner op. cit. § 28.
E) ΔΙΔΩΜΙ IN 2 TIMOTHY

Three interesting textual variants involving the verb δίδωμι occur in 2 Timothy. They are:

2 Tim. 2:7 δώσει

δώη

2 Tim. 2:25 δώη

δῷ
ceteri

2 Tim. 4:14 ἀποδώθη

ἀποδώσει

The form -δώη at 2 Tim. 2:7 and 2:25 and the form -δώη at 2 Tim. 4:14 can be read as the optative δώη. The Atticist stylist Phrynichus objected to δώη as an optative form. He preferred the Attic δοίη. Hence scribes influenced by Atticism would have avoided the form δώη. Theological motives may also have caused scribes to avoid ἀποδώθη at 2 Tim. 4:14. Ἀποδώθη gives the impression that it is an imprecation; the future ἀποδώσει on the other hand gives no offence, and is found in similar contexts at Ps. 61:13 (LXX), Prov. 24:12, Rom. 2:6, and 2 Tim. 4:8. Scribes therefore avoided ἀποδώθη and wrote ἀποδώσει, perhaps by assimilation to Ps. 61:13 (LXX).

The rarity of the optative mood in the New Testament, however, makes it unlikely that δώη is to be read in the above passages. What we should print in our Greek Testament is ἀποδώθη at 2 Tim. 4:14 and δώη at 2 Tim. 2:7 and 2:25. The spelling δώη represents a Hellenistic form of the 2nd Aorist subjunctive. At John 15:16 and Eph. 3:16,

---

where the mood is subjunctive, δῴη occurs as a variant reading for δῷ in some manuscripts. W.F. Howard\(^2\) cites δと言い as a subjunctive form. Blass-Debrunner\(^3\) agrees by saying that until A.D. 300 this subjunctive form was often mistaken for an uncommon optative and that the alleged optative δῷ at Eph. 1:17 is in fact the subjunctive δと言い. That a firm example of the optative mood does occur in the Pastoral Epistles (λογισθείη at 2 Tim. 4:16) does not really affect the issue here, for λογισθείη occurs after μή and this idiom is not unknown to Koine (cf. μή γένοιτο). At 2 Tim. 2:7 and 4:14 the wish is not negative, and the subjunctive is required at both places.

The variant at 2 Tim. 2:25 particularly shows that δ払い represents a spelling of the subjunctive. J.H. Moulton (op. cit., vol. i, p. 193) comments that δ払い here is in fact δと言い: the optative would clash with ἀνανήψωσιν and could not be justified syntactically. For parallels to this form, Moulton points to γνώῃ in Clem. Paed. 3:1, and elsewhere in early Christian literature. Some manuscripts read δhänge for δ払い at Plato, Gorg. 481 A, where an optative would similarly be out of place. Read δと言い at 2 Tim. 2:25. This reading appears in the United Bible Society text.

It is relevant to inquire at this point what the mood of δと言い is at 2 Tim. 1:16 and 1:18. Should we print δと言い or δと言い? Turner (op. cit., p. 129) says that δと言い at these places can be nothing else but optative. On the previous page of his Grammar, however, he states that Atticists often preferred the optative in such sentences. Some scribes, therefore, were content to read δと言い at 2 Tim. 1:16 and 1:18 as δと言い. We, however, may be justified in printing δと言い as the original reading at these places (and also at Rom. 15:5 and 2 Thess. 3:16). These subjunctives would be rare examples of the jussive (see Turner, op. cit., p. 94). If this is so, there are no examples of the optative of δίδωμι in the Pastoral Epistles.


At Hebrews 2:9 the reading χάριτι θεοῦ appears in printed editions of the Greek New Testament such as the United Bible Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, von Soden and Souter. This reading has the support of the vast majority of Greek MSS as well as versional and Patristic evidence. However, χωρὶς θεοῦ is read by M₅ (= 0121b) 424** 1739* Latin (Vulgate G) Syriac (Peshitta), by MSS known to Origen, 4 out of the 6 occurrences of the quotation in Greek by Origen and all the references to this verse in the Latin versions of Origen, and by a significantly large number of other Fathers including Vigilius, Fulgentius, MSS known to Jerome, Ambrose, MSS known to Ambrose, the Ambrosiaster, Eusebius, Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Anastasius-Abbot, Pseudo-Oecumenius and Theophylact.

Most commentators favour χάριτι. F.F. Bruce, for example,¹ says ‘Whatever may be said of the textual warrant for the phrase “by the grace of God” it is entirely appropriate in the context and makes for a smooth transition to the words which follow’. This is a typical comment.

χωρὶς, however, is favoured by Zuntz.² Following Harnack he argues that χάριτι is a dogmatic correction and that χωρὶς θεοῦ fits the theology of the author of the letter to Hebrews. χωρὶς θεοῦ according to Zuntz has the same meaning as δι’ ἑαυτοῦ which appears in KL et al. at Heb 1:3.

As far as the ancient commentators are concerned they too are often aware of the variation in MSS at this point. Origen, as can be seen from the apparatus criticus to this verse, knows both variants although in his comments he reaches no decision. Theodore of Mopsuestia, however, condemns χάριτι θεοῦ as alien to the argument. Theophylact and Oecumenius also know both readings.

Commentators ancient and modern have usually been preoccupied with theological considerations when discussing this verse and neglect

to examine our author’s linguistic usage. This is instructive and to my mind is decisive in our reaching a decision on the variants.

χωρίς occurs 13 times in the epistle to the Hebrews compared with a total of only 28 occurrences in the whole of the rest of the New Testament. χωρίς is always followed by an anarthrous noun in Hebrews, and this is true of the New Testament occurrences as a whole. The only two apparent exceptions to this practice are at 2 Cor 2:28 and Philemon 14 where χωρίς precedes the definite article. These are, however, not true exceptions because at 2 Cor 2:28 τῶν is used pronominally, and at Philemon 14 the normal usage has been affected by the presence of the possessive adjective in the attributive position which in the New Testament is always preceded by the article. In the latter instance therefore the usage with the possessive adjective has over-ridden the normal usage of χωρίς followed by an anarthrous noun.

χωρίς θεοῦ at Hebrews 2:9, therefore, would conform entirely with New Testament usage in general and with Hebrews usage in particular in this respect. χάριτι θεοῦ on the other hand does not conform with the usage of the article with this noun in either the New Testament in general or Hebrews in particular. χάρις is a common New Testament word occurring over 100 times in Paul alone. It occurs eight times in Hebrews. A close parallel to χάριτι θεοῦ at Heb 2:9 is afforded by Heb 12:13 where the author speaks of the ‘grace of God’. Here, however, it is significant that both χάρις and the dependent genitive have the article. This conforms with normal New Testament usage. χάρις is normally arthrous when followed by the nomina sacra as dependent genitives. ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (or κυρίου) occurs 34 times in the Corpus Paulinum. In all these places χάρις the divine name are arthrous. There are two exceptions, one at 1 Cor 15:10a and one at 2 Cor 1:12 where both χάρις and θεός are anarthrous. However, at 2 Cor 1:12 the normal usage has been broken in order to parallel 5:12a ἐν σοφίᾳ σοφικῇ. At 1 Cor 15:10a the normal usage may again have been altered for rhetorical reasons in so far as χάρις occurs three times in this verse. In the rest of the New Testament χάρις is arthrous when followed by the divine name as in the Pauline letters, and the only exceptions are at Lk 2:40 (χάρις θεοῦ) and 1 P 4:10 (ποικλης χάριτος θεοῦ). If χάριτι

---

were original at Heb 2:9 this anarthrous usage would disagree not only with Heb 12:15 but with the other instances of ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου) in the rest of the New Testament, where these nouns are, as we have seen, usually arthrous.

It seems therefore that χωρὶς θεοῦ is original to Heb 2:9 but, if so, what is its meaning? Among the ancient writers, Theodore of Mopoe- 
tia argues that the words were intended to show the impassibility of the Godhead. Fulgentius similarly states (ad Tras 3:20) that Jesus, in tasting death, was without God (sine Deo) only so far as his mortal nature was concerned; the divine part of him was still with God. Cf. also Ambrose (de Fide, 5:106). Another possible explanation for χωρὶς θεοῦ which has been put forward is less theologically significant. This says that Christ died for all, God only excepted, or that Christ died to bring all (ὑπὲρ παντός) under his power but that God is excepted from παντός (as in 1 Cor 15:27). This latter is followed by Tasker although he attributes the reading not to the author but to scribes who changed the original χάριτι θεοῦ to χωρὶς θεοῦ in order ‘to exclude God from the inclusiveness implied by ὑπὲρ παντός’. Bruce and Westcott to some extent offer this same suggestion. Bruce says that χωρὶς θεοῦ was originally a marginal gloss incorporated into the text, then altered to χάριτι θεοῦ ‘in time for P to know this reading’. The subtlety behind this suggestion tells against it, especially as we have no MSS reading the text without the alleged gloss. Bruce is right in saying χωρὶς would be more likely to have been altered to χάριτι than the reverse but is wrong in saying χωρὶς came from a scribe. Westcott on the other hand suggests χάριτι θεοῦ is original and that χωρὶς θεοῦ was a marginal gloss by a scribe, which was later substituted for the original reading. This as we have seen is unlikely to be so.

Far more significant than the above suggestions is the argument that χωρὶς θεοῦ was original to our author and meant that Christ in his death was separated from God. This agrees fully with the theological stance of Hebrews. χωρὶς θεοῦ at 2:9 agrees with the author’s view of the Passion, for instance 4:15, 5:7 ff, 12:2, 13:12 f. Jesus at his death is χωρὶς θεοῦ because he entered, albeit temporarily, the realm of Satan which is death (and which according to Paul is the last Satanic enemy

to be overcome, 1 Cor 15:26; cf. also Rom 5:21 in which it is stated that sin rules in death).

The idea of being without God in death is rooted in the Old Testament. For example, Ps 6:5: ‘In death there is no remembrance of you: in Sheol who shall give you thanks?; Is 38:18: ‘The grave cannot praise you, death cannot celebrate you: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for your truth’; cf. also Job 10:22, 14:12–14, Ps 30:9, 49:19, 88:4–5, 115:17. For this reason the dead are ritually unclean because they belong to the sphere of demonic powers. In the later parts of the Old Testament there is sometimes present the hope that YHWH will eventually swallow up death for ever. Meanwhile the living God and the abode of death are mutually exclusive.

In tasting death, by which is meant fully experiencing the alienation from God which the sin of Adam brought to every man, Jesus is without God. The author of Hebrews thus follows the same doctrine of death as Paul in Rom 5:12. This doctrine is entirely consonant also with Heb 2:14 where it is stressed that the fully human Jesus shared death like the rest of mankind, in order to be able (through his resurrection) to break the devil’s power over death and thus effect man’s ultimate salvation (cf. especially Jn 8:51–52). Salvation means salvation not from sin as such but sin’s consequence, *i.e.*, death.

The cry of desolation from the cross (= Ps 22:1, cited at Mt 27:46 and Mk 15:34) may also represent a similar theological position. Commentaries on these ‘uncomfortable words’ in the gospels reveal the extent to which a lack of appreciation of the Hebrew belief that death meant automatic estrangement from God has created difficulties for modern Christians. But this belief is as crucial to the saying in the crucifixion account as it is in Heb 2:9: it is basic to the Christian belief that resurrection is the only means whereby Christ first and Christians subsequently can be released from the bondage of death (*i.e.*, from being ‘without God’) and be eternally ‘with God’, restored in effect to the pre-Fall situation once again (cf. Rom 5:14 in which Adam and those who follow after him lose their potential immortality by allowing death to enter in as a consequence of their sin).

---

The close connexion of the cry of desolation in Matthew’s and Mark’s Passion narrative with Hebrews 2 may be more than coincidence, and be based on a common Jewish background. It is well known that Ps 22 has influenced the Passion narrative to a large extent especially in Matthew and John. Hebrews has also been influenced by that same Psalm. Having mentioned the death of Christ and his separation from God because of that death (v. 9), the writer goes on to point to Jesus’ resurrection and consequent glory. In doing so, he quotes from Ps 22:22, i.e., the verse which begins the second half of the Psalm, the half which is concerned not with the suffering and sense of rejection found in the first half (vv. 1–21) but with the glorious deeds of God who has not ‘despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted’ nor ‘hid his face from him’. Having therefore explicitly quoted from this Psalm in v. 12 it is likely that the author to the Hebrews had the first half of that Psalm in mind when writing v. 9.9

Moffatt’s suggestion10 that the author would have conveyed the meaning ‘forsaken by God’ with ἄτερ rather than χωρίς ignores the frequency with which χωρίς occurs in Hebrews and the fact that ἄτερ is restricted to two occurrences in Luke in the New Testament and is not part of our author’s vocabulary.

χωρίς θεοῦ, therefore, means that as a result of death Jesus was automatically separated from God. He was at that point apart from God and in Satan’s realm. Unlike 1 Pet 3:18–20 there is no attempt in Hebrews to describe what Christ did in this interval before his resurrection. Hebrews states only that when Jesus was raised he was separated from sinners (7:26) and eternally with God again (7:23–25).

The reason why χάριτι θεοῦ gained in popularity and became the standard reading for the majority of Greek MSS may have been due to Nestorianism. Theophylact and Oecumenius both ascribe the reading to the Nestorians for whom χωρίς θεοῦ would mean that Christ’s divine nature had no share in his death. Such condemnation of the reading may well have been sufficient to discredit it in the Church, and thus add to the popularity of the theologically acceptable variant χάριτι θεοῦ. It is not, however, true to say with Theophylact and Oecumenius

---

9 Cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, (London: Nisbet, 1952) p. 126, who argues that the principal Old Testament quotations in the New Testament were not thought of in isolation but carried their contexts with them by implication.

10 Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (International Critical Commentary), (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924), p. 27.
that the Nestorians invented the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ: what it is true to say is that the Nestorians adopted it. χωρὶς is not a mere Nestorian emendation: it had a wide circulation not only in Greek MSS associated with Syria but appeared also in Latin as the quotations in the western Fathers indicate. It is the appearance of these quotations in Latin which Westcott\textsuperscript{11} (who accepts χάριτι θεοῦ as original) is obliged to acknowledge as a ‘noteworthy phenomenon’!

Χωρὶς θεοῦ is the lectio difficilior and therein lies much of its claim to originality; χάριτι θεοῦ, on the other hand, is a perfectly innocuous phrase familiar to Christians from its frequent appearance in Paul’s writings, and is considered by many commentators, ancient and modern, to fit the context of Hebrews 2. Once established in the text χάριτι θεοῦ would not be a reading demanding alteration, as it is entirely appropriate\textsuperscript{12} and therein by comparison lies its weakness as a variant.

χάριτι is not a mere anti-Nestorian emendation. The variation in the text is older than the fifth century as the presence of χάριτι in P\textsuperscript{46} indicates. It was an early variation made by scribes who found the idea that Jesus was ‘without God’ puzzling, but who were familiar with the doctrine of God’s grace. It was an easy orthographical change to alter ΧΩΡΙΣ to ΧΑΡΙΤΙ and one that avoided an apparently difficult phrase by replacing it with a common New Testament idea. As we have seen above though, the ‘difficult phrase’ χωρὶς θεοῦ is in fact not only consonant with our author’s theological position in Hebrews, but also with the New Testament as a whole and with the Old Testament background.

In conclusion therefore we may summarize that on the ground of the author’s style and usage the writer to the Hebrews is more likely to have written χωρὶς θεοῦ than χάριτι θεοῦ. On exegetical grounds χωρὶς fits perfectly the theological position of the New Testament regarding the role and significance of death prior to Christ’s resurrection. χωρὶς θεοῦ therefore should be restored to the text of the New Testament for in that phrase belongs the depth of theological thought characteristic of the author to the Hebrews. There is thus much buried treasure in the critical apparatus to the Greek New Testament, which reveals the extent to which theological controversy affected the MSS of the Bible.

\textsuperscript{12} Pace Zuntz, op. cit., p. 34, who calls this reading ‘preposterous’.
As Zuntz\textsuperscript{13} comments \textit{à propos} this verse, ‘textual criticism here brings out a neglected aspect of the theology of Hebrews’. With this judgment we thoroughly agree.

\textbf{Postscriptum}

For 13(d) see further: René Kieffer, “‘Afin que je sois brûlé’ ou bien ‘Afin que j’en tire orgueil’? (1 Cor. 13:3)” \textit{NTS} 22 (1976) pp. 95–7.


For 13 (a) comments relating to UBS\textsuperscript{3} and the first edition of Metzger’s \textit{Commentary} apply equally to later editions of these works.

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Op. cit.} p. 44.
(b) Longer Studies
MARK 1:1–3—A LATER ADDITION TO THE GOSPEL?

The exegetical and textual problems in the opening verses of Mark’s Gospel are well known. The punctuation of verses 1:1–4 has exercised editors of critical editions as it has translators. Does one, for example, put a full stop at the end of verse 1 or not? How does the quotation of vv.2–3 relate to its context? There are also two main text-critical problems: (a) there is a choice between a longer and a shorter reading in v.1 and (b) the mss. are divided between ἐν τῷ Ἑσαϊᾷ and ἐν τοῖς προφήταις in v.2.

There are theological problems too, because these opening verses (1:1–3), which concern “the beginning of the gospel”, lead us into an account of the coming of John the Baptist: commentators strive to explain the prominence given by Mark to the Baptist and note the contrast with the other gospels, which have already established the priority or preeminence of Jesus (or the Logos) before John is introduced.

These difficulties are compounded if one were to add to them the following list of non-Markan features in these opening three verses:

1. The title Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs in Mark’s Gospel only in verse 1:1. Mark commonly uses the name ὁ Ἰησοῦς and he occasionally uses Χριστός where it still has a function as a title. In Mark 1:1 the two names seem to read merely as an extended proper name, which may explain the later additions found in various mss. (υἱοῦ θεοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ and υἱοῦ τοῦ κυρίου) to provide an appropriate epithet—additions probably influenced by liturgical usage.

2. Εὐαγγέλιον occurs 8 times in this Gospel. In 7 of these instances (Mark 1:14, 15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9; [16:15]) the meaning is the same: εὐαγγέλιον is used of the Divine plan, a meaning consistent

---

1 I would argue that the longer reading (+ υἱοῦ [του] θεοῦ) is secondary. It is unlikely that these words would have been deliberately expunged by scribes, although accidental omission encouraged by homoioteleuton is a possibility.
with εὐαγγελίζομαι in the LXX. Mark 1:1 is the only exception to that definition: there the meaning refers to messianic action, and is a stepping stone towards the even later change in meaning whereby the noun designates a distinctive genre of literature recounting Jesus’ ministry. In all the other 7 occurrences in Mark (including the reference in the disputed longer ending) εὐαγγέλιον refers to Jesus’ sayings (not actions) or is a résumé of his teaching. Only at 1:14 is εὐαγγέλιον qualified (by τοῦ θεοῦ or v.l. τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ) as befits the first reference on Jesus’ lips. The qualification Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ at 1:1 is an exception both in terms of usage and meaning—even if these names are taken as objective genitives. (If they were read as subjective genitives there would be a contradiction with Mark 10:29 where Jesus distinguishes himself from the εὐαγγέλιον, and cf. v.l. at Mark 8:35 ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου).3

3a. Καθώς in Mark always follows a main clause (4:33; 9:13; 11:6; 14:16, 21; 15:8; 16:7) as in Matthew and in most of the rest of the New Testament.4 It is not easy to apply this to Mark 1:2 unless verse one ceases to be a title ending with a full stop (which the anarthrous ἀρχή suggests should be the correct punctuation), and instead becomes linked with the quotation i.e. “The beginning of the gospel…(is) as it stands written in Isaiah…”5

3b. Such a punctuation is possible but unlikely, and it would not agree with the fact that elsewhere in Mark quotations are used to prove something already stated and not as a pointer forward to something yet to be written.

---

2 This verb is not found in Mark, who prefers to use κηρύσσειν (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον).
5 If this is the meaning then one cannot connect v.1 with vv.4ff. C.H. Turner’s attempt (“Notes on Marcan Usage” IV JTS 26 (1925) pp. 145–56, reprinted in J.K. Elliott (ed.), The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark (Leiden: Brill, 1993 esp. pp. 23–4 (= Supplements to Novum Testamentum 71)) to treat vv. 2–3 as one of Mark’s characteristic parentheses does not take account of (a) the usage of καθώς, a usage he failed to include among his many “Notes”, or (b) the point raised in 3b (below).
4. 'Ἀρχή elsewhere in Mark is temporal (10:6; 13:8,19). Commentaries often apply this meaning at 1:1 by connecting it to 1:4 (i.e. the chronological beginning of the gospel is the coming of John the Baptist), but that seems strained, and goes against the points raised above about Mark’s use of quotations. The simplest understanding of Ἀρχή at 1:1 is that here now is the start of the account of Jesus Christ’s ministry. But such a meaning is alien to Markan usage.

5. The scriptural quotation in vv.2b–3 is the only one in this Gospel coming from the narrator. There are relatively few Old Testament citations in Mark’s Gospel compared with the other three canonical gospels, but there are a few. All these others come within speech.

6. This is the only place in Mark where a quotation is introduced with the words καθὼς γέγραπται.  

7. If v.1 is treated as a separate verse, then we have here a verbless sentence. These are rare in Mark. The only firm example outside a quotation (Mark 1:3 (LXX)) is Mark 13:8, where the verb ‘to be’ is understood.⁶  

[We may also add: 8. 'Αγγελός in v.2 is the only place in Mark’s Gospel where the meaning is ‘a human messenger sent by God’. Elsewhere Mark uses the noun to refer to a supernatural being. However, as the noun occurs in a scriptural citation, the difference is perhaps not of relevance in a survey of Mark’s usage.]

* * *

These unique or non-Markan features are significant. In many ways the non-Markan character of Mark 1:1–3 is more pronounced than that of Mark 16:9–20. Analogies with the opening of Luke’s Gospel and its stylised introductory words (Luke 1:1–4) or with the Sepuagintalisms of Luke’s opening two chapters are not valid. Mark is not a careful rhetorician or stylistically conscious writer in the mould of a Luke or a Paul. It is improbable that the different features of Mark’s language and style in Mark 1:1–3 are due to his own deliberate and sophisticated writing of these opening sentence(s) to strike a particular literary mode. In fact, those opening verses lack any literary flourish or polish.

The logical conclusion is that Mark 1:1–3 is not from Mark.

⁶ I accept the originality of v.l. + εγενετο at Mark 1:11.
C.H. Roberts and T.C. Skeat in their work on the codex\(^7\) point to the vulnerability of the outer leaves of works written in codex form. For example, the endings of the Epistle to the Romans and the Book of Revelation contain textual problems. It is significant to note that many otherwise relatively complete mss. of the Greek New Testament lack the first few verses of their opening book. A common explanation of the lost ending of Mark’s Gospel is that the original conclusion was evulsed, the last leaf or leaves breaking away, with the consequent loss of one or two pages of text. It is futile to speculate what Mark wrote beyond 16:8 where his text ends with its peculiar \(\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\) except to surmise that he probably recounted a story of the promised Christophany in Galilee.

As the codex form was already being used by Christians from the beginning of the second century, we could even assume that the accidental shortening of Mark’s original Gospel occurred within the first fifty years of its composition and publication. The later additions to the end and indeed the beginning of Mark could have been made in the second century. Even though our earliest Greek ms. witnesses of Mark are fourth century, versional and Patristic evidence that verses 1–3 were an integral part of copies of Mark’s Gospel is firmly established for the preceding century.

In a codex the loss of the outer sheets affects both the beginning and the end of a book. This may have happened to Mark, but we need not presume that the loss of the beginning and the loss of the end require us to postulate that both losses must have happened simultaneously or in a book made up of a single gathering of sheets.

If the arguments for non-Markan authorship of Mark 1:1–3 are accepted, there are problems for textual critics. In favour of the decision to print an edition of Mark’s Gospel which ends at Mark 16:8 and to relegate to the margin the various secondary and later makeshift attempts to make good the unsatisfactory nature of having the Gospel end at Mark 16:8, text-critics for the past century and a half can at least point to manuscript support for the reading, albeit in only a few witnesses. By contrast, a decision to remove Mark 1:1–3 from the printed

text would be without any ms. support. All of our surviving texts of Mark’s Gospel (excluding, of course, fragmentary mss.) begin with 1:1; none begins at verse 4.

If one is averse to accepting conjectural emendations into a critically produced text, then one must print Mark 1:1–3 as part of the Gospel even if one realises its secondary nature. If the aim of textual criticism is to establish the original text of the original author (a claim that is often made), in this instance at least one is unable to print Mark’s original opening and has knowingly allowed a secondary reading to appear in its stead. However, if the purpose of textual criticism is to present the earliest available text which one can reconstruct (aware that this will not, in every instance, be the words of the original author), then it may be intellectually honest to print a form of Mark 1:1–3 as the earliest surviving text for the beginning of Mark’s Gospel, as long as the distinction is made clear to readers.

Mark 1:1–3 seems therefore to have been added to a version of Mark which had lost its original (Markan) beginning. Readers probably found it difficult to cope with a gospel that began abruptly at 1:4. Mark 1:1 was therefore added as a title, probably intended as an introduction to the whole work. This addition was possibly written under the influence of the opening words of the Fourth Gospel or, more likely, the opening words of Matthew’s Gospel, where the name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός appears. Then the citation from Isa. 40:3 was added (from Matthew 3:3) as an introduction to Mark’s story of the coming of the Baptist. Probably a different editor was responsible later for adding to that quotation the composite Q citation found at Matt 11:10/Luke 7:27 because that too had been applied by early Christians to the Baptist, albeit in a different context, but that editor failed to adjust the opening attribution to Isaiah. It was presumably left to pedantic scribes to make the necessary

---

8 Recently some conjectural emendations have been allowed. The UBS/Nestle text at Acts 16:12 prints a conjecture. G.D. Fee in his commentary on 1 Corinthians (New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) ad loc.) argues in favour of a text of chapter 14 that excludes verses 34–5, even though no ms. witness omits them.

9 Vincent Taylor’s commentary, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1952) ad loc., ventures the suggestion that 1:2b was probably a later insertion to Mark’s Gospel, although he recognises the lack of textual evidence to support his suggestion. (Morna Hooker’s commentary (see next note) makes the same point.) The introduction to Heron of Alexandria, Geometrica 2 of the first century AD provides an interesting parallel to this later insertion to Mark: Ἡρώνος ἀρχή τῶν γεωμετρουμένων. Καθός ἡμᾶς ὁ παλαιὸς διδάσκει λόγος, οἱ πλείστοι τοῖς περὶ
change to the attribution. (If one wishes to argue that the addition of the Q citation and the change from ‘in Isaiah’ to ‘in the prophets’ were made at the same time, one must recognise that the two changes were not maintained in all copies of the ms. tradition).\textsuperscript{10}

These additions to the beginning of this Gospel were similar to the additions appended as an epilogue to the Gospel, in the sense that they were drawn from other canonical gospels and the common currency of early Christian language.

Morna Hooker’s simple and effective little book \textit{Beginnings: Keys that Open the Gospels}\textsuperscript{11} in its chapter on Mark takes the opening passage, the key to that Gospel, as Mark 1:1–13. (Some take Mark’s “Introduction” as 1:1–15.) But even if we now strip away from his prologue the first three verses because these are merely a later generation’s attempt to open the door on this Gospel, the opening section now surviving from Mark’s original composition (1:4–13 or 1:4–15) still remains a telling and significant introduction. Mark’s prologue without vv.1–3 lacks the evangelist appearing as the ‘chorus’ introducing his drama, but the opening pericope about the Baptist remains (probably now even more emphatically) as the theologically and historically significant ‘key’ to the opening of this Gospel.

Parallels in Matthew and Luke prior to the account of Jesus’ baptism give little clue as to what either or both of these later evangelists read in their copies of Mark. It is, however, fascinating to speculate what Mark actually composed before 1:4 (a genealogy or a birth narrative of Jesus and even of John) but whatever it was, it was not Mark 1:1–3.

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{10} Morna Hooker in her commentary, \textit{The Gospel according to Saint Mark} (London: A. and C. Black, 1991) \textit{ad loc.}, recognises the difficulty for the normal two source solution to the synoptic problem where it would be argued that here Matthew and Luke (independently) had unravelled Mark’s citations in 1:2–3 and placed one citation in a Markan context and the other, combined, citation in a Q context later. But if the whole of vv.1–3 were post-Markan then the argument need not apply and the combined quotation from Exodus and Malachi could have been introduced from Q, where it was part of the original Q7:24–35.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{11} (London: SCM, 1997).
\end{quote}
Postscriptum

See recent commentaries on the text of Mark by Adela Collins (Hermeneia Series), Joel Marcus (Anchor (Yale) Bible), Robert A. Guelich and Craig A. Evans (Word Biblical Commentary).

For further discussions on λόγος and εὐαγγέλιον see chapter 12e.
In an essay contributed to the Lightfoot Memorial volume, Kilpatrick referred to the position of the verb in Marcan sentences. He noted that, despite the general freedom in Greek, Mark by and large tends to place his verbs early in the sentence—a feature characteristic of the New Testament as a whole. Kilpatrick quotes figures based on the first five chapters of Mark derived from the work of the German philologist, Kieckers, which suggests, perversely, that Mark preferred the medial position for his verbs rather than initial or final positions. Kilpatrick justifiably casts doubt on Kieckers’ figures and states his intention to investigate Mark’s word order elsewhere. As far as I am aware, Kilpatrick never completed this planned examination, nor do we find such a detailed study by other scholars (although we shall refer below to some of the pioneering work in this field by C.H. Turner in the 1920s). Such a study still demands attention but space here allows only a sampling of this feature of Marcan style.

We shall therefore restrict ourselves to Mark 13. This is a relatively coherent chapter, and one with a mixture of discourse-types. It also has the benefit of synoptic parallels so that we can monitor Matthew’s and Luke’s use of Mark here. But, importantly, this is the chapter Kilpatrick was investigating in the essay for Lightfoot. He tells us that a preliminary survey revealed 48 initial, 16 medial and 19 final position verbs. No details are given about how those figures are reached—and I have had problems in seeing how he arrived at them—but, nevertheless, his conclusion that for Mark the normal position for the verb is the initial one seems right.

With that conclusion in mind let us now try to reach a more precise and scientifically based set of figures, and then see what the exceptions

---

are, why such exceptions exist and the implications of all this for textual criticism, the exegesis of Mark’s gospel and the translation and punctuation of problem passages.

First, the figure for the initial position, that is where the verbs are not preceded by any other element in the clause that could grammatically have been placed there, for example the subject, the object or an adverbial/adjectival phrase. For this we are concerned mainly with finite verbs. I include imperatives, although it can be argued that some of these (e.g. in v. 33) stand alone and are therefore not truly verbs in an initial position. Participles and infinitives are excluded. Also we ignore connectives, particles, negatives, interrogatives, temporal and other conjunctions, relatives and the like standing before the verb. I also exclude ἰδοὺ as a verb, it being in effect a mere interjection. I also exclude αμὴν at v. 30. With those exceptions I reckon about 60 verbs in initial position in Mark 13, certainly a much higher figure than that quoted by Kilpatrick, who, perhaps, excluded imperatives. Some of the verbs are in disputed longer readings: at v. 11 v.l. + μελετήτε; at v. 33 v.l. + προσεύχεσθε (from 14:38?). There is nothing as far as the position of the verbs in these two v.ll. is concerned to disqualify them for consideration as original to Mark’s gospel, and so they are added below. Some verbs in vv. 9–10 are in a passage where the punctuation is ambiguous: the passage is discussed later but these verbs occur in the following list. One must recognise that in many cases there is nothing that might be expected to precede the verb.

The details are as follows:

Verb in initial position.

Verse 1 λέγει, ἰδε
2 βλέπεις, ἀφεθῇ, καταλυθῇ
3 ἐπηρώτα
4 εἰπόν, μέλλῃ
5 βλέπετε
7 ἀκούσητε, θροεῖσθε, δεῖ
8 ἐγερθήσεται, ἔσονται (bis)
9 βλέπετε, παραδώσουσιν, δαρήσεσθε, σταθήσεσθε

2 The reasons for placing these verbs in our list of verbs in initial position is justified below.
So far we are merely stating what is obvious. Nigel Turner on Mar-
kan style notes this preference for initial position and attributes it to
Hebrew influence.

Now let us set out the apparent exceptions to Mark’s preferred, ini-
tial, position.

1) Medial position:
Verse 2. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν but note v.l. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν. There is a strong case for accepting the originality of this longer
text: it is an unGreek expression, which scribes often tried to elimi-
nate. The same argument applies at v. 5, where we should accept as

3 We accept as original v.l. ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος with NA27. Further on this v.l.
below.
(Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1976) p. 18. The chapter on Mark is reprinted as chapter 12
Turner’s “Notes on Marcan Usage” together with other Comparable Studies (Leiden:
Brill, 1993) see p. 223 (= Novum Testamentum Supplements 71).
original ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς ἠρξατο...5 If the longer texts are accepted then εἶπεν in v. 2 and ἠρξατο in v. 5 are not medial but in the initial position after the participial phrase ὁ...ἀποκριθείς with αὐτοῖς in v. 5 attached to ὁ ἀποκριθείς: it is usual for pronouns to follow a verb of speech. We can therefore add εἶπεν and ἠρξατο to our earlier list and thereby reach a total of 64 verbs in initial position. [2. v.l. + καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν DW: unlikely to be original in this chapter.]

6 ἐλεύσονται
14 φευγέτωσαν
16 ἐπιστρεψάτω

[140]
20 ἐκολόβωσεν (sec.)
(24–25: for the verbs these verses see below)
28 μάθετε
29 ἔσται
34 ἀφεῖς, δοὺς

2) Final Position (at the end of either a string of elements or as the second of two elements):

Verse 4 ἔσται
5 πλανήση
6 εἰμί, πλανήσουσιν
11 λαλεῖτε
13 σωθήσεται
14 νοεῖτω

5 To widen our search to the whole of Mark’s gospel we note that v.l. ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν should be read instead ἔφη at 9:12,38; 10:20,29; 12:24; 14:29 against the reading usually preferred by the printed texts. If this is accepted then there is no firm example of φημί in Mark. Both Luke and Matthew write φημί and most examples seem firm, but neither uses ἔφη in the passages it shares with Mark, thus suggesting that in the form of the text of Mark used by Matthew and Luke ἔφη did not occur. In addition to the two verses in Mark 13 in our enquiry, there are other verses where scribes have attempted to eliminate this Semitism. Variants at 5:9; 7:6; 8:28; 9:39; 10:5,38; 11:29,33; 12:17; 14:20,62 read ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν or the like, and these are likely to represent Mark’s original text. The more Semitic reading has been corrected out not only in favour of ἔφη but to other forms as well. If we accept variant readings with ἀποκρίνεσθαι there are nearly 50 occurrences in Mark compared with Matthew 56, Luke 47, John 78, Acts 20 as well as Col. 4:6; Rev. 7:13. John and Mark, the two Gospels closest in other ways to Semitic style, have the highest percentage use of the phrase ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν.
Are there reasons why Mark has changed his normal word-order in these verses?

With the verbs εἶναι and γίνεσθαι we may suspect that as weak, and often dispensable words, they do not always merit the dominant position. Where εἶναι and γίνεσθαι appear in the initial position, e.g. vv. 8 bis, 11, 13, 19 (εἶναι); and v. 19 (γίνεσθαι), there is significance in the tense (future) or the finite verb is part of a periphrastic construction. At v. 4 the phrase πότε ταῦτα ἔσται with the emphasis on ταῦτα is paralleled in Matthew and Luke; in v. 6 we are dealing with the set expression ἐγώ εἰμι, again paralleled in the other two synoptic gospels. In v. 28 the word ἐγγύς deserves pride of place in the context as perhaps do τὸ θέρος. The parallel in Matthew omits the verb (except D which adds ἔστιν after ἐγγύς). Again, in v. 29 ἐγγύς deserves the primary place. The time expression in v. 33 pushes ἔστιν to the end. (In some MSS. ἔστιν is deleted.) As far as γίνεσθαι is concerned, in v. 28 γένηται follows ἄπαχλος—the emphasis is thus on ἄπαχλος (v.l. 2,1 is likely to be an assimilation to the Matthaean parallel). In v. 30 there are several variants concerning ταῦτα πάντα γένηται, but in none does γένηται attain initial position: it is (ταῦτα) πάντα that receives emphasis throughout the MS. tradition.

C.H. Turner was interested in those places where Mark placed his verb in a position other than initial. Although he did not devote much space in his Notes to Marcan word order, in two sections (X 3a and

---

X 3b) Turner examines the verb at the end of the sentence, after noun or personal pronoun, in a) with the verb ἅπτεσθαι and in b), more generally, with other verbs. As far as the final position of the verb is concerned, he explains that this phenomenon, fundamentally alien to the Greek language, is due to Latin influence on a gospel composed in Rome. As I hope to demonstrate, other explanations might be more plausible, and they could have a bearing on exegesis and translation.

In some instances it would be unexpected to find the verb in the initial position e.g. in v. 14 ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω or v. 23 with the emphasis on ὑμεῖς (cf. v. 29), but in other places, when different positions would have been possible, the main reason why the verb is not in its primary position is because Mark seems to want to emphasize another word. For example, in v. 5 the emphasis is on μή τις (cf. v. 21); in v. 20 and v. 28 the emphasis is on the prepositional phrase. The dominance of a prepositional phrase is also to be seen in vv. 14–16 where the verbs φευγέτωσαν, καταβάτω...ἐισελθάτω, ἐπιστρεψάτω come after prepositional phrases. A similar reason may account for the word order in v. 32 (where οἶδεν in the initial position would read oddly). In v. 15 the double negative phrase (avoided by Matthew’s parallel) has affected the word order: the balance in that sentence is especially noticeable if one accepts the longer text adding εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν after καταβάτω.

Sometimes style may dictate a different word order. Clearly v. 11 where the earlier phrase is picked up with τοῦτο and v. 13 where οὗτος resumes ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας will have dictated the word order following. In v. 6 the balance of πολλοὶ...πολλούς is likely to have been determinative. Balance and poetic sense could account for the final position of παρελεύσονται twice in v. 31 and for the position of λέγω...λέγω in v. 37. The late position of ἔρχεται at v. 35 could be due to Mark’s desire to place this verb near the three time expressions following, with which it is intimately connected.

One instance does not appear to merit such emphasis and convincing explanations are still sought, namely the position of ἐνετείλατο at v. 34. This is a strange sentence with the odd καί where we would have been expecting a third participle, or ἔδωκεν instead of καὶ δοῦς.

From our observation of Mark’s practice, it would seem that he wishes to draw attention to the word(s) in that dominant, initial position. For instance if one were to accept the order in κύριος ἐκολόβωσεν in v. 20 with the majority text then the emphasis would be placed on
κύριος, cf. 5:19 where κύριος (= God) is in the dominant position but see v.l. there σοι ὁ κύριος (or θεός).

If one agrees with the tenor of this paper then we should attempt to repeat the Marcan emphasis in our translations of the gospel, and, where that is not sensible, at least to recognize the emphases in our exegesis of Mark. As far as punctuation and exegesis are concerned our observation that Mark prefers initial position would encourage the division of vv. 9–11 to be:

a) βλέπετε… ἑαυτούς
b) παραδώσουσιν… συναγωγάς
c) δαρήσεσθε… βασιλέων
d) σταθήσεσθε… ἔθνη
e) δεῖ πρῶτον

This was the preference of Kilpatrick: his arguments are often referred to in recent commentaries. He was concerned to show that for Mark Jesus did not intend a gentile mission (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη belongs with the preceding phrase and is thus not connected with κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), and the arguments from Marcan word-order were contributory to that concern. Although Mark obviously did place his verbs in differing positions in the sentence, the natural place was at the beginning and, unless there are strong arguments to the contrary, we should construe ambiguities to conform with the majority position. Thus we can justify the verbs in vv. 9–11 in our list of verbs in initial position.

In vv. 24–25 Mark quotes loosely from Isaiah 13:10; 34:4. I have excluded the verbs from the lists above, but it is interesting to note that of the four verbs in that poetic passage none appears in initial position,

---

7 Note also v.l. 2.1. πρῶτον elsewhere in Mark follows the verb at 7:27; 9:11,12; [16:9]—an exception occurs at 3:27. Another v.l. is δεῖ δὲ πρῶτον. The latter merits attention. As far as the particle is concerned, note v.l. δεῖ + γάρ.

8 E.g. by Morna Hooker in the Black Commentary on Mark.

9 At 2:15f. we can again appeal to the argument about word order to express a preference for the punctuation “For there were many. There followed him… Pharisees. Seeing that he was eating…” As at 13:9 καί… καί seems to have misled translators and exegetes.
possibly two are in medial position (δώσει and ἔσονται)\(^\text{10}\) and two in final position (σκοτισθήσεται and σαλευθήσονται).

**Appendix**

It is noticeable that Luke, in using Mark, either fails to appreciate the emphases Mark gives, or deliberately attempts to avoid Mark’s use of the medial and, more particularly, final position, by giving a different word-order. In the following sample taken from C.H. Turner’s list, which is drawn from the whole of Mark’s gospel, we note that Mark puts his verb in a late position in the following places—presumably to allow the stress to fall earlier in the phrase. In verses asterisked below there is a Lukan parallel in which he readjusts the sentence, that has the effect of placing the verb earlier. This proves that word order was of significance to writers. An emphasis important to one writer, Mark, was not always accepted by a later writer, Luke. The existence of variants suggests that such matters were also of concern to scribes. The verses in my sample where the verb in Mark is in final or medial position are:

1:44*. Stress on σεαυτόν.
4:30*. NA\(^2\) favours the peculiar order ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολὴ θῶμεν, against which Luke’s order places the verb earlier, but note the v.l. in Mark ἐν τίνι παραβολὴ παραβάλωμεν αὐτήν, which could be original. If so, the emphasis is on the prepositional phrase.
4:41*. Accept v.l. αὐτῶι ὑπακούει.
5:10*. ἰνα μὴ αὐτὰ (v.l. αὐτοὺς; v.l. αὐτόν) ἁποστείλῃ.
9:18a* and 18b*. αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ...αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν.

Luke has the pronoun five times after the verb in the parallel to this verse.

\(^{10}\) The reading in NA\(^2\) placing ἔσονται in the medial position seems to be the lectio difficilior and likely to be the original. The v.l. giving the word order (οἱ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται (ἐκ)πίπτοντες places the verbs together as in v. 13, but as v. 25 occurs within (an imprecisely quoted) Old Testament passage the parallel may not be strictly determinative for deciding Marcan order here. (Matthew is closer to the LXX and avoids the periphrastic expression, cf. reading πεσοῦνται by W in Mark 13:25.)
9:19*. ἔσομαι.
9:37*. Accept v.l. ἐν τῶν παιδίων τουτῶν δέξηται.\(^{11}\)
11:28*. ἔδωκεν (especially in the reading of the majority text: τὴν ἔξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν).
The emphasis throughout is on τίς and σοι i.e. “Precisely who gave this authority to you of all people?”
12:12b*. εἶπεν. The emphasis is on πρὸς αὐτούς i.e. “…because it was to them especially that he directed the parable.”
(cf. 14:1*. ἀποκτείνωσιν. Emphasis on αὐτὸν again.)
14:10. παραδοῦ (or παραδῶ). Emphasis on αὐτὸν (but note v.l προδοῦ αὐτὸν and παραδῶ αὐτὸν).
14:11. παραδοῦ (v.l. παραδῶ). Emphasis on αὐτόν.
(Throughout, the spotlight is on αὐτόν = Jesus).
14:12*. To emphasize τὸ πάσχα.\(^{1}\)
14:30*. Emphasis on τρίς (? and με).
14:42. Emphasis on ὁ παραδιδούς (? and με).
14:63*. τί ἐτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων.
Note Luke: τί ἐτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν.
14:72*. εὐθὺς (v.l. om.) ἐκ δευτέρου (v.l. om.) ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.
Luke: ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ. In Mark, even with the longer texts the emphasis remains on the cock.
15:31. According to C.H. Turner the emphasis on ἄλλους and on ἑαυτὸν “seems to justify the order but again Luke’s instinct is for change ἄλλους ἔσωσεν σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν.”
16:7. Turner says that the order ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὤψεσθε “seems indefensible in Greek.” There is no Lukan parallel.

\(^{11}\) There is no firm example of τοιοῦτος used as an adjective with a noun in Mark (at 7:13 v.l. om. τοιοῦτο), which could have a significant bearing on the resolution of the v.l. in 9:37.
For further discussion see Keith D. Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount: Mark 13 and the Gathering of the New Community* (Bern: Lang, 1998) where full analyses of the vocabulary and syntax (and theology) of the chapter occur.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF MARK: ORIGINAL OR NOT?

Any of us who are writers like to impress our intended readers, first by grabbing their attention immediately with a brisk, appropriate opening paragraph. Similarly, we like to conclude our writings with a satisfying climax or summary that our audience feels rounds off our narrative or arguments. The same applies to the biblical authors.

Matthew starts off in grand style with the genealogy; Luke has an elegantly crafted introductory sentence of four verses in length. Both Matthew and Luke have extensive infancy narratives, which set the scene for their stories of the ministry of the incarnate Jesus. John uses the Prologue, possibly a composition already in existence at the time he began writing, in order to emphasize his belief in the preexistence of Jesus. All of those make splendidly appropriate openings. Matthew ends his Gospel with the risen Jesus’ stirring words from the mountain top, dispersing his followers. Luke and John have a satisfying selection of post-Easter appearances that reinforce in a positive way the announcement that the tomb is empty but that he has risen. John has even concocted two endings. John 20 reaches its conclusion in a satisfactory way, but later the author seems to have added chapter 21 as an appendix, again with its own convincing conclusion.

By contrast with these three evangelists, Mark seems rather blunted at both ends. His introduction is very brief, v. 1 looks like a short title, and then immediately after Old Testament citations we are suddenly introduced not to Jesus but to John the Baptist before being taken straight into the baptism story. We shall return to this later. Mark’s ending is disputed. Do we end at v. 8? Do we proceed to v. 20, noting the strange jump from v. 8 to v. 9, even if—or especially if—Mark was responsible for those last twelve verses? Verse 8 ends bizarrely, and that is especially significant if this was the intended conclusion to the Gospel. The section following vv. 1–8 does not logically join on; in fact vv. 9ff seem to parallel vv. 1ff. Those problems are raised by the textual evidence too. Some MSS have vv. 9–20, others do not. And what do we do about the so-called shorter ending? And what about the longer
text in W with the so-called Freer Logion after v. 14? The whole textual situation looks very unstable.

In this chapter we are looking at the way (or ways) in which one of the evangelists, Mark, closed his Gospel. But I am going to extend my investigation by looking at the opening verses of Mark as well. I shall turn to that beginning section a little later.

But, first, we need to remind ourselves that the beginnings and ends of ancient books were particularly vulnerable. That applies to (sc)rolls and to books in codex format. Obviously an unbound codex was liable to be damaged at both ends, but so, too, was a roll—especially if its ending was occasionally exposed when it was not rewound to the beginning after each consultation.¹ The disputed ending of Mark may be compared with the various endings of Revelation (where there are nine different readings, seven involving Greek MSS), or Romans and the disparate textual support for its alternative endings. Each of these books has suffered and it may well be that we have lost all traces of their original conclusions. The irretrievable loss of some verses is an eventuality we may have to accept. As far as manuscripts are concerned, many otherwise complete MSS have lost their beginnings and endings. Two obvious instances are Sinaiticus that has lost the beginning of the Old Testament, and Vaticanus where the opening to Genesis has disappeared as has the end of the New Testament. Outside the Bible, there are numerous instances where manuscripts of literary texts are accidentally truncated. The means to restore such damaged texts were not always to hand, even when the mutilations were conspicuous.

We shall turn now to look at the external evidence for the ending of Mark at 16:8, as well as at the linkage of vv. 8–9. Then we shall examine the internal evidence for the Markan authorship of 16:9–20. This means that we shall look at the language and style of those verses, then their theological content. We shall then pose certain questions: How did Mark lose its original ending and thus circulate in some witnesses ending at v. 8? Was it deliberate or accidental? If vv. 9–20 are secondary we need to ask when they were added.

External Evidence

Only two early Greek MSS (actually the earliest we have containing the whole of Mark) and one other, medieval, Greek MS, from among the thousand or so extant witnesses that contain Mark’s Gospel, end Mark at 16:8, and yet it is on the authority given to these two early Greek Bibles that most critical editions of the Greek New Testament and most modern English versions reach their climax to Mark with the cliff-hanging but inconclusive v. 8 that ends with the particle γάρ.

The proverbial man in the street may say that these witnesses could just be unusual copies. And, he may go on to suggest that, surely, democratic principles require our siding with the majority of witnesses that include vv. 9–20.

Most scholars, however, would say that we are dealing not with any two MSS, but with Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, splendidly produced and evidently prepared as deluxe editions. Possibly these were written in response to Constantine’s request for fifty Greek Bibles for his new capital. What is certain is that they represent attempts to define the Christian canon, as it had by then developed and to show this collection between one set of covers. Those editions did not spawn imitators. Generally, what continued to be copied by the church were the Gospels alone, or the Pauline corpus for example; and it was not until the Middle Ages that we again find complete New Testaments being produced. Whole Greek Bibles, Old Testament and New Testament, were not fashionable. One may therefore suspect that not only were these fourth-century witnesses, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, peculiar in their scale and contents but that their texts too were untypical. As far as the endings of Mark are concerned, the examples set by Sinaiticus (א) and Vaticanus (B), and possibly the other forty-eight copies also prepared for Constantine, were not followed. I do not wish to impugn

---

2 These are Sinaiticus (א 01), Vaticanus (B 03) and the twelfth century minuscule 304 (which had presumably been part of a four-Gospel codex). We exclude the twelfth century 2386 that at one time appeared in the apparatus (e.g., UBS) in support of Mark ending at 16:8. This MS merely has its last page of Mark missing; it may be used as an example of how the accidental shortening of Mark could have occurred at this exact place.

3 So much for Farmer’s opinion that Alexandrian MSS like those two were particularly influential. See W.R. Farmer, The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, SNTS Monograph 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

4 If Sinaiticus was held back and not sent to Constantinople, then we must say that only Vaticanus was sent (and we therefore must speak not of forty-eight but of forty-
B or even Θ with generic unreliability or to suggest they were maverick copies. B in particular seems to have an ancient pedigree yet we cannot ignore its or Θ’s distinctiveness here at the end of Mark.

But, in reading an apparatus of a critical edition of the Greek New Testament, it is not obvious that these MSS are not straightforward in this matter. Let us take B first.

It is essential to remember that B, uncharacteristically, leaves a blank column following his truncated ending of Mark. Such a gap is exceptional in the New Testament half of this manuscript. Elsewhere in B the text of each successive book starts at the top of the next column. It is almost as if the scribe hesitated here. Perhaps his exemplar had the so-called longer ending of Mark, i.e., vv. 9–20, and he had instructions not to include it. His hesitation made him leave the gap to allow for second thoughts, even though, as we are often told, the missing verses could not in practice have been inserted in such a gap (the end of one column and the whole of the blank column) if the same sized handwriting was to be employed. A similar situation is observable in those MSS that include the last twelve verses but who decided (or a later reader decided) to indicate the same hesitation by marking this longer ending with asterisks, obeli or a wavy line or with a note. A nine MSS). Other pandects did not survive and we cannot know if they too lacked the last twelve verses of Mark. There is no reason why the text of the fifty sent to Constantinople was identical in each MS, and the probability is that they are unlikely to have agreed with each other textually. Different exemplars would have been employed by the various scribes of each of the fifty copies.

See C.-M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro XIV* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), AnBib 26. B has much in common with the third century P52, and is unlikely itself to have been due to a recension. This groundbreaking study is ignored by Farmer, who seems to have been influenced by the intemperate opinions of John W. Burgon, the Anglo-Catholic Dean of Chichester, who implies B was maliciously flawed in his *The Last Twelve Verses according to the Gospel of Saint Mark* (Oxford: Parker, 1871).

6 In the OT the gap after Nehemiah is explicable: Psalms, written in two not three columns per page, follows; the two-and-a-half column gap after Daniel is the end of the OT; only the gap of one column following Tobit is comparable to that after Mark. Codex L has a blank where the Pericope Adulterae could appear.

7 The issue is not clear-cut. One of my students has demonstrated that it is possible to insert vv. 9–20 into the space available; he was concerned not with the average letters per column but the maximum text possible. Several years ago there was much discussion about this topic in the papers circulated by the Majority Text Society, of which I am admitted as a passenger, so I was informed. I have various documents on this issue, written by Mike Arcieri, Thomas Edgar and Maurice Robinson in early 1990s.

splendid Armenian MS in London (Arm. MSS add. 21932), like most early Armenian MSS, lacks the longer ending, but this one has 16:7–8 written in uncharacteristically huge letters that have the effect of using up spaces which had been calculated and left for the inclusion of much more text, presumably vv. 9–20—and this is yet another indication that, regardless of what the scribe chose to do, he was at least alert to the fact that here there was indeed a choice to be made.

A critical apparatus typically fails to note these scribal warning signs either in a MS that chose to omit the verses, or to add them, albeit with hesitation.

Now to Aleph. Here again the evidence is not entirely unambiguous. There are three scribes of this MS—A, B and D. Most of the New Testament was written by scribe A, but occasionally a section was written by scribe D. There are examples of D’s work at folio 74:2 and 7 in Matt; 84:3 in 1 Thess; 84:6 in Heb; 89:1 for only Rev 1:1–5. D also wrote parts of Genesis, Tobit, Judith, 4 Maccabees, and Psalms. As far as we are concerned, the bifolium containing the end of Mark and the beginning of Luke is in the hand of D, who wrote smaller than scribe A did. Milne and Skeat give the average for D throughout Sinaiticus as 692 letters per column and for A as 630–640. This replacement leaf contains the usual four columns per page thus making sixteen columns by D in total here. There are ten columns of Mark and six given to Luke. Column ten at the end of Mark is only partly utilized and the rest of that column is blank. The six columns of Luke are unusually cramped compared with D’s usual letter count per column elsewhere. The last six columns of Mark are stretched out, although the opening four columns by D in this replacement are not stretched out; in fact, column four has the second highest letter count of all sixteen columns. The letter count for the last six columns containing Mark is reduced to 598, 556, 605, 598, 560, followed by the concluding column containing the colophon.

Possibly, something went wrong at the beginning of Luke that required the text up to Luke 1:56 to be redone. Skeat argued that the reason for the rewriting was that scribe A had written part of Luke twice, a dittography, hence the rewriting required Mark to be stretched. But why did the stretching of Mark not start until column five? That
section obviously includes the ending of Mark, whatever was in the exemplar and whatever A had written in the now discarded pages. As published, Aleph has Mark end at 16:8.

A unique omission in א, due to homoioteleuton, occurs here: Mark 15:47–16:1 is omitted and that amounts to about five lines of text. Our question is whether 16:9–20 could have been fitted in columns five to ten. Again, as with our calculations regarding Vaticanus, the answer is “possibly,” although it would have been very tight, especially if the omitted words from 15:47–16:1 had also been reintroduced. The sixteen columns of this bifolium could not easily hold Mark 14:54–Luke 1:56 in D’s hand if 16:9–20 were included. It is even less possible in A’s hand. Luke cannot be written in less than six columns to reach the point at which scribe A’s text continues. The stretching at the end of Mark and the cramping at the beginning of Luke suggest the original calculations by scribe D were unrealistic. Mark 16:9–20 contains somewhere between 966 and 973 letters. That would require one-and-a-half columns in the writing of scribe D and slightly more in scribe A’s writing. All we may conclude is that the strange calculations suggest that the scribes were aware (as was the scribe of Codex Vaticanus) that the ending of Mark was disputed.

Scribe D of Sinaiticus was also very likely to have been one of two scribes of Codex Vaticanus—although not the one who wrote the end of Mark. But, nevertheless, this tells us that we are dealing with two MSS from the same scriptorium. One thus sees that the two pandects, if we may use that word of Greek MSS, were connected. Some have argued that this means we are concerned effectively with only one MS witness to the text of Mark ending at 16:8 rather than with two independent early Greek manuscripts.

Thus the Greek external evidence is not crystal clear in its witness as far as א and B are concerned. However, there are MSS that have the shorter plus the longer endings\(^\text{11}\) and those MSS may be included as added witnesses to the fact that vv. 9–20 were not regarded as the authoritative and original ending to Mark. (I know of no one who defends the Markan authorship of the shorter ending.)

\(^{11}\) The shorter ending is found between v. 8 and vv. 9–20 in L, \(\Psi\) 083, 099, 274mg, 579 l 1602. L has the shorter ending in the column following 16:8 and then has a decoration; following a critical comment comes the longer ending. None of these witnesses is older than the 7th century.
But the early versions support more strongly a text of Mark that ends at 16:8.

**Versions**

1. The fourth-century Latin MS Bobbiensis (k) is textually the oldest witness to the Latin Bible, with a text going back to the early third century. Vv. 9–20 are absent, and are replaced by the shorter ending. (It is therefore not surprising to see there is nothing from this ending quoted by Tertullian or by Cyprian in North Africa.) Lvt (k) differs from NA from Mark 15:45 onwards, e.g., at v. 16:1; the additions to v.3: and the absence of v. 8b.


3. Most early Armenian MSS lack the longer ending. In fact it has been calculated that some 99 of the 220 registered Armenian MSS lack the verses. The same is true of the oldest Georgian witnesses.

4. The Sinaitic Syriac is also an important witness for the omission.

5. The Byzantine lectionary system seems to have developed into a settled form by the eighth century—only after that time do most lectionaries contain a reading from the longer ending. Certainly the Georgian and Armenian lectionaries, which are dependent on the Jerusalem, not Byzantine, lectionary system, lack this pericope.

**Fathers**

Eusebius gives us our clearest evidence that most NT MSS known to him ended Mark at v. 8. Jerome repeats Eusebius’ observation, although Jerome’s Vulgate contains the longer ending; Jerome was also aware of a text we know as the Freer Logion (found in MS W within the longer ending).

We need to recall that Mark was not popular in the second century; hence this Gospel was seldom cited. Westcott and Hort\(^\text{12}\) and Cox\(^\text{13}\) and others list fathers who knew 16:9–20, of whom the most significant is Irenaeus. In AD 180 he knew 16:19 to be from Mark. But many


\(^{13}\) Steven Lynn Cox, *A History and Critique of Scholarship concerning the Markan Endings* (Leviston, Queenston, Lampeter: Mellen Press, 1993).
other fathers did not quote from the longer ending and may therefore not have known it. That is of course an argument from silence.

This external evidence shows quite clearly that from the earliest times we have reliable information that Mark’s Gospel circulated in different forms with differing endings.

To summarize, then, in the second century there is evidence that the longer ending was known and quoted; in the fourth century we have evidence that scribes were aware of a problem, the ending at v. 8 was known, as were the shorter ending and the longer ending; by the sixth century there is evidence of the shorter and longer endings together.

So what was it that caused the hesitation over verses 9–20, or their omission? Why do most printed editions and modern versions go with the minority of witnesses, and exclude vv. 9–20?

The answer is that the contents and theology of vv. 9–20 are uncharacteristic of Mark elsewhere. And also there is a significant difference in the language and style in those verses, compared with the rest of his Gospel. Let us look first at the grammar and vocabulary.

Internal Evidence

Language

This is not the place to indulge in a detailed analysis of the language, style and vocabulary of the longer ending. In 1971 I wrote a study of these features and it is flattering to see that that piece is still quoted with approval. Obviously, I could expand and nuance what I wrote then as a mere tyro.

The following strike me as the most important features that are peculiar to the longer ending or are alien to Mark 1:4–16:8:

---


15 James A. Kelhoffer (Miracle and Mission [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000] = WUNT 112 pp. 65–121) has built on my study and expanded it considerably. Farmer (Last Twelve Verses, 83–103) also has a study of the language although he has rightly been criticized for ignoring vital features, e.g., he says nothing about ήστερον, ταῦτα or σημεῖα and rather disingenuously attributes non-Markan features to the source used by Mark.
• vv. 10, 11, 13, 20: ἐκεῖνος is used as a pronoun.
• vv. 10, 12, 15: πορεύομαι is found as a simple verb. Elsewhere Mark uses it only compounded. I accept the v.l. giving the compound in 9:30. In the bulk of Mark πορεύομαι is used in the present and ἐλθεῖν in the aorist: here in the longer ending πορεύομαι is in the aorist.
• v. 10: τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ γενομένοις is used uniquely here of the disciples.
• vv. 11, 14: θεάομαι is not a Markan word.
• vv. 11, 16: ἀπιστέω is not a Markan word (n.b. ἀπιστία in 16:14).
• v. 12: έτερος is non-Markan.
• v. 14: ὕστερον is non-Markan. At 12:6 Mark has ἔσχατον where the Matthaean parallel (Mt. 21:37) has ὕστερον.
• vv. 17, 20: σημεῖα is Johannine not Markan. ταῦτα + anarthrous σημεῖα is not usual in the New Testament.
• v. 18: κἂν = ‘and if’ is non-Markan (at 5:28; 6:56 κἂν = ‘even’).
• v. 18: ἐπιθήσουσιν ἐπὶ + accusative is only here in Mark. At 5:23 the verb is followed by the direct dative where the Matthaean parallel has ἐπὶ + accusative.
• v. 19: μὲν οὖν is unique.
• vv. 19, 20: οὐ κύριος: this Christological title occurs only here. At 11:3 κύριος = “master.”
• v. 19: ἀναλαμβάνω: only here in Mark.
• v. 20: this extended genitive absolute is rare, and here three words peculiar to the Epistles occur within the construction: συνεργέω, βεβαιόω, ἐπακολουθέω.

(Note how many of the features listed above occur more than once in this longer ending. It is self-deceiving to pretend that the linguistic questions are still “open.”)16

Then, of course, there is the issue of the ending of the paragraph with γάρ. Much of the argument about this feature is well-known.17 The jury may still be out, but I am not inclined to think Mark intended his writing to end in this way and with a particle to boot, even though

Chapter Sixteen

Vaticanus and Sinaiticus seem to have been prepared to let the Gospel end with γάρ. Whatever the scribes allowed, albeit with hesitation, I conclude that no author would have chosen to end a piece of writing, sentence, paragraph and even less a book, with a postpositional particle, and so we must decide that, originally, a continuation of v. 8 existed (alongside a possible Easter appearance) until the final page of the original Gospel of Mark was irretrievably lost.\(^{18}\)

Just an aside: In assessing differences in language in this section, we ought to ask if we should expect authors to be consistent in such matters throughout. Could we perhaps find another passage in Mark of a length comparable to 9–20 and examine if its language and style are equally dissimilar to the rest of Mark? But I doubt if another similar passage betraying such anomalies exists. Yes, obviously, some stories have a higher than average run of different, distinctive vocabulary, but that is often explicable by the requirements of the context. But the nature of the differences between 16:9–20 and Markan usage elsewhere is, as we have demonstrated, more than mere vocabulary.

Turner subjected the whole of Mark (excluding the longer ending) to a closely detailed linguistic analysis. Nowhere does he have to except any pericope because it stands out as markedly different. Mark’s fingerprints, i.e., his distinctive style, are recognizable throughout. (We shall shortly turn to Mark 1:1–3 where I detect a significantly high level of non-Markan features, but that is a special case.)

Contents & Theology

Now to turn to the contents. Those have struck many commentators as peculiar, too. For instance, the opening words suggest that it is Jesus who is the subject in the preceding context and Mary is introduced as if for the first time. These verses hardly continue and explain what is written in vv. 1–8. The listing of the Resurrection appearances in a scanty manner in these verses looks more like a summary of Luke and John rather than a catalogue such as is found in the (earlier) 1 Corin-

---

\(^{18}\) As far as the verb φοβέομαι in v. 8 is concerned, the imperfect is followed by a direct object four times elsewhere in Mark (6:20; 9:32 11:18, 32) and that is normal in the NT and LXX, but there is no firm example of the imperfect in Mark where φοβέομαι is used absolutely. (At 10:32 v.l. by D and others omit the clause containing this verb.) At 16:8 we await a motive for the women’s fear. An English rendering that would indicate the interrupted sentence could end as follows: “…because they were fearful of.”
thians 15; and it follows a Jerusalem tradition, pace Mark 16:7, which looks to a Christophany in Galilee. The reference to signs following believers looks more Johannine than Markan. “Tongues” are nowhere else in our Gospels. Drinking poison without harm is nowhere else in the New Testament; this detail seems to belong better in the New Testament apocrypha. The picking up of snakes differs from Luke 10:19. Some of these anomalies can be argued over but cumulatively they tell against Markan authorship.

The Longer Ending is not counted in the Eusebian canon numbers. The canon tables do not allow for Jesus’ appearance to Mary Magdalene found in Mark and John. In some MSS attempts were made to extend the numbering system, without the canon table. These later insertions allow the numbers to reach beyond 233 with the new numbers in some manuscripts alongside vv. 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14.¹⁹

The evidence of the differences in language in the Longer Ending and indeed the problems of the theological contents of it seem to demand an author different from Mark, the author of 1:4–16:8. For readers who are apprehensive about dismissing vv. 9–20 as a later accretion, it may be worthwhile exploring if Mark could have incorporated these traditional verses into the Gospel himself, possibly (according to David Black)²⁰ at a later stage. After all, Luke seems to have taken over half a dozen canticles in chapters 1 and 2 that were probably in existence in Jewish circles prior to the composition of the Gospel. Some of them may even have already been used by John the Baptist’s disciples in telling of his nativity and then were commandeered and incorporated by Christians when they too began telling of their Lord’s birth.

Paul also borrowed hymns that were already in use in the early church, e.g., the kenosis hymn in Philippians 2:5–11; the “Christ hymn” in Colossians 1:15–20, and the hymn in 1 Thessalonians 5:16–22. The author of the Pastorals also uses a hymn in 1 Timothy 3:16. So there are adequate precedents in other New Testament writings to show that such things occurred (and we could also easily find similar literary borrowings within the Old Testament). But is Mark 16:9–20 one such literary composition taken over with approval by Mark to conclude his Gospel?

If it was, then the language, style, vocabulary, and even the theology are different from the undisputed words of the original author, as we have demonstrated. But it is rare (even unknown) for a NT author to lift, lock, stock and barrel, a narrative passage as opposed to a saying, a hymn, or a canticle, such as we are asked to believe Mark did when he found 16:9–20. It is an inferior piece of writing, plodding and grey, compared with Mark’s racy, simple, and colloquial writing elsewhere. If he did find such a passage already in existence, he certainly did not refashion it in his own style.

I am unwilling to credit Mark with the incorporation of this allegedly previously composed ending into his new Gospel. There is no evidence he has taken over any other comparable portion. Obviously, like all the evangelists, he used materials from the oral tradition. Matthew and Luke took over texts from Mark, but they rewrote them and left their own literary fingerprints on them. I am disinclined to believe that it was Mark, the innovative composer and creative theologian, who took over, unrevised, a paragraph such as vv. 9–20, especially as it may well have disagreed with his own theological stance.21

If I am right, then we are left with the argument that it was a later—probably second century—editor who found this paragraph and, despite its imperfections for such a purpose, used it (in time for Irenaeus to know it as part of Mark’s Gospel) to round off a dissatisfyingly incomplete Gospel—especially if that Gospel was by then being used to complete a fourfold Gospel canon.

*Western Gospel Order*

Another point that may be relevant is that in some early MSS Mark appears not as the Second Gospel to which we are accustomed but at the end, that is in the fourth position. This is the so-called Western order—Matthew, John, Luke, Mark—intended to put the writings by the two apostles before the two written by friends of the apostles. We find that sequence in MSS W, D, X,22 “several” of the older Greek minuscules,23 Gothic, Syriac Peshitta, Old Latin MSS. For them, of

---

21 For instance, the teaching that believers will be granted miraculous powers and that signs will prove the truth of the preaching is against Mark 8:11–13.
22 Early MSS א B C have Mark second in sequence.
course, 16:9–20 forms the climax of the whole collection. Is the summary of the Easter events found in 16:9–20 particularly significant coming in that sequence, summarizing the preceding four Gospels’ accounts? May one even suggest that the addition of the longer ending occurred first when the Gospels were collected together and originally published in that sequence? If Mark really was circulating in a form that ended at 16:8 its ending would look even more inappropriate as the conclusion to the four-fold collection. The longer ending would then be made the finale to all four Gospels and not just to Mark; its stories of the differing doubters about Jesus’ resurrection and its stirring message on Jesus’ lips are presumably intended as an appropriately hortatory climax to all four. Once added, this ending was kept even when Mark was placed in a different position among the Gospels.

Concerning Mark’s Intent

Before we turn to possible reasons why Mark lost its original ending, let us first ask if Mark really intended his work to end at 16:8. Many commentators and scholars are prepared to defend the version of Mark ending at 16:8 as a viable literary and theological composition. The retired Lady Margaret professor in Cambridge, Morna Hooker, recently published two little monographs. In these she showed the effectiveness of the ways in which each of the four evangelists opened and closed their Gospels. She tried to demonstrate that Mark’s original

---

24 See T.C. Skeat, “A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of the Gospels and Acts (P 45).” Hermathena 155 (1993) pp. 27–43, reprinted as chap. B5 in J.K. Elliott (ed.), The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat (Leiden: Brill, 2004) = Supplements to Novum Testamentum 113, pp. 141–57, esp. 146–47, Skeat argued that the Western order was that originally found in the Alexandrian MS \( \Psi ^{66} \), cp. id., “Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon” NovT 34 (1992) pp. 194–99 reprinted as chap. A6 in id., ibid., pp. 73–78, which argues that Irenaeus knew the Gospels (in a codex) in that order. Also, in “The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?” NTS 43 (1997) pp. 1–34 reprinted as chap. B6 in id. ibid., pp. 158–92 Skeat is prepared to conjecture that the earliest Western order was originally also in \( \Psi ^{66}\)-\( \Psi ^{64}\)-\( \Psi ^{67} \), despite their fragmentary nature.


intended ending was 16:8, which she sought to prove was a proper and significant conclusion. On such a theory, the women’s silence must be understood to be temporary and positive.

If Mark was subtly leaving his Gospel with a cliff-hanging ending, emphasized by his deliberate use of the provocative γάρ, then that subtlety was lost on his immediate followers and into the next century. Because his purposes were misunderstood early on, certainly before AD 180, the alternative endings we know today were tacked on. If Matthew and Luke used Mark they also found Mark’s ending deficient and added different Easter appearances to conclude their accounts. It seems they did not have anything to use in Mark beyond v. 8.27 Similarly, later scribal copyists of Mark also clearly found a Mark that ended at 16:8 dissatisfying—and wrong.

A sophisticated author could conceivably end his work in such an apparently truncated way in the knowledge that his audience were aware of what happened next, probably that these women, having regained their confidence did, indeed, do as the angel commanded and told the disciples. But to my eye Mark is not that sort of sophisticated author.28

The message that the women disobeyed the angelic command out of fear is a bizarre climax. Such an ending leaves unfulfilled the expectation that Peter and the other disciples will see the risen Jesus in Galilee. Are we to assume that the continuation of the story containing this promised Christophany was so well known that Mark felt he could withhold it? I doubt it: it is not in the nature of this Gospel that Mark points us forward without giving us the completion. His emphasis on Jesus’ divine foreknowledge of forthcoming events in the passion nar-

---

27 On the basis of Markan priority there is no evidence that Matthew and Luke were dependent on Mark’s Easter narratives. Both have different Easter stories. We cannot use Matthew or Luke to make claims about what they may or may not have read in their copies of Mark in chap. 16. If Mark was composed in AD 65 then its ending may have been lost before Luke and Matthew in the 70s-80s found it. Mark M.W. Waterman (The Empty Tomb Tradition of Mark: Text, History and Theological Struggles [Los Angeles: Agathos, 2006]) is another recent scholar who argues that Mark did not intend to go beyond 16:8 because his main interest was in the empty tomb. He lists (in his chap. 3 and in the Appendix) scholars who have accepted this position and the other main theories about the endings of Mark.

28 N. Clayton Croy (The Mutilation of Mark’s Gospel [Nashville: Abingdon, 2003]) is particularly good at exposing the weaknesses in arguments that 16:8 was Mark’s intended conclusion. He shows that it was the result of new critical methodologies, such as “reader-response” theories and the like, that anachronistic attempts to recruit Mark as a sophisticated author were made.
rative is a significant part of his Christology—for example, his predictions about the preparations in the upper room, the double cock crowing, the desertion of the disciples after the arrest, the betrayal by one of the twelve and so on are all fulfilled in the stories that follow. In all these cases Jesus knows what is to happen and inevitably these things come to pass.

The other Gospel writers show no reluctance to report the announced Christophany. Why should they? Even Paul, who shows little interest in or knowledge of what Jesus said and did during his ministry, is actively aware of the earliest traditions about the end of Jesus’ career and its continuation. Post-Easter stories belong to the earliest stratum of the Jesus story, and had been in existence for a generation before Mark wrote. It would be odd if he were the only one to be reluctant to include such incidents. It would be even odder if, by ending at 16:8, he gave the impression that the Resurrection message was not passed on!

Once the original ending beyond v. 8 was lost, an alternative ending that seemed to meet with general approval was concocted—that is to say, the ending known to us in the majority of our MSS. Only then could Mark’s composition be accepted unreservedly and read satisfyingly.

Concerning Others’ Intentions

Although we have suspected that the original ending to Mark’s Gospel was vulnerable to accidental shortening, it is worth asking if the shortening of the now lost ending could have been deliberate.

Could it be that a motive for the deliberate suppression of the original ending of Mark was indeed the very fact that it contained an appearance to Peter, as promised in 16:7? As we have it in the longer, spurious ending, Mary is specified as the first (πρῶτον) to witness to and believe in the resurrected Jesus. The summaries following emphasize that, by contrast, others, including Peter, are all doubters.

There seems to have been a reluctance from the beginning to tell of Jesus’ Christophany to Peter, especially if it was independent of a general appearance to the Eleven or if it occurred first. But some echoes of the tradition have survived. In Luke, Cleopas and his companion are keen to relate to the disciples that they have just witnessed the risen Christ in Emmaus, only to be informed that these two, otherwise unknown, followers, were not the first to see him; they are told that he has “already appeared” to Simon (Peter) but the episode itself is
not included. Paul, despite his rivalry with Peter expressed through his letters, is also aware of this private Christophany first to Peter (1 Cor 15:5). Obviously, an appearance of the risen Christ to Peter was so well known that reference to it could not have been expunged entirely from the tradition, but it is mysterious that no record of the encounter has survived.

We do not need to be seduced by modern preoccupations with Mary Magdalene and associated alleged conspiracy theories to note the significance that she is credited in this non-Markan ending (16:9) with a private, first, Christophany. That information thus superseded a story of Jesus’ appearance to Peter.

There seem to have been rival claims concerning Peter’s supremacy. We see this theme of questioning Peter’s primacy emerge elsewhere. The idealized Beloved Disciple and Peter are portrayed strangely in the Easter stories of the Fourth Gospel, where the issues are: Who wins the race to the tomb? (The Beloved Disciple): Who looks inside first? (Peter); Who believes first? (The Beloved Disciple). And just who is this rival to Peter anyway, this “beloved” but anonymous, disciple? John’s story of the first Easter morning matches the Gospels’ uncertainty about the Christophany to Peter; all this is peculiar, given his prominence. (We recall the saying about the keys of the Kingdom in Matthew 16:18–19, and the rehabilitation of Peter in John 21.) The overall picture is ambivalent.

Why, then, is there no surviving story of a Christophany to Peter? My suggestion is that there had been and it stood in the original ending to Mark’s Gospel but, because of the later reluctance to credit him with this revelation, that ending needed to be removed.

I leave these interesting speculations to one side now, but merely repeat the questions if the original ending to Mark contained an appearance to Peter and if it was that which was the motive for its deliberate suppression.

*Concerning Accidental Removal*

Let us now approach the reason why some MSS have Mark end at 16:8 from a different angle. If vv. 9–20 had been written by Mark or even if a different, now lost, ending was there, some have asked how

---

29 E.g., in Galatians 2.
the ending may have been *accidentally* removed. Burgon and others, reluctant to accredit the loss to mere wear and tear or to carelessness, latched on to the little word τέλος (presumably intended to indicate the end of a church lection) found in some MSS alongside 16:8.

It was therefore said that a scribe, coming across this word at the end at v. 8 thought that he had reached the end not of a lection but of the whole Gospel, and therefore expunged everything written beyond that point. Such an argument strikes me as weak and unnecessary. It is unlikely scribes would have been so deceived or beguiled by such a meaning for τέλος when they could see more was to come.

*Additional Considerations*

Let us now briefly examine the problems I have detected in the first three verses of Mark and which are more fully expounded in an article.30 First we must note that here there are no complete MSS of Mark that lack the opening verses (although we recall that there are no very early MS witnesses to this Gospel).

The problems are as follows:

1. **Punctuation.** Where do we print a full stop in these opening verses? It could occur after v. 1 or v. 3 or v. 4.
2. **Textual.** The text is uncertain, especially in v. 1.
3. **Theological.** Is the “beginning of the Gospel” the coming of John the Baptist, the forerunner? In the other Gospels Jesus’ pre-eminence is emphasized before John is introduced.
4. **Language and style.**

   • v. 1: The names Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occur together only here in Mark.
   • εὐαγγέλιον occurs eight times in Mark, seven of these refer to the divine plan in Jesus’ teaching. The one exception is 1:1 where it refers to the messianic action. Of the other seven, only at 1:14 is εὐαγγέλιον qualified (by τοῦ θεοῦ or v.l. τῆς βασιλείας): that seems particularly appropriate, if this is indeed the first mention (and on Jesus’ lips). The qualification Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 1 is unique.

---

• καθὼς always follows its main clause elsewhere and proves something stated; it is not used in anticipation. Even if v. 1 runs on, that rule cannot be made to apply. If v. 1 is a title ending with a full stop then καθὼς is, uniquely, at the beginning of a sentence.
• ἀρχή elsewhere is used temporally. Possibly v. 1 runs onto v. 4 but that is unlikely.31
• The quotation from the Old Testament is not only unusually extensive for Mark but this is the only citation from the narrator. Elsewhere a citation is within speech. And this is the only citation introduced by the words καθὼς γέγραπται.
• If it is an independent verse, v. 1 is verbless. Such a practice is exceptionally rare in Mark.

Thus there is a very high density of un-Markan usage—far higher than in 16:9–20, as it happens!

We also ought to note that the citation from Isa 40:3 found in Mark 1:2–3 is in the Matthaean parallel (Matt 3:3). The rest of Mark’s citation is found in Matthew 11:10 and paralleled in Luke 7:27. If Mark 1:2–3 were original and read as such by Matthew (and Luke) it is odd that they then unravelled Mark’s citation, putting it into two different contexts, one Markan, the other Q.

If these arguments are correct, then we have corroborative evidence that Mark’s Gospel was damaged at both ends (although not necessarily simultaneously nor, initially, in the same manuscript).

Let us also return to Kelhoffer. What he tried to do was to investigate where 16:9–20 could have come from, assuming, rightly, that it was not Markan nor traditional material in existence prior to AD 65, found by Mark and used by the evangelist to conclude his own writing. Arguing that it was added to a truncated Mark in the mid-second century, he investigates what its context could have been. He sees these verses almost as floating material, comparable to some of the second century apocryphal fragments that have been discovered. The difference here is that the fragment has been attached to what was soon to be accepted as a canonical Gospel, and as such it has remained. It did not survive independently of Mark. Kelhoffer looks in particular at the miracles referred to in 16:17–18. Those are seen as uncharacteristic

31 Croy (Mutilation, pp. 124–30) shows how in later MSS this word served as a “marker” to show where a new reading began.
of a first-century writing such as Mark, but are entirely compatible with second-century Christianity, and he finds many parallels in that century’s literature.

Kelhoffer has been rightly commended for locating a plausible context for this passage. I find his arguments overwhelmingly convincing. Kelhoffer says that the ending was no hastily compiled epitome, although we must make it clear that it was inappropriately cobbled on as a conclusion that can scarcely be said to develop or belong to vv. 1–8.

Thus 16:9–20 may be compared with additions to some Old Testament writings, e.g., the apparently later additions to Ruth, or to the Psalter, or to Deuteronomy. Those contrast with the abrupt ending to Ezra and the unfinished nature of Jonah, which serve as examples of texts that cry out for additions. Several pieces of literature in antiquity were revisited, edited, shortened, lengthened and (in the case of Acts) reissued in a second edition. What we thus witness with ancient literature shows that texts that were read and used were subsequently liable to reediting.

**Conclusion**

The textual problems at the end of Mark and indeed the fluid text in much of the New Testament as a whole make talk of inerrancy, as narrowly defined by some, indefensible. Realistically applied to the New Testament the term must allow for errors in the transmission of the text. Unfortunately, the misuse of this word is bandied around rather like the use of “infallibility” when applied to *ex cathedra* pronouncements by the Pope.

We may argue that the original authors of the biblical texts were themselves inspired but to pretend that their words were transmitted unchanged is stretching credulity to its breaking point. Further, to argue that a particular strand of the MS tradition, typically the text represented by the Textus Receptus, or the Majority text, uniquely preserves, through “providential care,” those inspired words in their entirety ignores the scientific results of textual criticism as practised in the past century or more, and such preconceived conclusions alienate academic discussion that depends on open and free inquiry. My work on MSS makes it clear to me that the New Testament is nowhere free from accidental and deliberate error and that the text certainly was
never transmitted free from blemishes. It is our task as text critics to identify these secondary accretions, wherever they may occur and in whatever MSS.

The Münster Institut speaks of *Ausgangstext*, a reconstruction as close as scholarship enables one to get to the possible original, authorial wording but one that explains the starting place from which subsequent existing corruptions arose. This they are trying to do in their *Editio Critica Maior* at present containing only the Catholic Epistles. As with other printed critical editions, I have my reservations about the resultant text they produce, but it is differing from NA$^{27}$—although not enough in my estimation. However, they are arriving at their text independently of any preconceived assessment about the Byzantine text or of any MS, Egyptian or otherwise. As a thoroughgoing text critic, I think that that seems a step in the right direction.

Inerrancy is not coterminous with canonicity. When the fathers promoted certain texts as authoritative for Christians to read, they would accept, e.g., the Gospel of Mark or the Epistle to the Romans. They did not require a particular form of Mark or Romans. They never stated that in commending Mark they had in mind only the version of Mark running up to 16:8 or to 16:20. The Mark accepted as canonical was the form of the text the person, individual church, or monastery happened to possess. We noted earlier that certain MSS containing the Longer Ending do so with a health warning, an obelus, marginal note, or other sign; antiquity was reluctant to omit verses deliberately, especially if the text in question was seen as a part of Jesus tradition. Church usage recognized the Longer Ending since it was of great antiquity, and once it was eventually included in Gospel MSS, it was read in public services. This was pious inclusiveness. Moreover, we cannot nowadays forget that for most of its history the Gospel of Mark was interpreted and used by those who assumed (wrongly, we might say) that vv. 9–20 were part of Mark's original composition.

On the other side, to denigrate the text found in א or B as if these are particularly corrupt specimens fails to recognize that at the very least the users of those MSS in antiquity read them as their form of canonical Scripture. My own approach to textual criticism allows that the correct, original text (or, better, the *Ausgangstext*) has been preserved, by sheer chance, somewhere in our 5,000 surviving Greek witnesses. Sometimes it may well be found in the majority of Byzantine MSS but at other times in א or B (as in the case of the ending of Mark), or at other times in an occasional minuscule or a unique majuscule. I am,
however, reluctant to accept conjectural emendation, and that is why I am cautious in my proposal about the secondariness of Mark 1:1–3, although I am prepared to admit that such a necessity may exist on occasions. The opening of Mark may well be one such occasion.

The word “canonical” does not imply “original” and it certainly does not involve appeals to divine protectionism, inerrancy, or inspiration (whatever those words are said to mean). Such judgments are made about texts by a certain brand of church tradition. The Bible may well be a collection of inspired writings or an inspired collection of writings (i.e., writings not intended by their authors to be so, but deemed to be so by later Christians) but whether those definitions can help to decide on the rough and tumble of textual variation is improbable. The sooner that the language of inerrancy is dropped in the context of textual criticism the better it will be for scholarship.

Obviously, most of our surviving witnesses contain vv. 9–20 and, as such, these verses have been accepted as canonical Scripture, i.e., recognized by the church as definitive for Christian theology and practice. Bridget Gilfillan Upton, in *Hearing Mark’s Endings*, makes a case for all three major endings to Mark. For her each was designed to have an effect on an audience that was hearing them read. She is not concerned with originality but merely to show that each ending known in the MS tradition was usable and could be effective rhetorically—and, of course, the users of the differing MS traditions were obliged to work with the form of Mark that they happened to possess.

But her work does not prove that any one of these texts was the text published by its author. Even the shorter ending would have been accepted as canonical where it appears in a MS. Let us take another example. The saying about the man working on a Sabbath found after Luke 6:4 in Codex Bezae (D) is a logion not accepted as authentic to Luke, but the owners of D would not have known that. There we are dealing with a saying found in a canonical text; other *ipsissima verba* may not occur in a text that became canonical Scripture. Paradoxically therefore, it may happen that a non-authentic saying attributed to Jesus may occur in a canonical Gospel and therefore by definition itself became canonical and authoritative, whereas an authentic saying may have survived only in a church father’s writing or in apocryphal

---

New Testament texts. The pericope of the adulteress is a floating piece of Jesus tradition (perhaps even an authentic story, and certainly as historically accurate as some other similar episodes), but it is probably a piece of an apocryphal text that never belonged to the original form of Luke or of John. Because it is now found in some MSS of the New Testament, it was not only preserved but branded as a part of canonical Scripture, Holy Writ. Mutatis mutandis, the same applies to the differing forms of Mark’s Gospel.

I conclude with two citations:

- Samuel Tregelles:33 “...[T]he remaining twelve verses, by whomsoever written, have a full claim to be received as an authentic part of the second Gospel, and that the full recognition of early testimony on this question does not in the least involve their rejection as not being part of canonical scripture.”
- Raymond Brown:34 “...[W]hile New Testament books are canonical, no particular Greek text should be canonized; and the most one can claim for a critically prepared Greek New Testament is scholarly acceptance” (italics mine).

Postscriptum

Other articles on the endings of Mark in the book from which my chapter comes are by Daniel B. Wallace, David Alan Black and Maurice Robinson. All the contributions are assessed in a response by Darrell L. Bock.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

THE TEXT OF ACTS IN THE LIGHT OF TWO STUDIES

The variants found in the Greek text of Acts that are included in this paper have been selected for three reasons: 1) They all contain readings which have the combined support of the Byzantine majority text and papyri. These have been taken from the lists to be found in Harry A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville, Camden, New York: Thomas Nelson, 1984). 2) They have a bearing on the study of Acts by M-E. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *Le Texte Occidentale des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstruction et Réhabilitation* (Paris: 1984), to be referred to hereafter as B + L. In their work B + L print as Lucan two versions of Acts, the Alexandrian (TA) and the Western (TO). 3) They show differing types of scribal emendation.

In each variant discussed the texts printed by B + L as either TA or TO are shown. The text printed by Nestle-Aland²⁶ (N-A²⁶) is also shown below, and, when they are available, I have noted the views of the United Bible Societies’ Committee as reported by B.M. Metzger in his companion commentary on the UBS text,³ the third revised edition of which is virtually identical with that in N-A²⁶ 7th printing.

The encouragement to those of us practising radical eclecticism in relation to textual variation is clear from both Sturz’s book and from the principles applied by B + L. Neither the Western text nor the Byzantine text should be dismissed as containing by definition a suspect text. These two recent studies clearly show the antiquity of these text-types and also that their distinctive readings deserve our close consideration. That having been said, let us now pay some attention to some of these readings. The representative selection of types of variants is set out under separate headings.

---

1. Hom

Some readings in our mss. are likely to have been created accidentally through scribal carelessness. Where *hom* (to use A.C. Clark’s word) can be demonstrated to have operated, a useful and basic rule of thumb is that the longer reading is likely to be original—other things being equal.

The old rule, *brevior lectio potior*, is unlikely to be as helpful to us. When assessing textual variation it is more common to find that an originally longer text was accidentally shortened than that an originally short text was deliberately expanded e.g. out of a desire to add explanatory glosses. The latter did undoubtedly occur, but when a clear palaeographical or optical reason for the former can be demonstrated this can often be a decisive argument in favour of the longer reading. As is well-known, it is within the D form of the Western text and in the Byzantine tradition that the text is, in general, the longer.

Two examples from Sturz’s lists will suffice:

a) List I p. 154:

Acts 17:13 σαλευσοντες : P45 Byz
σαλευσοντες και ταρασσοντες : P74 Ν B D.

ταρασσω is a word used elsewhere by our author (cf. Acts 15:24; 17:8) and is likely to be original here. The Byz text happens to be the shorter at this point! The accidental shortening can be explained as due to parablepsis caused by the repeated ending οντες.

[N-A26 has the longer text. B + L print the longer text both for the Western Text (TO) and in their Alexandrian text column (TA).]

b) List V p. 203:

Acts 5:32 αγιον o  P45 Ν A Byz
αγιον oν D *
αγιον B

[o = Westcott and Hort (= WH) text : o deleted in WH margin]

If oν were in the text originally *hom* would have encouraged its accidental deletion following αγιον. If oν were changed deliberately then the alteration o could be explained as a grammatical ‘correction’. The reading of D * can be justified as *ad sensum* (but not a correct
other examples of such a practice may be seen in the New Testament at

John 6:9: \(\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\rho\iota\nu\circ\ (v.l. [= \textit{varia lectio}] \circ)\)
Gal 4:19: \(\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\iota\circ\ldots\circ\upsilon\circ\)
Phil 2:15: \(\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ldots\epsilon\nu \circ\iota\varsigma\)
Col 2:19: \(\kappa\epsilon\varphi\alpha\lambda\eta\ldots\epsilon\circ\varsigma \upsilon\)

and indeed in Acts itself at 15:36: \(\pi\omicron\omicron\lambda\iota\nu \epsilon\nu \circ\iota\varsigma\).

[B + L: \(TA = [o]\)
\(TO = o\)
N-A\(^{26}\) : \(o\)]

Another instance of an apparent lack of concord may be seen at Acts 10:37:

Sturz’s List I p. 154 includes:
\(\alpha\rho\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\) \(P^{15} \text{ Byz}\)
\(\alpha\rho\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron \circ \upsilon \ B \ [\text{WH N-A}^{26}]\) \([252]\)
\(\alpha\rho\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron \gamma\alpha\rho \ P^{74} \text{ D}\)

[B + L: \(TA \text{ and } TO = \alpha\rho\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\)]

Here \(\alpha\rho\xi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\) is likely to be original. The form -\(\omicron\)v and the addition of \(\gamma\alpha\rho\) may be seen as grammatical improvements. NT usage seems to allow appositional phrases and circumstantial participles to be in the nominative rather than in the oblique cases, although scribes often avoided such a practice as may be seen by the \(v.l.\) indicated in the following list: Matt 10:11 \((v.l.)\); Luke 20:27 \((v.l.)\); 21:6; 24:47 \((v.l.)\); Acts 7:40; 2 Thess 1:5 \((v.l.)\); Jas 3:8 (but here see the punctuation) and the occurrences in D at Matt 4:16; 5:40; 17:2, 9, 14. According to N. Turner \textit{Syntax} p. 316 the references here to Luke-Acts show that the lack of congruence in participles is not confined to the least educated writers in the NT.

2. Fixed Expressions

With theological and other terms, such as ‘the grace of God’, ‘the word of God’, one may assume that an author’s practice would attain a
fixity of usage. Textual variants deviating from that norm could then be described as due to scribes’ having conformed the original expression to a differing version of the formulae, possibly under the influence of liturgical practice. Such scribal alterations were not undertaken consistently throughout the text.

a) ‘The holy spirit’
   List II p. 170

   Acts 8:18 + το αγιον P45 P74 D Byz

   om. το αγιον B [W H, N-A26]


   New Testament usage provides examples of both ‘Spirit’ and ‘Holy Spirit’. The addition of αγιον may reflect a pious expansion due to liturgical practice and this could explain v.l. + αγιον, but in the context of Acts 8:18 ‘Holy Spirit’ occurs three times (cf. vv. 15, 17, 19) and these are apparently textually firm. The removal of αγιον at v. 18 may therefore be explained as due to a scribe’s having deliberately excised the adjective on stylistic grounds.

   [B + L: TA and TO om. το αγιον]

b) ‘Grace of God’
   List IV p. 194

   Acts 15:40 θεου : P45 C Byz

   κυριου : P74 Θ BD [WH. N-A26]

   In their discussion B + L refer us to 13:46 and 14:26 although only the latter is relevant (on 13:46 see below (c)). Metzger’s Commentary also refers us to 14:26 as the cause of the reading θεου. We could by contrast suggest that the direction of change was the opposite and that, if assimilation were the cause of the scribal alteration, the parallel expression at Acts 15:11 could be adduced. But, as so often in such matters, it seems to me that the author’s total practice elsewhere is relevant. ‘Grace of God’ is our author’s stock expression (cf. 11:23;
13:43; 14:26; 20:24 and at Luke 1:30; 2:40). The phrase ‘grace of the Lord’ is found at 1 Tim 1:14 but within a context that makes it clear that κυρίος = θεός. The grace of the Lord, defined as Jesus (Christ) is to be found in the New Testament e.g. Rom 16:20, 24; 1 Cor 11:23; 2 Cor 13:13; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; 1 Th 5:28; 2 Th 3:18; Phlm 25; 2 Pet 3:18; Rev 22:21, but the significance of these references is that they occur in doxologies and closing greetings. Such a practice in early Christianity doubtless encouraged scribes to alter θεοῦ to κυρίου. 

χαρίς + κυρίου ησου (χριστου) may be seen in our author at Acts 15:11 (cf. 2 Cor 8:9) but this apparent exception may perhaps prove the rule, because, as in the doxologies, κυρίος here is unambiguous because it is defined.5

[B + L : TA = κυρίου; TO = θεοῦ]

c) Λόγος + θεοῦ/κυρίου

As with ‘the grace of . . .’ both ‘the word of God’ and the ‘word of the Lord’ occur in the New Testament. The apparent ambiguity of the title κυρίος again tempts us to argue that this alone seems to have been responsible for scribes changing this noun for an unambiguous title such as ‘God’, or ‘Jesus’ as appropriate. This sort of temptation (at least!) must be avoided.

With a set expression like ‘word of—’ we need to assess the validity of other arguments such as those deduced from our author’s (or from NT) usage.

Sturz refers us to the v.l. at Acts 16:32 because of the support for one of the readings by a combination of Papyri and the Byzantine text type.

List IV p. 194

κυρίου : P45 P75 Νc Byz [N-A26]
θεοῦ : Νc B [W H, N-A25]
[B + L : TA = τον λόγον τον θεον
      TO = τον λόγον (B + L argue that the archetype of D omitted the divine name with some cursives).]

Following is part of the list in B + L Index Ca λαλειν τον λόγον του θεου/κυριου where we note:

Acts 4:31 θεου firm
  8:25 (TA) κυριου v.l. θεου
  13:46 θεου firm
  (cf. Phil 1:14 θεου; Heb 13:7 θεου)

Other instances where θεου follows λογος in Acts are:

6:2; 6:7 (v.l. κυριου); 8:14; 11:1 (v.l. κυριου); 12:24 (v.l. κυριου); 13:5 (v.l. κυριου), 7, 44, 48 (v.l. κυριου); 17:13; 18:11.

Despite the variants, there are sufficient firm examples of λογος του θεου to establish our author’s practice.

λογος followed by κυριου is to be found at:

13:49 (v.l. om.); 15:35 (v.l. θεου); 15:36; 19:10 (v.l. ιησου); 19:206 20:35.

At 20:35 κυριου is defined by ιησου. The firm example of λογος του κυριου at 15:36 makes it more difficult to pontificate on the originality of θεου at 16:32.

The interchangeability of κυριος and θεος may also be seen in three other v.ll. in Acts, not included in Sturz’s lists, but which are of interest:

(i) Acts 10:33 θεου

   (P74 D Byz
   κυριου P45 Κ B [WH. N-A26]
   B + L : TA = κυριου
   TO = θεου

---

6 Here του κυριου probably belongs to the preceding κρατος, but note here the changes in word order in some mss. and also the v.l. κρατος/πιστευ.
Metzger says κυρίου is original because the committee was (as so often) ‘overwhelmed’ by the mss. supporting it, but here θεοῦ is a strong contender. The repetition of θεος in the verse may have encouraged a stylistically conscious scribe to substitute it for what in the context would be an unambiguous κυρίου.

(ii) Acts 17:27 θεοῦ P74 B κυρίου E Byz

Again, we may be dealing with a set expression. We have a firm example of ‘seeking God’ at Rom 3:11. There are no examples of ‘seeking the Lord’. (Pace G.D. Kilpatrick who prefers the originality of the ambiguous κυρίου7)

(iii) ‘Church of God/Lord’

This well-known v.l. is not given by Sturz. ἐκκλησια κυρίου occurs seven times in the LXX but never in the NT without v.l.: ἐκκλησια τοῦ θεοῦ occurs eleven times in Paul. Do we argue for Pauline usage in Acts? This is not impossible. If so, then κυρίου may have been introduced by a scribe familiar with the phrase in the LXX. Or has the opposite occurred? The UBS text committee decided on the originality of θεοῦ (see Metzger’s Commentary ad loc.) but the argument about κυρίου as an ambiguous word may on this occasion encourage us to accept it as original: the unambiguous θεοῦ or [χριστου] look like explanatory secondary readings. Here the Byzantine text looks like a conflate.

[B + L: TA = θεοῦ
TO = κυρίου]

(d) ‘From heaven’

Would this qualify as a stereotyped formula? Sturz’s list I p. 154 includes:

Acts 9:3 \( \alphaπo \ του \ ουρανου \) P\(^{45}\) Byz
\[ \varepsilonκ \ του \ ουρανου \] P\(^{75}\) \( \kappa \) B [WH. N-A\(^{26}\)]

\[ \text{[B + L : } \ TA = \varepsilonκ \]
\[ \text{TO = } \alphaπo \]

If this is likely to have become a set expression NT usage and, in particular, the usage in Luke-Acts would favour the originality of \( \varepsilonκ \), cf. Acts 2:2; 11:5, 9; 22:6; Luke 3:22; 10:18; 11:13, 16 etc. \( \alphaπo \ του \ ουρανου \) is found at Mark 8:11 (\( \varepsilonκ \)); Luke 9:54 (\( \varepsilonκ \)). The anarthrous \( \alphaπ \ ουρανου \) occurs without \( \varepsilonκ \) at Rom 1:18; 1 Tim 4:16; 2 Tim 1:7; Heb 12:29 and in our author at Luke 21:11. (At Luke 22:43 \( \alphaπ \ ουρανου \) \( \varepsilonκ \) occurs.)

3. Author’s Style

Even though author’s style can be determinative in discussing the categories listed above under subheadings (1) and (2) and of course in other matters, I am including here three issues where an individual author in the NT may be shown to apply his own distinctive favourite forms. The first example, taken from Sturz, is easily dealt with:

(i) List II p. 169 Acts 4:34 \( \upsilonπηρχεν \) P\(^{8}\) D Byz
\[ \etaν \] P\(^{74}\) \( \kappa \) B [WH. N-A\(^{26}\)]

\[ \text{[B + L : } \ TA = \etaν \]
\[ \text{TO = } \upsilonπηρχεν \]

Of the sixty or so occurrences of \( \upsilonπαρχω \) in the NT about forty occur in Luke-Acts. Thus it seems likely that \( \upsilonπηρχεν \) is original here. This verb may have been altered in v. 34 in particular to avoid three occurrences in three verses.

(ii) The examples given under this number, together with example (iii) below, all taken from Sturz, open wider issues, that, again, may be resolved by an appeal in the first instance to an author’s own usage, before we look at the NT practice in general.

List II p. 169

Acts 5:3: \( \piετρος \) P\(^{8}\) D Byz
\[ \o \piετρος \] \( \kappa \) B
and

Acts 5:8  ο πέτρος  P D Byz
          Π B

[WH and N-A follow Β in both verses and thus print a text which makes the author’s practice look inconsistent.

B + L : 5:3  TA = [ο]  πέτρος
           TO =  ο  πέτρος
5:8  TA =  πέτρος
      TO =  ο  πέτρος

At 5:3 B + L II p. 33 states ‘L’article devant le nom de Pierre est omis par D avec la Koinè contre la tendance du TO; il est attesté en revanche par le groupe Alexandrin également contre sa tendance’.]

A few years ago I dealt with the NT’s ways of referring to Peter’s names and devoted some pages to the variants concerning the article with Πετρος (pp. 252 f.). My conclusion there was that, as far as Luke’s gospel was concerned, the article should be read as original at 9:20 (v.l. om). In Acts the picture is more confused. Variants concerning the presence or absence of the article with Πετρος may be found at Acts 1:15; 2:14; 3:4, 6, 12; 4:8; 5:29; 9:31; 10:21, 34, 46; 11:4. In the light of the evidence from the gospel, one would be tempted to opt for v.l. + article were it not for the firm anarthrous occurrences at Acts 2:38; 3:1; 8:20; 9:38; 10:9; 11:2; 15:7. A final decision on the v.ll. at 5:3, 8 is therefore awaited.

But in this context we may also take from Sturz’s List II p. 169:

Acts 7:13b  του ιωσηφ  P5 D Byz
          ιωσηφ  B C [WH, N-A]
(Ν A have αυτου)

Here the name ‘Joseph’ occurs earlier in the sentence, firmly without the article (cf. also v. 14 following for a similar usage). It is tempting to reject the originality of του at v. 13b also.

---

In this connection we may also add from Sturz’s List V p. 203:

Acts 16:17: τῶν παυλῶν P45 P75 Π D Byz [N-A²⁶]

[WH hesitatingly print τὸν παυλόν.]

B + L: TA = παυλός

TO = τῶν παυλῶν]

Our author’s general practice seems to have been to include the article with Paul’s name, but a final decision must await a thorough investigation into Luke’s use of arthrous or anarthrous proper names.

(iii) A firmer decision may perhaps be reached with the variants concerning the use of the name Egypt in Acts. Αἰγύπτος occurs thirteen times in Acts 7. At 7:15 the inclusion of Egypt is in dispute as it is omitted by B (and as a consequence, bracketed by WH).

This v.l. occurs in Sturz’s List IV, p. 194.

[B + L: TA = om. εἰς Αἰγύπτον]

καταβαίνω is normally followed by an object e.g. Acts 8:26; 14:25; 16:8 and thus the longer text is likely to be original at 7:15. Another instance involving this noun is at 7:18 where επ Αἰγύπτον is in dispute. See Sturz’s List II p. 170:

επ Αἰγύπτον P74 Π B [WH.]

om. επ Αἰγύπτον (P65) D Byz

[The longer text is bracketed by N-A²⁶.

B + L: TA = longer text

TO = omit.]
to be following the LXX closely it is more likely he had the wording of the LXX originally.

Here we can assess the relevance of our author’s practice. It is certainly characteristic of Luke to write anarthrous Αιγυπτος, cf. Acts 7:9, 10 bis, 12, 17, 18, 34 bis, 39. Likewise it is characteristic of him to use the LXX phrase γη Αιγυπτου. There are v.ll. at Acts 7:11, 36, 40; 13:7 reading the article, but there are no firm instances of arthrous Αιγυπτος. To read εις Αιγυπτον at 7:15 and επ Αιγυπτον at 7:18 therefore does not violate our author’s normal practice.

4. Attic Usage

An issue wider than that of one Biblical author’s style and usage is the usage of the NT as a whole. One aspect of this wider question concerns v.ll. in which one reading seems to support an Attic word or phrase and another reading supports a Koine equivalent. There have been several studies of Attic/Koine v.ll. in relation to the NT text.9 In the present context I note that Sturz includes in his list I p. 154:

Acts 11:11 ημην P145 Byz
ημεν P74 Βδ [WH. N-A26]
[B + L : TA = ημεν
TO = ημην]

Many would overlook such a v.l. as a mere orthographical slip and opt for the reading found in their favourite mss., as the editors of N-A26 and W + H did. In the context first person singulars regularly occur in verses 5–12 and one such is expected here too. If ημην were original it could have been altered because of the reference to the men who were with Peter in front of the house. If accidental, the change could have occurred in either direction. Metzger’s Commentary ad loc. explains that UBS (and N-A26) print ημεν as the more difficult reading. But is it?

If Atticism is a relevant consideration here we would note that ημεν is Attic and ημην not, the declension being:

---
Moeris\textsuperscript{10} and Phrynichus\textsuperscript{11} condemned the use of ςμην as non-Attic (cf. Moeris’ commendation of ςσθα against ςζς).\textsuperscript{12} One way of avoiding ςμην would have been to alter it at Acts 11:11 to the 1st p.p. (cf. Acts 10:30 where ςμην is also avoided and cf. the \textit{v.l.} concerning ςμεθα at Matt 23:30; Gal 4:3; Eph 2:3 or ςσθα at Mark 14:67 (but firm at the parallel, Mt 26:69) against seven firm instances of ςζς).

It is therefore unlikely that ςμεν is original at 11:11. There is no firm example of this form in our author (at Acts 20:8 \textit{v.l.} ςσαν is probably correct: this verse does not form part of the ‘we’ passage). At Acts 27:37 ςμεν occurs, but note \textit{v.l.} ςμεθα. There are, however, some firm instances of ςμεν in the NT outside our author, e.g. 1 Th 3:4, 10; Tit 3:3.

An assessment of the relative worthiness of the different texts to represent the original text is inappropriate on the basis of the above sample, but the general tendency reinforces the normal argument of radical eclecticism that the correct, i.e. original, text is to be sought throughout the ms. tradition and not restricted in the way shown in our usual printed editions.

\textsuperscript{10} In I. Bekker, \textit{Harpocration et Moeris} (Berlin: Reimerus, 1883) § 197.32.
\textsuperscript{11} In W.G. Rutherford, \textit{The New Phrynichus} (London: Macmillan, 1881) § 240.4.
\textsuperscript{12} Bekker § 197.34.
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

AN ECLECTIC TEXTUAL STUDY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS

The distinctive characteristics of the transmission of the text of Acts are well-known, especially the longer ‘Western’ text and the alleged tendencies of its main representative, Codex Bezae, when compared with the shorter text in the so-called Alexandrian uncial manuscripts (normally followed in modern editions and translations). The issues raised by these features, their resolution in terms of establishing a presumed ‘original’ text and the explanations proffered for the subsequent history of that text are usually readily available in introductions to the New Testament, in commentaries on the text of Acts (recently that by Barrett in his ICC commentary1 is most helpful in this regard), and, conveniently and succinctly, in Metzger’s Textual Commentary.2

There is thus no need in the present article to rehearse all the differing views that have been expressed regarding the alleged superiority of one line of transmission to represent Luke’s original text, the motives for adapting that text in later mutations of it, the possibility that Luke himself was responsible for both main textual forms, or that both main text types represent editions of a now lost original.

In this context ‘original’ means a form of the text as close as possible to that issued, ‘published’, by the author.3

Ropes set out two forms of the text as represented by B and D in Beginnings of Christianity III.4 Boismard and Lamouille printed their

---

reconstructed *Texte Alexandrin and Texte Occidental* in parallel columns in *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres*.5

The great diversity in the transmitted form of this Biblical book, when compared with that of the Gospels and Epistles may be due to the fact that Acts as a narrative and with comparatively less teaching lends itself to later editorial revision, expansion or contraction. In this respect the textual history of Acts invites comparison to the way in which the apocryphal Acts were treated.

But most commentators, certainly all translators and editors of a printed Greek testament, need to work on only one form, the presumed original from which all subsequent changes are based. They do not have the luxury of using two forms such as displayed by Ropes or by Boismard and Lamouille, however much they choose to use their footnotes to tell us what ‘other ancient manuscripts’ add or subtract or change from the text they print above.

In choosing to print one and only one form of the text of Acts the editor, translator or commentator must make decisions at each point of textual variation in the manuscript tradition unless he is (rarely) deciding to work from the text of one manuscript only throughout. Ropes argued for the relative superiority of the Egyptian ‘Old Uncial’ text of Acts. Few now would agree with his view that the Western text is merely a later editor’s logical expansion of the original text. Nor would many agree with A.C. Clark6 who maintained the superiority of the Western text-type. In practice we may see that Ropes was often prepared to desert B in favour of Western readings and Clark asterisked readings which he accepted from outside the Western tradition.

Even the United Bible Societies’ edition which may be seen as a clone of Westcott and Hort’s edition and thus heavily dependent on the readings of B adopts a less doctrinaire approach to textual variants when it discusses Acts. This change in policy is expressed by the spokesman for the UBS committee, B.M. Metzger, where he writes in the *Textual Commentary*5, p. 235:

---


Inasmuch as no hypothesis thus far proposed to explain the relation of the Western and the Alexandrian texts of Acts has gained anything like general assent, in its work of editing that book the United Bible Societies’ Committee proceeded in an eclectic fashion, judging that neither the Alexandrian nor the Western group of witnesses always preserves the original text, but that in order to attain the earliest text one must compare the two divergent traditions point by point and in each case select the reading that commends itself in the light of transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities.

In practice we may see that the resultant text is less eclectic than that statement may lead us to expect but the ‘thoroughgoing’ text-critical approach espoused here strikes me as the best way—indeed the only way—to proceed with the editing of Acts, given its distinctive and complex textual history.

This article will thus be concerned with how editors and readers may deal with the morass of variants found in a full *apparatus criticus* of Acts by suggesting how the consistent application of criteria concerning intrinsic probability cuts through barriers such as the Western text versus the Old Uncial text and may assist in determining the original text and in explaining (in a way not always commonplace in a discussion predetermined by a prejudice in favour of the Western, Egyptian or Majority text types) how and why the secondary readings arose. In many ways the principles applied below are compatible with many of those to which ‘rational’ text-critics at least pay lip service and which are set out in various places. What a more consistent, that is a thoroughgoing, application of such principles can do is demonstrated in my sample below. Obviously in a short article only some examples can be covered, but it is to be hoped that the methodology demonstrated can be applied consistently throughout Acts (and indeed in the rest of the New Testament) to show that principles based on objectively agreed criteria, such as an awareness of the author’s style, and of the distinctiveness of the first-century Koine Greek language and an alertness to palaeographical considerations, may enable a resolution of most of the problems caused by variant readings in the manuscripts. I shall not indulge in a discussion of alternative text-critical theories nor shall I review previous literature on the verse or variant currently


---
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under the microscope. Hence footnoting and cross-referencing will be substantially reduced.

To achieve a single version of the text of Acts most ‘rational eclectic’ textual critics and editors pick and choose among the extant manuscripts, with support from versions and, where available, Patristic citations. They then print what they consider to be the best reading, usually and especially from among the oldest witnesses and with regard to the widest geographical spread. Thoroughgoing eclectic critics are less inclined to be bound by issues concerning the number, weight or alleged quality of particular manuscripts, and thus feel less inhibited in selecting the original reading from among the whole gamut of available variation units, initially regardless of their manuscript attestation. This is the approach I shall adopt here.

For recent discussions of the role of thoroughgoing textual criticism compared to the principles and practice of reasoned eclecticism and other methodological approaches see the recent books edited by Black,8 and by Ehrman and Holmes.9

Even those who balk at the application of thoroughgoing eclecticism, claiming it is subjective, liable to support readings found in only a few, or late or potentially maverick witnesses, are in practice less than consistent to their own principles when it comes to readings in Acts. In even the UBS text, used also in the current Nestle edition (hereafter = NA), we find at Acts 16:12 πρωτης μεριδος της which represents the Provençal and Old German versions only!

Such a genuinely eclectic approach to variants goes back to the earliest printed Greek testaments. Acts 9:5–6 in Greek was printed by Erasmus as a back translation from the Vulgate. His annotations have: Durum est tibi. In graecis codicibus id non additur hoc loco, cum mox sequuntur, Surge sed aliquanto inferius, cum narratur haec res. Nevertheless he printed the longer reading. That reading even infiltrated the AV (KJV) and thus has influenced English theology since then.

Similarly Acts 8:37 is not found in the Greek manuscript (now numbered 2816) used principally by Erasmus for Acts, but was none-theless translated by him from Latin into Greek. He considered the verse to have been accidentally omitted by scribes (*arbitror omissum librariorum incuria*).

A gloss at Acts 10:6 in the Latin was also translated in Erasmus’ Greek. The reading is found in the margin of the 15th-century manuscript 69 and itself may have been added after 1516; it is also in the 11th-century 1611, but that manuscript was not known to Erasmus. So, again, Erasmus was prepared to be swayed by his familiarity with the Vulgate and to include into his supposed original text, reconstructing Acts in Greek, a reading known to him outside his stock of available Greek manuscripts. [Erasmus was certainly alert to textual variation. In his Annotations of 1535 he discussed the reading Καυδα at Acts 27:16, known in his day only in B (recently arrived in the West), although his editions maintain the reading Χλαυδα.]

Let us now come to some examples where textual variation can be discussed not in relation to the manuscripts in support of the alternatives but in terms of which reading is primary (original) and why and how the secondary readings came about. Those who disagree with some of my arguments must either try to bolster those arguments with better or more convincing evidence or propose alternative arguments why X is right and Y and Z wrong. These examples are divided into several sections and subdivisions. The first concerns the language of the first century, mainly Hellenistic usage and Semitisms, including the use of diminutive forms. Secondly we turn to our author’s style including his use of periphrastic tenses and his repetitive style, and then to certain distinctive grammatical and syntactical uses, including his practice with proper names, notably ‘Jerusalem’. Under 3 we turn to palaeographical considerations, especially *homoiooteleuton* and under 4 certain orthographical features, concentrating on the augment with verbs with initial diphthong. Section 5 covers the assimilation of Old Testament citations in the New Testament to the wording found in the Septuagint. 6 deals with a small and random selection of variants, on which modern editors need to reach a decision. Section 7 looks at some variants where Alexandrian witnesses are allied with the Byzantine text-type in certain, set expressions.
1. New Testament Usage

1.1 First-Century Language

1.1.1 Atticism

When we have a pronouncement from the Atticist grammarians like Phrynichus and Moeris on what was deemed to be good Attic Greek and what, in their day, was identified as Koine, we may often find that the feature commented on, be it vocabulary or syntax or stylistic usage, is subject to textual variation when it occurs in the New Testament. Our criterion for dealing with such variants is to argue for the originality in the New Testament of the non-Attic reading, it being reasonable to assume that scribes in later centuries, influenced by the grammarians’ judgements would have altered (albeit not always in a thoroughgoing or exhaustive way) the offending term, and to argue that the direction of change would always be away from an original Hellenistic or Koine expression.

1. Thus Phrynichus CXXX and Moeris \( \eta \)\(^2\)\(^{10} \) preferring the Attic declension \( \eta \pi \theta \alpha \eta \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \pi t \pi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \)\(^{11} \) over against the Hellenistic \( \eta \mu \mu \eta \eta \pi \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha \eta \pi \sigma \alpha \nu \) condemn \( \eta \mu \mu \eta \) in favour of the Classical \( \eta \). It is therefore not surprising to find variation in our New Testament manuscripts over such matters. In Acts 11:11 \( \eta \mu \mu \eta \Psi \)\(^{45} \) H L P S; \( \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \psi \)\(^{74} \) A B (cf. 10:30 \( \eta \mu \mu \eta \); \( \epsilon i \mu i \Psi \) 1838, and 27:37 \( \eta \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha \) B A; \( \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \psi \) H L P 33 69 maj.). Our inclination here is to read the Koine form of the verb as original to our author and to argue that the Attic form is secondary. Note that D alone reads \( \eta \) (1 p.s.) for \( \epsilon \gamma e \nu \sigma \mu \eta \nu \) at Acts 20:18.

2. Moeris \( \alpha \)\(^{74} \) (cf. Phrynichus VI) condemns \( \alpha \chi r \iota \varsigma \) preferring only the form \( \alpha \chi r \iota \). Again there is variation in the New Testament manuscripts. In Acts the following are found:

---


\(^{11}\) As is usual in textual criticism accents and breathings are not printed.

3. By the same token we will prefer the Hellenistic form χαριτα to the Attic accusative χαριν because Moeris χ30 condemns the former. In Acts that means we shall read χαριτα at 24:27 against χαριν read by N Ε L 614. Note here that Ν itself reveals the change, Ν* χαριτα; Ν χαριν thus showing such a change was deliberate, not accidental. At 25:9 A reads χαριτα; χαριν cett. In Paul χαριν occurs without v.l.

4. Moeris ε20 states that ευλαβεισκαί in the sense of φοβεισκαί is Hellenistic. It is therefore of no surprise to find the following v.l. at Acts 23:10: ευλαβησεις H L P 1854 maj; φοβησεις ℃. We recommend printing the former as the original.

5. Phrynichus CLX tells us that ουδεις is Attic and therefore to be preferred, and that ουθεις is Koine. Not surprisingly variation over this orthography occurs in our manuscripts. In Acts the following variants are found: 15:9 ουθεν B H L P 049; ουδεν cett.; 19:27 ουδεν D L Ψ 33; ουθεν ℃ A B Ρ; 20:33 ουθενος ℃ Ρ A E; ουδενος cett.; 26:26 ουθεν Ν* Β; om. ℃ Ν* A33; ουδεν cett.; 27:34 ουθενος A; ουδενος cett.; cf. also 27:33 μηθεν ℃ Ρ Α B; μηδεν cett. (UBS/NA follow their favourite manuscripts Ν B and thus print the only occurrence of this spelling in the New Testament!)

6. Away from orthography we see that a matter as significant as a change in gender was commented on by Phrynichus and possibly affected the textual tradition of the New Testament as a consequence of such a ruling. Phrynichus CLXIV tells us that λιμος is masculine in Attic usage. This will explain the reason for the changes to the Attic masculine in the following variant: at Acts 11:28 we read μεγαν...οστις in D H L P but many manuscripts read μεγαλην...ητις (but see E which reads μεγαν...ητις!) (cf. Lk 4:25; 15:14).

7. ερωταν meant ‘to request’ in Hellenistic usage rather than ‘to question’. (See Mk 7:26.) In Acts we find this verb with the meaning ‘request’ at 3:3; 18:20; 23:18.20 and that conforms too to Luke (where επερωταν is reserved for the meaning ‘to question’) and it occurs seventeen times. επερωταν is found at Acts 5:27 and cf. 23:34 (v.l. επερωσησας L). At Acts 5:28 the sentence must be punctuated as a question: ου παραγηγελα...τουτω. In printed editions we find ερωταν in the sense ‘to question’ at Acts 1:6 but the variant επερωταν should be accepted as original with D E 33 etc. (against ερωτων/ερωτουν in Ν
At 10:48 ἐρωτήσαν in the sense of ‘request’ obviously caused problems. D here reads παρεκαλέσαν (cf. the longer addition by D at 16:39 which includes παρεκαλέσαν).

1.1.2 Semitisms

At Acts 3:12 we find, ἀπεκρίνατο: ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν D. Once we recall that the middle aorist is an Atticism and that the passive aorist of this verb is Hellenistic then this helps us resolve the problem. We should therefore accept ἀποκριθεὶς...εἶπεν as original. In Acts the passive aorist occurs some 19 times against this one disputed occurrence of the middle. The middle also occurs elsewhere in the New Testament six times (Mt 27:12; Mk 14:61; Lk 3:16; 23:9; John 5:17.19 and all are with v.l. avoiding this voice).

The reading by D incidentally betrays a Semitism, which scribes also often tried to remove. The stylistic feature of this Semitism helps us at other places. In Acts 4:19 D reads ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ...εἶπον. Printed texts give us ἀποκριθεῖν...εἶπον. Here the question of the agreement of the verb with the subject comes into play. As the subject of this verb is plural, ἀποκριθεῖν...is grammatically correct, but may be seen as an improvement. New Testament authors sometimes take the person of the verb from the nearest noun even if that is not the only subject. Thus ἀποκριθεὶς may be doubly right here.

In contrast to this variant at 4:19, at 16:33 D has αὐτὸς εβαπτίσθη καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ against the original εβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ which makes the inconcinnity less pronounced; cf. 5:21 παραγενομένοι Β* against παραγενομένος, and 14:14 ἀκουσας δὲ Βαρνάβας καὶ Παύλος D against the grammatically correct (and expanded) plural subject ἀκουσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀποστόλοι Βαρνάβας καὶ Παύλος.

1.2 Diminutive Forms

Diminutive forms of nouns are relatively common in the New Testament. Often the force is not that of a diminutive, and there are then variants removing the diminutive form. Our rule of thumb in such

12 Support for this meaning comes from the noun. At 1 Peter 3:21 in the context of baptism the hapax ἐπερωτήμα appears to require the meaning ‘a request (to God for a good conscience)’ , rather than, as is it often misunderstood, ‘the pledge (of a good conscience)’. 
variation units is to maintain the diminutive as Koine and original and to explain the non-diminutive variant as secondary. There are several instances in Acts. For example, the non-Classical hapax νησιον at Acts 27:16 is avoided by 88 915 (νησον) which is clearly secondary. See also the v.l. νεανισκος at 20:9 (by 614 1505 1611 2412 2495 2147); 23:17 (by 2147); 23:18 (by N A E 81 323 547 945 1245 1739 1891 2344); 23:22 (by P74 N B E 33 2344) contra νεανιας. We do however note the firm instance of νεανιας at Acts 7:58. Nonetheless the direction of change seems to be away from the diminutive form.

Let us now select certain other diminutives forms from the manuscripts of Acts:

αργυριον. Acts 17:29 αργυριον P74 A E etc.; αργυρω cett. The same manuscripts alter χρυσιω to χρυσω and we see at Acts 3:6; 20:33 that the diminutive forms of αργυριον and χρυσον survive unaltered, thus revealing here as elsewhere that change to the text was spasmodic, inconsistent and thus was incomplete.
κλιναριον. Acts 5:15 κλιναριον P74 Ν A B D 1739; κλινων cett. In each instance the variant giving the diminutive form is likely to be original.

2. Author’s Style and Usage

Each author has his own distinctive fingerprints. C.H. Turner helped us recognise Mark’s characteristic use of Koine Greek. Other authors in the New Testament have not been subjected to such an intense scrutiny, but nonetheless readers can recognize and identify unique traits in all our authors. Assuming that for the most part authors are relatively consistent in their use of certain phrases, grammatical features and vocabulary, we may use such touchstones to recognize variants that conform to our author’s known proclivities and to be able to separate these from readings that show a divergence from them. This section includes our author’s use of periphrastic tenses, his repetitions, his treatment of certain grammatical features, and his habit with proper names (Jerusalem, Simon Peter, and the Land of Egypt are taken as samples).
2.1 Periphrastic Tenses

C.H. Turner lists some twenty-four examples of Mark’s preference for the periphrastic tenses. Scribes often tried to eliminate that feature; as a consequence many of these twenty-four are not textually secure in our manuscript tradition, there being many v.ill. In Acts too periphrastic tenses are found, again with v.ill.:

6:4 προσκαρτερήσομεν: εσομεθα…προσκαρτερούντες D.
10:6 ουτος ξενιζεται: και αυτος εστι ξενιζομενος 614 1611 2412 d.
[Also here note that ουτος is better style than και αυτος and therefore is also likely to be secondary.]
14:4 εσχισθη: ην εσχισμενον D.
17:23 επεγεγραπτο: ην γεγραμμενον D.

Significantly we see at 10:30 the Hellenistic ημην…προσευχομενος; at 20:8 ημεν (ησαν) συνηγμενοι; and at 21:3 ην…αποφορτιζομενος (there are no v.ill. for these).

The periphrastic tenses should be accepted as original in all the above variation units.

2.2 Repetition

The author of Luke-Acts (unlike Mark) seems impervious to repetition. Scribes often noticed such repetitiveness and occasionally tried to eliminate it. The following examples in Acts may be places where stylistically conscious scribes attempted to limit repetition:

1:10–11 εις τον ουρανον occurs four times but v.ill. om. εις τον ουρανον (sec.) in v. 11 by D 33 69* 242 323 330 1270 may be seen as a way of reducing the occurrences.
4:34 υπηρχεν Ρ* D Byz; ην Ρ74 & B (= NA). υπαρχω occurs some forty times in Acts out of sixty occurrences in the New Testament as a whole. υπαρχω occurs three times in this immediate context and thus may have merited pruning by stylistically conscious scribes.

---

7:9–18 ‘Egypt’ occurs six times. In v. 15 B omits εἰς Αἰγυπτον; in v. 18 D E H P pler. om. επ Αἰγυπτον.

9:12 om. εν οραματι Ψ74 Χ A. The expression is used in v. 10.

13:41 om. εργον D L P 049 88 330 440 at the end of the citation. This is not in the LXX version of Hab 1:5. Assimilation to the LXX (see Section 5) may have encouraged the omission. The longer text also repeats the wording of the previous line and that too speaks in favour of this reading.

23:2 εκελευσεν C 88 945 1739 1891; επεταξεν cett.; παραγγειλεν Ψ74. κελευειν occurs in 22:30; 23:3 so the avoidance of this repetition may have been a consideration here. επιτασσω is not found elsewhere in Acts so is unlikely to have been original here. Scribes tended to avoid κελευειν followed by the dative. This usage seems to have offended some scribes’ sense of grammatical correctness.

There are many other places where scribes avoided repetition. I note briefly some further examples where our author repeats the same word but where variants avoid the repetitiveness:

6:8 πιστεως v.l. χαριτος Ψ74 Χ A B (πιστει earlier)
7:49 ποιως D v.l. τις cett. (ποιων occurs earlier)
8:37 ευνουχος v.l. om. (ευνουχος occurs four times in vv. 36–39)

The likelihood is that the repetition here, as elsewhere, is original, the reason throughout being that the author of Acts is prone to repetition.

2.3 Grammar

2.3.1 BDF14 § 279 states that εμε after prepositions is emphatic in the New Testament as in Classical usage, but προς is an exception and προς με is normal (although προς εμε sometimes occurs in some manuscripts). When we examine our Greek testaments it seems that

---

there are no undisputed examples of προς εμε. προς με is firm at Mt 3:14; 11:28; Lk 6:47; John 5:40; Acts 22:10; 26:14; Tit 3:12. At Mt 3:14 προς με is emphatic but not accented.

In Acts there are variants at the following verses where εμε is found in some manuscripts:

11:11 Ν*: 22:8 Ν* A B; 22:13 Ν%A B (nb Ν* has made the change deliberately); 22:21 C; 23:22 Ν B; 24:19 Ν Α B C E 33 81 1739 2344.

NA at Acts 24:19 was swayed by the manuscript attestation and therefore prints προς εμε but that must strike its readers as most peculiar. At John 7:37 NA prints προς με. εμε is in its critical apparatus. NA prints εμε at Lk 1:43 (v.l. με in its apparatus); at 14:26 it prints με and ignores v.l. εμε; the same is true at 18:16; see also John 6:35 εμε (apparatus shows v.l. με); 6:37bis εμε (bizarrely only the second occurrence has v.l. με in the apparatus, even though the variant occurs both times!); 6:45 εμε v.l. με shown. [As another indicator of inconsistency in NA note that it prints με (v.l. εμε shown) in the previous verse (6:44) as at 6:65 (v.l. shown).]

2.3.2 Pronominal εκεινος occurs at Acts 3:13; 21:6 (cf. κακεινος at Acts 5:37; 15:11; 18:19) but at 10:9,10 there are v.ll. At 10:9 εκεινον is omitted by Ψ74 Ν A E L 33 etc.; at 10:10 for εκεινον Ψ74 Ν A B C read αυτον. εκεινον should be read at both places.

There are some fifteen adjectival uses of εκεινος in Acts, where it follows its noun. That seems normal in New Testament usage as at 2:18 (in the quotation from Joel 3:1–5) although here om. D; 7:41 (see further Section V below); 9:37 in the expression ‘in those days’ and cf. 12:6 ‘in that night’; 19:23 εκεινος follows καιρος but at 12:1 it precedes καιρος (no v.ll.). The expression precedes the singular ‘in that day’ at 8:1 and in D (!) at 2:41. All other manuscripts at 2:41 have εν τη ημερα εκεινη cf. εν εκεινη τη ορα at 16:33 (no v.l.). That conforms to Lukan usage in his Gospel. There are some nineteen examples of εκεινος following its noun and six preceding the noun (when it is either ημερα singular or plural or ορα: Lk 5:35; 6:23; 7:21; 9:36; 17:31; 21:23). Other examples of εκεινος preceding a noun that is not a time expression are at Lk 12:47; 13:4; 20:18 which are emphatic in their contexts. It is common in the other Gospels too for εκεινος to precede the noun in certain time expressions.
2.3.3 Occasionally we find variation in a manuscript and indeed in our printed editions between differing forms of a third declension comparative adjective. Again Moeris may help resolve the variant. Moeris α75 states αμεινω Αττικοι αμεινονα Ελληνες cf. Β8; η10; π8. (The New Testament significantly prefers μειζονα to the Classical μειζω. NA prints μειζω at John 1:50; 5:36 in both places showing as a variant the Hellenistic reading.)

Applying that information about the ‘contracted’ comparative forms to πολυς we find that πλειους is Classical, πλειονας Hellenistic. Given our previous examples we should accept πλειονας other things being equal at Acts 13:31 with D* at 19:32 with 1175; at 25:6 with \( \Psi \) B 1827; at 27:12 with A B; at 27:20 with all manuscripts except A* 049 056 1175. Our printed editions show their inconsistency in that πλειους occurs in all the above places except at 27:12.20 (πλειονας/ -ας)! However, other things may not be equal here. At Acts 21:10; 23:13.21; 24:11; 25:14 πλειους is firm. At Acts 28:23 πλειονες is firmly attested. Other criteria need to be investigated. Possibly the presence of πλειους with (επι) ημερας at 13:31; 25:6; 27:20 is due to this being a set expression.

2.3.4 In Hellenistic Greek πληρης is indeclinable only when followed by a dependent genitive (BDF § 137). Otherwise it is declinable. Attic declined πληρης. The form πληρης has no v.l. at Acts 6:8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; 13:10 (cf. Lk 4:1; 5:12) but these are nominative singular masculine and feminine and so there is no problem. In the oblique cases we find Acts 6:3 πληρεις v.l. πληρης A E H P 88 431 915 alii. This is followed by a dependent genitive. At Acts 6:5 πληρης is read by most other manuscripts; πληρη B C 583 623 etc., again followed by a dependent genitive. At Acts 19:28 indeclinable πληρης is read by A E L 33; the declinable form is read by most other manuscripts—this too is followed by a dependent genitive. Therefore we suggest that one should accept the indeclinable form as the original text in all three passages. NA reads πληρεις πνευματος at 6:3 but πληρης πνευματος at 6:5 (cf. 7:55; 11:24): what are its hapless readers to make of this?
2.4.1 Jerusalem

There is frequently textual variation over the two forms of this name (Ιεροσολυμα and Ιερουσαλημ) in manuscripts of the New Testament. In Acts editors need to resolve the issue. Most printed editions present a confused picture that renders it well nigh impossible for exegetes and commentators to explain why our author apparently capriciously flits from one to the other without any apparent logic. The confused picture is not resolved by a rigorous application of the cult of the ‘best’ manuscripts nor by a blind adherence to the majority text type, for all manuscripts seem prone to indiscriminate usage. Nor is an appeal to possible different sources helpful in explaining the change from one name to the other. I have tried to resolve the issue by checking the firm instances of Ιεροσολυμα and the firm instances of Ιερουσαλημ to see if a pattern emerges to enable a pronouncement at those places where the manuscripts divide. The sensitivity and self-conscious usage of place names that differ in different languages or among different cultural groups may have their modern-day counterparts in multilingual Switzerland or Belgium, where writers take care not to offend or cross linguistic boundaries by using the place name inappropriate to the context or audience. This methodology for the variants Ιεροσολυμα (Greek)/Ιερουσαλημ (Hebrew) seems sound and, even if it does not meet with universal approval, it behoves detractors to come up with a comparable scheme that takes account of the undisputed instances and of the variants. (The examples below may be compared to the self-conscious use of the two forms in Paul’s letter to the Galatians cf. Gal 1:17f; 2:1 Ιεροσολυμα with 4:25f., concerning the Jewish tale of Hagar where the Hebrew form is found, as is to be expected). We recall Luke’s self-conscious use of language for the opening two chapters of his Gospel.

The manuscript evidence summarized briefly below reveals that if one were to follow blindly the text as found in one’s favoured manuscript then the resultant text printed would betray a confused and confusing picture. That is indeed the current situation felt by careful readers of our currently available printed editions. My own suggestion to resolve the difficulty is to discover, with the help of the firm examples, if Luke had a reason for using one form of Jerusalem in certain contexts and preferring the alternative in other contexts. ['Firm’ here means examples for which no textual variant has been reported to my
knowledge. The reading, collating and publishing of an increasingly larger number of cursives may result in some hitherto firm examples being disputed in the manuscript tradition, and we would then need to adjust these statistics accordingly. I suspect that few of the examples listed here will be affected.]

I note that Ἱεροσόλυμα occurs without variant at Acts 1:4; 13:13; 25:1.7.9.15; 26:4.10. In chapters 25–26 Festus would be expected to have used the Greek form (see v. l.l. below at 25:3.20.24). The name at 1:4 is in an editorial section, addressed to the Greek ‘Theophilus’. 13:13, however, is geographical and in a context in which the Hebrew is expected.

Ἱεροσόλυμα is firmly established at Acts 1:8.12b.19; 2:5.14; 4:5.16; 5:16.28; 6:7; 8:26; 9:2.13.21.26.28; 12:25; 13:27.31; 15:2b; 21:11.12.13.31; 22:5.17.18; 23:11; 24:11. Mainly the contexts here apply to Palestine (chapters 1–7) or in Jewish contexts (8–9). 13:27.31 takes place in a synagogue; 15:2 occurs in the reported speech between Paul and Barnabas where it may have been thought that the Hebrew form was natural; chapter 22 is also a special case, v. 2 tells us Hebrew was the language of the speech; 23:11 occurs in angelic speech, which often contains Semitic features (cf. 8:26). The instances in chapter 21 occur in a ‘We’ section that may have originated with a Jewish diarist (but see below). In 24:11 the Jerusalem spoken of here is in the context of the city of the Temple hence the Hebrew form seems most appropriate—even in a speech attributed to the Roman Governor!

All the above suggestions may help us resolve the following places where there is variation:

1:12a. E alone reads Ἱεροσόλυμα but the Hebrew form, read by all other manuscripts, seems likeliest here in the context of a description of the Mount of Olives’ being a sabbath day’s journey from Jerusalem. Other geographical references where the Hebrew is found are Acts 2:5; 11:2 but against that see 13:31 above.

8:1 like 1:4 occurs as an editorial addition, and again ‘Jerusalem’ was presumably in Greek as this section tells of the spread of Christianity outside Palestine in chapters 8–15. (Manuscript 2344 reads Ἱεροσόλυμα.)

8:14 D reads Ἱεροσόλυμα contra Ἱεροσολύμοις cett. Here the apostles from Jerusalem are likely to have been referred to using the Hebrew form (cf. apostles/disciples from Jerusalem at 2:42 D; 6:7 and see 15:4; 16:4 below). But at 11:27 the reference to the ‘prophets from Jerusalem’
has ‘Jerusalem’ in Greek in all manuscripts except 1175, which may then preserve the original form.

8:25 Ἰερουσαλὴμ H L P against Ε A B D. 8:27. Jerusalem here is the city of Jewish worship. Read the Hebrew form with all manuscripts (except 917). In 8:25–27 the Hebrew form should be read three times (the occurrence in v. 26 is firm).

10:39 This occurs in Peter’s speech. The Hebrew name is likely to be original and is found in all manuscripts except 33 489 623 927 1175 1270 1872 2344.

11:2 Read Ἰερουσαλήμ with Ε A B against D maj. This is a geographical reference; see 1:12 above.

11:22 Ψ74 Ε B Ἰερουσαλήμ against E H L P 181. The context is geographical.

11:27 Ἰερουσαλήμ (the reading of Ε C D) against Ψ74 A B occurs in the context of ‘prophets of Jerusalem’ cf. 8:14.

15:4 Ἰερουσαλήμ Ε C D against Ψ74 A B 88. (See 8:14 above.)

16:4 Ἰερουσαλήμ maj against Ε A B D! (Again, see 8:14.)

19:21 Ἰερουσαλήμ H L P against most manuscripts. The Hebrew is arguably original, as Paul’s thoughts are being recorded here.

20:22 Paul addresses the Ephesians; many Christians there were Jewish (see Acts 18–19) and so the reading Ἰερουσαλήμ of most manuscripts should be read against D Θ 88 Ἰεροσολυμα.

The following four variants occur in one of the so-called ‘We’ passages in Acts, which may be significant if we consider the source to have been from a Jewish diarist. The Hebrew form is found elsewhere in this section in this chapter. 20:16 Ἰερουσαλήμ Ψ74 Ε against B C D; 21:4 Ἰερουσαλήμ H L P against maj.; 21:15 Ἰερουσαλήμ H L P against maj. (Hellenistic form); 21:17 Ἰερουσαλήμ Ε 614 1505 et al. against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts.

25:3 Ἰερουσαλήμ against E 618 927 1270 1738 (Ἰεροσολυμα). The Hellenistic form is likely, given the context; 25:20 Ἰερουσαλήμ H L P 618 against the Hellenistic form found in other manuscripts. Again the Hellenistic form is likely. (See 25:1.7.9).

25:24 Ἰερουσαλήμ E (!) against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts. Festus is speaking here as at 25:20; likewise in Paul’s response the Hellenistic form occurs (26:4.10). Thus here and at 26:20 we should read Ἰεροσολυμα, with all manuscripts except E (Ἰερουσαλημ).
28:17 Here Paul is in Rome speaking to Jews as at 13:27.31. Ἰεροσολήμ with Θ 614 1505 1518 1611 2138 2414 2495 is to be printed, against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts.

We note that in the longer readings in D at 2:42; 8:1; 15:2 the ‘correct’, i.e. the Hebrew form appropriate to the context, is found, although on other grounds we may decide that the reading as a whole is secondary. At 18:21; 19:1; 20:23 the ‘wrong’ forms are found for the contexts at 18:21 in the speech to Jews in a synagogue the longer reading has the Greek form; at 19:1 the Greek would give a unique use of Ἰεροσολυμα outside the Festus story in the later chapters; at 20:23 the same may be said.

The above survey shows how the manuscripts divide erratically over this variant. It will be seen how these manuscripts are confused and that it is they themselves who sow that confusion.

Some may disagree over some details in specific verses, but unless one can come up with a better and more convincing alternative reason why Luke uses these two forms deliberately one has to admit that there is anarchy.

2.4.2 Simon Peter

Another proper name that caused scribal activity concerns ‘Peter’. Acts names Peter some fifty-six times. In the Cornelius story and the following he is ‘Simon called Peter’ four times (10:5.18.32; 11:13). At 15:14 Peter is called Συμεων, possibly indicating a different source for James’ speech and certainly one that gives the speech an appropriate Semitic flavour. Once again, we see that the author was sensitive to the form of proper names.

The concordance and apparatus reveal the following picture:

(a) Variants add the name Peter at 10:23 in C H L P 440 pler, and at 12:7 in 1243 2344 but see D (with 2344!) at 12:16 om. ‘Peter’.
(b) Variation over the inclusion of the definite article with Πετρος occurs at the following places (the manuscripts bracketed add the article):

1:15 (D); 2:14 (N A B D etc.); 3:4 (D); 3:6 (D); 3:12 (N A B etc.); 4:8 (547 1636); 4:19 (D 0156 104); 5:3 (N A B etc.); 5:8 (3 69 104 1739 etc.); 5:29 (056 33 88 429 915 etc.); 9:39 (C 431 440 614 etc.); 10:21 (D [23]
The following show where the article is firm with ‘Peter’:

1:13; 5:9; 9:34.40; 10:14.17.26; 12:5.6.11.16.18 (nom.)
2:37; 3:11; 9:40; 10:25 (acc.)
but see the firm anarthrous instances at 2:38; 3:1; 8:20; 9:35; 10:9; 11:2; 15:7.

My inclination is to accept the arthrous instances as original and to explain that scribes were tempted to remove the article before the name Peter once its origin and meaning were no longer uppermost in readers’ minds. In some verses that tendency was completely successful in eliminating the article from all extant manuscripts.

2.4.3 The Land of Egypt
The issue here is how we decide between γη and τη (Ἀγυπτ.). The following variants occur in Acts:

7:11 την Ψ 74 Μ A B C; την γην E A P 056 69; της γης D; γην 945 1505 1739 1891
7:36 γη Αγυπτου Ψ 74 D Θ 2412; γη Αγυπτω Μ A E H P S; τη Αγυπτω B C 69
7:40 γης Ψ 74 etc.; της 209 242
13:17 τη Αγυπτου Ψ 74 Μ A B; γη Αγυπτω C H L P; γη Αγυπτω Ψ; τη γη Αγυπτω D
cf. Heb 8:9 εκ της γης Αγυπτου; Jude 5 εκ της γης Αγυπτου.

The following verses are relevant: Acts 2:10; 7:9.10 bis.12.15.17.18.34bis. 39 cf. Mt 2:13.14.15.19; Heb 3:16; 11:26.27; Rev 11:8. An examination of the apparatus for these verses reveals that there is no firm example of the article with Αγυπτος. The variant may be explained on palaeographical grounds, THN and ΙHN look similar—one could have been accidentally written for the other. Coupled with that, as γη Αγυπτου is a fixed expression in the Old Testament the probability is that we should read γη above. The question about the dependent genitive Αγυπτου or the apposition (Αγυπτω) needs to be settled. In the Old Testament the dependent genitive is usual and that should help us to
clinch the originality of Αἰγυπτοῦ in the passages identified above in Acts.

3. Homoioteleuton

Whenever we are confronted by a variant that gives a shorter reading we need to check from the context to see if palaeographical considerations can be legitimately brought into play and ask if homoioteleuton or the like could have been encouraged an accidental shortening. Often the origin of a shorter text may be explained by parablepsis, that optical error where the scribe’s eye has jumped forward accidentally from one group of letters to the same or similar set later in his exemplar. Once such an error has occurred, and as long as the shortened text makes sense, such a reading can be perpetuated thereafter. In so far as we are concerned in our earliest Christian centuries with manuscripts that are written in scriptio continua then the term homoioteleuton need not be applied in its literal meaning. A.C. Clark coined the term hom for the phenomenon, because the like letter groups could come at the end, middle or beginning of words or even straddle words. Hom may well explain the v.11. at Acts 2:37 om. ινῶΠΟΥΣ D (ΤΟΥΣ precedes); 10:5 om. τιΝΑ L P maj (ΣιμωΝΑ precedes); 12:18 om. ουκ οινΩΣ D (because of ταραχΩΣ); 22:9 om. και εμφοβοι εγενΟΝΤΟ A B (. . . ΟΝΤΟ precedes); 27:41 om. των κυμαΩΝ A B (. . . ΤΩΝ).

It will be seen that even D, identified as a manuscript prone to longer readings, sometimes accidentally shortened its exemplar! Other examples, chosen at random are: 17:13 om. και ταρασσΟΝ ΕΣ Byz. (. . . ΟΝΤΕΣ precedes); 5:32 om. B; o Π A Dc; 15:36 ad sensum, although there D reads ωις to refer to αδελφους!] If hom is not applicable here at 5:32 then deliberate change on grammatical grounds is a possibility. [Further on Byz-Π alliances see Section 7 below.]

4. Orthography

The issue of variants related to orthography has been referred to in several examples discussed above. The special case of the temporal augment in verses with initial diphthong merits special mention here. I take just a few examples:
There are no firm instances of ηυ- but v.l. occur at Acts 7:11 ηυ-B E P 921 1241 2412 only (= NA); ευ- cett.; 8:40 ηυ- E only; v.l. ευρεθη cett. as read by NA. These two variants show the inconsistency of NA in this matter. Read ευ.-

4.2 ευχομαι

ηυ- Acts 27:29 in NA with Ὑ Bc maj. but ευ- B* C 049. The deliberate change in B is noteworthy.

26:29 ηυξαμην P. All other manuscripts read ευξα(ι)μην. Read ευ- in both verses.

4.3 ευφραινω

Examples at 2:26 and 7:41 again show that the printed editions are inconsistent:

2:26 ηυ- Α B C (= NA); ευ- cett.
7:41 ηυ- D P Θ; ευ- cett. (= NA).

4.4 ευκαιρεω

Acts 17,21 ηυ- (= NA); ευ- H L P maj. Read ευ.-

4.5 ευχαριστεω

27:35 ηυ- P Θ 69 etc.; ευ- cett. (= NA) (and see printed editions including NA at Rom 1:21 (ηυ- v.l. ευ-))! Note ευ- at John 6,11 (v.l. ηυ- D only).

4.6 οικοδομεω

7:47 οι- with B* D Θ and in the printed editions. οι- cett.

---

15 This issue is discussed in BDF § 67.
16 We may refer again to the Atticist Phrynichus, who advised (§ CXXXI) that this verb should not be augmented as οι-.
4.7 \( \alpha\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\omicron \)

5:19 \( \alpha\nu\omicron\iota\zeta\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\), \( \Psi\), \( \texttt{A}; \eta\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\omicron\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\;\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\;\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\;\varsigma\varsigm
the ambiguity. [Many variants concern Κυρίος when copyists have tried to be precise by altering this to Ἰησοῦς or to θεός as appropriate.] Here, as so often elsewhere, κυρίος is preferable. The LXX does not have this clause. Cf. 2:18 om. εν ταῖς ἁμεραῖς εκείναις D: LXX has the words. The reading of Ν A D etc. at v. 17 (εν ταῖς ἁμεραῖς εκείναις) fits its new context better, allowing the citation to stand away from its original context. The reading μετα ταυτα conforms the passage to the LXX. Similar motives may lie behind the reading concerning the pronoun in v. 17. υμῶν1,2: αὐτῶν1,2 D; υμῶν3,4: om. D; υμῶν5: om. C* E. υμῶν, although conforming to the LXX, is likely to be original at all four places. The ‘Western’ changes could have been theologically motivated to enhance the universality of the extent of salvation (cf. the changing of κατα σάρκα to κατα σάρκας by D earlier in this verse).

2:18 om. καὶ προφητευσοῦσιν D. Here this shorter reading by D conforms the citation to that in the LXX.

2:19 om. αὐτα…καπνου D. The longer reading conforms to the LXX but here we ought also reckon with the possibility that the longer text was original and was reduced accidentally through hom (ΚΑΤ…ΚΑΠνου).

2:20 καὶ επιφανὴ. These words are as in the LXX. v.l. om. Ν D. Again we need to weigh up arguments based on assimilation with arguments about hom. Here hom seems to have been responsible for the accidental shortening: μεγαλὴνΚΑΙΕπιφανὴΚΑΙΕ…

Cf. 7:18 ος οὐκ ηδεί τον Ἰωσήφ = LXX Ex 1:8; ος οὐκ εμνησθῇ του Ἰωσήφ D E. There Barrett (Commentary ad loc.) favours the Western reading, arguing that the alternative is due to assimilation to the LXX.

Barrett is also sympathetic to the variants in Acts 2:17ff. that depart from the wording of Joel in the LXX.

[27]

Thoroughgoing eclectic principles need to be carefully evaluated. Occasionally, competing criteria come into the picture. (In some ways we may compare this dilemma with similar problems faced by those who find that their favoured manuscripts, say Ν and B, go differing ways at a particular variant.) But textual criticism often involves the evaluation of criteria, and it ought not be concerned with the wholesale application of principles mechanically.
6. Varia

Here follows a small selection of variants where modern editors ought to reach a decision.

6.1 Acts 3:21

At 3:21 there are four variants in Greek:

των αγιων αυτου των προφητων D
των αγιων απ αιωνος αυτου προφητων Ψ²④ 8 Λ B*
παντων των αγιων αυτου προφητων απ αιωνος P
παντων των προφητων αγιων αυτου απ αιωνος 614 2412

απ αιωνος seems to have been added from Lk 1:70 although (less probably) the words could have been omitted if the question was raised whether prophets had indeed existed from the beginning. των αγιων was sometimes taken as a noun followed by an appositive, and that may have been the cause of some of the other changes. The Western text seems original.

6.2 Acts 10:30

The longer reading νηστευων και seems original. A shorter reading, omitting the words, makes no sense. The omission may have been occasioned because fasting was not mentioned in vv. 2–3. The meaning seems to be: “Four days ago I was fasting until this hour”, in other words Cornelius’ piety led him to a requisite period of fasting prior to baptism. A full discussion of this intriguing variant is found in Barrett, Commentary ad loc. and cf. Acts 9:9 and Did. 7:4.

6.3 Acts 13:33

Πρωτω D; δευτερω cett. (but in differing positions, a phenomenon that often indicates textual uncertainty); om. 1175. In so far as the Psalm from which the quotation comes is always now numbered as the second, πρωτω is the harder reading, and is the one likely to have been altered and therefore is the original. The reading may reflect a time when our first two Psalms were reckoned as one. (There exists some Rabbinic and Patristic evidence to that effect.) Ψ¹⁵ seems to read ἐν τοις Ψαλμοις here!
6.4 Acts 13:34

Our printed texts at Acts 13:34 begin with the sentence οτί. This may strike the perceptive reader as strange, because causal οτί follows the main clause in Mt, Mk, Eph, Pastorals, Heb, James, 1 Peter, 1&2 John. (There are no instances in 3 Jn or 2 Peter) There are exceptions in Jn and two exceptions in Paul out of fifty (Rom 9:7; Gal 4:6), where causal οτί precedes its main clause. There are exceptions too in Rev (3:10.16.17; 18:7) but all, apart from 3,16, may be punctuated to conform to the norm. As far as Luke-Acts is concerned, the apparent exception (at Lk 19:17) may be avoided. If it is to be read with the preceding then there is no exception. The servant is praised as ‘good’ because of his fidelity. (The asyndeton with ισθι is normal.) At Acts 13:34 the variant οτε read by D 255 614 1175 2412 gig Hil merits attention. οτε is the more difficult reading and may well be original here. If so, then there is no exception in Luke-Acts. (If οτε is accepted, then the quotation from Is 55:3 is more closely connected with the resurrection.)

7. Readings with Significant Byzantine Support

7.1 There is an apparent lack of concord at Acts 10,37 if we accept the originality of the nominativus pendens αρξαμενος with ℊ B and our printed editions. But we note the existence of the variant αρξαμενον in ϊς 45 Byz that removes the difficulty, but, as a consequence, may therefore be the secondary reading.

Other examples of appositional phrases and circumstantial participles in the narrative in Luke-Acts are at Lk 21:6 and Acts 7:40. There are v.l.l. over such features at Mt 10:11; Lk 20:27; 24:47; 2 Thess 1:5 and note the readings by D at Mt 4:10; 5:40; 7:2.9.14.

Here at 10:37 we argue that the reading αρξαμενον seems to be a grammatical improvement. It is remarkable that the manuscript attestation combines ϊς 45 and the Byzantine text type.

7.2 Other examples of this are in the following set expressions:

7.2.1 Holy Spirit

The expression ‘Holy Spirit’ is firm at 8:15.17.19 but at 8:18 we have the v.l. + το αγιον (Alexandrian/Byzantine) ϊς 45 ϊς 74 Byz; om. ℊ B alone (and that is the text printed in NA). The longer text is likely to be
original. The deletion was possibly to avoid repetition (see 1.1.2 above for this motive for removing text).

7.2.2  Grace of God
The expression is firm at 11:23; 13:43; 14:26. At 15:40 θεου (Alexan-
drian/Byzantine) ∥ C Byz; κυριου ∥ 74 Θ D cf. 20:24 κυριου Ψ; θεου cett. ‘The Grace of the/our Lord (Jesus Christ)’ is common in doxologies; liturgical practice may have encouraged scribes to alter the reading in this direction.

7.2.3  Word of God/Lord
Given the alleged ambiguity of κυριος, we would be inclined to accept the v.l. κυριου in the following places, were it not for the fact that λογος θεου is firmly established, as will be seen below. No firm example of λογος κυριου is found in Acts. Therefore θεου is preferred as the original in all the variants:


7.2.4  Church of God
The famous example is at Acts 20:28, where the following v.ll. are related to the meaning of υδιος at the end verse: θεου Θ B; κυριου 74 A D; κυριου και θεου C Η Λ Ρ Byz, an ‘obvious conflate’ declares Metzger in the Textual Commentary. Εκκλησια του θεου occurs eleven times in Paul; εκκλησια κυριου occurs seven times in the LXX but never without v.l. θεου in the New Testament.
7.2.5 *Son of God*

G.D. Kilpatrick\(^ {17} \) championed the reading θεου at Acts 7:56. θεου is read by \( \Psi^{24} \) 491 614 Gg boh (2 manuscripts) Macarius (c. 400) and in Latin in the *Vita Patricii*. Thus there is ancient and geographically varied testimony. Given the uniqueness of the term ‘Son of Man’ (especially the *standing* Son of Man) applied to Jesus outside the Gospels, it is improbable that it is original in Acts 7:56. The variant could have been occasioned by scribes sensitive to repetition (θεος occurs three other times in the immediate context [vv. 55–56]); they then assimilated the passage to Lk 22:69–70 which identifies Jesus, the Son of Man, as the Son of God).

8. Conclusion

This very small selection of variants demonstrates how, by applying (thoroughgoing) eclectic principles of textual criticism, conclusions about the likeliest direction of scribal alterations and the likeliest original text can be arrived at. Obviously the study of the textual tradition as a whole needs to be undertaken by editors of a critical edition of the text of Acts. That would require a full *apparatus criticus*, such as we may expect to find in a future fascicule of the ongoing series *Editio Critica Maior*. Certainly a new edition cannot be created from the woefully inadequate apparatus found, inevitably, in a hand edition of the Greek New Testament. But such work, painstaking and long winded though it may be, is necessary if we are to arrive at a satisfactory and satisfying text of Acts.

A preliminary analysis of the way the manuscripts behave may be made from the conclusions reached above, and it will readily be seen just how erratic our extant manuscripts can be: at one point we may be printing the original text with D, at other times with the Byzantine witnesses, while another variant selected as representing the original text may be found in the Alexandrian uncialls. But if we are to produce a text that is truly and honestly eclectic then such conclusions are only to be expected.

See further on the text of Acts with special reference to Codex Bezae:


CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF THE CONCLUDING DOXOLOGY TO THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

The conclusion to the epistle to the Romans is a major problem in textual criticism. The benediction (normally numbered Rom 16:24) and the doxology (normally numbered Rom 16:25–27) appear in differing positions in the manuscript tradition or are omitted. Kurt Aland has set out the various positions of these verses in a commendably clear form in “Der Schluss und die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Römerbriefes”.¹ He gives details of at least fourteen differing sequences for these verses in the epistle and offers a convincing reconstruction of the textual history. A simpler exposition of the problem may be seen in Lietzmann’s commentary on Romans.²

Normally Paul ends his letters with a benediction such as that which conventionally appears in the printed editions at 16:20 or 16:24 or at the conclusion to 1 Cor, 2 Cor or Gal. Where a doxology does occur in the authentic Pauline letters it is not normally at the end of the epistle, nor is it as extended as 16:25–27 (cf. Rom 11:36; Gal 1:5 Phil 4:20 and see also Eph 3:20–21; 1 Tim 1:17; 2 Tim 4:18).

Many scholars including Frede³ have discussed in general terms the authenticity of the ending in the light of the above considerations. More recently Harry Gamble⁴ has written a monograph on the textual history, aspects of which have been criticised by L.W. Hurtado.⁵ Most commentators argue that the doxology is non-Pauline⁶ although

---

² H. Lietzmann, An die Römer (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, ’1933) (= HNT 8).
⁶ For example H. Schlier, Der Römerbrief, (Freiburg, Basle, Vienna: Herder, 1977) (= Herder’s Commentaries VI) and E. Käsemann, An die Römer (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973) (= HNT 8).
Sanday and Headlam\textsuperscript{7} and Hurtado\textsuperscript{8} state that the language is not impossible for Paul to have written. The latter are following in the path of Hort\textsuperscript{9} who argued that the language and style of the doxology are consistent both with the epistle (e.g. Rom 11:33–36) and with Paul’s writing elsewhere (e.g. 1 Cor 16:22).

Although Hort attempted a brief analysis of the language and style, no thorough examination of either has been undertaken, as G.D. Kilpatrick laments in the Aland Festschrift.\textsuperscript{10} The following is an attempt to remedy this. The intention here is to see the extent to which the language and style of the doxology in Rom 16:25–27 are paralleled in or consistent with (a) the authentic Pauline letters and (b) the rest of the New Testament.

**Language**

τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ

Participial forms of δύναμαι are rare in Paul. They occur at Rom 15:14 and 1 Thess 2:7 (anarthrous nominative plural) and Gal 3:21 (arthrous nominative singular). The doxologies in Eph 3:20 and Jud 24 provide closer parallels to Rom 16:25 in that in all the dative is arthrous and refers to God. (This usage occurs in the doxology of Polycarp Ep Phil 20:2). Elsewhere the arthrous participle of δύναμαι is found at Mt 19:12; Hebr 5:2; James 4:12 (nominative); Mt 10:28; Act 27:43; 2 Tim 3:15; Hebr 5:7; James 1:21 (accusative); Act 20:32 (the only occurrence of the dative outside a doxology). The nominative singular appears without an article at Lk 1:20. δυνατός is preferred by Paul as may be seen in this epistle at Rom 4:21 11:23 (cf. 9:22). See also 2 Cor 9:8.

\textsuperscript{7} W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902) (= *International Critical Commentary*).
\textsuperscript{8} Op. cit.
στηρίζαι

There are three other occurrences of the aorist infinitive of this verb (1 Thess 3:2, 12; 2 Thess 2:17). The aorist passive infinitive occurs at Rom 1:11. In 1 Thess 3:2 the agent of the verb is Timothy; at Rom 1:11 Paul is the agent; at 1 Thess 3:12 the agent is the Lord (Jesus). The verb is used as an attribute of God in the context of a doxology at 1 Petr 5:10.

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μον

This expression occurs elsewhere in Paul (Rom 2:16 cf. 2 Tim 2:8). κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν occurs at 2 Cor 4:3; 1 Thess 1:5; 2 Thess 2:14.

tὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

κήρυγμα occurs on seven other occasions in the New Testament. It is unqualified at 1 Cor 1:21; 2 Tim 4:17; Tit 1:3 and is qualified at Mt 12:41 (= Lk 11:32) (by Ἰωνᾶ); at 1 Cor 2:4 (by μου) and at 1 Cor 15:14 (by ἡμῶν). Even when it is qualified the content of the κήρυγμα is not defined. Here it is defined. It is normally argued that Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here is an objective genitive in which case the expression is of especial significance insofar as the only other place in the New Testament where κήρυγμα is followed by an objective genitive is in the disputed, and later, shorter ending to Mark’s gospel.

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν occurs at Gal 2:2; Eph 3:3. ἀποκάλυψις appears at 1 Cor 14:6, 26; 2 Cor 12:7; Eph 1:17: the noun is unqualified in these verses. In the following ἀποκάλυψις is qualified: Lk 2:32 (by ἔθνων), Rom 8:19 (τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ) 1 Cor 1:7 (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) 2 Cor 12:1 (κυρίου) 2 Thess 1:7 (κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) Gal 1:12; 1 Petr 1:7, 13; Rev 1:1 (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). The noun is qualified by a personal attribution at Rom 2:5 (δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ) and 1 Petr 4:13 (τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ). The reference in this doxology is unique in being the only occurrence of ἀποκάλυψις qualified by an impersonal noun. The two nouns (ἀποκάλυψις plus μυστηρίου) do not appear linked elsewhere in the New Testament although the idea that the mystery has been revealed occurs in Paul’s writing at 1 Cor 2:6–10 and similar sentiments are to be found at Eph 3:3–9 and Col 1:26–27. Eph 3:9 provides
the closest parallel to the doxology of Romans (…τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου).

χρόνοις αἰωνίοις

αἰώνιος occurs about seventy times in the New Testament: about forty four of these are linked with ζωή. In Paul’s writing this combination may be seen at Rom 2:7; 5:21; 6:22, 23; 2 Cor 4:17, 18; 5:1 Gal 6:8. αἰώνιος and χρόνος are not linked in Paul’s writings although in the pseudonymous letters πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων occurs at 2 Tim 1:9; Tit 1:2. Elsewhere the plural of χρόνος occurs only at Lk 8:29; 20:9; Act 1:7; 3:21; 17:30 and 1 Petr 1:20. The only place where the plural of χρόνος occurs in the authentic Pauline letters is at 1 Thess 5:1 where specific events are in mind. The singular χρόνος occurs at Rom 7:1; 1 Cor 7:39; 16:7; Gal 4:1, 4. The dative of time is not used by Paul. Outside the Pauline corpus this Hellenistic usage may be found at Lk 1:75 (v.l. accusative in accordance with classical usage) 8:27 (v.l.) Act 8:11 with χρόνος (v.l.) 13:20 (v.l.). See also the variants at John 14:9; Act 28:12. In all of these the Koine dative should be read as original.

The idea expressed by χρόνοις αἰωνίοις here is similar to Eph 3:5 ἐτέραις γενεαῖς and Eph 3:9 ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνίων.

σεσιγημένου

This is the only passive occurrence of the verb in the New Testament although the active of σιγάω occurs in Luke, 1 Corinthians and Acts. The passive has a different meaning from the active and probably has the force ‘to keep secret’. This idea is expressed by ἀποκρύπτω in 1 Cor 2:7 cf. Col 1:26; Eph 3:9 or by οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη at Eph 3:5.

φανερωθέντος

This verb is common in Paul with eleven occurrences (Rom 1:19; 3:21; 1 Cor 4:5; 2 Cor 2:14; 3:3; 4:10, 11; 5:10, 11; 7:12; 11:6 cf. also Eph 5:13, 14; Col 1:26; 3:4 (bis) 4:4 and see 1 Tim 3:16; 2 Tim 1:10; Tit 1:3).

τέ

This particle is absent from some witnesses (including D E 110). There was a tendency in the first century for particles that could not stand first to be avoided and τέ was one of the earliest casualties. Scribes in
later generations sometimes introduced particles such as τέ to the texts they were copying. Of the 215 or so occurrences of τέ in the New Testament many outside Acts are not firm in the manuscript tradition.

τέ occurs in Romans in conjunction with καὶ at 1:12, 14 (bis) 16 (v.l. omit) 20, 26, 27 (v.l. omit) 2:9, 10 (v.l. δέ) 3:9; 10:12 and in 1 Cor 1:24 (v.l. omit) 30 Phil 1:7. τέ…τέ occurs at Rom 14:8.

τέ without καὶ or τέ following occurs in Paul only at Rom 2:19 and 1 Cor 4:21. The occurrences found in the printed editions at Rom 7:7 and 2 Cor 10:8 are not firm (cf. also Eph 3:19). The same is true outside the Pauline corpus at Mt 28:12 (v.l. omit) Lk 24:20 (v.l. omit) John 4:42 (v.l. δέ) 6:18 (v.l. δέ).

\[\text{γραφῶν προφητικῶν}\]

This phrase is unique in the New Testament. προφητικός is found in Philo, Lucian and in Patristic writers but in the New Testament occurs only at 2 Pet 1:19. At Rom 1:2 Paul speaks of the “prophets in the holy scriptures” but not to “prophetic writings”. He often quotes the words of the prophets as at Rom 9:25–28; 11:34–35; 2 Cor 4:13; 6:2, 16–18 but never describes them or introduces the quotation in this way. Mention of prophets in the context of the revelation of the mystery occurs in Eph 3:4–5; Rev 10:7.

γραφή is seldom qualified in the New Testament except by a demonstrative at Lk 4:21; Act 8:35 and by an adjective at 2 Petr 3:16 (λοιπὰς γραφὰς) and at Rom 1:2 (γραφαίς ἁγίαις). At Rom 1:2 the plural γραφή is anarthrous as in the doxology.

καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

This longer text is found in the writings of Origen and mss. containing this text were known to Jerome but it is unlikely that the words were contained in the original form of the doxology. Liturgical expansion of the text of a doxology was natural to certain scribes. ἐπιφάνεια is, however, found in the writings of Paul at 2 Thess 2:8 and is frequent in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:10; 4:1, 8; Tit 2:11).

\[\text{ἐπιταγήν}\]

At 1 Cor 7:6; 2 Cor 8:8; Tit 2:15 ἐπιταγή appears unqualified. The noun is qualified at 1 Cor 7:25 (by κυρίου) where the command is for a specific example of Christian discipline, and at 1 Tim 1:1 (by θεοῦ) and at
Tit 1:3 (by σωτῆρος) where the command is to be as the apostles. In contrast to these three examples the reference in this doxology is not to a specific command.

τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ

Attributes of God in the New Testament include (a) ζῶντος at Rom 9:26 (from Hos 2:1 LXX) 2 Cor 3:3; 6:16 cf. 1 Tim 3:15; 4:10, and, outside the Pauline corpus, Mt 16:16; 26:43; Hebr 3:12; 9:14; 10:31; 12:22; 1 Petr 1:23; Rev 7:2 (b) ἀόρατος Col 1:15 (c) ζῶντος + ἀληθινός 1 Thess 1:9 (cf. μακάριος at 1 Tim 1:11 and ἀφθαρτος, ἀόρατος and μόνος at 1 Tim 1:17). Only here is αἰωνίος used of God in the New Testament although it occurs in Bar 4:8, 11; 1 En 75:3; Jub 12:29; 2 Macc 1:25. Similar concepts are found in Paul but are expressed differently as at Rom 11:33–36; 1 Cor 2:7; 10:11 but Paul’s ethical teaching elsewhere does not usually include an appeal to God’s command.

ὑπακοὴν πίστεως

This phrase recurs in Rom 1:5. ὑπακοὴ occurs in Romans elsewhere at 5:19; 6:16 (bis) 15:18 (with a meaning similar to that in the doxology) and 16:19 (cf. also 2 Cor 7:15; 10:5, 6). Elsewhere ὑπακοὴ occurs in Hebr 5:8; 1 Petr 1:2, 14, 22; Phm 21.

τὰ ἔθνη

This noun is frequent in Paul’s letters and especially in this epistle.

γνωρισθέντος

This verb is used frequently by Paul including Rom 9:22, 23, but this is the only occurrence of the aorist passive participle. “Knowing the mystery” is a familiar idea in Ephesians as at 1:9; 3:3; 6:19 and provides another link between this doxology and the epistle to the Ephesians.

μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ

μόνος and σοφός are frequently used of God by Philo. In the New Testament μόνος occurs in the doxology at Jud 25 and 1 Tim 1:17 (cf. 2 Clem 20:5). Joh 5:44 (μόνου θεοῦ) 17:3 (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν

---

11 See Käsemann op. cit., p. 407.
θεὸν) are the only two occurrences of this adjective with θεός outside a doxology.

σοφός of God is rare although it is found outside the New Testament at 4 Macc 1:12 and 1 Clem 60:1. The occurrences of this adjective in the doxologies at Jud 25 and 1 Tim 1:17 are not textually certain and may be due to the common tendency to expand such formulae-in this instance through assimilation to Rom 16:27. Paul never uses σοφός with θεός although σοφία θεοῦ is found in Rom 11:33 cf. 1 Cor 1:21 (bis), 24; 2:7 (cf. Eph 3:10).

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

This phrase is frequent in Paul. See especially 1 Cor 15:57.

\[ \hat{\omega} \]

This relative is almost a pronoun and some mss. in fact read αὐτῷ in an attempt to provide a clearer reference to God. The anacolouthon in this sentence is awkward but not uncharacteristic of Paul (cf. Rom 2:12; Gal 2:4, 6 and see also 1 Tim 1:3 ff.).

\[ \hat{\omega} \] is probably original and is likely to refer to God. In other doxologies glory is to God (often through Christ) at Rom 11:36; Gal 1:5; Eph 3:20–21; Phil 4:20; Jud 24; 1 Tim 1:17; 2 Tim 4:18; 1 Petr 5:11. Glory is to Christ only at 2 Petr 3:18. The reference at Hebr 13:21 and at 1 Petr 4:11 is ambiguous but probably is to God.

eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων is not firm in the mss.: it is omitted by P\textsuperscript{17} B 1739.\textsuperscript{12} In the printed editions the other doxologies in the New Testament usually have the longer form (Gal 1:5; Eph 3:21; Phil 4:20; 1 Tim 1:17; 2 Tim 4:18; Hebr 13:21; 1 Petr 4:11; 5:11). In all of these however v.ll. omit τῶν αἰώνων. (At 1 Tim 1:17 the omission occurs only in 623).\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Hurtado (op. cit.) states that those mss. which have the doxology twice (i.e. at the end of chapter 14 and 16) have the shorter form twice. Among the mss. he cites is 104 yet its evidence is not obvious from the apparatus to Nestle-Aland\textsuperscript{16}. N-A\textsuperscript{26} is also unclear whether those mss. (e.g. P) that have the doxology in both places have the same v.ll. in 14 as are shown at 16:25–27.

\textsuperscript{13} B.M. Metzger is wrong at Hebr 13:21 to suggest the longer text is firm in the Pastorals in: B.M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971).
Metzger’s Commentary argues in favour of the shorter text at 1 Petr 5:11 and at Rom 16:27 stating that the normal scribal tendency would be to expand the phrase. The shorter form occurs in the printed texts in the doxologies at Rom 11:36 and Jud 25, but in both of these variant readings add τῶν αἰῶνων. The same v.l. (and others) occur at 2 Petr 3:18. At Rom 1:25; 9:5 the shorter text is firm in a doxology. This may give us the clue that in all the New Testament doxologies the shorter text is original, and the longer form was caused by scribal expansion, due possibly to liturgical influence.

Outside doxologies the shorter form is firm at Hebr 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21 (from Ps 110:4) 24, 28 (all singular) and at Hebr 13:8 (plural). The longer text is found in printed editions at Hebr 1:8 (singular) but some mss. omit τοῦ αἰῶνος. The singular, and shorter, form occurs in Paul’s writings outside doxologies at 1 Cor 8:13. See also Mt 6:13; 21:19; Mk 11:14; Lk 1:33, 35; John 4:14; 6:51, 58; 8:35 (bis) 51, 52; 10:28; 11:26; 12:34; 13:8; 14:16; 1 Petr 1:25; 2 Petr 2:17; 1 John 2:17; 2 John 2; Jud 13. These are all firm. At 2 Cor 9:9 the singular and simple form occurs with v.l. add τοῦ αἰῶνος. We may conclude that where variation does occur whether in a doxology or elsewhere the shorter text is likely to be original. The exception to this is in Revelation where the position is reversed. Metzger’s Commentary p. 732 argues that only at Rev 1:6 is the longer form τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων in question. The occurrences at 1:18; 4:9, 10; 5:13; 7:12; 10:6; 11:15; 15:7; 19:3; 20:10; 22:5 give the longer form. These are all firm and should probably encourage us to accept the longer text at 1:6. Inexplicably Metzger omits from his list Rev 14:11 (with or without the articles, singular or plural) and 5:14 where the Textus Receptus has a longer text including τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. These longer forms should be read at 5:14; 14:11 also.

**Style**

The style of the doxology is elaborate. Three prepositional phrases depend on the infinitive στηριξάω; three participles in apposition qualify μυστηρίου; two prepositional phrases illuminate φανερωθέντος and two amplify γνωρισθέντος. There are three indirect objects including one relative. There is one dative of time. διὰ appears twice, κατά three times and εἰς three times. No finite verb is expressed. All of this occurs within just over fifty words. This suggests a well-rehearsed and liturgically inspired composition possibly used in the earliest days of the church and pre-dating its addition to the epistle to the Romans.
Much of the doxology occurs elsewhere in the Pastoral Epistles especially in 1 Tim 6:14 f.; 2 Tim 1:10; 2:8; 4:18 and may well have originated at a similar date to those books possibly at a time when Paul’s teaching was having a revival and his extant writings were being gathered together and imitated. Parallels exist between the doxology and other books that were written among the latest in the New Testament canon e.g. 1 Petr 4:11; 5:10 (cf. Hebr 13:21) and Jud 24–25. There are however echoes of Paul’s own writings such as Gal 1:5; Phil 4:20 and to the deuto-Pauline Eph 3:6–9, 19–21. Links with Romans can be seen at Rom 11:36 and especially 1:5, a verse which seems to have inspired the original author of the doxology and explains why it was chosen as being of particular significance to conclude this epistle. Three phrases in particular brand the doxology as non-Pauline. These are χρόνοις αἰωνίοις, γραφῶν προφητικῶν and κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ.

κήρυγμα Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ and σοφῷ θεῷ are unique expressions in the New Testament. κήρυγμα and ἐπιταγή seem to bear a more general meaning than is found elsewhere in the New Testament and this possibly indicates a later date when these terms had become less specific. τῷ δυναμένῳ and στηρίξαι belong to the language of doxologies although the parallels to Paul’s writings are not precise. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου is an expression with differences from the authentic Pauline letters. σεσιγημένου has a different usage from the rest of Paul’s epistles.

On the other hand κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, φανερωθέντος, ὑπακοὴν πίστεως, τὰ ἐθνή, γνωσθέντος, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας are found elsewhere in Paul’s letters, τέ is unlikely to be part of the original draft of the doxology.

Conclusion

Although some of the vocabulary closely parallels Paul’s own writings, the doxology is unlikely to be from his pen. Within the fifty odd words of the doxology there is too high a percentage of unusual or unique expressions. An editor later than Paul wishing to provide a suitable conclusion to either a fourteen or sixteen chapter version of Romans used a doxology that had possibly been current in the liturgy as an entirely appropriate climax to the epistle that had to some extent provided the inspiration for some of its formulae. In addition to the precise linguistic parallels to Romans found in the doxology and set out above, the ideas of Rom 1:2; 5:2, 16 and elsewhere find
their counterpart in the doxology. The original author of the doxology however was also inspired by and seems to have relied heavily on the language and style of the doxologies found in the post-Pauline writings. The language of the doxologies in the Pastoral Epistles, Ephesians and the Petrine letters has been adopted. A further similarity to these books is seen in the self-contained nature of this doxology which is closer to the doxologies in Eph 3:20–21; 1 Tim 1:17; 1 Petr 5:10–11; Jud 24–25 than to the doxologies in Rom 11:36; Gal 1:5; Phil 4:20. The doxologies in the latter group develop from and act as a climax to the preceding sentence(s).

Whoever placed the doxology which we conventionally read at Rom 16:25–27 made it a suitable climax to an epistle where glory is given to God for the salvation of the gentiles. Aland\textsuperscript{14} argues that the doxology was in existence in the second century. The parallels to the later New Testament books might suggest a date towards the end of the first century. The Hellenistic temporal dative might lend support to this argument. Thus even though modern printed editions of the Greek New Testament legitimately bracket Rom 16:25–27 as non-Pauline we nevertheless have access here to a very early liturgical formula which has happily and accidentally been attached in most mss. to one of Paul’s letters. Our understanding of primitive Christianity’s doxologies is enriched by our possession of these verses.

**Postscriptum**


\textsuperscript{14} op. cit.
CHAPTER TWENTY

THE DIVINE NAMES IN THE CORINTHIAN LETTERS

Many text-critical variants concern the *nomina sacra*. Editors of the Greek New Testament need to resolve these variants when printing a critically established text. Commentators must also heed such matters.

We shall concentrate in this essay on the four names that are invariably contracted in the manuscripts, namely IC XC KC and ΘC. In this context conventional wisdom often informs us that scribes were prone to expand divine names out of piety or under the influence of liturgical practice or the lectionary text, and that therefore the original text of the New Testament authors should be the variant with the simplest form. Conversely, we are told that scribes would be disinclined to omit the *nomina sacra* deliberately from the texts. Another commonly expressed opinion concerns the many variants where the mss. are divided over KC and IC (or XC) and KC and ΘC; it is said that the apparent ambiguity of KC, which may mean either Jesus or God, encouraged scribes to opt for a more precise name in preference to the original KC, and that therefore *v.l. (= varia lectio) KC* is to be preferred as the original reading.

It is also pointed out in some introductory guides that the large number of variants involving the exchange of the abbreviated *nomina sacra* especially IC KC XC and ΘC was precisely because these contracted forms (typically the initial letter and the last letter) looked alike and one *nomen sacrum* could be accidentally misread as another and therefore be mis-copied. (Such an observation, even if true, would not of course help us to solve the direction of change in textual variants involving the substitution of the one for the other.)

All of those guidelines may be correct in some instances, but none must be applied mechanically without regard to the contexts and the author’s discernible preferences. It is Paul’s established practice and the context of the variants that will concern us in this essay.

Many variants also concern the sequence of the combined names IC and XC. Logic may suggest that the sequence should have IC first with XC as the designation following. Obviously once XC was being seen
less as a title and increasingly as a proper name then scribes would have less compunction in reversing the names. We shall examine that argument too.

To establish our author’s preferences and usage we need to look to firm examples (that is, examples where the recorded manuscript evidence is united and for which no deviation has been reported as yet). Restricting ourselves to examples in the Corinthian correspondence for the purpose of this study, we shall separate the title in which \( \text{KC} \) is present, preceding or following \( \text{IC} \ \text{XC}/ \ \text{XC} \ \text{IC} \), from those instances where \( \text{KC} \) is either not present or where its presence is not firm. (Later we examine variants involving other instances of \( v.ll. \) concerning \( \text{KC} \) and also variants involving \( \Theta \).)

A.

Where \( \text{KC} \) is present and firm.

1) When ‘[Our] Lord’ precedes ‘Jesus Christ’ or ‘Christ Jesus’:

i) In the formula \( \tauου \text{KY} \ \etaμων \text{IY XY} \) (genitive). An asterisk denotes that there are variants involving the presence of ‘Jesus’ and/or ‘Christ’ (see below A3):\(^2\)

1 Cor. 1:2, 7, 8*, 10 (but D reads \( \text{XY IY του KY ημων} \)); 5:4pr.* (and note word-order variant 4–5, 1–3 \( \text{IY XY του KY ημων} \) in minuscule 81), 5:4sec.*, 5:5*; 6:11*; 15:57 (again, note word order 4–5, 1–3 in majuscules 0121 0243 and cf. 1 Cor. 15:31); 16:23*; 2 Cor. 1:3, 14*; 8:9*; 11:31* (a reading not given in the apparatus of NA = Nestle-Aland 27th ed.). [The word order in 81 and in 0121 0243 noted here is unlikely to be original, given the prevalence of the order with \( \text{KC} \) preceding, but see 2 below.]

The phrase in the accusative occurs at 1 Cor. 16:22*.

ii) In the formula ‘Lord Jesus Christ’ (nominative or genitive):

---

\(^1\) ημων is not firm at 1 Cor. 5:4bis, 5; 6:11; 16:22, 23; 2 Cor. 1:14; 11:31. These are discussed below pp. 329–30.

\(^2\) The apparatus here has been assembled from NA\(^27\), UBS\(^4\), von Soden, Tischendorf\(^*\), Text und Textwert II,2 (ANTF 17), and Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus (hereafter NTAP) II,2 (ANTF 12)—only a sample of the witnesses appears in this article.
1 Cor. 1:3 (grace, cf. 1 Cor. 16:23; 2 Cor. 1:2; 13:13); 8:6; 11:23*; 2 Cor. 1:2*; 13:13*

2) Where ‘[Our] Lord’ follows ‘Jesus Christ’:
1 Cor. 1:9 (a sequence demanded in the context) [5]
1 Cor. 9:1 where the inversion may be explained by the unusual word order of the whole sentence. (v.l. om. ΧΩ Α Β 0150 and cf. ΧΩ ΙΩ FG).
1 Cor. 15:31 εν ΧΩ ΙΩ ημων: εν ΚΩ D*.

3) Where ΧΩ and/or ΙΩ is disputed (i.e. those places asterisked above A 1 i and ii):

1 Cor. 1:8 om. ΧΩ Α Β Ψ, a reading that has influenced NA which brackets the name. As ΙΩ ΧΩ occurs in vv. 7 and 9 the longer reading could have been due to assimilation to these neighbouring verses but the title ‘Our Lord Jesus’ is less common than ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ.’

5:4pr. om. ΧΩ Α Β D* Ψ. ‘Our Lord Jesus’ follows in the verse in these mss. The shortening of the title could therefore be due to assimilation in order to create an exact parallel. Other mss. read the fuller title ‘(Our) Lord Jesus Christ’ (P46 D2 F G L P maj). These are mss. that show a tendency to read the full title elsewhere. Fee (Commentary 4 p. 198) says that the later scribal addition of ΧΩ relates to the syntactical problem of finding which verb the prepositional phrase modifies.

5:4sec. The readings here are a) του ΚΩ ημων ΙΩ ΧΩ P11 D F G L; c) του ΚΩ ημων ΙΩ cett. Only (a) and (b) fit Paul’s style. Maybe (a) is correct, the others being expanded forms based on 5:4pr. Zuntz5 favours (a). Fee says that if ΙΩ were original, its omission could only have been accidental through homoioteleuton.

5:5 ΚΩ: + ΙΩ P61 Ν Ψ maj.; + ΙΩ ΧΩ Α Β F G P (some of these mss. add ημων—see below, under ‘Possessive’). Fee, Commentary, thinks

5 On the relevance of the preposition see below.
that the shorter reading is the likeliest and states that the expression ‘The Day of the Lord’ is decisive, drawing attention to that term in 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Thess. 2:2, although in the latter v.l. $\overline{XY}$ is read by D² maj. Fee also ignores 1 Cor. 1:8 (see above). Also see 2 Cor. 1:14 following.

[6] 6:11 om. $\overline{XY}$ A D² L Ψ etc. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, in a signed dissentient note in his *Textual Commentary*, argues that the shorter reading is original, given the general scribal tendency to expand divine names. This is a constant thesis in his notes and commentary but we need to treat that advice with caution because in certain contexts (such as a formal grace) our author himself may favour a fuller title. Fee (Commentary) says $\overline{XY}$ was added for liturgical reasons, then the possessive was added at an even later stage of development. (On the presence or absence of the possessive see further below.)

11:23 IC XC 2 221 257 314 319c 378 823; om. IC XC B 328 383; IC cett. XC here in this narrative looks like a scribal expansion but KC IC is unusual (see below). The omission of IC (XC) has probably been encouraged by KC alone earlier in the sentence.

16:22 K\V: + (ημων) IV XV א C3 D F G K L P Ψ etc. This seems to be a good example of a scribal expansion of a title, especially in this context.

16:23 (grace) om. $\overline{XY}$ Ν* B 33. Here the longer form seems plausible, appearing as it does in a formal grace (see 1 Cor. 1:3). Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, argues in favour of $\overline{IV}$, despite the fact that the longer reading is characteristic of the benedictions at Rom. 16:24; 2 Cor. 13: 13 q.v.; Gal. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; 1 Thess. 5:28; 2 Thess. 3:18; Philm. 25. Again, he emphasises the tendency of scribes only to increase the divine names.

2 Cor.

1:2 om. $\overline{XY}$ 075. The grace (with $\overline{XY}$) is firm at 1 Cor. 1:3: this suggests that the same formula should occur here too.

1:14 om. $\overline{XY}$ all except Ν* D² F G P 0121 0242. ‘The Day of the Lord Jesus’ may be said to have attracted a growing tradition: first + $\overline{XY}$ then + the possessive, but, as we see below, the combination ‘Lord Jesus’ is not firm in these letters.

---

8:9 om. ΥΥ B*. See below on ‘Lord Jesus’.

11:31 ΥΥ ΥΥ: + ΥΥ Η Κ Λ 049 0150 0151; om. ΥΥ 216. The context, stating the relationship of God the Father to Jesus, suggests that Paul would have written ‘the Lord Jesus Christ’ here. For v.l. + /– ημων see below, under ‘Possessive’.

13:13 om. ΥΥ B Ψ. Again, the firm example of a grace at 1 Cor. 1:3 may be decisive in favour of the full title here as at the v.ll. at 1 Cor. 16:23; 2 Cor. 1:2. Thrall, Commentary, says that B Ψ have the shorter form at 1 Cor. 16:23 but, according to the apparatus in NTAP, Ψ has + ΥΥ. If it were correct, that would show this scribe’s inconsistency of practice at the endings of 1 and 2 Cor.

Were we to accept ΚΚ ΙΗ (i.e. without ‘Christ’) at 1 Cor. 5: 4pr.; 11:23; 16:23; 2 Cor. 1: 14; 8:9; 13:13 this would result in a title of which there are no firm examples in these letters. So, in none of these places do I advocate reading ΚΚ ΙΗ.

Possessive

The possessive is firm at 1 Cor. 1:8; 2 Cor. 8:9; it is disputed at 1 Cor. 5:4pr. om. Η A Ψ a (and, as a consequence, is bracketed in NA); 5:4sec. om. P 629 (but see above, where we accept v.l. om. ημων ΥΥ); 5:5 + ημων A F G P 0150; 6:11 possessive in only B C ιδ P and, according to Metzger, Textual Commentary, is due to assimilation to the posses-

sive following; 16:22 + ημων K P; 16:23 + ημων A L P 056 075 0142; 2 Cor. 1:14 om. P 629 A C maj. (and bracketed in NA); 11:31 + ημων D P 056 075 pc.

On the basis of those places where the possessive is firm (1 Cor. 1:8; 2 Cor. 8:9) I am inclined to accept as original the full title ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ’ elsewhere. Where the possessive is not firm, the issue is more complex and may suggest an evolution from a simple title to the addition of another name and later the further adding of the posses-
sive. There the original would have been expanded out of piety to conform to the full, firm title. If, however, we think our author would have shown consistency in such matters then we should accept the


8 1 Cor. 12:3 is clearly different.
variant giving the full title including the possessive at 1 Cor. 5:4pr., 5; 6:11; 16:22, 23; 2 Cor. 1:14; 11:31.

In all the instances above (even where the names ‘Jesus Christ’ occur only in disputed readings as at 1 Cor. 5:5; 11:23) the sequence is always ‘Jesus’ followed by ‘Christ’. There is no instance of the reverse. If we argue that the presence of KC preceding IC XC in the formula in the genitive is decisive because it determines unambiguously the case and that is why IC can precede XC, such an argument is of minimal importance. (As Thrall, Commentary p. 81, says, both names would as it were have been read and pronounced in one breath and ‘Jesus’, whatever the case, would not have been understood in isolation.) Also we see that IC XC is the natural order even in those rare instances where KC follows.

B.

i) Where KC occurs as a variant (see also G below):

1 Cor.

1:30 + τω KW IY (sic) 056; + τω KW ημων 0142. These readings look like expansions.

4:17 om. IY A B D2 L P Ψ (IY is bracketed in NA); KW IY D* F G; XW IY cett. Again, we may we witnessing an expansion from an original XW to + IY and then XW misread as KW later. (On the improbability of ‘Lord Jesus’ being original see above.)

16:24 + τω KW ημων lect. 592; om. εν XW IU 075 81 and lectt. 597, 598, 895, 1356, 1777. These are interesting readings to find in lectionary texts.

2 Cor.

4:5pr. om. KV P; om. IV 913 1610. KV could have been omitted through hom. There is no obvious reason why IV was omitted.

4:10pr. IY+; XY D* F G; XY IY D; KY IY K L Ψ; KY ημων IY 0142. The reference here is to the death of Jesus which leads us to favour Jesus simpliciter as in the Gospels. Cf. v. 14 following.

4:14 τον KV IV: om. KV P46 B 33 (an attestation that results in the word being bracketed in NA); om. τον KV 0243 33 640 1739; τον KV IV XV 056 0142 1845.
Thrall, *Commentary* note 1055, accepts that the shorter reading is an assimilation to Rom. 8:11, referring to Jesus’ being raised from the dead. Simple IC has preceded in vv. 10–11 as befits the context. But Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, argues that assimilation to Rom. 8:11 is not nearly as strong as the ever-present tendency to expand the divine titles.

8:23 XY: KY C F; + IY 048. δοξα + KY occurs at 2 Cor. 3:18; 8:19. There is no example of δοξα + IY in the NT. (At 2 Cor. 4:6 δοξα is followed by ΘΥ.) Therefore read XY.

ii) places without KC but where there are v.ll. concerning the presence or absence of IC and/or XC:

1 Cor.
l:2pr. om. IY 056 0142. The shortening may have been influenced by εν ΧW earlier in this verse.

4:15 εν...ΧW IY: om. IY B. εν ΧW stands alone without IY at 1 Cor. 3:1; 4:10 (v.l. εν KY P11); 4:15; 15:18, 22; 2 Cor. 3:14; 5:17, 19; 12:2, 19sec. (v.l. om. P16 075).

2 Cor.
2:10 XY: ΘΥ 33; + IY 1149 1872 (cf. 2 Cor. 4:6 under C below).

2:14 ΧW: + IY P16 and cf. 3:14 v.l. IY XY 69.

4:5 IY: KY ΧY 0186; IY XY 629 630; ΧY 056 0142 (cf. the reading of these two mss. at 1 Cor. 1:2 above). Metzger, *Textual Commentary* prefers IY or possibly IY but views the longer readings with ‘Christ’ as pious expansions.

4:10sec. + XY P16 D* F G 0186. ζωη του IY follows showing Paul’s practice for this phrase. I am disinclined to see the variant as an assimilation to this occurrence.

4:11 του IY: του IY XY D* F G; ΧY C; om. 1311. It is interesting to note that D F G here and in the preceding reading show a tendency to favour expanded forms. The omission of IY by 1311 is likely to be a careless error.

---

4:14 sec. IY: + XY 216 242 326 385 440. This too looks like a later expansion. IC simpliciter after a preposition may be seen at 2 Cor. 4:11 pr.
5:18 (not shown in the apparatus of NA) XY: IY XY D2 K L 049 056 075 0142 0151. 056 0142 seem to be prone to adjusting the nomina sacra. XC with IC follows in the next verse—perhaps that shows Pauline usage but may equally show that the reading here was influenced by or assimilated to that later, fuller title.

We may now be in a position to resolve the variants where the order of ‘Jesus’ and ‘Christ’ is disputed:

1 Cor.
1:1 XY IY P46 B D F G; IY XY נ A L P Ψ
2:2 IV XV: XV IV F G 2 1827 2143
3:11 IC XC: XC IC C2 D 0150 (and v.l. om. IC C*)
9:1 IV (XV): XV IV F G

2 Cor.
1:1 XY IY A D mins; IY XY P46 B (and v.l. om. both names F). Thrall, Commentary pp. 81f. accepts XY IY.
1:19 IC XC: XC IC נ* A C 0223 (and v.l. om. XC 33). Thrall, Commentary, ad loc note 219 keeps an open mind on this variant (unlike her comment on 2 Cor. 4:5pr. see below).
4:5 pr. IV XV K V P46 נ A C etc (= NA25); XV IV K V B H maj (= NA25). Thrall, Commentary note 855, prefers the order IV XV because that ‘conforms to the confessional formula in Phil 2:11 and Acts 11:17’, although fails to point out that v.ll. reverse the order at Phil. 2:11, and that a v.l. in A has K K precede at Acts 11:17. On the v.ll. omitting K K and IY see above.
4:6 IY XY: XY IY D F G 0243 (and v.l. om. IY A B). Metzger and Wikgren in dissenting notes in the Textual Commentary prefer the reading by A B; they draw the comparison with 2 Cor. 2:10 where the phrase ‘the face of Christ’ occurs. They claim that the name ‘Jesus’ was added later either before or after and they ask why an original ‘Jesus’ would have been omitted. NA brackets IY. Thrall, Commentary, ad loc note 876 prefers XY arguing that v.l. + IY is a pious expansion. (Cf. 2 Cor. 2:10 above, under B ii.)
13:5 IC XC B D Ψ maj; XC IC Π A F G P 0150 0243. Thrall, *Commentary, ad loc* note 152, prefers IC XC.

Read XY ΙΥ at 1 Cor. 1:1; 2:2; 2 Cor. 1:1: ΚΥ does not precede, thereby unambiguously showing the case, so XY has to take precedence before ΙΥ to show that this is genitive.\(^{10}\) Read IC XC at 1 Cor. 3:11; 2 Cor. 1.19pr.; 13:5 because IC first shows the case unambiguously. Likewise read IV XV at 1 Cor. 9:1; 2 Cor. 4:5pr.

Ev seems to require ‘Christ’ to precede ‘Jesus’, a point recognised by Thrall, *Commentary* pp. 81f. 1 Cor. 1:4 serves as a firm example. This usage would rule out the *v.l.* εν ΙΥ ΙΩ at 2 Cor. 2.17 by 38. For 1 Cor. 15:31 see earlier.

Obviously an exhaustive survey would ideally look at all comparable examples in the authentic Pauline corpus, but I doubt if such a further study would overturn the conclusions just reached on the basis of examples found in only 1 and 2 Corinthians.

D.

XC

XC alone is found some 30 times in 1 Cor., and c. 19 times in 2 Cor. excluding the formula εν ΙΩ already covered above, but there are variants at the following:

1 Cor.
1:6 ΘΥ B* F G. This reading is likely to be original given the parallel use of ΘΥ after μαρτυριον at 1 Cor. 2:1 (*v.l.* μυστηριον).
2:16 ΚΥ B D* F G due to assimilation to ΚΥ preceding.
9:12 ΚΥ C* acc. Lyon; ΘΥ 056 0142. As we have already noted above the two uncial 056 0142 are often indiscriminate in their treatment of the *nomina sacra.* ευαγγελιον is often unqualified but where it is qualified it is followed by XY at 1 Cor. 2:12 *v.l.;* 9:13; 10:14 *v.l.;* and see 1 Cor. 9:18 following.
9:18 + του XY D² F G K L P Ψ (*pace* NA27) etc. Possibly this reading is the result of assimilation to 1 Cor. 9:21.

---

\(^{10}\) As proof of this practice note that at 1 Cor. 1:10 instead of του ΚΥ ημων ΙΥ XY ms. D reads XY ΙΥ του ΚΥ ημων.
9:21 Θ 056 0142. Again, we are disinclined to follow the lead of these two mss. in such variants.

10:9 ΧV: P ΘV A; om. 927 1729 1985 2102 2659. The likeliest reading is ΧV. It is the more difficult reading because readers found the concept of Christ in the wilderness strange. Origen read ΧV and based Christological arguments on it. Marcion also knew ΧV. ΘV seems to be a reading that was assimilated to the LXX.11

10:16sec. ΚΥ D* F G. ΚC is ambiguous and that may indicate its originality here, αἰμα ΧΥ however occurs at Eph. 2:13; Heb. 9:14; 1 Pet. 1:2, 19. The rare αἰμα ΚΥ is not firm at 1 Cor. 11:27.

2 Cor.
2:12 ΘY 33 38 1912 cf. 1 Cor. 9:12; 2 Cor. 9:13; 10:14 for the author’s preference for ΧΥ with εὐαγγελίων.

4:4 ΧΥ: ΚΥ C; ΘY 255. Pauline practice is varied: δοξα + ΘY 2 Cor. 4:6 v.l. ΚΥ; + ΚΥ 2 Cor. 3:18; 8:19; + ΧΥ 2 Cor. 8:32 (a different idea).

4:4 ΧΥ: ΚΥ C; ΘY 255. Christ is God’s εἰκὼν at Col. 1:15–20. ΘY may have come in accidentally on account of ΘY following.

5:14 ΘY C P. αγαπη ΘY occurs at 2 Cor. 13:13 and indicates our author’s usage.

5:15 και + ΧC F G 206 823 pc. This looks like an explanatory addition.

only ‘Jesus’ alone both times. IC is also firm at 2 Cor. 4:11pr. At 2 Cor. 11:4 in the distinctive expression ‘another Jesus’ the v.l. ΧV occurs in FG (these two mss. are not reliable in this regard).

F.

ΘC

Although this name occurs frequently there are, surprisingly, a large number of variants:

1 Cor.
1:4 om. του ΘV A* 056 0142 (056 0142, already noted as unreliable witnesses to the original text of the nomina sacra, also omit ΙV at 1 Cor. 1:2, and see 2:9; 3:10; 4:15 below); cf. 1:14 om. Θ* B 424. At 1:14 the noun follows ευχαριστεω as at 1 Cor. 1:4; 14:18 where the noun is firm. At 1 Cor. 1:4 the noun qualifies χαρις (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10 below). The noun could have been omitted accidentally at 1:14 through hom: ευχαριστεωτικα. NA inconsistently brackets τω ΘW at 1:14 because of the external witnesses for the omission.
1:29 ΘY: αντυ του C* Ψ. ΘC occurs three times in the context and is probably original here too because εξ αντου following needs its antecedent.
2:9 om. o ΘC 056 0142. See 1:4 where we indicate our reluctance to follow these particular mss.
2:14 om. του ΘV 2 216 255 330 440 823 pc. (after πνευμα). A careless omission; this noun is commonly—but not invariably—qualified.
3:10 om. του ΘV P16 (see 8:3 below) 056 0142 (see 1 Cor. 2:9). Although there are v.l. concerning the noun qualifying χαρις at 1 Cor. 1:4; 3:10, ΘV is firm after χαρις at 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 6:1; 9:14.
4:4 + ΘC D*. This looks like an addition to explain ΚC εστιν.
7:40 ΧV P15 33 after πνευμα cf. 1 Cor. 2:14. In the NT πνευμα is qualified by ΙV, ΚY, ΧY, and ΘY.
8:3 om. P16. This ms. omits υπ\' αντου later in this sentence. Both the noun (and the pronoun) are needed in the context. The omissions may be mere carelessness.
8:6 om. ΘC Θ* An omission through homoioteleuton: ειτεθεινο. 11:3 ΧC C (a nonsensical reading here).
12:3 om. ΘV P after πνευμα. This reading could be either a careless omission or an explanatory addition.
12:6 KC 1738; om. 177 337 618; XC 1354 1736 1890; KC και ΘC 1943. ΘC makes better sense alongside ο ενεργων.

2 Cor.
1:1 om. 489. Cf. 1 Cor. 1:1 where the noun is firm in the same formula.
2:15 om. τω ΘW K 0151. Possibly scribes found this concept difficult and therefore dropped the name deliberately.
2:17 ΘY: XY Ψ. λογος του ΘY occurs at 1 Cor. 14:36; 2 Cor. 4:2. λογος του XY occurs only twice in the NT (in Col. and Heb.). XC follows and may have influenced the scribe to place it here too.
3:7 θανατου: ΘY K*
4:4 sec XY 378. The term εικων του ΘY occurs at Col 1:15 and may indicate it is original here too.
4:6 του ΘY: αυτου P46 C* D* F G cf. Eph. 1:12, 14: 3:6. After δοξα (as in next variant): this noun is qualified by ΘY at 1 Cor. 10:31; 11:7. Possibly αυτου is original here and ΘY is a later explanatory change. At 4:15 KY is read by 056 0142 (and again we are disinclined to accept their reading as potentially original).
5:18 om. του ΘY 0243. One would need good arguments before considering accepting the reading of only one ms. in such a variant. Other such variants may be seen at 2 Cor. 6:16 (KC 69); 10:4 (ΧW 0209); 11:2 (om. ΘY 0243).

12:19 ΘY: XY 436 642. Possibly XY has been accidentally written here because εν XY follows.

G.

KC

KC is firm some 79 times in 1 and 2 Cor. In addition to those variants already dealt with (under B i above) there are variants at:

1 Cor.
7:17 KC… ΘC P46 Θ A B; ΘC… ΘC Ψ 629 1881; KC… KC o ΘC G; ΘC… ΚC maj.; ΚC… ΚC 1319 2004. Fee, Commentary says God is the one who assigns in Rom. 12:3; 2 Cor. 10:13 but that theological
subtlety here requires the Lord (= Jesus) to assign and God to call. That subtlety seems to have been lost on scribes.

7:23 KW: ΘW F G. The context requires ΚC to be repeated, but that is possibly what a scribe thought.

11:23 απο του ΚY: παρα α ΘY F G. The variant removes the ambiguity because ΚC following = Jesus.

11:27 ΚY: ΧΥ A 33 489. The sentence as originally constructed is well-balanced, suggesting ΚY is original.

11:29 σωμα: + του ΚY Ν; D F G etc; + του ΚY ΧΥ Ψ. Both variants seem to be explanatory glosses. Fee, Commentary thinks that the additions destroy the sense and come from the influence of v.27. There is, as we have noted earlier, no firm occurrence of ΚC ΧC in the Corinthian letters, but see Col. 3:24.

14:37 ΚY: ΘY A 1739*. εντολη του ΚY occurs at 1 Cor. 7:19 and may indicate this variant is original.

15:47 ανθρωπος Κ: ΚC 630; + ο ΚC Α D1 K L maj. ΚC is an exegetical addition which makes Paul’s original soteriological or eschatological statement Christological. The replacement of ανθρωπος 2 with ΚC loses the balanced structure of the sentence.

2 Cor.

5:6 ΚY: ΘY D* F G. The addition removes the ambiguity as is also the case at 2 Cor. 5:8 Θ Y D* (again); 5:11 ΘY 1611 1867 2005*; 8:21 του ΘY P*; 11:17 [ΘV] a f r t; ΚY 326; 12:1 ΧY F G.

6:17 om. λεγει ΚC K 1739 but cf. 6:18 and the phrase is likely to be there twice in these quotations.

8:5 KW: ΘW P* 547 a f r. Scribes have probably been influenced by ΘC following. [15]

The above examination reveals on many occasions the carelessness of scribes concerning the reproduction of the divine names. Some variants, however, are deliberate to provide explanations or to avoid apparent ambiguity. Sometimes an expansion may be due to piety and the influence of liturgical formulae. But in general it is the sheer interchangeability and flexibility of these names that is striking, and it seems to have been there from the beginning of the textual transmission.
B. Exegesis and Textual Criticism
The text of Mark 1:45 reads as follows: ο̄ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἠρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὡστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐξω ἐπ’ ἐρήμους τόποις ἤν. καὶ ἠρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν. Many commentators on Mark have noticed the ambiguity in the verse within the context of the pericope of the healing of the leper. The ambiguity concerns the identity of the subject ἠρξατο. Is it Jesus or the leper?

Translations have generally favoured the leper, e.g. the Authorized Version, Revised Version, Revised Standard Version, and the New English Bible. As a result, these translations usually add or understand the name ‘Jesus’ when rendering αὐτὸν later in the sentence. By and large recent commentators have favoured this interpretation too. Vincent Taylor, for example, argues that although ο̄ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἠρξατο could refer to Jesus, ‘it is much more probable that Mark meant the healed leper went out and disobeying the command of Jesus began to publish his story far and wide’. Similarly Nineham is aware of the ambiguity but concludes by writing of 1:45a as follows: ‘On balance St. Mark may be taken to have referred the first half of the verse to the healed leper.’ Cranfield, Swete, Johnson, and Wrede hold similar views. It is assumed that 45 belongs to 44 and that the ο̄ δὲ construction introduces a contrast with the preceding command, i.e. ‘but on the contrary the leper went out…’. It is, however, doubtful whether

---

6 W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901).
δέ would be a sufficiently strong adversative for such a meaning to be likely. The author may not have intended the action in 45 to be a contrast to the command in 43–4.

There are further linguistic details which cause difficulties for the usual translations. Jesus is the subject of the preceding main verb λέγει in 43 and it is plain that Jesus is the intended subject of δύνασθαι... εἰσελθεῖν (45b). There is nothing to indicate a change of subject for ἦρξατο. ο in 45 can be seen as a way of resuming the subject of λέγει two verses before. Also, if the leper were intended by Mark to be the subject of ἦρξατο, it is unlikely that the subject would become Jesus again in 45b by means of the weak and ambiguous pronoun αὐτόν. This point seems not always to have been recognized by translators and commentators.

There are, however, other linguistic points which help to settle the problem. In two articles several years ago G.D. Kilpatrick argued that if the leper is the subject of ἦρξατο, then λόγος would mean 'the story he made known'. This is the interpretation favoured by most of the versions listed above. Swete's commentary says λόγος means 'the tale' 'the matter' and cites 1 Macc. 8:10 and Acts 11:22 as examples of this meaning. Kilpatrick, however, shows that λόγος elsewhere in Mark does not bear the meaning 'the story', even though this can occasionally be the meaning outside Mark (e.g. Luke 5:15, 7:17, Matt, 28:15). He argues that Mark intends τὸν λόγον here to mean 'The Christian message' which is the common meaning in Mark (e.g. 2:2, 4:33, 8:32, and eight times in the Parable of the Sower), and frequently in the New Testament as a whole. It is surprising that this point has not been taken into account by later commentators on Mark. Taylor, although writing in 1952 ignores Kilpatrick’s articles and accepts the translation 'story', citing with approval Luther’s translation ‘die Geschichte’ for τὸν λόγον here.

---

7 Pace T. Nicklin on this verse in _Expository Times_, li (February 1940), p. 252.
8 One notable exception is W.C. Allen, _The Gospel according to St. Mark_ (The Oxford Church Biblical Commentary, London: Rivington, 1915).
Kilpatrick is mainly concerned with λόγος, but we can take his line of argument a little further and reinforce his conclusions.

If the leper is the subject of ἠρξατο κηρύσσειν this too would be uncharacteristic of Marcan usage. The only people said to preach (κηρύσσειν) in this Gospel are the Baptist (1:4, 7) Jesus (1:14, 38f.) or the apostles (3:14, 6:12, 13:10, 14:9, and Ps.-Mark 16:15. 20). In Mark other dramatis personae do not preach the Gospel. There are two apparent exceptions to this at 5:20 and 7:36 (verses which will be considered again later), where strangers are said to preach (κηρύσσειν); but it is clear from the contexts that it is not the gospel message which is preached. This, however, is not so in Mark 1:45; in fact the addition of διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον (‘to spread the Christian message’) parallels κηρύσσειν πολλά and is a characteristically Marcan example of tautology.

Pierson Parker in his book on Mark shows that ἠρξατο, a characteristically Marcan word, occurs 18 times in this Gospel and that the majority of the occurrences introduce acts or sayings of Jesus, or sayings by or to Peter. If Jesus is the subject of ἠρξατο at 1:45 then 11 of the 18 occurrences of ἠρξατο in Mark introduce words or acts of Jesus.

So far our consideration of the linguistic details gives strong support for the suggestion that there is no change of subject in 1:43–5 and that it is Jesus who is the subject of ἠρξατο; but despite the cumulative strength of the linguistic arguments, the exceptions noted above make us hesitate before we can accept these conclusions with confidence and certainty. To summarize: ὁ δὲ in 1:45 might indicate a change of subject; λόγος in the New Testament sometimes means ‘the news’; κηρύσσειν is not always used of preaching the gospel; and the subject of ἠρξατο in Mark is not always Jesus but can be a stranger as at 5:20. It is therefore necessary to consider the context of the verse in the pericope and in the gospel.

First, it is valuable to compare this miracle story with others where there is a command to silence. At 1:34 the demons are ordered to be silent; at 3:12 the unclean spirits are commanded not to make Jesus known; at 5:43 the people in the house are ordered to secrecy; and at 8:26 the blind man is ordered not to tell people about his cure.

---

These verses are often considered to be Marcan insertions to show Jesus’ concern in preserving the secrecy of his Messiahship. It is not recorded whether the commands for silence are obeyed or not in these stories: one must presume they are unless Mark tells us otherwise. If the leper is the subject of ἤρξατο at 1:45 then this pericope would be an exception to the other miracle stories cited above. But if the paragraph relating the healing of the leper ended at 1:44, the story would then fit in with the general pattern that Jesus’ command concludes the pericope. Form critics would presumably approve of this regular and formal climax to such miracle stories. There is, however, one story where Mark records without ambiguity that the command to silence was disregarded—this is in the story of the healing of the deaf-mute where it is reported that the crowd disobeyed Jesus’ order (7:36). Also of note is Jesus’ departure from normal practice at 5:19 where the Gerasene maniac is commanded to tell of his cure. Once again we find that 7:36 and 5:19 are the exceptions to the rule but, as often, the exceptions could well prove the rule. In both of these stories, the scene is set emphatically in the Decapolis. It is only in Galilee where the Messianic secret is preserved. At 5:18f. the man is prevented from accompanying Jesus and from going to Galilee with him. He is told with some emphasis to stay in his own area with his own people (πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς is absent from the Lucan parallel—Luke 8:39) and Mark records that the man began to preach ἐν τῇ ∆εκαπόλει. Similarly at 7:36 despite Jesus’ almost reflex-action command to silence, the people (not the deaf-mute) disobey by going out to preach, but the preaching is again in the Decapolis (7:31). In contrast, the healing of the leper is in Galilee and there is therefore no premature declaration of Jesus’ Messiahship. In the Decapolis, however, spreading the news of Jesus’ Messianic powers (which is the force of κηρύσσειν at 5:19 and 7:36) is permitted in Mark’s Christological pattern. It is noteworthy that in both verses the Greek does not have the ambiguity of subject which 1:45 has. At 5:20 the wording is clear: καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ ∆εκαπόλει, ὡσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ τὰ ἀρχαγγέλων. As also at 7:36: ὅσον δὲ αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον. Similarly, in neither of these verses is λόγος found. The proclamation in both verses is the news of the cure wrought by Jesus’ power. Mark 1:45 does not therefore agree with either 5:20 or 7:36.

If the healing of the leper ends at 1:44 the pericope conforms with the general Marcan pattern of miracle stories in Galilee which reach
their climax with a command to silence that is presumably obeyed.\textsuperscript{13} This leaves 1:45 as an unconnected verse,\textsuperscript{14} which forms a characteristically Marcan summary such as is found at 1:39 and 2:13. Many of these summary statements show Jesus’ popularity (e.g. 1:28, 2:15) or his need to escape from the crowds following him (e.g. 2:1f., 3:7ff., 3:20, 4:1, 6:31f., 6:54ff., 7:24, 9:30). Mark 1:45 also tells of Jesus’ popularity and need to escape from the crowd. All these summaries fit Mark’s alleged secrecy motif. Most of the summary statements are either isolated verses or editorial additions to a story. Mark 1:45 is just such an isolated verse and consequently unconnected with the story of the leper. If, as many writers on the synoptic problem admit and argue, many of the pericopes in Matthew and Mark are based on either one another’s work or a common source, then the parallel to the story of the healing of the leper in Matthew needs to be taken into account, and it re-enforces our case. The Matthaean parallel is in Matt. 8:1–4 and supports the argument that the pericope in Mark ends at 1:44. There is no Matthaean parallel to 1:45 after this healing.\textsuperscript{15}

Thus, consideration of the context re-enforces the general tendency of the linguistic and syntactical arguments, namely that Jesus is the subject of ἠρξατο in 1:45, that λόγος refers to the gospel message and that the verse is independent of and unconnected with the healing of the leper. This story reaches its climax in a characteristically Marcan way with a command to silence; and 1:45 is a summary statement—a device used often by Mark to provide a link with the next story as well as to give a progress report on the popularity of Jesus’ mission.

(II) IS ὁ ἐξελθὼν A TITLE FOR JESUS IN MARK 1:45?

I have argued that the pericope of the healing of the leper occurred in Mark 1:40–4 only and that 1:45 was a separate summary statement

\textsuperscript{13} There is irony in the fact that the post-Resurrection command to proclaim Jesus’ power is disobeyed—the women are silent (Mark 16:7–8).

\textsuperscript{14} As Kilpatrick suggests at the end of his article ‘Mark 1:45 and the Meaning of λόγος’, p. 390.

\textsuperscript{15} The Lucan parallel (Luke 5:12–16) follows Mark but avoids the ambiguity inherent in Mark 1:45. Luke does not state that the healed leper himself was responsible for spreading the fame of Jesus.
independent of the preceding verse. This would enable the Markan miracle story to conform to the parallel in Matt. 8:1–4, which ends with the command to silence. If the pericope ended at 1:44 it would then conform also to the general pattern of Galilean miracle stories in Mark, which reach their climax with a command to silence.

Such an interpretation makes it possible to argue that Jesus is the subject of ἠρξάτο in 1:45 and that λόγον in that verse means ‘gospel message’ which is normal in Mark. The weak and ambiguous pronoun αὐτόν in 45b need not be the first reference to Jesus in the verse (as most translators assume) but be a redundant pronoun picking up ὁ (δὲ) at the beginning of the sentence. If αὐτόν is original (DW 478 omit it) then it need not, according to New Testament usage, indicate a change of subject (cf. Matt. 24:4).

Some would wish to speak against this argument by pointing out (correctly) that ὁ δὲ in Mark always indicates a change of subject\(^{16}\) and that as Jesus is the subject of the preceding finite verb (λέγει in 1:44) he cannot therefore be the subject of ἠρξάτο. This argument would apply only if ver. 45 belonged to 44. G.D. Kilpatrick\(^{17}\) argued that ὁ δὲ introducing a new paragraph contrasted with the subject of ver. 40 at the beginning of the preceding paragraph. The subject of the finite verb in 40 is the leper and therefore the subject of ἠρξάτο should be Jesus.

These arguments about ὁ δὲ may, however, be irrelevant as we could be misreading the beginning of ver. 45. We may not be dealing with the frequent ὁ δὲ construction here. δὲ can of course often stand as a mere connective between article and noun and there are numerous instances of this in Mark, e.g. 6:19 (ἡ δὲ Ἡρῳδιάς), 15:4, 9, 14, 15 (ὁ δὲ Πιλάτου), 9:23, 27, 39, 10:5, 18, 21, 24, 29, 38 (ὁ δὲ Ἡσοῦ). ὁ in 1:45 may therefore stand not with δὲ but with ξελθόν as a substantive.

The New Testament often uses participal forms as substantives even when a cognate noun is current. Mark for instance writes ὁ βαπτιστής in preference to ὁ βαπτίζων in 1:4, 6:14, 24, 25, 8:28.\(^{18}\) cf. βοῶντος

---

\(^{16}\) As at Mark 3:4, 5:34, 6:24, 37, 38, 49, 7:6, 28, 8:5, 28, 33, 9:12, 19, 21, 32, 34, 10:3, 4, 20, 22, 26, 36, 37, 39, 48, 50, 11:6, 12:15, 16 (bis), 14:11, 20, 31, 46, 52, 61, 68, 70, 71, 15:2, 13, 14, 16:6. Most of the above instances are followed by a finite verb of speaking.

\(^{17}\) 'Mark 1:45', JTS. xlii (1941), p. 67.

at 1:3, and δαιμονιζόμενος at 5:15, 16 (where the present participle is used even after the man has been healed, showing that the participle is understood more as a noun than as a verbal form): see also στρατευόμενοι used in preference to στρατιώται in Luke 3:14. If ὁ ἔξελθων stands as an articular participle as such in Mark 1:45, δέ would merely be a connective introducing a new paragraph without necessarily having any adversative force or implying any contrast with the preceding verse or paragraph. Mark usually begins a new pericope with καί, but occasionally δέ is used—for instance at 1:14, 7:24, 10:32, 14:1, 15:6.

Grammatically and stylistically ὁ ἔξελθων is possible in Mark. But would Jesus be described in this way?

There are certain indications in Mark and in the New Testament as a whole that this is possible. Several Old Testament texts quoted in the New Testament speak of the Messiah as ‘the coming one’. The famous quotation from Ps. 118:26 (εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου) occurs in all four gospels (Matt. 21:9; Mark 11:9; Luke 19:38; John 12:13) thus showing the wide currency of this prophecy as fulfilled by Jesus. The same quotation is found on Jesus’ lips in the lament over Jerusalem (Matt, 23:39 and Luke 13:35). Jesus is also identified as the ‘one who is to come’ of the Old Testament prophecy in the question from the Baptist in Luke 7:19–20 and Matt. 11:3 (σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον (ἕτερον Matt.) προσδοκῶμεν). Jesus is seen in the verses as the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy: ‘The Coming One’ has arrived.

We may see this clearly also in the words attributed to the Baptist in his prophecy before Jesus’ ministry in John 1:15 (ὁ ὄπισω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν): here the words of Mark 1:7 have been rephrased to give force to the participle ἐρχόμενος (cf. John 1:27: ὁ ὄπισω μου ἐρχόμενος οὐ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἡμῖν). Paul in Acts 19:4, recalling John’s baptism, reminds his audience that John referred to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος. In John 6:14 ‘the people’ call Jesus ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος; and in John 11:27 Martha confesses that Jesus is the Messiah and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.


20 Other examples may be seen at Matt. 2:6; 26:46; John 6:63; 8:18, 50; Acts 17:17; Rom. 2:1; 8:34; Eph. 6:28; Phil. 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:10; 2:12; 4:8; Heb. 7:9. (See chapter 13a above)
In some later parts of the New Testament, when ideas of a second coming became prominent, ὁ ἐρχόμενος does not refer to Jesus’ ministry. For instance, Heb. 10:37 (again quoting from the Old Testament) can speak of Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος still to come.

In Mark, however, thoughts of a Parousia are not paramount. In this gospel, Jesus, ‘The Coming One’, has come: hence he is ὁ ἐξελθών. For this use of the participle the tense is significant. At Mark. 2:17 Jesus remarks in reference to his mission οὐκ ἠλθόν καλέσαι δικαιούς ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς, and at 10:45 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἠλθεν διακονηθήσαι ἀλλὰ διακονήσαι...—both passages contain the aorist of ἔρχομαι; and at 1:24 the demons, recognizing Jesus, ask him if he has come (ἦλθες) to destroy them. In this, Mark is of course close to Johannine theology where (ἐξ) ἔρχομαι is used always in the perfect or aorist when it refers to Jesus’ mission (John 5:43, 7:28, 8:14, 42, 10:10, 12:47, 13:3, 15:3—used absolutely; 3:19, 9:39, 12:46, 16:28, 18:37—used of his having come into the world; 8:42, 13:3, 16:27, 28, 30, 17:8—of his having come from God or the father; cf. also 1 John 4:1; 2 John 7; and (outside the Johannine literature) 1 Tim. 1:15, in the faithful saying which possibly emanated from a Johannine or Markan circle).

Within the context of the verse in question (Mark 1:45) Jesus says immediately before the appearance of the leper that he wishes to preach in the neighbouring country towns (ἐἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον, 1:38). Many scholars, including D.E. Nineham, argue that this refers not to Jesus’ coming from Capernaum (1:21) or out on his ministry, but to his coming from heaven, which, as we have already seen, is a common idea in Mark and John. This line of interpretation is certainly reinforced by the Lucan parallel to Mark 1:38: Luke 4:43 understood the phrase in a theological way by interpreting εἰς τοῦτο ἐξῆλθον as ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην. The close connection between Mark 1:38f. and 1:45 is seen in the parallelism εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἠλθεν κηρύσσων, and δὲ ἐξελθὼν ήρξατο κηρύσσειν. The freestanding pericope of the healing of the leper interrupts this connexion. Such an interruption is typical of Mark (cf. 14:1–2, 10–11 separated by 14:3–9; 11:12–14, 20f. separated by 11:15–19; 6:6b–13 and 30 separated by 6:14–29). The

---

21 It is debated whether Mark’s gospel contains any ideas of a Parousia. 14:62 has been interpreted as a return to God rather than a second coming from him. (See T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent (London: Epworth, 1945).)
22 In the Pelican Commentary on Mark, ad loc.
Irony in 1:45 is that Jesus, ὁ ἐξελθὼν the one who has come (i.e. from heaven), is unable to enter into (ἐισελθεῖν) any town publicly.

It is interesting to note that although ὁ ἑρχόμενος was used as a title of Jesus before and during his ministry as one who fulfilled a Messianic prophecy, and was also used with reference to the Parousia in later New Testament writings, ὁ ἐξελθὼν is found only here to describe the incarnate Jesus. This is possibly due to the fact that the description of Jesus’ ministry as completed in his lifetime had only brief and limited circulation. Once concepts of a second coming developed, Jesus had to be referred to as the one still to come and the old prophetic title ὁ ἑρχόμενος remained in current use. The present participle with its timeless form could be used not only in a future, but also in a present and a past sense.

We may therefore be more accurate in describing ὁ ἐξελθὼν in Mark 1:45 not so much as a title of Jesus, which was current as such in Christian circles, but as a description of Jesus coined by Mark on the analogy of ὁ ἑρχόμενος under the influence of εἰς τὸ γὰρ ἔξηλθον at 1:38.

(III) THE HEALING OF THE LEPER IN THE SYNOPTIC PARALLELS

I have argued above that the pericope of the healing of the leper in Mark 1 runs from vv. 40–44 and that v. 45 is a separate paragraph. The subject of this paragraph is Jesus and not the leper, as is commonly supposed by those who connect v. 45 to vv. 40–44. I was concerned with the pericope as a type of Galilean healing miracle where silence is characteristic of such stories in Mark. Also I was concerned to deduce from Markan usage that the likeliest subject of ἠρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον was Jesus.

In section (II) I tried to argue that ὁ δὲ at the beginning of the verse was not an indication that there was a change of subject from that of λέγει in v. 44 (i.e. Jesus) but either a change of subject from that at the beginning of the preceding paragraph (i.e. the leper of v. 40) or, more likely, should be read as ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν in which the participle as substantive is a way of describing Jesus in the light of v. 38.

Those sections I) and II) referred only in passing to the parallels in the other Synoptic Gospels. A closer examination of a synopsis of the
gospels at this point is helpful and reinforces my earlier conclusions. This is especially so if a suggestion by Frans Neirynck is adopted. In a recent article Neirynck has proposed printing the Sermon on the Mount to follow the parallel to Mark 1:21, and thus to precede the parallel to Mark 1:22.\(^{23}\) This has the effect, correct in my view, of making Mark 1:35–39 paralleled only in Luke and not, as in Huck’s or Aland’s Synopsis, of making Mark 1:35–38 paralleled in Luke and 5:39 paralleled in Luke and Matthew.

Taking Mark’s order as the basis the parallels to Mark 1:14–45 appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matth.</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:16–20</td>
<td>4:18–22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>4:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>7:28–29</td>
<td>4:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:23–28</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:33–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32–34</td>
<td>8:16</td>
<td>4:40–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35–39</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:42–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40–44</td>
<td>8:1–4</td>
<td>5:12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:15–16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming (a) Markan priority and (b) that Matthew and Luke have independently copied from Mark, it would seem that Luke has kept close to Mark’s order and contents and that Matthew has made an editorial selection from Mark inserting into it his own material. Those who adopt other solutions to the Synoptic problem will need to make the necessary adjustments to the arguments presented here.

Matthew appears to have inserted the Sermon on the Mount between the call of the disciples and the healing of the leper preceding the sermon with an introductory link roughly based on an expanded form of Mark 1:21 (and possibly Mark 3:7–10). Having returned to Mark 1:22 to conclude the sermon Matthew then follows Mark in having a healing except that he chooses not the healing of the demoniac in the

---

synagogue (Mark 1:23–28) but the healing of the leper. What is significant is that the verses Matthew lifts from Mark are 1:40–44. Matthew does not take v. 45 as forming part of the healing. This separate linking verse is of no use to Matthew in his reshuffled sequence of Markan pericopes.

Matthew’s behaviour may be seen as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matth.</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:12–17</td>
<td>1:14–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:18–22</td>
<td>1:16–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23–25</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–7:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:28–29</td>
<td>1:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1–4</td>
<td>1:40–44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke 4:14–5:26 has followed Mark 1:14–45 much more closely, as may be shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:16–30 (with many Lucan additions)</td>
<td>6:1–6</td>
<td>13:54–58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:33–37</td>
<td>1:23–28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40–41</td>
<td>1:32–34</td>
<td>8:16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:42–44</td>
<td>1:35–39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12–14</td>
<td>1:40–44</td>
<td>8:1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15–16</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17–26</td>
<td>2:1–12</td>
<td>9:1–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke has kept Mark’s contents and order almost exactly, with the exception of (a) 4:16–30 which replaces Mark’s call of the disciples and instead parallels loosely Mark 6:1–6, and (b) the addition of the miraculous draft of fishes (taken from a source known to the Fourth Gospel?). The addition of the latter at this point shows that Luke did not see Mark 1:35–39 as having originally been an introduction to the healing of the leper. It was recognised by Luke that Mark 1:40
was separate from 1:39. Matthew’s reorganisation of Mark shows even more clearly that the healing of the leper (Mark 1:40–44) was identified as a detachable pericope.

It is significant that Mark 1:35–39 is paralleled only by Luke. Similarly it is significant that Mark 1:45 is paralleled only by Luke. These two facts are connected, and reinforce our argument that Mark 1:38 and 1:45 are bound closely together. Mark 1:40–44 was added by Mark later than the composition of 1:35–39, 45. Similarly Mark 2:1f. which contradicts 1:45 also came in at a different stage in the composition. Matthew recognised that Mark 1:35–39 plus 45 were separable from 1:40–44, and thus felt able to delete these verses from his gospel.24

Postscriptum


---

B) ANNA’S AGE (LUKE 2:36–37)

Translations and commentaries vary over Anna’s age: some say she was a widow aged eighty-four (e.g. AV, RSV, NEB; others that she had been a widow for eighty-four years (e.g. RV). Some modern English versions (e.g. NIV, GNB) give one in the text, the other as a marginal alternative.

If she had been a widow for eighty-four years then Anna would have been over one hundred years old. We are not told at what age she married but fourteen years would be appropriate. She was married for seven years. This would mean she was about one hundred and five years old.

Not only is the figure ‘seven’ significant for the number of her years of marriage but the figure ‘eighty-four’ is of especial significance, being a multiple of two symbolic numbers, seven and twelve, both of which are made use of in several Biblical narratives. If her total age of one hundred and five is accepted then this would doubtless have reminded Luke’s readers of another Jewish prophetess who had an extended period of widowhood, namely Judith who in Jud 16:23 is said to have reached the age of one hundred and five (a multiple of seven). Just as Elizabeth in this infancy narrative is modelled on Hannah, so Anna is a type of Judith whose widowhood is in itself exemplary. Historical and literary associations as well as numerical symbolism thus favour the higher age for Anna. The context favours this too.

Luke seems to be preparing his readers for Anna’s advanced age in 2:36 by the addition of the pleonastic πολὺς in προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς when compared with 1:7 προβεβηκότες ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτῶν (of Elizabeth and Zechariah) and 1:18 when Zechariah speaks of Elizabeth as προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῆς.

---

1 Sin Syr and Ephr state that her marriage lasted only seven days.
2 01* reads seventy-four but this is a mere error as it is a number of no special significance. A different but nonetheless equally symbolic significance behind the figure eighty-four is seen by E. Nestle (Ex Tim 14 (1912–13) p. 43) who finds in Rabbi Eliezar that eighty-four years is equivalent to one hour with God.
3 This identification is often overlooked by commentators on this verse, (e.g. by M.P. John in his short note on this verse in Bib Trans 26 (1975) p. 247). Pseudo-Matthew 15 says Anna had been a widow for eighty-four years.
Lukan style may also help us here. When he gives an age or duration of time Luke applies the figure *directly* to the nearest verb (e.g. Luke 13:11, 16). This would encourage our attaching the ‘eighty-four years’ to her period of widowhood rather than our reading it as an amplification of προβεβηκυῖα in the previous verse.

The resolution of the textual variants involving the personal or demonstrative pronoun in the context may be of assistance too. Lukan style seems to make frequent use of the demonstrative οὗτος as a 3rd person pronoun (e.g. Luke 1:32; 2:34; 7:12; 8:41, 42; 19:2 (some with v.l.)). Our printed texts often vary, especially with the feminine form. In Luke 2:36 ff. it would seem most probable that the original text intended αὐτη to be read as the demonstrative αὕτη. We should then read αὕτη in v. 36, v. 37 and should add αὕτη before αὐτῆ at v. 38 (where obviously the repetition of the same letters facilitated the haplography). The longer text in v. 38 is supported by Θ, 053, fam. 1, fam. 13, and the Majority Text. There are thus three statements about Anna in vv. 36–38 each introduced by αὕτη.⁴

1. She had been married for seven years.
2. She had been a widow for eighty-four years.
3. She gave thanks to God.

Each statement is thus separate from the other. This text also avoids the clumsiness apparent in some editions of making αὕτη in v. 36 the subject of ἀνθωμολογεῖτο in v. 38.

A subordinate textual problem may be considered here. ἕως in v. 37 would imply the extent of her long widowhood was *as much as* eighty-four years. If the v.l. ὡς is original here (with 01, W, Θ, 053, fam. 1, fam. 13, Majority Text) this is unlikely to mean ‘about’ or ‘nearly’ as some lexicons state. New Testament practice often uses ὡς before numbers large and small, but always to indicate a precise figure (e.g. the precise ‘five thousand’ at Mt 14:21; 15:38, cf. Mk 5:13; 6:15; Lk 1:56; 8:42; Acts 1:15; 4:4; 5:36; 13:18, 20; 19:34; 27:37, and frequently so in John).⁵ ὡς is likely to be original here and implies a precise fig-

---

⁵ In several of these references v.ll, are found in which ὡς is omitted or is replaced with ὡσεῖ.
ure. ἕως followed by numerals in Luke seems to be used of ‘until’, i.e., ‘extent to’ as at Luke 23:44; Acts 19:9 (longer text). (In Mt 18:21f. ἕως is used in a special and significant sense of ‘up to as many as’.)

A lady’s age may be an indelicate subject for enquiry, but Luke wants us to know that his female counterpart to Simeon in the Temple was no ingénue but a centenarian προφήτις of stature and experience who invited comparison with Judith, a character famed for her thanksgiving, and for her nationalistic fervour.
C) IS POST-BAPTISMAL SIN FORGIVABLE?

Hebrews 6:4–6 is usually quoted as the definitive biblical statement that post-baptismal sin is unforgivable. The New English Bible is typical of modern translations in reading: “For when men have been enlightened, when they have had a taste of the heavenly gift and a share in the Holy Spirit, when they have experienced the goodness of God’s word and the spiritual energies of the age to come, and after all this have fallen away, it is impossible to bring them back again to repentance; for with their own hands they are crucifying the Son of God, and making mock of his death.”

Taking the semi-colon in this translation as a convenient juncture, we note that up to that point the translation is faithful to the Greek and renders accurately the four aorist participles φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους, γενηθέντας, and παραπεσόντας. These verbs are followed (significantly) by two present participles: ἀνασταυροῦντας and παραδειγματίζοντας. It is the rendering of these verbs which causes problems. As we have seen, the NEB adds “for”; RSV and Moffatt add “since”; AV and RV add “seeing that”. But is there any need to include these words? Must these two present participles be in a causal clause?

The words after the semi-colon could be translated “while they are crucifying . . . and mocking . . .”, taking the participles as temporal. Such a translation is to be commended. It makes sense of the dramatic change to the present participles after the sequence of aorists. But it is not a translation which has commended itself to modern versions. The ARV has “the while (they crucify) . . .” but only in the margin. F.D.V. Narborough in his 1930 Clarendon Bible places in the margin “the while they are crucifying . . .” but appears to neglect the significance in the commentary. The Revised Peake seems only to hint at this translation. Modern commentators prefer to support the causal sense. Manson states that the author assumes that there has been a falling away and that the crucifying and the mocking are examples of

---

this falling away. Westcott\(^4\) says the present participles bring out the moral cause of the impossibility which has been affirmed. Cf. the commentaries by Héring\(^5\) and Spicq\(^6\) for similar comments.

The causal sense gives the harder saying. Tertullian (De pudic. 20) obviously took a firm line and argued that post-baptismal sin was an irreversible step, and this teaching tended to commend itself to church authorities, although modern preachers seem not to repeat this strong line. But is this a correct reading and interpretation of Hebrews 6? Is it a tenet of New Testament teaching that the baptised Christian is in a worse position than the unbaptised, insofar as the latter still has the opportunity to repent and be forgiven, but that the former having once been forgiven will never again be forgiven should he subsequently fall?

Hebrews 10 is usually cited as support for the traditional hard line of Hebrews 6, but in 10:26f. a sacrifice for post-baptismal sin is denied only to those who, having received the knowledge of truth, persist in sin. The emphasis in this paragraph seems to be on the persistence, not on the fact that a sin has been committed. Biblical teaching elsewhere seems not to support Tertullian’s teaching. Romans 6, for example, deals with a similar situation. The Roman Christians are told that because they had been buried (in baptism) with Christ and therefore died to sin they should no longer sin. Paul says that although it is now illogical for them to sin they were still capable of sinning, and he therefore exhorts them not to allow sin to remain in their body (6:12). The auctor ad Hebreos is giving similar advice in 6:4–6 (cf. Hebrews 2:14f.).

In the sub-apostolic Similitudes of Hermas 8, a second chance of repentance after post-baptismal sin is permitted.

The suggested translation of Hebrews 6 would agree with this doctrine. The falling away need not be seen as irreversible. Because of the two qualifying present participles, which explain the nature of the falling away, repentance is impossible only while those who sinned are still doing so. The possibility of conversion need not be ruled out. F.F. Bruce\(^7\) states that such a moderating rendering is a “truism hardly

---

worth putting into words”. But the words would have had hortatory significance and it may well have been necessary to state even the laxer doctrine in order to stress that baptism, far from ensuring eternal forgiveness automatically, needed to be accompanied by moral behaviour and sinlessness if its effects were to be seen.

As well as being defensible theologically, the suggested translation also suits the immediate context in Hebrews. In the illustration of 6:7–8 the thorns and the thistles (i.e. the sin which parallels the crucifying and the mocking of v. 6) are burned, not the ground (i.e. the sinner). In other words the sinner is left purged and forgiven (cf. 1 Corinthians 3:15).

Our suggested translation also agrees with the use of the present participle elsewhere in Hebrews. The author’s usage supports our taking the participles in a contemporary, temporal sense rather than in a causal. In the next verse, 6:7, we have an example of the present participle used temporally. Similarly see Hebrews 1:3–4 where φέρων is temporal and is surrounded by aorists; cf. also ὅν at 5:8, ποιῶν at 13:21, and πειραζόμενος at 11:17. Our author is precise with the tenses of the participles. Note the correct use of the perfect at 7:26, 28; cf. also Heb 6.10 διακονήσαντες followed by διακονοῦντες—the latter having contemporary not causal significance.

Hebrews 6:6 should therefore read: “...it is impossible to bring them back again to repentance while they are crucifying the Son of God with their own hands and making mock of his death.”

Postscriptum


CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

THE PARABLE OF THE TWO SONS: 
TEXT AND EXEGESIS

Joël Delobel has reminded us on numerous occasions in oral presentations and in published writings of the interaction of textual criticism and exegesis. The editing of a text, the choosing of one textual variant in preference to another, and the discussion of manuscript variants are all concerned with meaning; and meaning gives rise to exegesis.

Whenever a variant makes sense (as most variants do) then the ms(s). which contain(s) that reading would have been used, read and understood by its readers as if all of its distinctive and peculiar readings belonged to the canonical text of sacred scripture. If a church or monastery possessed but one copy of, say, the gospels, then its ms., however flawed some of its readings may be judged to be by textual critics nowadays, would have been interpreted as the original gospel text by its users, most, if not all, of whom would have been unaware that its ms. possessed any distinctive or peculiar readings.

The aim of modern text-critics is, of course, to try to produce a text that is as close to the original author’s writing as they can, dependent as they always are on the chance survival of a small proportion of all the ms. copies that were ever made, and in recognition of the fact that even our oldest surviving copies are several generations removed from that autograph.

To produce a critically established text is an obligation placed on text-critics by the wider reading public. But that proper, albeit narrow, aim should be accompanied by a recognition that sometimes the alternative ‘secondary’ text is important and needs to be displayed alongside the supposed original. Textual criticism can plot the history of Christian doctrine or exegesis as much as it can hope to establish an original text.1

1 See M.W. Holmes, “Reasoned Eclecticism and the Text of Romans”, in S.V. Soderlund and N.T. Wright (eds.), Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee (Grand Rapids. MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans. 1999), pp. 187–202, p. 201: ”Obviously one cannot exegete (sic) a document until its text has been deter-
Textual variants that affect meaning by definition influence exegesis. That is especially true of those variants which involve a choice between a longer and a shorter text. One’s understanding of Mark’s intentions differs according to whether his opening verse (possibly its title) includes the words ‘Son of God’ or not. Similarly, the theology of Mark’s teaching on resurrection depends on whether one’s text includes the last twelve verses of chapter 16 or not. Likewise, the text-critical crux at Rom 5:1 or the variants at Heb 2:9 are profoundly important for one’s exegesis of their context. The way in which one treats the variants at the end of Luke similarly influences the exegesis of that Gospel, not least in the theologically sensitive area of the presence (or not) of the Ascension.

As an example of the need to be aware of and alert to all reasonable alternative readings, the Matthean parable usually known as the Parable of the Two Sons (Mt 21:28–32)² has been chosen for this essay.

The parable may well have had a pre-Matthean origin. As it now stands, the parable is an interruption between vv. 23–27 and vv. 31b–32. The ideas in verses 25 and 26 are picked up in v. 32. The passage 21:23–32 reads well without the parable. (We may compare the insertion of this parable with Luke’s addition of the Parable of the Two Debtors into his version of the anointing story.) If Mt 21:28–31a had originally circulated as an independent unit,³ the message would simply be that actions speak louder than words. This parable about saying and doing in the context in which it finds itself is rather strained as an illustration of unbelief and belief in relation to John the Baptist.

² Although the ἄνθρωπος [τις] seems to be defined as the children’s ‘father’ in Jesus’ subsequent question, the children are not called his sons. The common description of this parable as the Parable of the Two Sons owes something to a comparison with Luke’s Parable of the Prodigal Son. The two boys in that parable are υἱοί. Possibly Matthew avoids υἱός in Mt 21:28–32 because the parable following (Mt 21:33–41) may be read as an allegory, in which the landowner’s son is Jesus. In 21:28–32 the author would not wish a reader to identify either son as Jesus. If the ‘father’ in v. 31 is ‘God’ and Jesus asks which boy obeys God’s will, then there is a difference between the ἄνθρωπος in v. 28 and the πατήρ in v. 31, and the vocative κύριε (rather than πάτερ) in one boy’s reply is merely a respectful address within the context of the parable. (If there is a subtext here reminding us of Mt 7:21 then κύριε; = ‘Lord’: οὕτως ὁ λέγων μοι· κύριε κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.)

³ Possibly even without the answer to the question—and in many ways the free-standing parable (ending with πατρός;) would be even more effective and characteristic of the gospels as an unanswered question addressed to the readers.
Here, however, we are not concerned with the parable’s pre-literary or pre-Matthean origins but with its textual transmission as part of the canonical Gospel of Matthew.

The parable in Matthew appears in three main differing forms, which we label here Form 1, Form 2, and Form 3.

**Form 1**

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω, ὕστερον (δὲ) μεταμεληθεῖς ἀπῆλθεν.

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἐγώ, κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν.

λέγουσιν· ὁ πρῶτος.

In the reading of א C* Maj with support from the bulk of Vulgate mss. and OL mss. c f q Syr* Syr² Copt* mss the first child refuses but later changes his mind. The second child agrees to the man’s request but reneges on his promise. The child who does his father’s will is identified as ὁ πρῶτος. The hearers’ judgement appears to agree with Jesus’. This sequence is the reading in the Huck-Lietzmann synopsis and in NA27 (= UBS⁵), which basically agrees with the editions of Tischendorf, Vogels, and Bover. This order is found in the RSV, the Jerusalem Bible and the AV.

**Form 2**

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἐγώ, κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν.

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω, ὕστερον μεταμεληθεῖς ἀπῆλθεν.

λέγουσιν· ὁ ὕστερος. [B Copt* both]

or

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ὑπάγω, κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν.

ό δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω, ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεῖς ἀπῆλθεν.

λέγουσιν· ὁ ἔσχατος. [mss. Θ fam. 13 Diatarm]

In the reading found in B Θ fam. Copt* and Diatarm the first child is the one who promises to work in the vineyard but disobeys; the second child refuses but later obeys. The child who does the father’s will is identified in v. 31 as ὁ ὕστερος⁴ in B or ἔσχατος in Θ fam. or δεύτερος (4, 273 according to the apparatus in Legg).⁵ Again, the hearers’ judgement

---

⁴ Although in other contexts ὑστερος could be seen as a grammatical correction for ἔσχατος when only two elements are listed, here this word is possibly original, because of the author’s play on words (ὕστερον in v. 29). The change to ἔσχατος could well have been made to avoid repetitiveness.

⁵ Cf. v. 30 where B א C* read δεύτερος (א* C* read ἐτέρῳ with maj. D Θ). The correctors show that the changes were deliberate and self-conscious. The reading of B and the correctors was printed in NA25 and other editions in v. 30 (see NA27 appendix III, ad loc.).
seems to agree with Jesus'. This reading, possibly as old as the creation of Tatian’s Diatessaron, is found in Westcott and Hort’s edition, von Soden, NA\textsuperscript{25} and is the sequence found in NEB and REB.

That \(\text{א}\) and B support different readings is the reason why textual critics, especially those who favour readings which have the support of these two mss. together, find this variation unit difficult. On external ground these two readings are equally balanced in the eyes of those who set great store by such attestation.

There is a third reading, supported mainly by D and some Old Latin Mss. (\(a\ aur b\ d\ e\ ff^1\ ff^2\ g\ h l\ r^1\)) and by Syr\(\text{א}\):
\[
\text{ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐ θέλω, ὑστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα}
\]
\[
ο ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἰπεν· ἐγώ, κύριε, ὑπάγω, καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν.
\]
\[
λέγονσιν· ὁ ἔσχατος.
\]

Here the order of the children is as in Form 1 above, but the child who does the father’s will is said by the hearers to be the one who agrees to the man’s request yet seems to do nothing to fulfil it. In this form the judgement of the hearers and the response of Jesus may be thought to differ.

We may summarize the textual issue as follows: Is the recusant but later obedient boy mentioned first or second? What is the answer to Jesus’ question: is it ‘the first’ or ‘the latter’? Two of the forms (1 and 3) have the same sequence but different answers. Two of the forms (2 and 3) have the same answer but a different order.

The UBS text recognizes the complexity of the textual arguments by labelling the reading “C” (which means that the committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text). Aland & Aland, Text, introduce the complexities of this parable in their chapter on the praxis of textual criticism\textsuperscript{6} as “unquestionably” (p. 316) the most difficult problem of textual criticism.

Textual critics (and exegetes) normally assume that the original authors wrote sense. Perhaps that is the correct and wise assumption to make, but it cannot be denied that there are several places in the New Testament manuscript tradition where there is a confused textual position and that where there are many variants at a particular varia-

tion unit we are often dealing with either an obscure passage or one which early commentators and readers felt to be in need of interpretation and even rewriting.

Certainly in the parable of the two children the nest of variants (greater than the two main variants involving the sequence of obedient child / disobedient child, as may readily be observed in the apparatus of NA) tells us that the early copyists had as much difficulty with the verses as modern commentators.

A. In Favour of Form 2

a) Exegetes take the story within a context in which i) Jesus’ audience in 21, 23 comprises “the chief priests and the elders of the people”; ii) the parable follows on from a discussion about the authority of John the Baptist; iii) the parable leads on to Jesus’ statement in Mt 21:31b–32. Thus they identify the child who refuses but later changes his mind and goes (presumably to work “in the vineyard”) with the tax collectors and prostitutes; the other child is therefore identified with the chief priests and elders, who had refused to believe John. Thus the tax collectors and prostitutes (a unique combination in the New Testament) symbolizing those deemed to be ‘outsiders’ from the Jewish perspective could well be ‘Gentiles’, and the chief priests and elders, as representatives of the Jewish establishment, could be ‘the Jews’—that bloc which so regularly in the New Testament means those Jews who refused to follow Jesus and who were not Christians.

Read this way the parable may be interpreted as a statement of the composition of the Christian community at the time of Matthew’s writing—a situation similar to that which Paul had tried to explain several decades earlier, as he observed that the churches around him

---

7 D Lvt (except aur g’ l) add εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα. The verb ὑπάγει in v. 28 is clear; the verb ἔπηλθεν in vv. 29 and 30 seems to require the meaning “to go off to work in the vineyard”. (For an alternative meaning see the discussion of Michaels’ explanation, below.) Οὗ θέλω must mean οὗ θέλω ὑπάγειν and ἐγώ implies ἐγώ ὑπάγω as the v.l. + ὑπάγω in D and v.l. ὑπάγω (pro ἐγώ) in Θ (and printed by von Soden) make clear.
8 Of course as the father in v. 31 is God, then what is meant is that the chief priests and elders disobeyed not John per se but the teachings of God; one of John the Baptist’s purposes was to remind such people of God’s word (cf. v. 32). Of course, when the parable existed as a free-standing unit, the reference to John in v. 32 would not originally have belonged to the parable.
(many of which had indeed been his creation) were predominantly Gentile and that the bulk of opposition to his Christian message was generated by ‘the Jews’. It thus seemed a self-evident fact for Matthew, as for Paul, that the ones previously ‘not my people’ were now the insiders and that this was indeed ‘the will of the father (God)’ (Mt 21:31). On such a reading the parable of the two children would then stand as a retrojection into the ministry of Jesus of the situation in the life of the early church. The observable demography and composition of the Matthean and other churches was a surprising turn of events for the earliest apostles, and was in need of explanation (as Paul himself found): one way to resolve the issue, certainly in terms of the narrative genre of a gospel, was to invent a dominical saying to justify the situation with a prophecy.\(^9\)

This argument would favour the sequence found as Form 2 in which the first child (= the Jewish nation) is the one who is initially compliant but who does nothing, and child number two (the one who was originally an outsider but who is now the beneficiary of the promises of God) represents the Gentiles. (In other words the Parable of the Two Sons is a different way of writing the “parable” of the two olive trees of Rom 11.) That sequence fits in with the way in which Christianity or the history of salvation was perceived. If that was indeed Matthew’s understanding, then the chronological sequence found in those mss. which support Form 2 is correct and represents what Matthew wrote. We have another piece of early Christian writing about the rejection\(^10\) of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles.

---

\(^9\) In v. 31 προάγουσιν may be taken as having a future meaning and therefore be eschatological. But in the context—especially if the kingdom is understood as a present reality (cf. Lk 11:20)—the present tense may be understood as Jesus’ divine foreknowledge of the state of affairs in Matthew’s church beyond the circumstances of his own ministry.

\(^10\) Whether this was seen as a temporary or permanent rejection of the Jews depends on whether we take this merely as an illustration of precedence or not. At the end of another parable about a vineyard in this gospel (Matt 20:16) comes the saying: οὕτως ἐσονται οἱ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἐσχατοί which is also to be found in Mt 19:30. This implies that the Jews will ultimately be admitted, cf. Rom 11:32: συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. But against such an interpretation see the conclusion to the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen following (Mt 21:43: ἀρθήσεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἐθνεῖ ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς). In 21:45 the chief priests (and Pharisees) recognise that Jesus’ parables (the plural there suggests most naturally the two parables of 21:28–31a, 33–41) apply to them. The ‘optimistic’ interpretation is hardly in keeping with Matthew’s view in 21:41–43, and especially if we accept the originality of v. 44 as part of the saying, where the tenants of the vineyard (surely ‘the Jews’)
b) A different argument in favour of the originality in Matthew of the sequence in Form 2 is found in an article by J.D.M. Derrett, who claims that the disobedient but ultimately compliant boy of the parable is parallel to the younger son in the Parable of the Prodigal Son of Luke 15:11–32. Hence the designation of him as δεύτερος in v. 30. After the originally free-standing parable of the two boys was inserted into its present context Derrett argues that this son was understood to represent the tax-collectors and prostitutes—sinnners who eventually followed the teaching of the Baptist (here understood as the father in the parable) and hence the order in Form 2 was adjusted by scribes to fit the sequence of v. 31 where the tax-collectors and prostitutes precede ‘you’ (the audience of v. 23). This according to Derrett, is why Form 1 was created.

B. In Favour of Form 1

a) If it is legitimate to interpret the parable as entirely ‘intra-mural’ among Jews and not as a contrast between Jews and Gentiles, we are now dealing here with two types of Jews, the obedient and the disobedient, with the tax-gatherers and prostitutes representing the former. Form 1 matches Jesus’ application in v. 31b where the tax-gatherers and prostitutes precede the chief priests and elders into the Kingdom. Once interpreters later than Matthew identified the two types as ‘Gentiles’ and ‘Jews’ the original order (Form 1) was adjusted to fit the chronology whereby the first boy, who says he will obey but disobeys, represents Jews, and the second boy is the recusant who later obeys. If that argument is accepted, then the original in Matthew is Form 1, altered by scribes to Form 2. This explanation is therefore the reverse of Derrett’s argument.

b) The ostensibly more accurate sequence in Form 2 from the Christians’ perspective of salvation history could, however, be the secondary reading imposed by later scribes. On that argument Matthew’s original sequence was that of Form 1.

---

are thrown out the vineyard apparently irrevocably and irretrievably, and the rejected stone has now become the cornerstone.

12 Cf. note 5 above.
c) An alternative but weaker argument favouring the originality of Form 1, would be to say that because Form 2 makes the first boy the one who agreed to the command, then the story could read somewhat illogically and be in need of adjustment. This requires readers to have been puzzled why the man should turn to the second son if the first had already agreed to go. Logic would dictate that the man would only turn to the second if the first had refused.13 This argument would suggest that if Matthew wrote Form 1 then Form 2 would be a scribal change to improve the logical details in the story. But the argument implies that the man needed only one worker in his vineyard. It fails to recognise a conventional story-telling technique in which the same questions are repeated to more than one person with differing consequences. Also, may it not be that in 21:28ff. the man is testing both boys—he makes the same request of both before waiting to see who obeys? If that is so, then we cannot solve the ‘original’ sequence on grounds of logic.

C. In Favour of Form 3

The reading in D is the one that is most difficult. Often the maxim *difficilior lectio potior* is applied to text-critical decisions, but in this case the reading of the maverick so-called Western text (of which D is one of the earliest representatives) is often deemed to be too difficult by far14—a lectio difficilima. Such is the opprobrium in which many distinctively Western readings are regarded! Nevertheless, the relative consistency with which its interpretation is carried out in certain mss. (especially through to v. 32) suggests that the reading was taken seriously.

The text of D here has been interpreted and made sense of by several scholars. Westcott and Hort treated it seriously and devoted a considerable amount of space to the variants in these verses in their

---

13 We could perhaps equate the story here with that of the Parable of the Wedding Feast (Mt 22:1–14) where the king’s slaves try to find a willing acceptance to the king’s invitation until they succeed.

14 B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary to the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and the United Bible Societies, 1994) p. 45 calls this reading “not only difficult” but “nonsensical”.
“Notes on Select Readings”.

Among their points is that, although the Western text is not original, it stands intermediate between Form 2, the reading of B, and Form 1, the reading of א. They argue that the reading now found in D was understood as a rebuke to the Jewish leaders’ “wilful denial of the truth”.

At least one patristic writer read the D type text in that way. Jerome was obviously alert to the reading now known to us from D. In his Commentary on Matthew he writes (ad loc.): si autem novissimum volverimus legere, manifesta est interpretatio, ut dicamus intelligere quidem veritatem Judaeos, sed tergiversari et nolle dicere quod sentiunt, sicut est baptismum Joannis scientes esse de caelo dicere noluerunt (cf. his comments on v. 27). His argument that the hearers deliberately gave a foolish reply to Jesus’ question “Who did the father’s will?” requires us to understand (prompted by v. 45) that the chief priests and elders recognised that the story was directed at them. B.M. Metzger (Commentary, ad loc.) dismisses as overly subtle an explanation attributing to the Jews (or to Matthew) “far-fetched psychological…motives”.

In favour of Form 3 one notes that two chapters further on in this Gospel (Mt 23:3) Jesus castigates other Jewish groups (scribes and Pharisees) as hypocrites who do not practise what they preach:…κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἐργα σὺνέν μὴ ποιεῖτε· λέγουσιν γάρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσιν. That was precisely the fault of one of the children in the parable under our microscope. To have the Jewish groups approve of the behaviour of the hypocrites (as the D text does in v. 31) would not be inconsistent with Matthew’s view of ‘the Jews’, but one can appreciate why such a sophisticated text would not be popular with copyists for whom the moral of the parable would need to be more directly focused for their readers.

This reading would not be untypical of Codex Bezae. Epp’s argument that the theological tendency of many of the distinctive readings in D are anti-Jewish could be reenforced by this interpretation of the reading here.

---


16 Cf. the Beelzebul controversy (Mt 12:22–30).

The reading of D may explain Jesus’ words against the chief priests and the elders in his strongly worded response,\textsuperscript{18} prefaced, as his important logia are, with \textit{ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν}. In Form 3 the judgement of the hearers must differ from Jesus’, hence his tirade against their answer; his reaction is more likely in Form 3 than if he were merely responding to a judgement with which he was in agreement, as seems to be the case in Forms 1 and 2.

In more recent times J.R. Michaels treated the reading of D to careful exegesis.\textsuperscript{19} Among his conclusions are that the parable in Matthew interprets an earlier parable and turns it into what he calls the Parable of the Regretful Son, of which Form 3 as found in Lvt (aur g1 l (r2)) contains our earliest surviving example. That text was later contaminated with additions and changes of order or wording. To reach such conclusions Michaels quite properly makes use of Matthean language and style. In particular he discusses the meaning of a) \textit{μεταμελῆσθαι} and b) \textit{ἀπῆλθεν}.

a) \textit{μεταμελῆσθαι} is taken to mean something less than \textit{μετανοεῖν} and is best rendered by ‘to show futile regret’, a comparison being made with the use of this verb to describe Judas in Mt 27:3. In 2 Cor 7:8–10 \textit{μεταμέλομαι} (and \textit{μεταμέλητον}) appear alongside \textit{μετάνοιαν} and could bear a different meaning. The absence of the negative before in \textit{μετεμελήθητε} in v. 32 (in D) implies that the chief priests and elders were compared to the first boy; the addition of the negative in other mss. contrasts them to that boy. Michaels argues that for Matthew to specify here that the chiefs and elders are to be identified with the boy who showed futile regret confirms that for D at least the verb \textit{μεταμελῆσθαι} carried an unfavourable connotation. Variation over the negative and variants adding or omitting or repositioning the negative show the confusion among copyists about the meaning and significance of this verb.

b) \textit{ἀπῆλθεν}, according to Michaels, implies a mere “slinking off”. The boy refuses his father’s request, regrets his action “too late” (which is how he translates \textit{ὑστερον} cf. Mt 25:11) and goes away (but not to the vineyard); the other boy says he will obey the man and does not

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Lk 7:29–30. Unlike the tax-collectors the scribes refused John’s baptism—that accusation seems to have been well established.

slink off. One enters the kingdom, the other is excluded; the latter may be compared with those refusing the king’s invitation to the wedding feast and are destroyed (Mt 22:7). Michaels notes that those who fail to come to the wedding feast in Mt 22:4 and 5 respond negatively (ἀπῆλθεν in 22:5). He also draws attention to ἀπῆλθεν in Mt 19:22 when the rich young man fails to respond to Jesus’ request to follow him.

One major problem in Michaels’ interpretation is that the mss. are not consistent. D and its allies but not Lvt (aur gi l) are among the very ones that support the v.l. + εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα post ἀπῆλθεν in v. 29! Another argument against Michaels is one that he himself acknowledges (his fn. 16), namely that in the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard ἀπῆλθεν expresses obedience to the householder’s command “Go (ὑπάγετε) into the vineyard” (Mt 20:4) and Michaels therefore has to describe Matthew’s usage as ‘flexible’.

Michaels’ essay is to be commended: it is a fine example of how even the reading all too easily branded as bizarre can be explained. The faithful who owned and read D could well have found a plausible reading within their text of Matthew 21. We may not accept all of Michaels’ conclusions (especially his attempt to find an originally oral parable behind the parable written by Matthew seems strained, as too do his arguments showing the parallel growth of an oral and written form of these two, originally, separate parables) but we applaud his attempt to take seriously the exegesis of a version of these verses which circulated not only in D but in the Old Latin, sometimes in slightly differing forms, a fact which allows him to argue that this reading had a certain currency over a long period in different churches. His article of over 30 years ago deserves greater recognition.

C.-B. Amphoux20 identifies Form 3 as the earliest of the three main forms of this parable that have come down to us. He, like Michaels, recognises that the verb ἀπῆλθεν needs attention, but makes much of the fact that the boy who says “yes” stays with the man and that there is therefore no rupture: as he takes that to be a favourable state of affairs, it merits the response ‘the last’. But the difficulty here is that,

although this boy may indeed remain with the man, it is nonetheless against the command that he leaves him and goes to the vineyard.

The purpose in using the illustration of this particular parable as an example of the dilemma textual critics face if their main purpose is to establish one particular form of the text of the New Testament as the ‘original’ text is to emphasize that in these circumstances an editor of a critical text or a textual critic has the obligation to present in an even-handed way both or all competing variation units, especially if (as in the case of this parable) plausible alternatives exist. Such viable alternatives mean that each is capable of bearing a legitimate meaning—each carries within it a sense which would have been used by its readers. To deny commentators and exegetes the chance to expound on more than one form of the text by restricting the critical text to only one variation unit, especially in places where the chosen text is uncertain (a “C” or a “D” reading to use the rating system of the UBS text), is indefensible.

Quite how the alternatives ought to be displayed is for discussion by publishers and editors. In some cases a critical apparatus could identify in a distinctive way in the margin those readings which merit consideration. NA alerts its readers (pp. 45*ff.) to the fact that the text in NA is a working text, not fixed for all time: “It intends to provide the user with a well-founded working text together with the means of verifying it or alternatively of correcting it”. That message needs to be clearly understood by users of that edition. A similar message ought to accompany other comparable editions. For translations the use of marginal notes or sections bracketed off from the main text is tried and trusted, but occasionally, as with the parable discussed here consideration ought perhaps be given to presenting in parallel columns within the body of the text the different forms of the text as genuine alternatives labelled “either/or”. These methods would encourage the results of textual criticism to be more immediately available to those whose business is exegesis.

---

21 Something like the ‘bullet points’ in the Editio Critica Maior of James suggests itself.
Further see:
CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

PAUL’S TEACHING ON MARRIAGE IN I CORINTHIANS:
SOME PROBLEMS CONSIDERED

I Corinthians 7 deals with marriage and related topics. The chapter may be conveniently subdivided: vv. 1–7 contain Paul’s discussion on conjugal rights; in vv. 8–9 Paul gives his famous advice to the unmarried and widows; in vv. 10–11 Paul repeats Jesus’ command prohibiting divorce; vv. 12–24 concern the problem of the Christian married to a pagan; vv. 25–38 return to the problem of the unmarried; and vv. 39–40 concern the remarriage of widows. This to-ing and fro-ing is typical of Paul’s often irregular method of presenting arguments. Our first problem is the unity of vv. 25–38. We need to ask (a) if the section is connected or whether vv. 36–8 concern a separate problem from vv. 25–35 and (b) which group or groups of persons in the Corinthian church Paul is addressing in these verses.

Commentaries on I Corinthians usually point out the many exegetical problems in vv. 36–8. If one follows the RV and Allo’s commentary then one assumes Paul is giving advice to the father of a girl who is beyond marriageable age: if the father thinks he is behaving dishonourably to his daughter in this regard Paul assures him he is not sinning by letting her marry; but if he is resolute to keep her unmarried, his behaviour is even more commendable. Such an interpretation is, however, strange. As Héring points out there has been no previous mention of parental duties nor is there any explanation why the father should have scruples because his daughter is too old for marriage. The verb γαμείτωσαν (v. 36) introduces an abrupt change of subject: a suitor has not been mentioned in the context. The v.l. γαμείτω read by D* G 1611 and others is clearly secondary to avoid this awkward plural.

The language in these verses is similarly against the traditional interpretation. παρθένος is an unusual word to use for ‘daughter’. The RV

for example finds it necessary to add the word ‘daughter’ after ‘virgin’ in both v. 36 and v. 37. The adjective ὑπέρακμος is difficult to translate but the rendering ‘past marriageable age’ ‘past the flower of her age’ required for this interpretation is not necessarily the most natural translation for the adjective (see below) nor is it likely in the context of I Cor. 7 that Paul would urge a scrupulous father to give his daughter in marriage merely because she is advancing in years.

The reason why this interpretation has been favoured is because of the verb γαμίζω in v. 38 or ἐκγάμιζω which I would wish to argue is the correct reading both here and throughout the New Testament whenever it occurs as a variant. (ἐκ)γάμιζω is usually assumed to mean ‘to give in marriage’ as at Matt. 22:30 and parallels and Matt. 24:38 and parallel. If this is so, then parental duty seems to be implied in the context but it is by no means necessary to translate the verb as transitive. As Lietzmann3 points out, the classical rule whereby -ιζω (transitive) verbs are differentiated from -εω (intransitive) verbs is not always respected in Koine Greek. He points to the examples ὑστερίζω, γνωρίζω, χρονίζω, ὑνίζω, παννυχίζω, ἐλπίζω, ὑβρίζω, and ἐρίζω as indications of the weakening of the transitive -ιζω form in Hellenistic usage.4 (ἐκ) γάμιζω could therefore be used by Paul as a synonym for γαμέω.

The RSV assumes a different situation altogether for these verses. The interpretation in this translation is that Paul in v. 36 is speaking of engaged couples. παρθένος in 36–8 therefore means ‘fiancée’. Paul is advising the man to marry his fiancée if his passions are strong although he is specially commended if he refrains from marrying her. In this translation ὑπέρακμος means ‘highly sexed’, a meaning found elsewhere in the second-century medical writer Soranus (see Liddell and Scott). Grammatically ὑπέρακμος could refer either to the man or to his fiancée, but the context makes it more likely that it refers to the man because it is he who is the subject of the nearest finite verb. γαμείτωσαν now appears naturally in its context and refers to the girl and her suitor. This interpretation seems probable and agrees with Paul’s advice about marriage in v. 2, v. 6 and especially v. 9. The phrase

---

4 See also J.K. Elliott, The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus (Studies and Documents 36) (Utah: University of Utah Press, 1968), p. 79.
καὶ οὕτως ὁφεῖλε γίνεθαι in v. 36 implying the pressure of society supports this interpretation.

Thus it would seem that vv. 36–8 give Paul’s advice to engaged couples. Many commentators agree on this. What I wish to argue here is that the entire section (vv. 25–38) concerns engagement. Much of the argument hinges on the meaning of παρθένος in this section. The topic begins in v. 25 with the words περὶ τῶν παρθένων. Such a formula is characteristic of this epistle and always indicates that Paul is now turning to a topic raised by the Corinthians. In view of our decision about the meaning of παρθένος in vv. 36–8, παρθένοι here could mean ‘engaged couples’. παρθένος in the rest of the chapter refers only to women although in Koine Greek it can refer to men also (cf. Rev. 14:4). Pace the NEB, παρθένων in v. 25 is unlikely to mean ‘celibacy’—for this παρθενία would have been appropriate. v. 28 can also support our case: this verse reads ‘if you (addressing the man) marry, you have not sinned: and if ἡ παρθένος marries she has not sinned’. The context suggests betrothed couples are in mind: couples undecided whether or not to fulfil their promises of marriage in view of the present distress. Paul has been asked about this issue and as so often in I Cor. he carefully and legalistically sets out his arguments: in this particular chapter he attempts to avoid further misunderstanding by presenting his argument from both the man’s and the woman’s side. The meaning ‘virgin’ is inappropriate in v. 28.

In the rest of the New Testament παρθένος is commonly used of a betrothed girl. In Luke 1:27 Mary is called παρθένος—she is engaged: Matt. 1:18, 23 are similar. The parable in Matt. 25:1–13 speaks of the ten girls as παρθένοι (vv. 1, 7, 11) which in the context of waiting for their bridegroom most naturally means ‘brides’ or ‘betrothed girls’. Another example of this use of παρθένος is at II Cor. 11:2 where again marriage is mentioned in the context, and where the addition of ἁγνή suggests παρθένος does not bear the meaning ‘chasteness’.

Further evidence that παρθένος means ‘betrothed girl’ is found in the troublesome I Cor. 7:34. Paul here differentiates between the unmarried woman and the παρθένος. This is natural in the context: one does not seek marriage, the other is engaged but both are linked because until marriage they are both able to serve the Lord. There is no difficulty in both being linked by the singular verb μεριμνᾷ. The text which most naturally allows us to accept this meaning is the reading of \(^15\) BP 104 181, etc. Here καὶ μεμέρισται belongs to v. 33 (i.e.
the married man is divided in his loyalty to God on the one hand and to his wife on the other). The reading of D‘GK etc. μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος is to be rejected: it gives an unnatural force to the verb μερίζω which does not normally mean ‘there is a difference between’. The reading of Ἐ ὀ Ἂ etc. while apparently connecting καὶ μεμέρισται with the preceding words, agrees with D‘GK in so far as the word ἄγαμος is added after παρθένος. The scribes who made this addition were unaware of the technical term παρθένος in this section. The reading of Ἐ ὀ Ἂ Ἄ etc. preserves the balance in these verses. vv. 32–3 contrast the unmarried man with the married man. This balances v. 34 which contrasts the unmarried woman (including the engaged girl) with the married woman.

In view of the above arguments about the interpretation of παρθένος in the section vv. 25–38, v. 27 should now be translated ‘Are you engaged to a woman? Do not seek a release (i.e. do not break off the engagement). Are you free from a woman (i.e. single)? Then do not seek a woman (as wife).’ Most translations, however, render λέλυσαι by ‘divorced’ or ‘separated’. This may do justice to the perfect tense but the advice following in v. 28 is inconsistent both with Paul’s advice in v. 11 and possibly with v. 39 where Paul contemplates the remarriage of widows but not of divorcees. It would seem that first marriages are implied in v. 28.

The suggested translation above of v. 27 demands taking γυνὴ as ‘woman’ for the first two occurrences of the word in the verse although ‘wife’ is a possible translation for the third occurrence. It is probably better though to translate γυνὴ as ‘woman’ throughout the verse. Such a meaning is not impossible. Throughout Paul’s writings γυνὴ is an ambiguous term. It clearly means ‘wife’ in I Cor. 7:3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 33, 39 as the context in all these verses makes plain but in I Cor. 7:1 it clearly means ‘woman’ as it is contrasted with ἄνθρωπος not ἀνήρ. γυνὴ seems only to mean ‘wife’ where the context is clear. Where the context is not clear γυνὴ is qualified. At I Cor. 7:34 γυνὴ is followed by ἄγαμος; at Rom. 7:2 the noun is qualified by ὑπανδρος; cf. also Luke 4:26 where χήρα follows in apposition to γυνὴ.

A further point in favour of the argument that vv. 25–38 concern betrothal and that γυνὴ can mean ‘woman in general’ in this passage is found in v. 29. Here γυναῖκες clearly does not mean ‘wives’. If it did, then Paul would be contradicting vv. 3–4 where conjugal rights are encouraged. In v. 29 Paul is still thinking of engaged couples: if he
were thinking of those already married ἔχοντες γυναῖκας would be a strange way of referring to husbands; he would more naturally have addressed them as γεγαμηκότες as in v. 10 or as οἱ γαμήσαντες (cf. v. 33).

To return now to the translation suggested above for v. 27, it will be seen that δέω is understood as ‘bound by a promise of marriage’. δέω however means ‘bound in marriage’ as v. 39 and Rom. 7:2 show, but the context in both is clearly that of husband and wife, and in Rom. 7:2 this meaning is further clarified by the addition of νόμῳ. My suggested translation contrasts v. 27 with v. 28 which speaks of the marriage itself. As one might expect γαμέω is used in v. 28. v. 27 a, therefore, speaks to the man who has made a promise of marriage to a girl. Rather than break it off to agree with the teaching in v. 26, Paul tells him that there is no need to break off a contract already entered into: it is no sin to marry.

If δέω means ‘to bind by a promise’ then λύω in v. 27 must mean ‘to break off the engagement’ and that to ask (v. 27 b) λέλυσαι ἀπὸ γυναῖκός is equivalent to asking if the man is ἄγαμος. The perfect tense δέδεσαι but both perfects are to be thought of as present in force. Even Barrett and the ICC, which interpret v. 27 differently, recognize that Paul is unlikely to be addressing just divorcees, which a strict interpretation of this perfect tense might suggest. In support of my translation it will be seen that the compound form ἀπολύω bears the meaning ‘to break off a betrothal’ in Matt. 1:19 where it is plain that the meaning ‘divorce’ is wrong because Joseph is not married until encouraged to do so by the angel (Matt. 1:20, 24). When Paul speaks of divorce the verb he uses in this section of I Cor. is not λύω (or ἀπολύω) but ἀφίημι (vv. 11, 12, 13).

Paul is concerned in this section to clarify his own position. If, as has been suggested καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι (v. 26 b) is a
quotation, representing either the Corinthians’ attitude or Paul’s own previous teaching on this topic, then it would seem Paul is re-defining his position in the light of queries from Corinth. The church there may have asked Paul if as a result of this slogan engaged couples should break off their engagement because marriage would be sinful. This section represents Paul’s considered reply. In vv. 1–24 Paul redefines his views on marriage and divorce, in vv. 39–40 he gives his view on remarriage. It is not only in vv. 36–8 he considers engaged couples but in the whole section vv. 25–38. There is a unity in the section. This is shown not only in the use of the term παρθένος but also in the consistency of the arguments. Paul’s teaching in v. 28 is identical with v. 38. I discount entirely the suggestion that Paul is speaking of spiritual marriage in either vv. 36–8 (cf. NEB) or in vv. 25–38 as a whole. If Paul were encouraging spiritual marriages his teaching in this section would be at variance with 7:2–5. Although spiritual marriages were known to have existed in the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, who condemn them, there is no evidence that these marriages were practised in the middle of the first century in Christian circles. It is also unlikely that γάμιζω could be used in the sense ‘to consummate the marriage’ in vv. 36 f. if this were the situation Paul was discussing. It is similarly unlikely that levirate marriage was in Paul’s mind⁹ because this would presuppose a Jewish milieu.

Hurd¹⁰ recognizes the unity of the section vv. 25–38 but does not decide in favour of either engaged couples or spiritual marriage, as he is doubtful about the validity of the arguments (particularly à propos vv. 36–8) in favour of engagement because these assume a sizeable number of engaged couples in Corinth at the time. But this is not necessarily so. Paul has been asked about engagement probably because one or two definite instances were known to the Corinthians. Paul deals with the problem of an individual wrongdoer in I Cor. 5:1 f. who is merely called τις; and in 7:36 the engaged man in a quandary is similarly called τις. In vv. 39–40 and vv. 8 f. Paul addresses widows: these too like the engaged couples in vv. 25–38 form a separate

---


category in the Corinth church. Neither group need comprise large numbers.

Another problem in this chapter is Paul's teaching on divorce. It will be seen that Paul uses the verb ἀφίημι to mean divorce in vv. 11, 12, 13 but χωρίζομαι is found in vv. 10, 11, 15 (bis) and this is usually taken to be synonymous with ἀφίημι. In vv. 10–11 Paul quotes Jesus' words on divorce. If ἀφίημι and χωρίζομαι are synonymous then Paul is repeating the prohibition known to Mark 10:11–12, in which a woman can divorce a man as in Roman law. We have already seen above that Paul makes a distinction between ἀφίημι (to break off a marriage) and λύω (to break off an engagement). There may similarly be a deliberate distinction drawn between ἀφίημι and χωρίζομαι. Elsewhere in the NT χωρίζομαι need not refer to legal divorce. The statement in Mark 10:9 where the verb occurs can mean that no one (i.e. an outsider) is to cause a legally married couple to separate. In the context of Mark 10:1–11 it is significant that χωρίζω is used in v. 9 as distinct from the verb ἀπολύω in vv. 2, 4, 11, 12. ἀπολύω there corresponds to ἀφίημι in I Cor. 7. The same distinction in vocabulary is preserved in the parallel to Mark 10:1–11, namely Matt. 19:1–12. Outside the gospels χωρίζω/χωρίζομαι means either ‘to separate’ (as in Rom. 8:35, 39; Philem. 15; Heb. 7:26) or ‘to leave’ (as in Acts 1:4, 8:1, 2). If therefore χωρίζομαι in I Cor. 7:10–11 means ‘leave’, ‘separate from’ without implying a legal divorce, then Paul's statement on divorce is in line with Jewish practice where a woman cannot divorce a man, and thus Paul is closer to the Matthaean divorce sayings (Matt. 5:31–2, 19:3–9), even though the exception of πορνεία is absent from Paul.

In vv. 12 ff. the situation is somewhat different: Paul turns from the Christian married to a Christian to οἱ λοιποί. These are Christians married to heathen partners, and as Paul has no command of Jesus to repeat, he speaks on his own authority. Marriage of Christian to Christian is indissoluble, but the marriage of a Christian to a heathen is different. The Christian should not in this instance prohibit divorce, although Paul is plainly in favour of the marriage continuing if possible. He does not approve of divorce. The verb used in vv. 12 and 13 is ἀφίημι and applies to both the Christian husband married to a heathen, and to the Christian wife married to a heathen. Paul has presumably been asked by the Corinthians to clarify the position whether Christians should divorce a heathen partner. He clearly does not
advocate divorce merely on this ground if they are willing to continue the marriage.\footnote{If it can be maintained that in II Cor. 6:14–7:1 Paul is speaking not against immorality as such but against mixed marriages (as is possibly indicated by 6:14 and by the addition in 6:18 of καὶ θυγατέρας to the quotation of II Sam. 7:14) then it will be seen that Paul’s attitude has hardened. In both letters he speaks against mixed marriages in the future, but in II Cor. 6:14–7:1 he appears to encourage the dissolution of existing mixed marriages.}

If we can maintain, as I think we can, a differentiation between ἀφίημι and χωρίζομαι, then v. 15 concerns a new problem. Barrett\footnote{Op. cit. p. 166.} recognizes this. Paul is speaking here of the departure of the heathen partner—not of legal divorce. ὁ ἄπιστος in v. 15 applies to both sexes as v. 15b makes clear. χωρίζομαι therefore applies to either the husband or the wife. Thus the argument in the ICC\footnote{Op. cit. p. 140 (footnote).} that χωρίζομαι in v. 10 differs from ἀφίημι in v. 11 only in so far as the husband sends the wife out of his house (ἀφίημι) when he divorces her, and the woman leaves the home (χωρίζομαι) when she divorces him is destroyed when v. 15 is considered. As in v. 10 Paul in v. 15 is speaking of separation. Paul is happy to allow separation in those situations where the two are not happy to live together since one became a Christian. Paul urges peace.

Commentaries are divided over the interpretation of v. 16: is Paul optimistic or pessimistic? If v. 16 belongs to v. 15 then v. 16 is pessimistic; i.e. Paul is allowing a separation for the sake of peace as there is very little chance of converting one’s heathen partner.\footnote{So ICC (op. cit. p. 144) and Héring (op. cit. p. 53).} If v. 16 belongs to v. 14 then Paul is being optimistic; i.e. he is saying it is worthwhile maintaining the marriage as there is always a chance the heathen partner will be converted.\footnote{So Barrett (op. cit. p. 167).} If, as I have suggested above, v. 15 deals with a different topic from v. 14 (i.e. separation not divorce) then v. 15 begins a new paragraph and v. 16 belongs with v. 15 to explain why precisely Paul does allow this separation to go unhindered. Therefore both vv. 15 and 16 contrast with vv. 12–14. In vv. 12–14 some good is seen to come from preserving those marriages in which the heathen partner is happy to continue to live with a Christian. It is interesting to note that in both vv. 12 f. and v. 15 the initiative lies with the heathen.
C. Text-Critical Issues concerning the Synoptic Problem
CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEXT AND APPARATUS OF THREE RECENT GREEK SYNOPSIS

Serious study of the synoptic problem can be undertaken only with the aid of a Greek synopsis. At the present time three such synopses are readily available:  

1. Aland’s *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, the 13th edition of Huck extensively revised by H. Greeven and the recently published text by B. Orchard. In this article these synopses are referred to as follows: Aland as Syn when all editions are intended, otherwise as Syn\textsuperscript{A=1–8} or Syn\textsuperscript{B=9–12} to differentiate between the two major editions of the text, the earlier of which has a text comparable with the twenty-fifth edition of Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (= N-A\textsuperscript{25}) and the later a text comparable with N-A\textsuperscript{26}; Greeven’s revision as H-G; and Orchard’s text as Orchard.

Syn and H-G print the parallel columns of the synoptic gospels in the sequence Matthew, Mark, Luke. Orchard, whose text was produced in order to assist those scholars who feel such a sequence prejudicial against the neo-Griesbach theory, prints the parallels in the sequence Matthew, Luke, Mark.

It is my task in this article not to discuss these three editions as aids to a particular attempted solution to the synoptic problem but to examine the texts and apparatuses with special reference to H-G and Orchard but with comparisons with Syn also.  

2. What is immediately striking is that each of the three has a different text despite the claim of one of them (Syn\textsuperscript{B} p. xi) to be the ‘Standard Text’ of the future.

Inevitably discussion of the synoptic problem involves the close comparison of the text of the gospels and for most students the text itself, rather than the variants to that text printed in an apparatus, is

---

1. R.J. Swanson’s *Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels* the Greek edition of which at present covers only Matthew and its parallels has been discounted from this article, so too has W.R. Farmer’s *Syntopicon* dismissed by H.F.D. Sparks in his review in *JTS* 1971 as of use only in conjunction with a conventional synopsis. Farmer’s exercise cannot be considered a new synopsis in its own right.

2. A full discussion of the text found in Syn\textsuperscript{B} is to be found in my reviews of UBS\textsuperscript{5} and N-A\textsuperscript{26} in *NovT* 20 (1978) pp. 242–77 and *JTS* 32 (1981) pp. 19–49.
of greatest importance (however shortsighted and regrettable such a judgement is). Thus decisions on the synoptic question based solely on the printed text are affected by the text one chooses to work from. This present article is thus intended as a consumers’ guide to synopses and tries to indicate the relative merits of the texts printed.

But those whose investigations into the synoptic problem are based only on the printed text and who ignore the apparatus do so at their peril. Unless the editors can convince the readers that the text printed is in all respects virtually identical with the autographs then variant readings must be taken into account as potential contenders to represent the original text. Orchard’s apparatus appears as an appendix, which might have the effect of positively dissuading students from consulting it. If so, that would be unfortunate. Thus this article will also consider the relative merits of the apparatuses in Syn, H-G and Orchard.

**Text**

It is well known that the Textus Receptus and the majority of medieval Greek mss. contain a large number of verses subsequently omitted by later editors and translators principally on the evidence of the mss. א and B which read the shorter text. The following table lists these verses and the longer sections that are in dispute in the synoptic gospels and indicates where our editions include / exclude x or bracket [ ] the longer text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H-G</th>
<th>Syn#</th>
<th>Orchard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:47</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:2b–3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:44</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:16</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44, 46</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:28</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:9–20</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ [ ]]</td>
<td>[ [ ]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The disputed verse is numbered 23:13 in Orchard.
4 Included without brackets but headed 'Der unechte Markusschluss'. (The English translation is neutral.)
As far as the so-called Western non-interpolations are concerned Luke 22:19b–20 appears in all three synopses and so too do Luke 22:62 and 24:12. Luke 24:40 appears in Syn^b and Orchard but is absent from H-G.°

In John’s gospel Orchard double-brackets the pericope of the woman taken in adultery and John 5:4 (5:3b is printed as part of the text). Syn^b omits John 5:3b–4 and double-brackets the pericope de adultera.

A further list of variants concerning a longer or a shorter text now follows to show how these three synopses behave. These variants have in general influenced modern versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H-G</th>
<th>Syn^b</th>
<th>Orchard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>9:55b–56a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:36^6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:43–44</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ [ ]]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the so-called Western non-interpolations are concerned Luke 22:19b–20 appears in all three synopses and so too do Luke 22:62 and 24:12. Luke 24:40 appears in Syn^b and Orchard but is absent from H-G.°

In John’s gospel Orchard double-brackets the pericope of the woman taken in adultery and John 5:4 (5:3b is printed as part of the text). Syn^b omits John 5:3b–4 and double-brackets the pericope de adultera.

A further list of variants concerning a longer or a shorter text now follows to show how these three synopses behave. These variants have in general influenced modern versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H-G</th>
<th>Syn</th>
<th>Orchard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>5:22 + εἰκῆ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14 + πολλά</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15; 13:9, 43 + ἀκούειν</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 + ἰσχυρόν</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:9 + καὶ...μοιχάται</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:30 + κύριε</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:12 + τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:30 + θεοῦ</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:4 + καὶ δυσβάστακτα</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:1 + καὶ τῆς νύμφης</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:20 + μαθητῶν</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:28 + καὶ τῆς</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:16, 17 + ιησοῦν (τὸν)</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:24 + τοῦ δικαίου</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:6 + ὁ κύριος</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mark | 1:1 + υἱὸς θεοῦ | x | [ ] | / |
| 1:4 + ὁ | x | [ ] | / |
| 2:16 + καὶ πίνει | / | x | / |

---

° Sometimes known as 36a if 37 appears as 36b.

6 H-G also omits the longer texts at Luke 24:36, 51, 52, all Western non-interpolations (but cf. Luke 24:6 where the longer text is included by H-G and the v.l. ignored in the apparatus).
It is obvious from the lists above that Orchard in general gives us a longer text than either H-G or Syn\(^8\), and that H-G gives a more confident longer text than Syn\(^8\) which tends to emphasise its lack of decisiveness with an overuse of brackets.\(^8\) This survey is not intended to pass judgment on the correctness or otherwise of the readings printed; merely to show that, depending on which synopsis one is studying and working from, one’s decisions on matters relevant to the synoptic problem could vary. In other cases disputes over words in the mss. are not

---

\(^7\) Only the first half of the verse is in dispute despite Orchard’s comment (p. 339) that implies that the whole verse is disputed.

reflected in the texts of our three synopses. Examples where all three agree over a variant may be seen in the following places: Matt 6:13; 7:13; 8:10; 24:36; 27:49b; Mark 14:24; Luke 1:28 (a rare example of a shorter text in Orchard); 24:3, 6, 13.

(a) H-G compared with Aland Synopsis

Sometimes H-G agrees with the text of Aland Synopsis\(^A\) (= N-A\(^{25}\)), sometimes with the text of Aland Synopsis\(^B\) (= N-A\(^{26}\)) sometimes with neither. Frans Neirynyderk has provided a very useful list of places where H-G differs from N-A\(^{26}\). This list also indicates whether H-G where differing from N-A\(^{26}\) agrees with N-A\(^{25}\), the TR, von Soden and the texts of Tischendorf\(^8\), Westcott and Hort and Weymouth (or Weiss). Neirynyderk’s list ought to be supplemented by one further reference where Greeven disagrees with the text of N-A\(^{26}\) but agrees with the text of N-A\(^{25}\), that is at Luke 23:12. Neirynyderk’s list also requires the addition of a dagger (to indicate agreement with N-A\(^{25}\)) at Mark 13:2 (om.); 13:15 (~); Luke 9:59; 12:53 (also p. 125). The dagger at Matt 13:4 ought to be removed: N-A\(^{25}\) = N-A\(^{26}\) here.

Many of the places where H-G agrees with N-A\(^{25}\) against N-A\(^{26}\) are where N-A\(^{26}\) has a word bracketed and N-A\(^{25}\) has the word without brackets (e.g. Matt 6:1; 14:16; 15:14; 19:11; 20:10, 23; 22:35; 24:39; 26:36) but this is not always so. At Matt 8:13 παῖς is read in H-G = N-A\(^{25}\); N-A\(^{26}\) reads παῖς [αὐτοῦ]. Occasionally N-A\(^{25}\) is bracketed and N-A\(^{26}\) is not: here H-G usually accepts the longer text without brackets e.g. Matt 1:25; 5:28; 7:13; 9:18; 10:23; 13:16; 14:22; 16:12; 23:37; 26:58; 27:41, 51 etc. This is consistent with H-G printing the longer text where variation exists e.g. Matt 3:7, 14; 9:32; 11:8; 13:11, 44, 45; 15:6; 18:34; 20:8, 21; 21:29; 22:21, 39; 23:38; 27:54 (but against this H-G prints the shorter text at Matt 13:35; 14:15, 29; 19:3, 10, 21, 22, 24; 21:19, 28; 23:4; 25:3; 27:16; 28:14 etc.).

Of the four hundred and seventy or so changes made by Syn\(^B\) from Syn\(^A\) in the synoptic gospels H-G preserves the text of Syn\(^A\) about two hundred and eleven times and agrees with Syn\(^B\) about one hundred and seventy-seven times. Of the six hundred or so differences between H-G and Syn\(^B\) H-G agrees with the TR about five hundred times. H-G

is frequently close to von Soden’s text (about eighty percent of those places where H-G differs from Syn\textsuperscript{8}). In some of the places where H-G differs from all editions of Syn H-G agrees only with TR, especially where a longer text is involved, but occasionally the text in H-G appears to be peculiar to that edition:

\begin{itemize}
\item e.g. Matt 13:8 (καρπούς) * (no apparatus given)
\item 13:40 (καίεται\textsuperscript{10})
\item 17:16 (ἡδυνάσθησαν) * (no apparatus given)
\end{itemize}

Mark
\begin{itemize}
\item 2:14 (ἡκολούθει)!\textsuperscript{10}
\item 3:27 (οὐδείς)
\item 3:27 (τὰ σκεύη τοῦ ἱσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν)\textsuperscript{*}
\item 8:7 (αὐτὰ εὐλογήσας)
\item 8:33 (om. αὐτοῦ) (no apparatus given)
\end{itemize}

Luke
\begin{itemize}
\item 3:22 (Words at Baptism) *
\item 6:33 (om. γὰρ) *
\item 9:33 (om. ὁ) *
\end{itemize}

At Luke 9:33 the omission of the definite article with the name Πέτρος is of significance.\textsuperscript{11} Greeven sees the addition as a harmonizing variant. At Mark 8:33 H-G omits the possessive after μαθητάς—this goes against New Testament practice: N-A\textsuperscript{25} and N-A\textsuperscript{26} correctly include the possessive here.\textsuperscript{12} Readings above marked with an asterisk indicate that the likely reason, and the one usually given in the apparatus for H-G’s choice of text, is the pursuit of a reading that is not in agreement with the parallel—and this is laudable. The reading marked with an exclamation sign indicates that the reading chosen gives a harmonizing text and is at variance with N-A\textsuperscript{25} = N-A\textsuperscript{26} which gives the correct text. A fuller discussion of harmonizing v. ll. (especially when H-G agrees with either N-A\textsuperscript{25} or N-A\textsuperscript{26}) occurs below.

\textsuperscript{10} This form agrees with UBS\textsuperscript{1-2} (and Vogels): N-A\textsuperscript{26} brackets the prefix. N-A\textsuperscript{25} reads the compound form without brackets.


\textsuperscript{12} See my “Mathētēs with a Possessive in the New Testament”, Theologische Zeitschrift (1979) pp. 300–4; p. 300 is not correct in saying there is no variant here, although the general principle holds true that there is only one firm instance of μαθητής without a possessive (Mark 4:34) and that exception proves the rule. Article reprinted as chapter 11 in J.K. Elliott, Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism (Cordova: El Almendro, 1992) (= Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria 3).
Changes that are orthographical or involve a change in breathing and accent can be seen when comparing H-G and N-A\(^{25}\) = N-A\(^{26}\) at the following places: Matt 1:15; 2:23; 12:24, 27; 16:17; 21:9, 15 (cf. Mark 11:9 f. and parallels); 27:33; Mark 3:22; Luke 3:24; 11:15, 18, 19. The names in the genealogies are all accented in N-A: in H-G not all are. Usually H-G agrees with the orthography of N-A\(^{25}\) where it differs from N-A\(^{26}\) e.g. Matt 3:14; 4:18, 19; 5:42; 6:6; 7:4, 5; 24:26; Mark 12:41 (bis), 43; 15:34; Luke 2:19; 6:34 (bis), 35; 7:41; 8:29; 12:3; 23:12,\(^{13}\) 24:27, but sometimes H-G agrees with N-A\(^{26}\) against N-A\(^{25}\) as may be seen at Matt 1:19; 6:10; 15:5, 23; 25:39; 26:3, 57; 27:22; Luke 3:2; 13:11; 14:29. At Matt 21:2 H-G prints εὐθέως with N-A\(^{26}\) against N-A\(^{25}\) (εὐθύς), but at Matt 26:74 H-G prints εὐθύς with N-A\(^{25}\) against N-A\(^{26}\) (εὐθέως)!

In many places in the synoptic gospels variation occurs when harmonizing may have been responsible for one or more of the variants. A normal and useful rule of thumb is that a variant that makes parallel passages more dissimilar is likely to represent the original text (other things being equal). This is a principle generally acknowledged if not in the text at least in the selection of variants to be found in the apparatus to H-G. One of the main virtues and benefits of H-G is that even though one cannot always accept Greeven’s text, at least one has in general a serviceable and relevant selection of variants from which one can establish a text closer to that of the supposed original. In the following places a variant involves a parallel text in another gospel: an asterisk after the reference means that H-G agrees with Syn\(^{B}\): [*] means that Syn\(^{B}\) encloses the longer text in brackets: no asterisk implies H-G agrees with Syn\(^{A}\). A dagger following the reference means that the reading printed in H-G (given in column two below) is likely to be a harmonized (i.e. secondary) reading:

| Matt\(^{14}\) | 6:33 (+ τοῦ θεοῦ) [*] |
| 9:6 | (ἐγερθείς) * |
| 9:14 | (+ πολλά) [*] |
| 9:19 | (ηκολοθησεν) * |
| 11:9 | (προφήτην ἰδεῖν) |

\(^{13}\) Here H-G accents οὗτος with N-A\(^{25}\) but cf. Luke 12:21 where H-G prints ἐκοινωνεί with N-A\(^{25}\) against ἐκοινοῦ of N-A\(^{25}\) and also cf. Luke 24:12 where H-G has ἐκοινωνία with N-A\(^{25}\) against ἐκοινωνία of N-A\(^{25}\).

From these forty-one examples H-G occasionally (10–12 times)\(^\text{15}\) prints the secondary text whereas Syn A or Syn B give the correct text at these points. However, a conclusive decision should not be made about the originality or secondariness of these texts purely as a mechani-

\(^{15}\) At Matt 19:24 I have bracketed the dagger after \(\epsilonἰσελθεῖν\) as this verb agrees with the Lukan parallel, \(\nu.l. ~ διελθεῖν\) agrees with the Markan parallel (cf. Mark 12:9 where \(\nu.l. + \text{oùv} = \text{Luke}\) and \(\nu.l.—\text{oùv} = \text{Matt}\)).
cal application of the rule concerning dissimilarity: other factors may well have influenced Greeven’s choice of text in those passages marked with the dagger. Those who work on the interrelationship of synoptic parallels need to keep their eye on the apparatus as well as on the parallel columns. Textual criticism and work on the synoptic problem are inseparable. It is thus disturbing to note that in two places in the above list (Mark 7:28; Luke 18:24) H-G has not provided an apparatus even though at Mark 7:28 his text is the harmonized text. In some instances where H-G is secondary, e.g. at Luke 9:13, the apparatus only shows the v.l against the text thus evading and avoiding the showing of the likely direction of harmonization to the text of the parallel. (Cf. also Luke 20:44.)

Our rule concerning dissimilarity carried with it the qualifying ‘other things being equal’. One area where other things should prevent a mechanical application of the rule is in orthographical matters where Atticism may be of over-riding influence. At Matt 17:19 Greeven prints ἐδυνήθημεν (cf. 17:16 ἥδευνασθησαν) in order to make Matthew differ from the Markan parallel (ἡδυνήθημεν). Had an apparatus been provided at 17:19 doubtless Greeven would have justified the v.l. ἡδυνήθημεν as assimilation to Mark (or possibly to his 17:16), but it is likely here and throughout the New Testament that the form augmented with ε is original. Moeris the Atticist condemned the Hellenistic prefix ε with this verb (Syn., all editions, incorrectly reads η). Similarly, at Mark 6:41 Greeven reads v.l. ἡὐλόγησεν (which agrees with his Lukan parallel but not the Matthaean ευ-). Again, Atticism should help us resolve the variation. New Testament usage prefers ευ throughout as in Syn. At Luke 6:48 ὠικοδομῆσθαι is printed—no v.l. is shown, in accordance with the principle at II 11c, III 2, but one exists (οἰκοδομῆσθαι) and this is likely to be the original text. Syn prints the correct text—no parallel is involved.

---

16 See my “Textual Criticism Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels” op. cit.
19 See Phrynichus §124 in E. Fischer, Die Eklogo des Phrynichos (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1974) = Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker I.
Elsewhere Greeven seems to have taken care to consider the possibility that Atticist grammarians may have influenced orthography. At Luke 1:22; 9:36; 24:23\textsuperscript{20} (where there are no parallels) he prints ἑόρακεν / ἑόρακαν / ἑορακέναι in preference to the form εώ\textsuperscript{21} found in Syn. More work in this area needs to be undertaken to assist editors of texts, but the general principle must hold—namely that in such instances the mechanical avoidance of forms that would make parallels more similar cannot be applied.

In the forty-one examples given above (pp. 391f.) H-G in general prints a text that is dissimilar to the parallel(s): usually such readings are likely to represent the original text. Doubts we may have about the originality of the text in specific instances may be dispelled when we have the companion volume to hand, promised in the Introduction p. v.

For the sake of comparability we see that of these forty-one examples\textsuperscript{22} Syn\textsuperscript{b} gives an unharmonized text twenty-three times. In those references above not followed by an asterisk (together with those asterisked and followed by a dagger) Syn\textsuperscript{a} gives the unharmonized i.e. ‘correct’ text eighteen times. As far as Orchard is concerned this text is less determined than H-G to avoid printing harmonized readings, and gives us over twenty-six readings that agree with the parallel(s) out of the forty-one above.

This survey tells us that H-G is a more reliable text than Syn\textsuperscript{b}; that Syn\textsuperscript{b} is more reliable than Syn\textsuperscript{a} and that Orchard, often through an apparently mechanical application of a principle determined to avoid brevior lectio potior has created parallels that are exactly the same. In a few places Orchard succeeds in avoiding an apparently harmonized text (e.g. Mark 13:22 δὲ; Mark 15:12 θέλετε; Luke 9:13 φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς) where H-G has a harmonized reading. Generally though H-G deliberately avoids such readings.

That is not to say that H-G’s text is also mechanically produced. Occasionally even that text shows assimilation. Sometimes reasons are obvious why Greeven has chosen not to accept the v.l. allowing him to print unharmonized parallels, but at other times we query his decision and seek explanations. For instance in the anointing story H-G has the cost of the ointment at 300 denarii in both John and Mark even though

\textsuperscript{20} Neirynck op. cit. fn 3.
\textsuperscript{21} Blass-Debrunner §68 prefers εوها in the New Testament.
\textsuperscript{22} For the purpose of this check a bracketed word is taken as part of the text.
his apparatus to John 12:5 would encourage one to accept the variant giving the unharmonized 200. One could argue that an original 200 in John was later harmonized to 300 in Mark rather than an original 300 was altered to 200 through assimilation to the story of the great feeding in John 6:7. Again, H-G’s apparatus would allow one to record the unharmonized γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι at Matt 15:1 against the text printed on the authority of ΝΒ which may have been assimilated to Mark. (Cf. also Matt 15:6 λόγον = Markan parallel in the text and v.l. νόμον in the apparatus.) Sometimes Greeven’s apparatus and text are defective. At Mark 6:37 for instance the inclusion of the variant omitting αὐτοῖς (cf. Syn) would encourage the reader to consider the possibility that this reading (giving an unharmonized text) is original. Likewise at Matt 15:7 the unharmonized προεφήτευσεν included as a v.l. in Syn is absent from H-G: again this unharmonized text may be original. At Mark 7:6 complications occur because an Old Testament quotation may be assimilated either to the LXX or to the synoptic parallel, but Greeven, unlike Syn, ignores the v.l. τιμᾷ/ἀγαπᾷ. Work on the Old Testament texts in the synoptic material requires one to tackle such v.l.l., and a case could be made for printing Matthew’s version of the quotation differently from Mark’s. At Matt 15:17 v.l. εἰσερχόμενον could be original: the printed text agrees with the Markan parallel.

H-G p. x states that the text differs from Synb nine times per chapter on average. Professor Greeven in a private communication informed me that his sample was taken from chapters 11, 12, 13 in the synoptic gospels. The nature of the comparison may be seen in the following table, and it will be noted that in order to reach this average, orthographical changes and itacisms need to be ignored.

Square brackets indicate H-G has moved away not only from Synb but from Syna also. An asterisk indicates that H-G has moved away from the text of ΝB and that Synb follows ΝB. A dagger indicates the reverse: here Synb betrays its guilt by inserting brackets. The number of asterisks shows the dependence of Syn on ΝB and how frequently H-G moves away from the stranglehold exerted by these mss. on other editors. Where there is no asterisk we are in general dealing with variants in which ΝB agree with neither text. In such instances Ν and B often support different readings.
Matt

(1) 11: 9 προφήτην ἰδεῖν
(2) [21] βηθσαιδάν
(3) [23] καταβιβασθήσῃ
(4) 12: [4] * ἔφαγεν
(5) [10] θεραπεύειν
(6) 15 om. ὤχλοι (bracketed in Synb)
(7) [36] * ἐάν λαλήσωσιν
(8) [47] (whole verse included) (bracketed in Synb)
(9) 13:[4] ἤλθεν...καὶ
(10) [ 8] καρποὺς (no apparatus in H-G)
(11) [22] + τοῦτον
(12) [23] * συνίων
(13) 28 αὐτῷ λέγουν (no apparatus in H-G)
(14) [30] μέχρι
(15) 35 † om. κόσμου
(16) [40] * καἰεται24

Mark

(17) 11: [2] * κεκάθικεν
(18) [ 3] + ὦτι
(19) [ 6] εῖπον
(20) 11 ὀψέ (no apparatus in H-G)
(21) [17] ἐποιήσατε
(22) [18] γρομματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἅρχηρεῖς
(23) [19] ἐξημορεύετο
(24) [23] * + γὰρ
(25) [29] + κατὰ
(26) [31] ἐλογίζοντο
(27) 31 † οὖν
(28) [33] * λέγουσιν τῷ ιησοῦ
(29) [33] * + ἀποκριθεῖς
(30) 12: 1 ἐξέδοτο
(31) 4 ἐκεφαλαιώσαν
(32) [ 5] ἀποκτέννοντες
(33) 9 † οὖν
(34) [14] * κῆνσον καίσαρι δοῦναι
(35) 16 εῖπον
(36) [17] * καὶ ἀποκριθεῖς ὁ ιησοῦς
(37) [17] ἐθυμᾶτο
(38) [19] * τέκνον μὴ ἀϕῇ ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν (bracketed in Synb)
(39) 23 * όταν ἀναστῶσιν (bracketed in Synb)

---

24 Synb reads [κατα]καἰεται.
(40) 26 + ὁ\(^3\), + ὁ\(^4\) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(41) 28 εἰδοὺς (no apparatus in H-G)
(42) [32] εἴπας (cf. 12. 16!!)
(43) 34 αὐτῶν (no apparatus in H-G) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(44) [36] + ὁ
(45) 37 + ὁ (no apparatus in H-G) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(46–48) 41 bis + 43 γαζοφυλακείον/γαζοφυλακεῖον (no apparatus in H-G)
(49) [43] * βέβληκεν
(50) 13: 2 + ἀποκριθεὶς
(51) 2 * om. ὡδὲ
(52) [5] * + ἀποκριθεὶς
(53) [8] * + καὶ\(^2\)
(54) [8] * ἀρχαί
(55) [9] ἐνεκα
(56) 15 δὲ (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(57) [15] * + εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
(58) 15 τι ἄραι
(59) 22 * ποιήσουσιν
(60) [22] * καὶ\(^3\)
(61) [24] ἀλλ᾿
(62) [25] * ἐκπίπτοντες
(63) [27] * om. αὐτοῦ (bracketed in Syn)
(64) [28] * αὐτῆς ἦδη ο ἱλάδος
(65) [29] ταῦτα ἱδήτε
(66) [33] + καὶ προσεύχεσθε

Luke
(67) 11: 10 ἀνοιγήσεται (no apparatus in H-G)\(^{25}\)
(68) [11] μὴ (no apparatus in H-G)
(69) [12] + μὴ
(70) 13 ὁ\(^2\) (bracketed in Syn)
(71) 14 *καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν (add om. after black dot in H-G apparatus) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(72) [19] κριταὶ ὑμῶν
(73) [20] om. ἐγὼ (bracketed in Syn)
(74) [23] * + με
(75) 24 om. (τότε bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(76) 33 οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον (no apparatus in H-G) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))
(77) 33 * φέγγος (no dot in H-G app. to show v.l. = N-A\(^{20}\))
(78) [42] * om. δὲ
(79) 44 οἰ (no apparatus in H-G) (bracketed in Syn\(^b\))

\(^{25}\) Syn\(^b\) reads ἀνοιγ[η]σεται.
Let us now analyse the nature of these changes:

(a) Over half of the variants are due to H-G printing a text that makes the parallel more dissimilar. Usually, unless the text in Syn involves brackets (about which more below), Syn prints a variant that harmonizes the parallels. The underlined serial numbers above refer to those places where in general H-G justifies the text printed by referring in the apparatus to parallels to which the variant(s) assimilated the original text. In variants 27, 33, 50, 51 despite such a justification being offered, the text as printed still agrees with a parallel.

Occasionally H-G prints as the text a v.l. that makes the parallels more similar. In variants 3 and 44 harmonization to the LXX is offered as the reason for the txt, the assumption being that such assimilation is stronger than assimilation between the gospels. In variants 4, 9, 21, 25 H-G has an assimilated text (Syn has an unassimilated text for variants 9, 21, 25) but given Greeven’s habit of not generally giving parallel passages to txt in the apparatus these variants are not exposed as possible harmonized readings. Full explanations for these changes are awaited eagerly in the promised companion volume giving a commentary on the apparatus.
(b) Several of the differences involve H-G removing words (or parts of words) bracketed in Syn. This may be seen at variants 6, 15, 16, 63, 73, 75, 91, 95, 96, 98. Some of these have the effect of presenting an unassimilated text (only for variant 91 is an apparatus not provided). Sometimes a progression is detected in that a word present in Syn\textsuperscript{A} is bracketed in Syn\textsuperscript{B} and is then omitted by H-G e.g. the omissions at Matt 5:11; 10:32, 33; 13:40 (= UBS\textsuperscript{1,2}); 27:40; Mark 1:4 (= UBS\textsuperscript{1,2}); 5:42; 7:6; 8:28; 14:33 (bis); Luke 2:52; 3:3; 17:6; 24:49.

(c) Several of the differences involve H-G removing brackets from the text of Syn\textsuperscript{B}. This may be seen at variants 8, 27, 33, 39, 40 (bis), 43, 45, 56, 67, 70, 71, 76, 79, 86\textsuperscript{26} 89, 100. In general an apparatus is not provided: H-G assumes a bracketed word in Syn\textsuperscript{B} is equivalent to the word being present [cf. also Matt 3:2, 16 (bis); 6:33; 9:14 (= UBS\textsuperscript{1,2}); 9:27; 14:3, 10, 30; 15:2 (= UBS\textsuperscript{1,2}); 15:15; 17:24; 18:15; 19:7; 20:17; 25:6 (= UBS\textsuperscript{1,2}); 25:41; Mark 3:33, 35; 6:41; 7:4, 37; 10:7; 14:68; 15:12; Luke 1:15; 8:43; 9:2; 22:18; 23:11; 23:28, 50]. At Matt 26:20, Luke 9:9 H-G removes brackets found in Syn\textsuperscript{A}.

(d) Orthographical changes account for variants numbered 2, 19, 30, 31, 32, 35, 42, 46, 47, 48, 61, 84. For these an apparatus is not provided—in accordance with the declaration in Intro. II 11, III 2. Usually harmonizing is not involved, variant number 2 being a significant exception. Sometimes the orthography in H-G agrees with Syn\textsuperscript{A} rather than in the later editions. An orthographical change not included in the list above is at Matt 12:24, 27; Luke 11:15, 18, 19 where H-G splits the name Beelzebub into two (cf. Mark 3:22). H-G departs from the conventional orthography found in Syn, but (inconsistently) prints the name as one word at Matt 10:25\textsuperscript{27}

(b) Orchard compared with Aland Synopsis

Of the four hundred and seventy or so changes made from Syn\textsuperscript{A} by Syn\textsuperscript{B} Orchard agrees with Syn\textsuperscript{A} about one hundred and sixty four times, and with Syn\textsuperscript{B} about two hundred and seven times in respect of the synoptic gospels. Orchard agrees with H-G against Syn about

\textsuperscript{26} Here author’s usage would favour the originality of the possessive (cf. “Mathētēs with a Possessive” op. cit.) as at Matt 27:64 (against Syn\textsuperscript{A}) although H-G ignores this at Matt 19:10 where H-G = Syn\textsuperscript{A}: (There Syn\textsuperscript{B} brackets the possessive). Cf. also Mark 8:33 above (p. 561).

\textsuperscript{27} For other orthographical changes see p. 402.
thirty times in the synoptic gospels. These may be seen in the follow-
ing verses: Matt 3:2 + καὶ; 3:16 τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ; 6.33 + τοῦ θεοῦ; 9:14 +
pολλά; 9:27 + αὐτῶ; 14:3 + αὐτῶν; 14:12 αὐτό; 14:30 + ἵσχυρόν; 15:15 +
tαύτης; 17:24 + τὰ; 18:15 + εἰς σὲ; 19:7 + αὐτήν; 25:41 οἱ; 26:45 + τὸ;
Mark 3:17 ὀνόματα; 3:33 + μω; 3:35 + γὰρ; 7:37 τοὺς ἀλλάλους; 12:26 + ὁ (bis); 13:15 + δὲ; 14:68; καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν: 15:12 + ὁν λέγετε;
23:11 + κω; 23:50 + καί. Most of these involve a longer text or longer
version of a word and in each case the addition is bracketed in Syn8
(or in the case of Luke 9:9 in Syn4) and therefore does not represent
the independence of Orchard and H-G against the tradition embodied
in Syn. Disagreements between H-G and Orchard are detailed below
in a sample restricted to Matt 11; 12; 13; Mark 11; 12; 13, and Luke
11; 12; 13.

From the list of these four hundred and seventy or so changes the
independence of Orchard in respect of both H-G and Syn is small. It
may be seen in two areas, orthography and longer text. Orchard prints
an idiosyncratic accenting of ἴδιος ἔβελζεβουλ. (Matt 10:25; 12:24, 27; Mark
3:22; Luke 11:15, 18, 19), of σαλα (Luke 3:35) and a unique punctua-
tion and word order at Matt 11:9 τί ἐξήλθατε; ἰδεῖν προφήτην. As
far as the longer texts are concerned Orchard does not betray real
independence for, as with the agreements of H-G and Orchard against
Syn, Syn often brackets the longer text. The fact that Orchard does not
use brackets in the text means that his text may be read with greater
confidence.

These readings may be seen at Matt 8:13 παῖς αὐτοῦ (H-G omits αὐτοῦ);
14:29 + ὁ29 (with UBS1,2); 17:24 + τὰ (with UBS1,2); 19:10 + αὐτοῦ (cf.
8:21); 19:22 + τοῦτων 23:4 + καὶ δυσβάστακτα; 26:45 + τὰ (with UBS1,2);
27:17 + τὸν Mark 1:1 + νόον θεοῦ; 3:7 ἦκολοθέθησαν; 3:14 longer text
(a good reading!); 4:28 πλήρης σίτων; 6:22 αὐτής; 6:23 + πολλά; 6:41
+ αὐτοῦ; 7:4 + καὶ κλινόν; 7:6 + ὁτι; 7:35 + εὐθέως 29:42 εἰς ἐμέ; 10:7
longer reading (that shows how hom could have operated); 10:35 + δύο;

28 In general Orchard prints μαθητὴς with a possessive cf. Matt 19:10; 27:64 and

29 A greater degree of consistency in the use or non-use of the definite article with
proper names would be helpful. At Matt 14:10 Orchard omits the article before John’s
name (with Syn4) but not at Mark 9:2; Luke 9:49 (against H-G), cf. v. ll. concerning
other proper names at Luke 11:30 (against H-G); Mark 16:1; Matt 1:24 (against H-G);

Where a variant omits a pronoun (often a post-positional possessive) Orchard to his credit adds the pronoun. This may be seen at the following places where Syn\textsuperscript{b} omits (an asterisk after the reference again indicates that Orchard disagrees with H-G): Matt 3:7, 16; 5:28; 9:27; 12:49; 13:11, 16; 18:34, 20:8, 21; 22:21; 23:37; 25:3*; 27:64; Mark 1:7; 3:33; Luke 13:27*; 15:29*; 20:45*,\textsuperscript{32} but this is not so at Matt 15:2: Orchard omits αὐτῶν (found in Syn\textsuperscript{b} (bracketed) and in H-G) or at Mark 8:20 om. αὐτὸ (bracketed in Syn\textsuperscript{b}). Many of the differences between Syn and Orchard concern particles. In general Orchard tends to include particles, especially καὶ, whenever variation occurs. A comparison of the two texts may be seen at the following places (an

\textsuperscript{30} If one looks outside the 470+ references given prominence by the changes in Syn\textsuperscript{b} from Syn\textsuperscript{a} the same trend is seen.

\textsuperscript{31} Often Syn\textsuperscript{b} brackets the longer text. An asterisk in the list following indicates that Orchard disagrees with H-G.

\textsuperscript{32} This number can be increased if one adds those places where Orchard adds uniquely, e.g. Matt 26:8 + αὐτοῦ (against Syn and H-G); Mark 14:8 + αὐτή; 14:9 + τοῦτο.

In all these respects Orchard is on the right lines to print the longer text, especially involving pronouns, as the normal tendency would be for texts to be shortened as the tradition developed. Often such shortening would be accidental but could sometimes be stylistic to avoid such semitic features of Koine Greek as the over-use of certain particles or the excessive use of post-positional possessives. Such principles should not be applied mechanically and H-G's awareness that harmonizing influences were also at work should be borne in mind to a greater extent than Orchard seems to allow.

In other respects too Orchard's text has made a wise choice. For example μνημεῖον is printed in preference to μνῆμα of SynB at Mark 15:46, 16:233 although this tendency to prefer the Hellenistic diminutive does not apply at Luke 5:2 where Orchard prints πλοῖα against πλοιάρια found in SynA and H-G.

In two other areas where there is often ms. variation that is also reflected in different printed editions (namely orthography and word order) Orchard follows different tracks. In orthography Orchard tends to follow SynB against SynA. This can hardly be coincidental but is surprising as Orchard, at least according to his footnote 3 (p. xi), seems not to know that Aland's Synopsis has proceeded beyond the seventh edition described as 'currently popular'? These orthographical changes may be seen by comparing SynA with Orchard at the following places (references followed by an asterisk indicate that this orthography differs from that found in H-G); Matt 1:15*, 19; 2:7, 23*; 3:14*; 4:18*, 19*; 5:42*; 6:10; 16:17*; 21:33*; 24:26*; 25:39; 26:57; 26:67*; 27:22; Mark 1:6*, 16*, 17*; 2:4, 9, 11, 12(bis); 6:55; 12:1*, 4*, 40, 41(bis)*, 43*; 14:63; 15:34*; Luke 2:19*; 3:2; 5:2*; 6:34(bis)*, 35*, 48*, 49*; 7:41*; 8:29; 9:32; 10:7*; 11:2, 15; 12:3*, 4, 21, 24*; 13:11; 14:13*, 21*, 26*, 29; 18:29*; 19:29*, 36; 20:9*; 21:1*, 37*; 23:12*; 24:12, 27*. Exceptionally—but inexplicably—Orchard agrees with the orthography of SynA against

that found in SynB at Matt 6. 6 where ταμιεῖον is printed. At Matt 7:4, 5 (σου); 27:33 Orchard follows the accenting in SynA against that in SynB and H-G. At Mark 6:29 Orchard (with H-G) prints ἀλλων and at 6:50 εἰδοὺ even though his normal form is in -ον cf. Luke 9:32 εἰδοὺ with SynB and Luke 11:15 εἰποὺ with SynB. At Luke 19:29 Orchard has βηθανίαν with SynA (SynB brackets the final consonant). (In contrast to the normal pattern in Orchard, H-G prefers the orthography found in SynA).

As far as word order is concerned Orchard seems to prefer the variant found in SynA rather than that of SynB as can be seen by comparing the editions at the following places (the asterisk again indicates that H-G disagrees with Orchard): Matt 4:2; 13:28; 15:30; 20:12, 30, 31; Mark 3:3; Luke 4:8; 6:26; 9:13, 18, 59; 10:35; 16:12; 18:11; 20:44 (but not at Mark 6:38; Luke 18:4; 21:11).

(c) Orchard’s text compared with H-G

We have already examined the extent to which Orchard’s text differs from SynB. To compare Orchard with H-G it is convenient to use those one hundred places where H-G differs from SynB to see how Orchard behaves. In fact of the one hundred, sixty-seven agree with SynB, thirty-two with H-G. The latter are numbers 4 8* 11 13 18 25 27 31 33* 39* 40*(bis) 41 43* 45* 56* 58 60 66 67* 68 69 70* 71* 76* 79* 86* 87 89 90 94 99* 100*. (The asterisk indicates that the text is bracketed in Syn.)

Just as Orchard prefers the orthography of SynB to that in SynA so he prefers the orthography of SynB to that in H-G (e.g. numbers 2 19 30 31 32 35 42 46–48 61 84). As is consistent with Orchard’s declared aim (p. 307) this text in general gives the longer text as may be seen in the following places where H-G differs from SynB (the asterisk after the serial number indicates that Orchard in printing the longer text disagrees with H-G): 6* 8 11 15* 16* 24* 25 26 33 39 40 43 45 51*56 60 63*66 69 70 71 73* 75* 76 78* 79 85* 86 89 91* 95* 96* 98* 99 100. (Sometimes the longer text is bracketed in SynB as may be seen in the

---

34 Orchard is inconsistent here in respect of the form of this word. At Matt 24:26 τομεῖον is read (cf. Luke 12:3, 24).
35 At Mt 11:9 Orchard’s idiosyncratic punctuation ἔξηλθατε; ἰδεῖν προφήτην; agrees with neither Syn nor H-G. In Orchard this text agrees with the Lucan parallel where again Orchard has the same idiosyncratic text.
full numbered table above.) Occasionally however Orchard gives the shorter text as at numbers 29* (cf. the omission of ἀποκριθεὶϛ at 50 52 with ΝΒ against H-G, and number 36), 44* 53* (with ΝΒ) 57* (with ΝΒ) 74* (with ΝΒ) 82 (with P45 p75 ΝΒ) 90.

The word order of SynB is preferred by Orchard to that found in H-G at the following: 22, 28, 34, 36, 38, 64, 65, 72, 83, 88, 92. Earlier we noted that where SynB differs from SynA in word order Orchard tends to follow the latter and this is so in two cases (numbers 13 and 58) where Orchard and H-G agree with the word order of SynA against that in SynB.

In addition to the idiosyncratic text of Orchard in variant number 1 this text goes against H-G and Syn at Mark 11:31+ τὶ εἴπωμεν and + ἧμῖν; 13:8 + καὶ ταραχαί Orchard goes against H-G and SynB and supports the text of SynA at Matt 13:7 ἀνέπνιξαν; Mark 13:22 ἐγερθήσονται δέ; Luke 11:30 + ὃ (bracketed in SynA); 12:22 + ὑμῶν (bracketed in SynA); 12:28 ὀμφιάζει.

The importance of the changes in the text of Orchard when compared with either of the other editions in the survey is ultimately in their significance for work on the synoptic problem and it is of interest to note that from the one hundred examples in the above list (but only of course where parallels exist) the text in Orchard serves to make the parallel(s) more dissimilar in numbers 4 17 20 25 26 29 33 34 40 49 51 54 57 60 64 67 73 74 75 76 but, unlike H-G, Orchard is less concerned overall to print the reading that in general is intended to achieve this aim.36

---

36 See for instance the change at Mark 8:34 where Orchard’s text (unlike H-G or SynB) makes the parallels agree more closely.

---
The variation units set out in three pericopes are shown for H-G, Syn⁸, and Orchard. The figures in brackets after Syn⁸ are the number of variation units in N-A.³⁷

   \begin{tabular}{lcccc}
   & H-G & Syn⁸ & & Orchard \\
   \textit{Matt 12:1–8} & 14 & 13 (10) & 1 & \\
   \textit{Mark 2:23–28} & 18 & 26 (7) & 1 & \\
   \textit{Luke 6:1–5} & 30 & 26 (14) & 4 & \\
   \end{tabular}

   \begin{tabular}{lcccc}
   & H-G & Syn⁸ & & Orchard \\
   \textit{Matt 17:1–8} & 22 & 19 (15) & 0 & \\
   \textit{Mark 9:2–8} & 35 & 21 (10) & 3 & \\
   \end{tabular}

   \begin{tabular}{lcccc}
   & H-G & Syn⁸ & & Orchard \\
   \textit{Matt 19:16–22} & 20 & 19 (16) & 4 & \\
   \textit{Mark 10:17–22} & 28 & 19 (7) & 1 & \\
   \textit{Luke 18:18–23} & 26 & 13 (8) & 2 & \\
   \end{tabular}

In general H-G displays a greater number of variants than either of the other synopses, and the selection in H-G is specifically designed for study of the synoptic problem. In fact H-G’s apparatus is a rare example of a controlled apparatus established within specified parameters. All too often a critical apparatus is an eclectic assembly of variants from numerous sources citing an apparently indiscriminate number of manuscripts in an idiosyncratic manner.

\textit{Greek witnesses}

The introduction to Syn¹² lists forty-two papyri, one hundred and seventy-one uncials and one hundred and thirty-six cursives. Of these I have been unable to locate five papyri, twelve uncials and seven cursives in the apparatus itself. This means that of the three hundred and forty-nine mss. listed, three hundred and twenty-five are to be found in the apparatus. In addition the symbol K subsumes the combined evidence of eight uncials and one hundred and seventy-five cursives.³⁹

³⁷ The Münster \textit{Bericht} (1979–81) tells us that future editions of the diglot Synopsis will have the same apparatus as N-A.


³⁹ 272, 399, 945, 998, 1229, 1604 occur in the main list as well as in the list of mss. subsumed under the symbol K. I have counted these mss. in both lists.
Also two uncials not listed\(^{40}\) and seven cursive not listed\(^{41}\) actually appear in the apparatus. Syn\(^{12}\) lists six lectionaries of which two seem not to be cited in the apparatus although \(l\) 1602 not listed is found in the apparatus.

Orchard does not provide an introductory list of mss. but a count of the mss. which appear in the apparatus to his edition reveals twelve papyri, eighty-four uncials\(^{42}\) and twenty-nine cursive (fam. 1 and cur- sive 1 are counted as one ms. for the purpose of this exercise; and fam. 13 is counted as one ms.). This represents a limited choice of mss. and ignores the proclamation of K. Aland in the introduction to N-A\(^{26}\) p. 47\(^{4}\) that we are now entering the age of the minuscules. No lection- aries are used.

The introduction to H-G tells us that this apparatus was carefully based on a careful study of certain mss. In the introduction Greeven lists thirty-seven papyri, one hundred and sixty-six uncials, sixty-one cursive (taking the list on p. XVII as correct—not that on pp. XXX–XXXI which omits 174) and one lectionary. This makes a grand total of two hundred and sixty-four mss. that (according to the English translation of berücksichtigt) are ‘noticed’ in the apparatus. In point of fact not all these mss. are seen in the apparatus: I have been unable to locate five papyri (p\(^{6}\) p\(^{36}\) p\(^{55}\) p\(^{73}\) p\(^{86}\)). Forty-four uncials are absent and one cursive (2191) seems not to appear. The reasons why this should be so are not obvious although in some cases fragmentary mss. may not yield a reading relevant for the apparatus even though the ms. itself may have been studied by Greeven in the establishment of the text and apparatus. In fact ‘berücksichtigt’ may perhaps better be understood as ‘examined’ rather than ‘noticed’.

Actually many more than the two hundred and fourteen mss. (out of the two hundred and sixty-four) appear in the apparatus. A further two uncials, two hundred and twenty-six cursive and one hundred and forty-three lectionaries are to be found in the apparatus without their being listed in the introduction. Some occur only once, but others are cited more frequently than even the listed mss. (e.g. \(l\) 184 is to be seen two hundred and seventy-five times in the apparatus, \(l\) 18 seventy-seven times, \(l\) 19 likewise, \(l\) 49 one hundred and seventy-six

\(^{40}\) 0153 (ostraca) and 0249.

\(^{41}\) 2ap, 58, 175, 257, 301, 569, 1325.

\(^{42}\) Including 0153 and 084, 0112, 0113, 0119, 0124, 0125, 0180, 0190, 0202 as separate mss. Add p\(^{37}\) p\(^{39}\) 0124 to my list in RevBib 92 (1985) p. 555.
times). These are certainly ‘noticed’: what we do not know is if these have been examined by the editor in the way those listed in the introduction may have been. Whatever the reason for this, the apparatus to H-G cites some five hundred and eighty-six mss. This means that this synopsis displays the evidence of a vaster array of gospel evidence than any other modern text.

Non-Greek witnesses

Orchard cites twenty-seven Old Latin mss. in his apparatus, including gigas. Syn lists thirty-seven and seems to cite all but two (Beuron 24 and 28) in the apparatus. (In addition Syn cites f in the apparatus to 1 Cor 11:24.) Greeven lists fifty-one and cites all but seven in his apparatus (20, 23, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43). This is characteristic of H-G which displays a vastly superior array of versional and patristic material to that in the other two synopses even to the extent of covering various Gospel harmonies: such information is not readily found elsewhere. Orchard uses the symbol Lvg but does not explain what is meant: it is particularly confusing at e.g. John 5:4 where in the apparatus vg supports the shorter reading: the verse is in the Clementine vulgate but not in Stuttgart. Evidence from Coptic and Syriac is well presented by Orchard.

(a) H-G

The difficulties encountered when attempting to assemble a comprehensive and clear apparatus of variant readings are well understood by all those who have similarly tried such an enterprise. Greeven’s highly complex and compact apparatus betrays the results of many years’ labour. The planning and execution are of the highest order, and it is but seldom that one cannot unravel the intricacies of the material. Even a complicated set of variants such as one encounters at Luke 12:18 can, with patience, be unravelled.'

43 There are in addition to gospel mss. a few non-gospel texts used in the apparatus to 1 Cor 11 for example. Full details of these, and other, statistics may be seen in my “The Citation of Manuscripts” op. cit. Table III in that article is incorrect in respect of Syn: uncials 0167 0184 0215 and cursive 29 38 47 are in the apparatus. The statistics and discussion therefore need emendation. I am grateful to J.I. Miller for drawing my attention to this.

44 I have discounted p (cited at Matt 13:55 §38) and v (cited at Luke 8:52 §117) as these are Johannine mss. and are clearly incorrect.
For the purpose of sampling the apparatus in detail I have examined the Greek and Old Latin testimony for Luke’s gospel, and have found very few errors, and only a few omissions of note: one’s verdict on the sample is that it is in general accurate and reliable. The following is a list of some changes that could be considered in a future edition. The nature of the changes proposed is such that the reader should draw the obvious conclusion that the bulk of the apparatus is of the highest level of accuracy. Many of the suggestions below are minutiae, especially those involving the Old Latin where the editor has inevitably had problems in transposing Jülicher’s apparatus45 to a Greek apparatus.

Greek:
1:9 l 883 is now known as l 1761.46
2:5 Scrivener’s edition of D and his notes on N do not suggest that the omission of γυναικί is only by the first hands of these mss.
2:15 N supports B W 565 with ἐλάλουν.
3:32 Only N* has σαλα with txt. (N reads σαλμιον.) (At 7.4 N not N* has ἥρωτον according to Scrivener.)
4:2 πειρασθῆναι. Add 1009 Ss Sp Δ.
4:7 (+ μοι). Read only by N*.
4:17 τοῦ προφήτου ἡσαΐου. 430 supports txt.
5:36 Ρ has a lacuna in the verse and cannot be used as support for σχίσει, although it does support συμφωνήσει.
8:8 Θ reads καλὴν καὶ ἀγαθὴν.
8:10 Θ like N should be bracketed to show it reads ἀκούωειν.

Old Latin:
2:5 According to Jülicher2 r1 omits only [γυναικί] not [αὐτῷ γυναικί].
2:14 All Lvl mss. except d omit [ἐν] and not just β r1.
3:16 It is difficult to reconstruct Lvl from H-G in the lemma λέγων...ιωάννης. Jülicher indicates that there are no less than nine Lvl mss here. Lvl b ff 1 have different readings; r1 does not agree with e in supporting the H-G text.
3:16 (lemma νς.—ςμ.) According to Jülicher Lvl r1 seems not to have the same reading as Lvl e.
4:10 The omission of [τοῦ...σε] is by 1 not b.
4:34 b does not add [πρὸ καιροῦ] after ἦλθες but [τί πρὸ καιροῦ] before ἦλθες.
5:6 τὰ δίκτυα. Lvl e and b read plural.

5:24 L\(^1\) implies all except e a c d support txt but ff\(^2\) r\(^1\) 30 have a different order.
5:25 Lvl mss supporting \(prm\) \(τὸ\) κλίνίδιον include a b c implying these have the same reading. In fact all three differ. In the same lemma Lvl e d do not support D in reading \(τὴν\) κλίνην.
5:26 In a rare citation of d the information is incorrect, d follows 1319 1542\(^b\) in reading φόβον + ἀπαντεῖς and not the reading of 716 l1963.
5:33 \([καὶ\) οἱ τῶν φαρισαίων\] in most Lvl mss. follows \([πυκνὰ\] and does not agree in following the position of the addition in D.
5:33 ff\(^2\) supports + μαθηταί σου with D. d agrees with the bulk of Lvl not D. k does not contain Luke, and is included unnecessarily in 5:33 ff.
6:20 c not e reads αὐτοῦ\(^1\).
7:6 ἰκανός εἰμι. z supports ff\(^2\) 1 q r\(^1\).
7:9 εἴπε αὐτῷν. p should be q.
7:22 Jülicher does not know of the inversion of εἴδετε καὶ ἦκουσατε by ff\(^2\) r\(^1\) z.
7:32 e supports the omission of υμῖν\(^2\).
7:42 According to Jülicher f 1 do not agree in omitting αὐτῶν\(^2\).
7:46 A greater number of Lvl mss. than b c d q omit μου τοὺς πόδας.
8:4 b does not agree with 1 q r\(^1\) (although z does).
8:28 e omits αὐτῶ.
8:32 1 supports a b ff\(^2\) q z.
9:22 (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) a and r\(^1\) do not have the same text (a = tertium diem; r\(^1\) = diem tertium).
14:3 q does not support ὁμ. λέγων.
17:28 e supports ἡσθοὺν καὶ.
18:31 c omits [μαθητὰς].
20:28 a also adds [αὐτοῦ] after [γυναῖκα\(^2\)].
21:30 e omits ἦδη\(^1\).
22:26 (διάκονος). D should read D\(^1\) because d does not agree with the bulk of Lvl.
23:14 (ἐυρίσκω). Add c z.
24:10 a omits [μαρία] and cannot be included as part of the inversion.

(b) Orchard
Orchard’s apparatus is limited and selective. First impressions are that it is easy to read, especially when compared with H-G and its complexities. In practice, however, Orchard has many puzzling features. Sometimes the mss. supporting an omission from the printed text are set out, and the support for the text given only as ‘hab cet’. In other places the mss. supporting the text as well as those supporting the alternative(s) are given. Sometimes the variants from the text precede the reading in the text, sometimes they follow. Not only is the practice
of the display of the apparatus inconsistent but the same apparatus
when repeated can be presented differently (cf. the apparatus to §151
when it is found at §107). At §101 cet Or appears at the beginning of
the apparatus: when that apparatus reappears at §144 hab cet Or is
printed in the more usual position at the end of the variation unit. At
§150 the readings for and against the text of Luke 13:21 appear even
though Luke is not the dominant text: at §240 only the reading against
the text is set out in full.

This inconsistency is disturbing when differing information occurs
for the same variants on different pages. The following have come to
my attention after only a brief examination of the volume. Further
reading may, regrettably, cause the list to be extended:

§243 the mss. supporting ἥξει ὅτε are shown. At §305 the mss. against
this reading are given.
§228 shows two v.l.l. for Matt: the repetition of this section in §80 has
three.
§51 gives one v.l. for Matt, five for Mark, and one for Luke. The repeti-
tion of this parallel in §114 adds two extra v.l.l. for Matt (9:6, 8).
At §51 the v.l. at Matt 9:8 is marked in the text but is absent from the
apparatus.

Whereas Syn usually repeats an apparatus in full each time a parallel
recurs, and whereas H-G never does, Orchard’s policy is not clear: v.l.l.
are sometimes repeated if the text recurs but not all variants recur for
the text that is the secondary authority. Where repeated apparatuses
appear discrepancies sometimes occur and we read different or contra-
dictory information depending which apparatus we follow!

Matt 13:13. The mss. said in §145 to support βλέπονται are to be found in
§102 in support of βλέπουσιν. In §102 the variant has been omitted.
Mark 9:49. L is cited incorrectly for omission at §186. This appears (cor-
rectly) as C at §250.
Luke 11:33. Ambrose is cited for the omission of δὲ at §104. When that
v.l. appears at §219 Amb is replaced by the Armenian version.
Mark 6:3. L g at §38 becomes L q at §120 (cf. also John 4:51 §37 L q and
§91 L g).
John 4:51. p66 at §37 becomes p66c at §91.
At §150 a larger number of mss. is given than at §240.
The mss. at Matt 23:26 differ in §221 and §304. It would seem as if the
mss. at §221 are for the v.l. shown at §305 for Matt 23:28. A similar
error may be seen when comparing §54 with §135 where the mss. at
Luke 6:1 omitting δευτεροπρῶτῳ are different: it seems as if at §54 the
mss. for the v.l. following (Luke 6:2) have been accidentally repeated,
and §135 is more correct, although even here there are errors, such as the inclusion of papyrus 45. That papyrus is not extant for this verse! p75 is intended. The Latin is also faulty. The mss omitting are b c 1 q r1: according to Jülicher e has a different reading and L cannot be noted as this ms. is not extant in chapter 6! Multiple repetitions of passages only increase the sort of illogicalities already noted. To avoid the sorts of difficulties and inconsistencies illustrated above, the policy of cross-referencing found only occasionally in Orchard’s apparatus would seem a safer policy to adopt (e.g. at Luke 11:33 at §62 we have a cross-reference to the detailed exposition under §219, cf. also Mark 1:2 at §131, Mark 9:49 at §61 or Mark 3:14 at §56). If this practice were to be extended room for error would be reduced.

Other irregularities mar Orchard’s apparatus. The sequence of mss. is sometimes erratic: II follows D at Luke 6:50 but precedes at Mark 9:40. At Luke 6:45 Y precedes BDW. In §139 Δ follows Ω (cf. §86 where Δ precedes Ω in the same apparatus). In the introduction Orchard claims to be following the sequence of mss. found in Souter2. This claim seems not to be justified.

Occasionally the apparatus in Orchard will mislead us badly, and mss. are cited in support of the wrong reading! BDWY read ἐθεράπευσεν not ἐθεράπευεν at Luke 4:40. At Luke 9:55b–56a Ψ and 047 omit the text, (This mis-information seems in part to have been cribbed from UBS1,2: UBS3 gives the correct information.) Less readily observed slips are to be found in the false citation of individual mss. The Johannine ms. 0109 appears in support of a reading at Matt 13:55! Should this be 0119 as at Matt 13:57? The non-gospel ms. 0223 occurs at Matt 3:15 and should be 0233 according to the apparatus in N-A26. Uncial number 0149 is no longer used and no modern text cites this ms. number—except Orchard at Mark 6:41.47 Uncial 029 is cited under this symbol at Luke 22:47b but as the letter T at Luke 22:68(bis). R is cited at Luke 10:1 (δύο1) but this uncial is not extant here.48

Even if one’s concern in using an apparatus is not in the mss. actually in support of a reading but is in the variants themselves one still needs to exercise extreme caution in reading Orchard’s apparatus.

47 The use of 0187 for 0149 was specified over sixty years ago by von Dobschütz (ZNW 23 (1924) p. 252).
48 1579 at Mark 9:41 §128 should be 1 579. 505 at Mark 4:16 §103 §147 is more likely to be 565 (cf. N-A26 ad loc). 2047 at Matt 22:23 §301 cannot be correct: this is a cursive of Revelation. C and P cannot be cited at Luke 8:26: neither is extant for this verse.
At Luke 8:3, for instance, the reading by NYII etc. is said to support αὐτῶν: actually these mss. read αὐτῷ.

Improvements to the apparatus that may be recommended are the following:

Matt 9:29: §180 add P15 (vid). Luke 6:10: The omission of in ira is not peculiar to f. a seems not to have these words either. 6:48: P15 is fragmentary and does not contain the longer text. 7:28: Ψ does not omit προφήτης (only τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ). 8:37: Why is only v.l. γεργασηνῶν shown? There is the same range of v.ll. here as is shown for the v.l. at 8:26. 8:45: Π has καὶ...αὐτῶ according to N-A26 and Scrivener’s collation. So too do L f, according to Jülicher, and 157. Luke 9:51: L has αὐτῶν (cf. N-A26); P15 omits αὐτῶν 10:1: (δύο) add L15. 11:2 (πάτερ): For the shorter text add L15. 11:24: Add Ψ in support of σχολάζοντα. 12:27: Add Le to a as exceptions to the omission.

Errors, including drafting faults, may also be noted in the following places. The omission of Luke 5:39 is shown oddly at §53. §345: Π is said to be in opposition to the reading of Π*. Similarly in §241 P75 and P75c are cited on opposing sides, om.cet. is misleading at Luke 10:21: ἐν om.cet. is incorrect because ΠΔΛΞ have ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ. At Luke 6:2 P4 B R 700 omit not only ποιεῖν but ποιεῖν ἐν. Matt 20:17: The extent of the matter in dispute is καὶ ἀναβαίνοντα ὁ and μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν and not as stated in §280. Mark 6:22: The v.l. expressed as + τῆς om. is confusing (§159). Mark 16:9–20: On p. 340 the statement that the ms. tradition (by which the author presumably means the mss.) is not ‘about equally divided’ between the inclusion or omission of these verses. Very few mss. omit the verses. Mark 12:27: The colons around Or suggest a variant has been accidentally deleted (§301). Matt 23:13 (§304): It is not true to state that UBS3 and N-A26 omit verse 13; they omit what Orchard calls v. 13.

As we have seen, Orchard’s apparatus (referred to on p. xv somewhat strangely as the Text Apparatus Criticus) is much smaller than those found in Syn and H-G. As a select list of major alternative readings (pp. 315–340) it is in general acceptable. It is however a delusive task to be selective and truly representative. It is easy to point to important or major variants that could have been included in any selection but

49 Has Orchard confused fam 1 with Old Latin f here? Brixianus is normally cited as L f.
50 L15 may also be added to the v.ll. given at Luke 9:1, 54; 11:37 (om. δὲ); 11:44 (om.); 12:11 (add η τί).
the following surprised me by their absence from Orchard’s apparatus given the importance attached to many of them in his edition:

Matt 19:24 + εἰσελθεῖν. The omission from Orchard’s text of Matthew creates a dissimilarity with the parallels.
Matt 20:30f om. κύριε. Here the addition creates a dissimilarity with the parallels.
Matt 22:30 + (τοῦ) θεοῦ. The omission makes the parallel agree (cf. H-G).
Matt 27:16, 17 + Jesus. Syn\(^5\) brackets the longer name.\(^5\)
Mark 2:22 Major details of disputed text ignored.
Mark 3:7 Only the omission of ἱκολούθησαν αὐτῷ is shown not the reading of ἱκολούθησαν read in Syn and H-G.
Mark 3:16 The apparatus gives us no indication that a shorter text exists as in H-G.
Mark 4:28 πλήρης στὸν which differs from Syn\(^4\) and H-G is not shown to be disputed.
Mark 7:35 The unique reading ἐυθέως\(^2\) is not defended in the apparatus. Neither the apparatus to H-G nor Syn (nor N-A\(^26\)) know of such a reading. On what authority is this reading based? The evidence given for the omission of the adverb in the apparatus does not agree with that found in N-A\(^26\).
Mark 14:20 + ἕν.
Luke 9:2 The evidence should be presented not only as a choice between τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας and ἀσθενεῖς (actually τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς) but also between a longer and shorter text. Syn brackets the longer text because B omits.
Luke 10:38 Longer text against Syn\(^8\).
Luke 12:18 H-G has a different text here. Various significant v.ll. exist.
Luke 17:24 The longer text is bracketed in Syn\(^8\).
Luke 19:15 Text in Syn B is τί διεπραγματεύσαται and this v.l. should be shown.
Luke 23:38 The longer text is found in H-G.
Luke 23:39 A rare instance of Orchard printing a shorter text as well as a text at variance with Syn and H-G, yet the v.l. om. λέγων is ignored.
Luke 24:32 The longer text is bracketed in Syn\(^8\).

**Corrigenda**

(a) *H-G*
The printers and proofreaders of this edition are to be congratulated on their excellent workmanship. The complicated nature of their task is readily recognisable and it is to their credit that errors are so few.

\(^{51}\) The apparatus in H-G is similarly deficient here.
Printing slips in the introductory matter and in the text and apparatus are, in general, easily spotted. Among the less obvious errors in the apparatus are the following:


\[ \phi \alpha \rho \cdot \text{ at Luke 12:22} = \phi \alpha \gamma \cdot; \text{ at Luke 24:2 D reads } \alpha \pi \omega \kappa \nu \lambda \acute{\iota} \acute{s} \acute{\epsilon} \acute{i} \acute{e}; \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \varsigma \text{ is misspelt in the apparatus at Luke 6:45; at Luke 21:27 1 should not be italicised. At John 12:5 the apparatus should refer us to the parallel at 6:7 not 6:71.} \]

(b) Orchard

It is obvious from the numerous examples given that Orchard's edition would be considerably enhanced were a revision of the apparatus to be undertaken. In undertaking such a revision the opportunity should be grasped to standardize certain matters of presentation. First, certain minor matters need attention. In the introduction to the apparatus the Vetus Latina I Verzeichnis concerning Old Latin mss. should be dated 1949. Also in the introduction the relative weight of the abbreviations pl pc al could be indicated: this is particularly significant when one of these abbreviations is used in opposition to 'cet' in support of a rival reading. It would also be helpful if the baffling abbreviation C G s found in the apparatus to John 5:4 could be elucidated in the introduction. Another strange intrusion is the symbol 'ms' at §91 (but not at §37). The siglum for papyrus appears in four different forms (cf. Luke 3:32, 33; Matt 13:35 (§107, cf. §151!); John 1:34). In tidying up the apparatus other remedial work is needed: K is repeated in §144. At §103 p and c are separated. r should be r1 at §302 (cf. §209). L k appears in upper case at Matt 13:55 §38. At Luke 6:31 L 15:51 are joined (cf. §267 also). At §114 it is Luke 5:17 not 15:17 that should appear. B is inexplicably bracketed at Luke 6:48. The initial alpha of \( \omega \mu \eta \nu \) at Luke 7:28 is capitalised at §94 but not at §131.
In standardising the apparatus a consistent policy should be adopted in italicising both abbreviations (cf. pt at Luke 6:1, 2; Matt 22:35 (both v.ill.) and al at Mark 3:2, 5) and uncial numbers (cf. Mark 6:33 and Mark 9:29 or Luke 22:43–44, 61, 68). The abbreviation hab is sometimes followed by a full stop (e.g. Luke 6:10; 9:1; Mark 2:17 §52) which is not the normal practice in the house-style of this book. Om is not abbreviated only at §115 (Mark 2:15).

A more serious lack of consistency concerns the presentation of longer and shorter texts in the apparatus. Here inconsistency may puzzle the unwary. For instance, the evidence for the reading printed is sometimes preceded by hab\(^{52}\) (e.g. Luke 6:10, 45; Mark 2:17; 6:38) implying that there exists a v.l. omitting the word(s) enclosed by half brackets in the text. At other places hab does not precede the evidence but again one must infer that an unexpressed variant omits the words half-bracketed in the text (e.g. Mark 9:7; 10:1; Luke 4:17). Occasionally we need not make inferences because the alternative reading is set out in the form om. cet (e.g. Mark 8:15). Difference in presentation can be seen by comparing the apparatus at the following points: Matt 13:9, 11, 35; Luke 6:45; 13:12.

Another related inconsistency is that sometimes the mss. for the longer printed reading are given, whereas at other times only the evidence for the alternative shorter text is set out in the apparatus. Problems can occur when the evidence for the printed text is not specified. At Matt 9:26 for instance a rare instance of there being more than two readings exhibited, the evidence for the printed text is suppressed and needs to be spelt out in even an abridged form (although cet alone would be meaningless here).

Luke 24:35 is numbered 24:34; the verse number of Matt 9:3 is omitted. τοῦτον at Matt 19:11 is mis-printed.

Conclusion

Aland’s *Synopsis* is well-established and has the virtue of printing the text of John in full.\(^{53}\) The repetition of each pericope almost each time

\(^{52}\) Or in the case of Matt 19:16, 17 by sic. At Matt 19:21 the evidence of D Θ is set out twice, once preceded by hab, once not!

\(^{53}\) As too does Orchard.
it is relevant to a parallel together with the repetition of its apparatus on most occasions (an exception being the parallels to Luke 22:56–66 in pericopes 332–333) may be uneconomical in terms of space and cost but it is of enormous benefit in studying the synoptic problem.

H-G has a text that is in many ways superior to that in the other two; the apparatus to H-G is the most helpful and considerate. Orchard’s main value is in allowing the proponents of the neo-Griesbach theory to proselytize: armed with this text the theorists of that alleged solution to the synoptic problem are now to be encouraged to demonstrate their convictions with copious examples drawn from Orchard’s display and we await their demonstrations eagerly.

Postscriptum

The promised companion volume referred to on page 394 and page 398 has been only partially fulfilled: Heinrich Greeven and Eberhard Güting, *Textkritik des Markusevangeliums* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005) (=*Theologie: Forschung und Wissenschaft* 11).
The main object of textual criticism is to establish as accurately as possible a text approximating to the original words of the original authors. As far as the text of the synoptic gospels is concerned, one of the main problems in establishing the text is the amount of cross-fertilization in the MSS whenever the gospels are in parallel. Scribes were prone to assimilate the gospel they were copying to a parallel text in another gospel.

Professor Bruce Metzger in the companion volume to the third edition of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament shows on numerous occasions how the committee responsible for producing that text were aware of the problem of assimilation. As far as the gospel of Mark is concerned, Metzger explains that the committee claimed that harmonization was a contributory or a major factor in dismissing at least one of the secondary readings in each of the following verses: Mark 1:8 (bis), 11, 27, 29, 34, 39; 2:5, 9, 16, 22 (bis), 26; 3:16; 5:1, 36, 42; 6:3, 39; 7:24, 28; 8:10, 15, 16 (bis), 38; 10:2, 19, 34, 40, 46; 11:22, 24, 26; 14:4, 5, 20, 24, 25, 30 (bis), 41, 65, 72 (bis); 15:10, 12, 25 (bis), 28, 34 (bis), 39.

In general the UBS committee seem to have reached the correct decision on the above variants. It is a useful and valuable rule of thumb in textual criticism to accept as the original text the variant which makes parallel passages more dissimilar, and to explain the secondary text as scribal harmonization. This principle does not seem to have been applied consistently in the formulation of the UBS text and as a result several secondary readings have crept into that text. In the following places in Mark, Metzger’s Commentary reveals that the UBS

committee dismissed or disregarded the likelihood that assimilation to a parallel may have been responsible for scribal emendation.²

[1:40], [3:14], 5:[21], 22; 6:20, [41]; 7:6; 8:35; [9:42]; [10:1, 7]; [12:23]; 13:2, 22. At 7:6 it would have been relevant to point out that Matthew 15:8 has τιμᾷ firm in the textual tradition; that at 3:14 the shorter text could have resulted from assimilation to the parallel in Matthew (10:1), just as at 5:21 [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] the shorter text could have resulted from assimilation to Luke 8:40. At 13:2 Matthew 24:22 may have been the cause of scribes adding to their texts of Mark. (/octet has also been added by B to the text of Luke at this point, Luke 21:6.) UBS does provide an apparatus at Luke 21:6 and the Commentary suggests there that ὡδε has come in either from Matthew or Mark. ὡδε in MSS of both Mark and Luke is likely to have come from Matthew.

The principles which were applied to some of the variants in Mark seem therefore not to have been consistently acknowledged in other variants. This observation ought to make us cautious in using the UBS³ text or of our accepting uncritically the explanatory notes in Metzger’s Commentary. Our concentrating here on the UBS³ text is significant, because the 9th edition of Aland’s Synopsis (= Syn³)³ has a text substantially the same as UBS³ (which also agrees with Nestle–Aland in the forthcoming 26th edition of that text) whereas the 8th edition of Aland’s Synopsis was based on Nestle–Aland²⁵ (= N–A²⁵). The majority of scholars who will work on the synoptic problem in the future are likely to base their work on the text of Syn.⁹ It is important therefore to see how far that text is reliable and in particular to what extent assimilated readings have been allowed to appear as the text rather than as part of the marginal apparatus.

One test which can be applied to Syn⁹ in this regard is to see how far this text differs from its immediate predecessor. An analysis of the changes between Syn⁸/N–A²⁵ and Syn⁹/N–A²⁶ has been attempted by

Professor Frans Neirynck. By selecting from the lists produced by Neirynck those changes involving variants in passages where there are synoptic parallels we can see that sometimes Syn⁹ presents a text where there are fewer agreements between the parallels, and in other places more. The following readings newly printed in the text of Syn⁹ increase the dissimilarities between the parallels and therefore on the basis of the rule of thumb concerning dissimilarity enunciated above produce a more reliable text than Syn⁸. An asterisk following the reference indicates that Metzger discusses the variant in the Commentary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:33*</td>
<td>[τοῦ θεοῦ]</td>
<td>6:39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:6</td>
<td>ἐγερθεῖς</td>
<td>7:28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14*</td>
<td>[πολλά]</td>
<td>8:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>ἥκολούθησεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:7</td>
<td>ἔπνιζεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>διεστεῖλατο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15*</td>
<td>[εἰς σὲ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>πάντα τευτα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>[τοῖς]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:24</td>
<td>τρυπήματος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:17*</td>
<td>[μαθητάς]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:2</td>
<td>εὐθέως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>δύο ἐσονται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Syn⁸ assimilated to Luke with Ν B)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark and Luke with Β)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark with Ν* Β)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Luke)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Luke)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark and Luke)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Mark)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Luke with Ν B)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Matt. with Ν B*)  
(Syn⁸ with Ν B adds ναί from Matt. creating a Markan ἀ.λ.)  
(Syn⁸ assimilated to Matt. with Ν B)

---

5 Although Syn⁹ here makes Matt. and Luke dissimilar whereas Syn⁸ had them agree in reading the shorter text, the textual problem is more complex in so far as some MSS at Luke 17:3 add εἰς σὲ.
6 Syn⁹ assimilated Matt. to Luke which does not have τοῖς but the issue is more involved than either edition of the Synopsis suggests: v.l. adds τοῖς in Luke. It must therefore be decided which gospel(s), if any, should have the article.
7 Again the position is more complicated. There are v.l. at Mark 10:25 and Luke 18:25 suggesting a great admixture. Here we are concerned only to indicate that the principles underlying Syn⁹ have given us a text which shows all three synoptics dissimilar.
Luke 18:24* + [περίλυπον (Syn⁸ assimilated to Matt. and Mark)
γενόμενον]
20:44 κύριον αὐτὸν (Syn⁸ assimilated to Matt. and Mark)

By contrast the following readings appearing in Syn⁹ increase the similarities between two or more gospels. On the basis of the rule of thumb concerning dissimilarity this has resulted in a less accurate text than Syn⁸. An asterisk after the reference indicates that Metzger discusses the change in his Commentary.

Matthew 11:8 + εἰσίν as Luke (Syn⁸ omits with Ν* B)
11:9* ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; as Luke (Syn⁸: προφήτην ἰδεῖν; with Ν* B C*)
12:44 omit καὶ as Luke (Syn⁸ adds [καὶ] with Ν C*)
14:3 + [οὐτὸν] as Luke (Syn⁸ omits with Ν* B)
14:12* αὐτὸν[ν] with Ν* B as Mark (Syn⁸ —οὐτὸ)
14:15 omit οὖν as Mark⁸ and Luke (Syn⁸ adds with Ν C Z)
20:18 θανάτωρ as Mark (Syn⁸ εἰς θάνατον with Ν alone)
21:19 omit οὖ as Mark (Syn⁸ + οὖ with BL)

Mark 1:8 + ἐν as Matthew and Luke (Syn⁸ omits ἐν with B)
3:1 + τὴν as Matt. and Luke (Syn⁸ omits τὴν with Ν B)
4:22 omit τί as Luke (Syn⁸ + τί with Ν A C)
9:38* omit ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν as Luke (Syn⁸ adds)⁹
9:42* + [εἰς ἐμέ] as Matt. (Syn⁸ omits)
12:9 + [οὖν] as Luke (and Matt.) (Syn⁸ omits with BL)
13:2* ὅποτε as Matt. (Syn⁸ omits)
13:22 γὰρ as Matt. (Syn⁸ δὲ with Ν C)
13:22* δόσουσιν as Matt. (Syn⁸ ποιήσουσιν)
13:31 + ημὲν as Matt. and Luke (Syn⁸ omits with B D*)

Luke 6:3 ὅποτε as Matt. and Mark (Syn⁸ ὁπότε)
9:13 ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν as Matt. and Mark (Syn⁸ φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς with B)
9:59* + [κύριε] as Matt. (Syn⁸ omits with B* D)
11:24* + [τότε] as Matt. (Syn⁸ omits)

⁸ v.l. + οὖν in Mark here is likely to be secondary. There are only two firm instances of οὖν in this gospel, although scribes sometimes inserted this particle to eliminate asyndeton. See Mark 12:9 below and also the section on asyndeton below, p. 240 f.
⁹ The longer text is characteristic of Markan tautology, cf. 12:23 where Syn⁹ adds (correctly) ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν albeit in brackets.
24:36* + καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν as John (Syn8 omits)
24:40* + whole verse mostly as John (Syn8 accepts western non-interpolation)

In the above list we would not necessarily wish to defend all the readings in Syn8. The purpose of the list is merely to show that because Syn8 represents a different text from Syn9 the relationship between the gospels inevitably differs depending on which synopsis text one is working with. Such changes inevitably affect one’s judgement and statistics on these parts of the text. Our samples above merely warn us not to accept the text of Syn9 as representing on all occasions the original words of the original authors.

The lesson to be drawn is that the synopsis text cannot be consulted without recourse to the apparatus, because the original text, so often the unassimilated text, is sometimes to be found in the apparatus. But it is a lesson which cannot be consistently applied because occasionally the apparatus to the Aland Synopsis does not give the information we require to be able to adjust the text along the lines recommended above. Often an apparatus fuller than that provided in the select apparatus to Syn9 needs to be consulted.

The above arguments however need qualification and refining. We have implied and perhaps have even recommended that the rule of thumb concerning dissimilarity be applied automatically to variants in the synoptic parallels. Such a mechanical application of a rule of thumb is however a bad method of proceeding, especially if one is attempting to apply eclectic principles to textual problems. Several difficulties need to be recognized and several differing factors have to be borne in mind whenever a textual critic is confronted by variants in the synoptic parallels, as footnotes 5–9 have indicated.

It is particularly important when evaluating the likeliest direction of change and assimilation to take all the variants into account. It is all too easy to be dogmatic about the direction in which assimilation is likeliest to have gone when only one gospel’s variants are discussed. For instance at Mark 2:16 Metzger’s Commentary tells us that the longer text ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει is due to assimilation to Luke, and that the shorter text ἐσθίει was followed by Matthew 9:11 who added ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν, an expression which in turn was adopted by C L Δ at Mark 2:16. Why could we not equally assume Luke copied Mark’s longer text, and that some scribes at Mark 2:16 assimilated to Matthew 9:11?
At Mark 12:36 ὑποκάτω is printed in UBS³ on the grounds that ὑποπόδιον has been introduced from the parallel in Luke 20:43 (= Acts 2:35). But ὑποκάτω which is found in some of the MSS of Matthew may have been responsible for scribes’ altering an original ὑποπόδιον in Mark to ὑποκάτω. ὑποπόδιον in Luke is not firm in the tradition either. ὑποκάτω may in fact be original throughout the synoptics, and scribes may have been responsible for correcting all synoptic gospels to the LXX form.

Matthew 23:38 is another instance of this need to resolve variants in all the parallels independently of, yet alongside, the need to be alert to the phenomenon of harmonization. Here Syn⁸ includes ἔρημος in the text making Matthew and Luke dissimilar, whereas Syn⁷ omits ἔρημος, with B L making Matthew and Luke parallel. Yet some MSS of Luke add ἔρημος. The issue here is further complicated by the fact that the variants occur in a quotation from Jeremiah, and scribal assimilation to the LXX may again be responsible for the variants in both gospels.

Another typical textual problem involving assimilation is at Luke 8:8. The MSS are divided here between ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν and εἰς τὴν γῆν. ἐπὶ agrees with Matthew 13:8 and εἰς with Mark 4:8. In both of these parallels the preposition is firm in the tradition so a decision has to be made which variant in Luke is original and which preposition has been introduced by scribes through assimilation to one or other of the parallels. Do Matthew and Luke agree against Mark here (a ‘minor agreement’) or is Luke independent?

Some have suggested that the solution to such problems may be found if we could determine the relative popularity of the different gospels especially for lectionary purposes. It is however a solution not easily arrived at. One would need to discover which of the synoptic gospels was most frequently read in church and so would be the gospel to which the others would be most likely to be assimilated. This information would not be easy to arrive at or to apply to our problem in hand. The answer might vary in different periods of church history and in different geographical areas. It would also surely mean that the age of a MS would have to be determined accurately and perhaps its geographical origins. Such a procedure might be possible, but until convincing examples are produced one must remain sceptical that such methods would aid our solving the text of the synoptic gospels.

Only in a very limited way can one see this method in practice. One can for example see how the correctors of one given MS proceeded. Many of the corrections to the synoptic gospels in 8 are due to assim-
lation. For example at Luke 11:24 τότε is absent from $\mathbf{N}^*$ but is added in $\mathbf{N}^{\text{corr.}}$ from the parallel in Matthew. Working through a MS such as $\mathbf{N}$ noting the way the corrector(s) worked might indicate if there is any consistent pattern in its assimilating the parallels but the results would tell us more about the scribal habits of that MS than the general and relative popularity of the gospels.

A more rewarding way of solving some of the knottier problems created by intermingled assimilated passages is to establish the text of the separate gospels by appealing to the author’s style and usage, where this can be determined and demonstrated. When a variant involves a choice between a reading in accord with the author’s style and usage and one which reflects a different usage, then the former is likely to be original. This rule is important and it can be demonstrated that the criterion of usage should take precedence over the criterion of assimilation.

This means that in establishing the text of the synoptic gospels variants will be accepted if they are in accord with the author’s style or NT usage even if the resultant text may increase the similarities between the gospels. Let us take some examples. The first three concern NT usage, the fourth an individual evangelist’s style.

(1) μαθητής + αὐτοῦ
The NT authors tended to qualify μαθητής, usually by a possessive pronoun. This was necessary when the gospels were first being written in so far as leaders other than Jesus had disciples. We read in the New Testament of the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees, for example. Later in the life of the church ‘his disciples’ came more frequently to mean Jesus’ disciples and hence scribes of NT MSS often felt free to omit the possessive pronoun with reference to Jesus’ disciples and to speak of them only as the disciples. Hence there are many v.ll. adding or omitting the possessive after μαθηταί. Wherever such variation occurs we should add the possessive (usually αὐτοῦ). Adjusting our printed editions of Mark in this way would mean that only at 4:34 is μαθητής unqualified by αὐτοῦ—and there ἰδιός makes the possessive unnecessary. In Matthew too any exceptions to μαθηταί

---

αὐτοῦ are explicable on similar grounds. The general rule can again be made to apply to Luke and John.

As far as the synoptic gospels are concerned, accepting the originality of αὐτοῦ throughout the gospels even when it is not textually certain means that the resultant synopsis so printed gives us more similarities between the gospels. Where Matthew, Mark and Luke are in parallel μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ would occur in all three gospels as follows.


For (b) Syn⁹ prints the shorter text in Matthew and Luke, and brackets αὐτοῦ in Mark thus showing apparent agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark. For (c) in Syn⁹ all three gospels have the text without the possessive and in (d) Syn⁹ has only Mark with αὐτοῦ.

Where two gospels only are in parallel our acceptance of αὐτοῦ makes 12 further agreements between these gospels:

Mark 8:27 (pr.) = Luke 9:18  
Matt. 23:1 = Luke 20:45  
Matt. 26:40 = Luke 22:45  
Matt. 14:15 = Mark 6:35  
Matt. 14:22 = Mark 6:45

Matt. 15:12 = Mark 7:17  
Matt. 15:32 = Mark 8:1  
Matt. 15:33 = Mark 8:4  
Matt. 15:36 = Mark 8:6  
Matt. 26:19 = Mark 14:16  
Matt. 26:36 = Mark 14:32

(2) Diminutives

If it is agreed that Koine Greek made use of many diminutive forms without thereby implying any diminutive force, then it is likely that whenever we come across a variant giving the faded diminutive this should be accepted as original.¹¹

One significant such faded diminutive which occurs in the synoptic parallels is μνημείον. This occurs as a variant to μνήμα on three occasions in Mark where there is a parallel in another gospel. (a) At Mark 5:3 μνημείοις occurs in several MSS according to von Soden’s

---

apparatus. This diminutive should be accepted as original as it is characteristic of Markan style, cf. 5:2. The *v.l.* μνημασίν has probably been introduced from the Lukan parallel in order to avoid the diminutive, (b) At Mark 15:46 μνημείῳ is read by C A W Θ and occurs in Syn²: it is likely to be original even though it makes Mark, Matthew (and John) parallel here. Syn⁸ has μνήματι with B 1342 only, a reading which parallels Luke, (c) At Mark 16:2 Syn⁹ reads μνημείον with most MSS (Syn⁸ has μνήμα with Λ* C* W Θ 565) and is likely to be original. Syn⁸ and Syn⁹ should also read μνημείον at the parallel passage in Luke 24.1. (This *v.l.* occurs only as a marginal reading in the apparatus to both editions.) If the correct text were to appear in both Mark and Luke this would create another instance of the parallels being closer than our printed texts normally allow.

(3) Compound verbs followed by the same preposition

W.C. Allen¹² lists the places where Matthew, on the assumption of Markan priority, avoids repeating from Mark the characteristically Markan feature of compounding a verb with a prefixed preposition and following it with the same preposition, e.g. at the Matthaean parallels to Mark 5:17, 6:10, 7:31. Without necessarily accepting Allen’s arguments for the two-source theory we can adapt his observations and apply them to scribal technique. Many variants show that scribes were often as scrupulous in avoiding this feature of Koine, rather than essentially Markan, style as Allen claims Matthew was in relation to Mark. Sometimes scribes of Mark’s gospel altered this stylistic feature by assimilating Mark to Matthew, e.g. Mark 1:16 *v.l.* περιπατῶν δὲ (pler.) and Mark 9:25 *v.l.* ἔξελθε ἀπό (C* Δ Θ).

Variants of more significance occur when we have to balance considerations of the author’s usage against assimilation to the parallel(s).

(a) Mark 9:42 περὶ *v.l.* ἐπὶ (D pc.). The parallel in Luke 17:2 has περίκειται περὶ firm, and Matthew 18:6 has περὶ *v.l.* εἰς and ἐπὶ (D).

(b) Mark 10:25 should on the basis of Mark’s characteristic use of this Koine feature read διελθεῖν διὰ and εἰσελθεῖν εἰς as in both Syn⁸ and Syn⁹. The variants are διελθεῖν *v.l.* εἰσελθεῖν and εἰσελθεῖν *v.l.* omit. Syn⁸ for Matthew 19:24 reads διὰ τρῆματος ραφίδος εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ whereas Syn⁹ has διὰ τρυπήματος

where the verbs parallel Mark. Syn$^8$ made the parallels dissimilar:

Matthew εἰσελθεῖν διὰ and εἰς
Mark διελθεῖν διὰ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς
Luke εἰσελθεῖν διὰ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς.

Luke 18:25 like Mark is the same in both Syn$^8$ and Syn$^9$: διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν (v.l. διελθεῖν in UBS$^2$) ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν In Luke the two instances of εἰσελθεῖν look ugly, which may explain why some scribes altered the first to διελθεῖν by assimilating to those MSS of Matthew and Mark which have διελθεῖν here, but on the other hand διελθεῖν διὰ which itself is a feature often altered by stylistically conscious scribes might be original to Luke here in which case all these gospels would be exactly parallel in their verbs.

(c) Whereas Matthew seems on the basis of Allen’s assumptions and examples to avoid Mark’s habit of prefixing a verb and following it by the same preposition, he himself is not immune to this feature of Koine Greek as the above instances have shown. Another instance is at Matthew 27:44: σὺν σταυρωθέντες σὺν in most MSS with v.l.l. omitting either the freestanding σὺν or the prefix. The Markan parallel should on the basis of Markan style read συνσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ and the v.l.l. omitting σὺν or changing it to μετ’ dismissed. The balance of probability therefore favours the originality of συνσταυρωθέντες σὺν in Matthew as being the form most likely to be altered. Acceptance of this solution will again make parallels closer.

(4) Markan style
Much work has been done on the distinctive style and language of the Markan gospel especially in the pioneering studies by C.H. Turner. Much remains to be done not only on Mark but on the usage in the other gospels. An appeal to author’s style and usage to solve textual problems is a necessary and valuable principle. Sometimes of course this will result in a text that makes the parallels more similar, but the first stage is to establish the original text. Later those working on the

---

Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels

Synoptic Problem need to assess the significance of the text so produced. In isolating below some features of Markan style that have a bearing on the synoptic parallels only Markan individuality is argued for, not Markan priority. Those who favour the traditional 2- or 4-document hypotheses, and those who prefer to follow the new Griesbach solution to the Synoptic Problem should both be equally concerned to establish a synopsis text approximating to the original words.

(a) ὀχλος occurs 38 times in Mark’s gospel. Only at 10:1 do the printed editions have the plural ὀχλοι; the rest are all singular. A variant does occur at 10:1 in D Θ giving the singular συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὀχλος and this should be printed as characteristic of Markan style. The plural is likely to have been introduced from the parallel in Matthew.

(b) In Mark πᾶς ὁ ὀχλος is followed by plural verbs, e.g. 2:13, but scribes often made the verb singular through assimilation to a parallel. At Mark 4:1 v.l. ἦν may be influenced by a singular verb in Matthew; at 11:18 ἐξεπλήσσοντο is original to Mark, the v.l. is likely to be from Luke, where although the parallel is not exact the verb is singular.

(c) Turner stated that Mark tends to begin a story with a plural verb implying ‘Jesus and his disciples’ but that Matthew and Luke when parallel do not have the plural and tell the whole story in the singular referring to Jesus alone. Scribes often altered the introductory plural in Mark to the singular by assimilation to the parallels. Our printed texts have sometimes been influenced by such scribal emendation.

At Mark 2:13 for instance ἔρχεται appears in the printed text, but v.l. ἐρχονται in א A B C D and not ἐρχονται which appears in some MSS of Mark from the parallels where the singular stands firm. Turner in fact accepts the minority reading εἰσῆλθον at Mark 11:11 with Θ i k: the singular occurs in most MSS again from the parallels where the singular is firm.

(d) ὅτι interrogative is characteristic of Mark. Again scribes tended to alter this, often by writing τί in imitation of the Matthaean and/or

---

Lukan parallels. We should accept ὅτι as original to Mark in the following places:

2:7 with B Θ v.l. τί (τίς in Luke)
2:16 with B C pc v.ll. τί ὅτι, τί, or διὰ τί (with Matthew and Luke)
9:11 pler. v.l. τί οὖν (from Matthew)
9:28 pler. v.l. διὰ τί (from Matthew)
14:60 with B L W v.l. τί (from Matthew).

ὅτι does not usually appear in the printed editions at 2:7 or 14:60. An additional reason why stylistically conscious scribes would have removed ὅτι interrogative from 2:16 is that ὅτι occurs earlier in the verse.

(e) ὅτι recitative is frequent in Mark, but is less common in the other gospels. Hence scribes prone to assimilating tended to make Mark conform to the shorter parallels. Where v.ll. exist reading ὅτι these should be accepted as original. In the following verses v.l. omits ὅτι.

Mark
1:40 (C L D W Θ)—from Matthew and Luke (v.l. + κύριε in this verse also comes from the same parallels in Matthew and Luke)
2:17 (pler.)—from Matthew and Luke
3:22 (D)—from Matthew and Luke
5:23 (D)—from Matthew
5:28 (28 33)—from Matthew
6:4 (Δ)—from Matthew
6:18 (D 28)—from Matthew
7:6 (pr) (Δ Θ 33)—from Matthew
8:4 (pler.)—from Matthew
8:28 (pler.)—from Matthew and Luke
12:7 (D Θ 1 28 565)—from Matthew and Luke
12:19 (D 69 108)—from Matthew and Luke
12:29 (D W Θ 1 28 565)—from Matthew and Luke
13:6 (D Θ 33)—from Matthew and Luke

15 The brackets around ὅτι in Syn9 should be removed.
16 ὅτι is included in B L Δ. Syn9 lists only the MSS omitting ὅτι!
14:14  (*pler.* according to von Soden and Legg)—from Matthew and Luke

(f) Asyndeton is a characteristic of Markan style. As a rule of thumb, whenever a variant occurs adding a particle to Mark this should be rejected. Often such particles have been introduced by scribes through assimilation to a parallel. The following list gives those verses in Mark where *v.l.* remove the asyndeton. An asterisk after the reference indicates that Matthew and Luke agree against Mark if the shorter text in Mark is read:

Mark

1:8  + μέν (*pler.* according to von Soden)
1:22  + καί (from Matthew) D* Θ asyndetic
2:9  + γάρ (W) (from Matthew)
2:17  + οὖ γάρ (C pc) (from Matthew)
3:27  + αλλά (Ν B with changed word order)¹⁷
3:35  + γάρ (*pler.*). Asyndeton only in B Old Latin. Syn⁹ adds brackets on the strength of the shorter text in B (cf. Syn⁸)
9:38  + δέ (from Luke) or + καί¹⁸
10:9  + οὖν (from Matthew) A D k* omit¹⁹
10:14*  + καί
10:27  + δέ (from Matthew)
10:28  + δέ (from Luke) + τότε (from Matthew) + οὖν or + καί
10:29*  + δέ. Read ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν with A U V W. This is the fourth asyndetic sentence in five verses.

¹⁷ αλλά at the beginning of a sentence is rare in Mark. The only exception is 13:24 within a poetic section of the apocalyptic discourse.


¹⁹ οὖν is frequent in Matthew (60 times) and Luke (30 times) but rare in Mark. In Syn⁹ οὖν occurs 6 times in Mark (10:9; 11:31 bracketed; 12:9 bracketed; 13:35; 15:12; [16:19]. In Syn⁸ οὖν is not bracketed at 11:31, therefore the brackets in Syn⁹ are a step in the right direction: but at 12:9 [οὖν] has been added to the text so here Syn⁹ has moved in the wrong direction. Variants remove οὖν in all the above places except 13:35 and 15:12. At 10:9 only D has the text without οὖν. At 10:9; 11:31; 13:35, the parallel in Matthew has the particle (*v.l.* omits at parallel to 11:31). The parallel to 11:31 in Luke has *v.l.*+ οὖν (Luke 20:5).
12.9* + οὖν
12:17 + οὖν (from Matthew)
12:20 + οὖν (from Luke with a changed order) or + δέ (from Matthew)
12:23* + οὖν (closest to Matthew)
12:24 + καί (from Luke) or + δέ (from Matthew)
12:36 + γάρ (from Luke)
12:37* + οὖν
13:6* + γάρ
13:7* + γάρ
13:33 + οὖν (from Matthew) + δέ or + δέ καί
13:34 + γάρ (from Matthew)
14:6 + γάρ (from Matthew)
14:19 + καί (from Matthew) or + οἱ δέ
14:64 + νῦν (§) (from Matthew)

[242] These v. ll. show that if the shorter text is accepted as original in Mark, scribes often removed the asyndeton by the most natural way open to them, that is assimilation to a parallel wherever one existed.
At tempted literary solutions to the Synoptic Problem usually involve close observation of parallel texts. Those who try to assist the visual presentation of material common to or dissimilar to two or more parallels often do so by means of colour coding, or by underlining or overlaying the text with different colours to indicate where a gospel agrees with or disagrees with the parallel verse in another gospel. Even those who do not use such a visual aid collect instances of minor agreements (of Matthew and Luke against Mark), of places where all three parallels agree, of places where all three parallels disagree and so on. This exercise is usually undertaken on the basis of one particular text—the old Huck(-Lietzmann) synopsis served as a vade mecum to many earlier scholars. Nowadays several synopsis texts are on the market.¹ The text in the Aland Synopsis (= Syn), from the 9th edition, is based on the text to be found in Nestle-Aland 26th edition (NA26). The Huck-Greeven synopsis (= HG) has a text of its own. Thus where these two synopses differ there may, therefore, be differences in the statistics and observations on which decisions over the Synoptic Problem as a whole may be dependent or over which nuances that effect the overall judgement detected. The following study attempts to select from the differences between these two texts those variants that affect a parallel or parallels. There are some 10 differences on average per chapter (excluding orthographical or punctuation changes) between these two texts. In all nearly 700 variants may be found, but obviously not all of these involve a text that has a meaningful parallel in another gospel. By grouping these differences in the categories of agreement and disagreement meaningful for a discussion of the Synoptic Problem it may be shown that one’s judgement on the Synoptic Problem can

be influenced by the Synopsis on which the study is based. Even if the
differences shown up by the evidence presented below are not conclu-
sive in relation to the total question of the Synoptic Problem, at least,
in dealing with the exegesis of individual pericopae or sayings, the
apparent changes or agreements found in the parallels must influence
the way in which an interpretation (be it in the case of literary study,
theology or historical investigation) may be made.

I have attempted on several occasions\(^2\) to preach that decisions
about the Synoptic Problem ought not to be made on the basis of the
text in any one Synopsis but that one should make use of the alterna-
tive readings to be found in the critical apparatus and that one should
not imbue the editor of any one printed text with an omniscience that
enabled him to produce a definitive version of the text. In reality I
recognise that such preaching generally falls on deaf ears. Most writ-
ers on the Synoptic Problem still base their discussions on one printed
text and with scarcely an acknowledgement that the apparatus is of
help. However, one notable exception among scholars of the Synoptic
Problem is Professor Neirynck, and that is why this present study is
offered in grateful tribute to an indefatigable contributor to and critic
of the international synoptic debate. Neirynck is all too well aware of
the differences in printed synopses and the effect these can have on
aspects of the Synoptic Problem: he is also alert to the textual vari-
ants. The publication of a new text of the Greek New Testament or a
new synopsis is usually swiftly followed by a perspicacious analysis of
that text in relation to the Synoptic Problem by Professor Neirynck
in \(ETL\)\(^3\). My own work on the Synoptic Problem constantly draws on
(and I hope benefits from) Neirynck’s invaluable lists and comments
in this journal. The verifiable scholarship and solid adherence to the
text characteristic of his work are beacons of sanity in a discipline
where some less determined Biblical theologians are tempted away
from such rigorous work by fads and ephemera.

The preparation of this present article owes much to Neirynck’s list
of differences between Huck-Greeven (= HG) and Syn found in \(ETL\)

\(^2\) Most recently in D.L. Dungan, \textit{The Interrelations of the Gospels} (\(BETL\), 95), (Leu-
Elliott, \textit{Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism} chapter 12 (Cordova:

\(^3\) E.g., on Greeven’s text or on the Boismard-Lamouille synopsis (for the references
see below) or on the NA text (in \(ETL\) 55, 1979, pp. 331–356, reprinted in \textit{Evangelica},
It is on these two synopses that I rest my case, but occasional observations about two other recent synopses, those of Orchard and by Boismard-Lamouille, will be included where pertinent. By concentrating on Syn and HG we shall be referring to the two synopses most frequently in use. The facts and statistics I outline with reference to them can be extended and expanded and also used to incorporate Boismard-Lamouille (= BL) and Orchard in their entirety should the utility of such an exercise be demonstrated, but I trust the following sample, while not exhaustive, is at least representative, and does show that differences in the text of the gospels can have a relevance beyond the individual gospel itself.

In my contribution to the collected papers of the Jerusalem Conference on the interrelationship of the gospels, I cited the example of a rare instance of a saying of Jesus which was so fluid in the ms. tradition that one could, in theory, manipulate the three parallel accounts so as to create a solution to the interrelationship of the gospels for at least that verse. The saying in question is Mt 19:24; Mk 10:25; Lk 18:25. I stressed there that such an opportunity to create a maverick text from a multitude of variants is not usually available to students of the Synoptic Problem, nor should such an opportunity be misused to create a text in favour of one or other attempted solution to the Synoptic Problem. It is also a misuse of the generally accepted canons of textual criticism. If we confine ourselves to the way in which the synopses of Aland and Greeven conduct themselves here we see the following: Mt 19:24 HG διὰ . . . εἰσελθεῖν . . . εἰς, Syn διὰ . . . διελθεῖν . . . εἰσελθεῖν εἰς. To follow HG will show Matthew agrees closely with Luke against Mark, in other words is a “minor agreement”. To follow Syn would be to read a text closer to Mark.

Changes to the text of the synoptic gospels at a point where a parallel exists in either or both of the printed editions under consideration inevitably affect any statistics built up concerning the relationship of

---

4 Not that that article is free from the need to include addenda and corrigenda. I have noted its shortcomings in the lists following. To these add Lk 23:12 HG αὐτούς = NA23 (i.e. NA15 1932f), Syn αὐτούς. Some errata previously notified have been corrected in the reprinted article in Evangelica II, 1991, pp. 377–388.

5 A review of Boismard-Lamouille by the present writer is to be found in TLZ 113 (1988) cols. 740–743. Orchard’s text is included in my survey, “An Examination of the Text and Apparatus of Three Recent Greek Synopses”, in NTS 32 (1986) pp. 557–582. Reprinted as chapter 24, above.

6 Cf. above, n. 2.
the gospels. The cumulative effect of certain changes may indeed have an influence on one’s judgement of that relationship. In the following pages I have tried to indicate the types of changes that have occurred in the interrelationship of the gospels depending on which printed edition is being consulted. For the purpose of documenting my observations in an orderly manner subdivisions are given numbers and letters.\textsuperscript{7}

**Types of Changes**

A. When any two gospels occur in parallel
   I. *Matthew*
      i) Where HG makes the parallels differ but Syn agrees with
         (a) Mark (b) Luke
      ii) Where Syn makes the parallels differ but HG agrees with
           (a) Mark (b) Luke
   II. *Mark*
      i) Where HG makes the parallels differ but Syn agrees with
         (a) Matthew (b) Luke
      ii) Where Syn makes the parallels differ but HG agrees with
           (a) Matthew (b) Luke
   III. *Luke*
      i) Where HG makes the parallels differ but Syn agrees with
         (a) Matthew (b) Mark
      ii) Where Syn makes the parallels differ but HG agrees with
           (a) Matthew (b) Mark

B. Where three gospels occur in parallel
   I. *Matthew*
      1. Where HG makes all three agree Syn has
         (a) Matthew against Mark = Luke
         [(b) Mark against Matthew = Luke]
         (c) Luke against Mark = Matthew
         [(d) All three different]

\textsuperscript{7} Sections in square brackets seem not to occur in the two synopses under consideration.
2. Where Syn makes all three agree HG has
   (a) Matthew against Mark = Luke
   [(b) Mark against Matthew = Luke]
   [(c) Luke against Mark = Matthew]
   [(d) All three different]
3. Where HG makes all three differ Syn has
   [(a) Matthew against Mark = Luke]
   [(b) Mark against Matthew = Luke]
   [(c) Luke against Mark = Matthew]
4. Where Syn makes all three differ HG has
   [(a) Matthew against Mark = Luke]
   (b) Mark against Matthew = Luke
   (c) Luke against Mark = Matthew
5. This subheading and the following letters and numbers are
   used for other combinations.
      (a) HG reads Matthew = Luke against Mark where Syn
         has
         i) Matthew = Mark against Luke
         [No instance of variants in Mark or Luke]
         ii) Mark = Luke against Matthew
         [No instances of variants in Matthew or Mark]
         (b) HG reads Matthew = Mark against Luke where Syn
         has
         i) Mark = Luke against Matthew
         [No instances of variants in Matthew or Luke]
         ii) Matthew = Luke against Mark
         [No instances of variants in Luke or Mark]
         (c) HG reads Mark = Luke against Matthew where Syn
         has
         i) Luke = Matthew against Mark
         [No instance of variants in Mark or Matthew]
         ii) Mark = Matthew against Luke
         [No instances of variants in Matthew or Luke]

II. Mark (where 1 (a) (b) (c) (d) etc. is as for Matthew) [341]
1. (a) (b) (c) [(d)]
2. [(a)] (b) [(c)] [(d)]
3. (a) [(b)] (c)
4. [(a)] [(b)] (c)
5. See under Matthew
III. *Luke* (where 1 (a) (b) (c) (d) etc. is as for Matthew)

1. \[(a)\] \[(b)\] (c) \[(d)\]
2. \[(a)\] \[(b)\] (c) \[(d)\]
3. (a) (b) \[(c)\]
4. \[(a)\] \[(b)\] (c)
5. See under Matthew

A. Where the Parallels Occur in Only Two Gospels

I. *Matthew*

i) Where Syn harmonizes Matthew to one of the other synoptic gospels and HG makes the two parallels dissimilar.

(a) Syn makes Matthew = Mark

3:6 \[BL = HG\]

3:16 HG ἀνέβη ἐυθὺς Syn 2 1

9:18 HG λέγων Syn λέγων ὅτι
[BL = HG]

10:42* HG ἔαν Syn ἕν
(This v.l. is not in HG’s apparatus)

14:22 HG εἰς πλοῖον Syn εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
[BL = HG]

The reading in HG here parallels Jn 6:17. Those working on the interrelation of the gospels may wish to take into account harmonizations in this direction. See also Mt 14:24 where the longer reading in Syn parallels Jn 6:19 (A I ii a).

14:26 HG καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν Syn οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί

15:4 HG ἐνετείλατο λέγων Syn εἶπεν

15:17* HG οὔπω Syn οὐ

16:8* HG ἐλάβετε Syn ἔχετε

20:24 HG ἀκούσαντες δὲ Syn καὶ ἀκούσαντες

20:30* HG θεοῦ Syn omit

Cf. Lk 20:36 ἰσάγγελοι.

---

* The addition of an asterisk after a reference denotes that the words occur in a saying of Jesus. See below, p. 455 (Sayings of Jesus).
Whether the longer text of HG may have been due to dittography or the shorter text of Syn due to haplography, the case remains that the separate editorial decisions have resulted in a synoptic presentation that could affect the statistics assembled about literary interrelationships one way or the other. Cf. Lk 20:38 for a different word order.

Cf. Lk 21:9 ταύτα

Cf. Lk 21:9 ταύτα

Cf. Lk 21:9 ταύτα

(b) Syn makes Matthew = Luke

Orchard’s synopsis has Matthew = Luke, but prints the idiosyncratic ἰδεῖν προφήτην; in both.

This variant is absent from HG’s apparatus, presumable because it is deemed to be merely orthographical and therefore (but wrongly) of no interest to the synoptic problem. Neirynck in ETL 58 includes most such v.l.l. in his footnote 3 on p. 125.

At the Lucan parallel, Lk 9:40, HG prints ἡδυνήθησαν. The variants at Mt 17:16 and Lk 9:40 are ignored in HG’s apparatus. Neirynck, ETL 58, p. 125, ignores Lk 9:40 in the list, even though ἡδυνάσθη is specially referred to in his footnote 3 on that page: the v.l.l. at Mt 17:16 is included. 9

24:43* HG διορυχθήναι Syn διορυχθήναι

---

ii) Where HG harmonizes Matthew to one of the other synoptic gospels and Syn makes the parallels differ.

a) HG makes Matthew = Mark

14:9  HG διὰ δέ  Syn διὰ
14:12 HG αὐτό  Syn αὐτὸν
14:24 HG μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν  Syn σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχεν
19:9* HG καὶ...μοιχᾶται  Syn omit
27:16 HG Βαραββᾶν  Syn Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν

This v.l. is not shown in HG’s apparatus.

27:17 HG Βαραββᾶν  Syn Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν

This v.l. is not shown in HG’s apparatus.

27:51 HG εἰς δύο ἀπ’ ἀνωθεν ἐως  Syn 3–6 1–2 κάτω

In the case of 19:9 above it might well be decided that homoio-teleuton was responsible for the shorter text and that, therefore, Syn prints a secondary reading, but, in the context of an examination of a synopsis text, those relying only on the printed text may well draw certain conclusions from the differing parallels in Syn or from the similarity in HG and add these examples to the sum of comparable instances in their search for a description of the interplay of the gospels.

(b) HG makes Matthew = Luke

7:5* HG τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ  Syn 3–6 1–2 σοῦ

There are no other significant variants under this heading but Mt 11:23* may be included in this list even though different conditions apply. In reading καταβιβασθῆσῃ HG prints a text in agreement with the Lucan parallel. Syn reads καταβῆσῃ in both Matthew and Luke. This is because the variations καταβιβασθῆσῃ and καταβῆσῃ exist in Luke too (Lk 10:15). καταβῆσῃ is in agreement with the LXX and it is clear from the HG apparatus that assimilation to the LXX by both Matthew and Luke is the cause accepted by Greeven for the change. Were either of these synopses to have made the parallels dissimilar then conclusions could be drawn about which of the two seemed to be adapting his predecessor’s word either away from the LXX or (as is usually the more likely) towards the wording of the LXX. It is of note,
and to be commended, that BL prints καταβήσῃ in Matthew and in καταβιβασθήσῃ in Luke.

Another “special case” may be added at this point to show that this phenomenon, whereby HG makes Matthew = Luke and Syn offering a different text in both, makes these two parallels agree. This is at Mt 23:23*. This time the LXX is not a complicating factor. Here HG omits δέ; Syn includes δέ (after ταῦτα) and this happens both here in Matthew and in the Lucan parallel (Lk 11:42). BL creates dissimilarity here: this synopsis has δέ in Matthew but not in Luke. (The footnote in BL ad loc indicates that the addition of δέ in Matthew is due to harmonization to Luke, but does not warn us that δέ in Luke is not firmly fixed in the ms. tradition).

As with the examples given above, and as will be seen in comparable examples to be found below under Mark and under Luke, when HG prints a text in agreement with a parallel, the apparatus to HG does not draw our attention to the fact that the text printed may be due to assimilation, whereas the apparatus usually indicates where a variant seems to have been due to assimilation either to a direct parallel or even to a more remote parallel. This inconsistency in the apparatus or rather the incompleteness of the evidence must not be construed as hypocrisy or intellectual dishonesty in a synopsis deliberately constructed to avoid harmonizing variants. But what one may wish to say about HG’s apparatus is that it is, at the very least, one-sided and thus gives the erroneous impression that the text is a text which is free from harmonization. A reading of the apparatus proper would soon dispel that illusion, and, of course, there may well have been entirely respectable text-critical motives why, on occasion. Professor Greeven printed as the text a harmonizing variant. His untimely death has robbed us of his promised companion volume (HG p. v), in which his text-critical decisions were to have been explained in detail. Thus the harmonizing readings in his text must for the moment be explained only by inference.

II. Mark

i) Where Syn harmonizes Mark to one of the other synoptic gospels and HG makes the two parallels dissimilar.

(a) Syn makes Mark = Matthew

2:3  HG πρὸς αὐτόν  Syn 4 1–3 (which agrees with
     παραλυτικὸν φέροντες  the word order in Mt)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>HG</th>
<th>Syn</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:26*</td>
<td>HG μεμέρισται</td>
<td>Syn ἐμερίσθη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:24*</td>
<td>HG τοῖς ἀκούουσιν</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2</td>
<td>HG δυνάμεις</td>
<td>Syn αἱ δυνάμεις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:32</td>
<td>HG omit ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ</td>
<td>Syn ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:49</td>
<td>HG φάντασμα εἶναι</td>
<td>Syn ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:56</td>
<td>HG ἥπτοντο</td>
<td>Syn ἥψαντο</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:16*</td>
<td>HG include verse</td>
<td>Syn omit verse</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27*</td>
<td>HG καλὸν ἐστιν</td>
<td>Syn 2, 1</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>HG καταβαινόντων δὲ</td>
<td>Syn καὶ καταβαινόντων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>HG ἀπὸ</td>
<td>Syn ἐκ</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12*</td>
<td>HG Ἡλίας</td>
<td>Syn Ἡλίας μὲν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:42*</td>
<td>HG τῶν μικρῶν</td>
<td>Syn τῶν μικρῶν τούτων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:42*</td>
<td>HG πιστευόντων</td>
<td>Syn πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6*</td>
<td>HG αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός</td>
<td>Syn αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>[BL here reads ὁ θεός which creates a stronger dissimilarity than that found in HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>HG λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ</td>
<td>Syn 2–3 1</td>
<td>[BL = HG.¹⁰ The translation may be affected by this change in word order]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15*</td>
<td>HG ὁ δὲ</td>
<td>Syn ὁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15*</td>
<td>HG εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:22*</td>
<td>HG ποιήσουσιν</td>
<td>Syn δώσουσιν</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[345] 13:27*</td>
<td>HG ἐκλεκτοῦς</td>
<td>Syn ἐκλεκτοῦς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>[BL = HG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:28*</td>
<td>HG αὐτῆς ἥδη ὁ κλάδος</td>
<td>Syn 2 3–4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:16</td>
<td>HG μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>Syn μαθηταὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:19</td>
<td>HG καὶ ἄλλος μὴ ἔγω</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
<td>[BL = HG. The shorter text could have been due to homoio-teleuton rather than assimilation]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Synoptic</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:31</td>
<td>HG με δέη</td>
<td>Syn 2 1</td>
<td>Haplography and dittography must be borne in mind in the resolution of the textual problem. Where the editors differ, the text in HG offers possibilities of Mark expanding Matthew or Matthew reducing Mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>HG ῥαββι (bis)</td>
<td>Syn ῥαββι (semel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15:20 | HG τὰ ἰδια | Syn αὐτοῦ | Also under this heading one could perhaps add Mark 14:72 where Syn reads εὐθύς and HG lacks an adverb. The longer text in Mark makes Mark = Matthew (Mt 26:74 εὐθέως in Syn, εὐθύς in HG!).

(b) Syn makes Mark = Luke

3:14 | HG omit οведущ καὶ | Syn οведущ καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασεν | ὄνομασεν

Cf. Mk 3,16.

4:22* | HG τι | Syn omit |

[BL = HG]

5:40 | HG ὁ | Syn αὐτός |

[BL = HG]

9:38 | HG ὃς ῥάκολουθεὶ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν | Syn 5–7 ὀτι 2–4 |

[BL = HG]

9:39 | HG omit Ἰησους | Syn Ἰησους |

10:13 | HG ἤψηται αὐτῶν | Syn 2 1 |

10:52 | HG ὁ δέ | Syn καὶ ὁ |

11:2* | HG κεκάθικεν | Syn ἐκάθισεν |

11:6 | HG εἶπεν | Syn εἶπαν |

Cf. B II 3a.

This v.l. is not in the apparatus to HG.

11:18 | HG οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς | Syn 4–5 3 1–2 |

Cf. Mt 21:15.

12:43* | HG βέβληκεν | Syn ἐβαλεν |

Cf. tenses at 11:2 above.

---

This difference between the two editions is not noted in Neirynck, ETL 58 (1982), p. 25, although other instances of εὐθύς v.l. εὐθέως are included in the list there, and expressly indicated in his footnote 3 on that page.
ii) Where HG harmonizes Mark to one of the other synoptic gospels and Syn makes the parallels differ.

(a) HG makes Mark = Matthew

1,18   HG εὐθέως Syn εὐθύς
Not shown in HG’s apparatus.

3:16   HG καὶ Syn καὶ ἐποίησε τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ
HG explains the longer text as an assimilation to verse 14.

6:22   HG αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑρῳδιάδος Syn αὐτοῦ Ἑρῳδιάδος
Syn therefore suggests that in Matthew the girl is the daughter of Herodias and in Mark that the girl is Herod’s daughter with the name Herodias. HG, although not having the identical wording, makes Matthew and Mark agree in saying that the girl is the daughter of Herodias, αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑρῳδιάδος in Mark being a typical example of Mark’s defining an indefinite term (here αὐτῆς) with an explanation (τῆς Ἑρῳδιάδος, “that is to say of Herodias”).

7:28   HG νοί κύριε Syn κύριε
HG ignores this v.l. in the apparatus.

8:17   HG ὁ Ἰησοῦς Syn omit
8:32   HG αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος Syn 2 3 1
8:37*   HG δῶσει Syn δοий
10:39*   HG μέν Syn omit
13:22*   HG κατ’ Syn omit
15:12   HG οὖν Syn οὖν θέλετε
HG indicates that the reading in Syn is due to assimilation to the remote Mk 15:9.

15:24   HG σταυρώσαντες Syn σταυροῦσιν
Cf. aorist finite verbs in Lk 23:33.

15:36   HG εἶς Syn τις

(b) HG makes Mark = Luke

3:4   HG ἀγαθοποιῆσαι Syn ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι

10:46   HG ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν Syn προσαίτης 1–4
ὀδὸν προσαίτων
Cf. also Mt 20:30. The apparatus to Mark in HG does not indicate that txt, i.e. his printed text, agrees with Luke, but does show v.l. ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὀδὸν ἐπαίτων was created
by assimilation to Luke because of the compound verb. From the point of view of assimilation it is the word-order that is important!

III. Luke

i) Where Syn harmonizes Luke to one of the other synoptic gospels and HG makes the two parallels dissimilar.

(a) Syn makes Luke = Matthew

4:8* HG προσκυνήσεις κύριον Syn 2–5 1 (= LXX)
7:22* HG ὀτι Syn omit
7:24*, 25*, 26*
7:28* HG προφήτης Syn omit
7:33* HG ἔσθον Syn omit

As an orthographical variant this is not reported in the apparatus to HG, despite its possible significance for the study of the literary interrelationship of the gospels.

9:59 HG omit κύριε Syn κύριε
[BL = HG]
10:15* HG τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Syn οὐρανοῦ
Cf. [τοῦ] Ἄδου under A III ii a.

(b) Syn makes Luke = Mark

6:5 HG ὀτι Syn omit
9:1 HG ἀποστόλους Syn omit
21:3* HG ἡ πτωχὴ αὖτη Syn 3 1 2
21:4* HG ἅπαντες Syn πάντες
and HG ἅπαντα Syn πάντα
22:57 HG ἡρνήσατο αὐτὸν Syn ἡρνήσατο

ii) Where HG harmonizes Luke to one of the other synoptic gospels and Syn makes the parallels dissimilar.

(a) HG makes Luke = Matthew
10:15* HG ᾦδου Syn τοῦ ᾦδου
Cf. under A III i a, 10:15* HG τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ Syn οὐρανοῦ
12:25* HG προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν Syn 2–5 1
ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ
19:26* HG ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ Syn omit

(b) HG makes Luke = Mark
18:21 HG μου Syn omit
HG’s apparatus here suggests that the shorter text came about by influence of Acts 26:4!
[348] 20:41* HG υἱὸν Δαυιδ εἶναι Syn 3 2 1
21:11* HG κατὰ τόπους καὶ Syn 3 1–2
This change affects the translation and exegesis of this passage.
Mt 24:7 does not include λιμοὶ (καὶ λοιμοί).13
21:12* HG εἰς συναγωγὰς Syn εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς Syn omit
Cf. Mt 10:17 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν.
23:38 HG γεγραμμένη Syn omit
Cf. B III 2 c for further on this verse.

12 As in my other lists the variants are of differing types (word-order changes, longer or shorter readings, synonyms). Thus it is not as if HG only allowed itself to print readings of a particular type (e.g., only longer readings) that had the effect of harmonizing parallels. The evidence adduced throughout suggests a less rigorous application of the rule of dissimilarity than the introductory matter leads us to expect.

13 For the Markan parallel (Mk 13:8) note that Orchard’s text prints the longer reading + ταραχαί against HG and Syn.
B. The Triple Tradition

I. Matthew

1a) In the following verses HG harmonizes the parallels but Syn makes Mark = Luke against Matthew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>HG</th>
<th>Syn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>υἱέ</td>
<td>υἱός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:4</td>
<td>ἔφαγεν</td>
<td>ἔφαγον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:35*</td>
<td>παρελεύσονται</td>
<td>παρελεύσεται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seem to be no instances where HG has all the parallels agree at a point where the text of Matthew in Syn makes Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement”) (B I 1 b). Where Syn makes Matthew = Mark against Luke (B I 1 c) see Mt 9:9 under B II 1c Mk 2:14.

d) There seem to be no instances where Syn has a text making all three parallels differ at a point where HG has all three the same.

2. In the following examples Syn makes all the parallels agree but HG harmonizes two against one.

a) Where the reading in HG makes Mark = Luke against Matthew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>HG</th>
<th>Syn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>Ἰάκωβας</td>
<td>καὶ Ἰάκωβος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:29*</td>
<td>γυναικα</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:2</td>
<td>ἀπέναντι</td>
<td>Syn κατέναντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:12</td>
<td>τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:2</td>
<td>Ποντίῳ</td>
<td>Syn omit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27:60 | ἐθεκεν | Syn ἐθεκεν αὐτό

Cf. v.l. ἐθεκεν/κατέθηκεν at Mk 15:46 at B II 2 b.

There seem to be no instances where Syn makes all the parallels agree but the reading in HG creates a “minor agreement” of Matthew and Luke against Mark (B I 2 b) or where HG makes Matthew = Mark against Luke (B I 2 c).

14 The parallels read the masculine pronoun.
d) There seem to be no instances where HG has a text making all three parallels differ at a point where Syn has all three the same.

3. There seem to be no instances where HG makes all three parallels differ but where Syn ranges two gospels against three (B I 3 a, b, c).

4. In the following passages Syn makes all three parallels differ. In one it is arguable\(^{15}\) that HG creates a “minor agreement” (B I 4 b) of Matthew = Luke against Mark. That is at

\[
\text{27:59} \quad \text{HG σινδόνι} \quad \text{Syn ἐν σινδόνι}
\]

This variant is ignored in HG’s apparatus.

Examples in which HG has Matthew = Mark against Luke (B I 4 c) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
13:4 & \quad \text{HG ἥλθεν} \quad \text{Syn ἐλθόντα} \\
19:21 & \quad \text{HG ἐν οὐρανῷ} \quad \text{Syn ἐν οὐρανοῖς}
\end{align*}
\]

Cf. also Lk 18:22 under B III 4 c below.

There seem to be no instances where Syn makes all three parallels differ at a point where HG has Mark = Luke against Matthew (B III 4 a).

5. Obviously, when attempting to avoid certain harmonizing variants, a text may be printed that nonetheless creates agreement with the other parallel. The following are examples where the editor in avoiding one apparent case of assimilation allows a different harmonization to appear, perhaps because the pull in one direction (determined by the ms. support for the variant) is deemed stronger than in the other direction.

a i) When HG creates an agreement of Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement”) and where Syn has Matthew = Mark against Luke

\[
\begin{align*}
17:5 & \quad \text{HG αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε} \quad \text{Syn 2 1} \\
19:21^{16} & \quad \text{HG πτωχοῖς} \quad \text{Syn τοῖς πτωχοῖς}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{16}\) In this verse HG also reads οὐρανῶν creating an agreement of Matthew and Mark against Luke: Syn reads ἐν οὐρανοῖς thereby having all the parallels differing. This
b ii) The inclusion of Mt 21:44* by Syn and the omission of this verse by HG (and BL) means that we have here an example of HG creating a text in which Matthew = Mark against Luke but Syn creates a “minor agreement” of Matthew = Luke against Mark.


II. Mark

1. In the following examples HG makes the three parallels agree in the detail specified, whereas Syn harmonizes two against one.

a) Where the reading in Syn makes Mark = Luke against Matthew

5:34* HG θύγατερ Syn θυγάτηρ

This variant is not in the apparatus in HG but should not have been dismissed as if it were merely orthographical, cf. Lk 8:48 HG: θύγατερ; Syn: θυγάτηρ. Again, this v.l. is not in HG’s apparatus.17

b) Where the reading in Syn makes Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement”).

8:35*18 HG ἀπολέσῃ Syn ἀπολέσει

This v.l. is absent from HG’s apparatus.

11:3*19 HG ὅτι Syn omit

11:29* HG κακώ Syn omit

shows the complexity of our problem, created by an uncritical and blinkered adherence to the text of one synopsis only. See Lk 18:22 under B III 4 c below.

17 The v.l. in Mark is shown by Neirynck (ETL, list p. 125) but the v.l. in Luke is listed under his footnote 3 as an “orthographical change”. In his Minor Agreements, p. 40, no. 16, Neirynck includes θύγατερ at Lk 8:48 with Tischendorf, von Soden and Huck-Lietzmann, but as Huck-Greeven also supports this reading G ought to stand in this list in Minor Agreements, p. 99.

18 See further on Mk 8:35 below at B II 2 b and on the Luke parallel (Lk 17:33) at B III 2 c.

19 The reverse may be seen at Mk 8:28 HG omit ὅτι, Syn ὅτι: this example can of course be added to this list.
12:17   HG ἐθαύμαζον  Syn ἐξεθαύμαζον

c) Where the reading in Syn makes Matthew = Mark against Luke
2:14   HG ἠκολούθει  Syn ἠκολούθει
      Cf. Mt 9:9 HG ἠκολούθει  Syn ἠκολούθει and sec B I 1 c.

d) There seem to be no instances where HG harmonizes all three but Syn makes all three synoptic gospels differ.

2. In the following examples Syn makes all three parallels agree and HG harmonizes two against one.

b)20 Where the reading in HG makes Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement”)

1:42   HG εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ  Syn omit
2:5    HG ἰδὼν δὲ  Syn καὶ ἰδὼν
4:18   HG ἐπὶ  Syn εἰς
      [BL = HG]
4:31*  HG κόκκον  Syn κόκκῳ
5:2    HG ἀπήντησεν  Syn ὑπήντησεν
5:14   HG ἀνήγγειλαν  Syn ἀπήγγειλαν
5:25   HG τίς  Syn omit
      [BL = HG]
[351]  8:34*  HG ὡστὶς  Syn ἐὰν τις
8:35*  HG τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν  Syn 1 3 + αὐτοῦ
      [Cf. B II 1 b]
10:13  HG τοῖς προσφέρουσιν  Syn αὐτοῖς
10:21* HG ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν  Syn omit
10:52  HG τῷ Ἰησοῦ  Syn αὐτῷ2
11:33  HG ἀποκριθείς  Syn omit
      [BL = HG]
13:9*21 HG ἐνεκα  Syn ἐνεκεν

This v.l. is absent from HG’s apparatus.

---

20 There seem to be no instances involving variations in Mark where HG makes Mark = Luke against Matthew (B II 2 a) or where HG makes Matthew = Mark against Luke (B II 2 c).

21 This piece of text is absent from Minor Agreements, p. 73, and, probably as a consequence, absent from p. 96, where this example could have been included and been as valid as many of the examples given in pp. 96–97.
13:29*  HG τούτα ἴδητε   Syn 2 1  
[BL = HG]

14:43  HG Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης   Syn Ἰούδας  
15:46  HG κατέθηκεν   Syn ἐθηκεν²²  
[BL = HG]

d) There seem to be no instances in Mark where Syn has all three parallels in agreement but where HG has all three differ.

3. In the following examples HG makes all three parallels differ.

a) Where Syn has a text that makes Mark = Luke against Matthew
2:22*  HG ῥήσσει   Syn ῥήξει  
9:7    HG ἠλθεν   Syn ἐγένετο²  
12:16  HG εἴπον   Syn εἶπαν  

cf. A II i b. This v.l. is not shown in HG’s apparatus.

b)²³ Syn has a text that makes Mark = Matthew against Luke
11:31  HG ἐλογίζοντο   Syn διελογίζοντο  
12:14  HG κῆνσον καίσαρι δοῦναι   Syn 3 1 2  
13:22  HG τούτου   Syn omit

4. In the following examples Syn makes all three parallels differ.

c)²⁴ Where HG makes Mark = Matthew against Luke
13:2  HG καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθείς   Syn καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς  

The apparatus in HG states that the omission of ἀποκριθείς is due to harmonization to Luke, but Luke omits ὁ Ἰησοῦς also! See other variants involving ± ἀποκριθείς in Mk at 12,17 and 13,5 (B II 5 b i).

The following may also qualify for inclusion under B II 4 c. At Mk 2:22* HG ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται (cf. Mt 9:17 ἐκχεῖται [352]

²² Cf. also at Mt 27:60 under B I 2 a.
²³ There seem to be no instances where HG has all three parallels in agreement but Syn creates a “minor agreement” of Matthew = Luke against Mark (B II 3 b).
²⁴ Under this subheading there seem to be no examples where HG harmonizes Mark = Luke against Matthew (B II 4 a) or where HG harmonizes Luke = Matthew against Mark (a “minor agreement”) (B II 4 b). The addition of ἀποκριθείς in the text of HG at Mk 12:17 only serves to underline the already existing dissimilarity in all three parallels and therefore ought not to have been included in Minor Agreements (1991), p. 96, as another instance of a minor agreement created by the Gereven text.
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται and Lk 5:37 ἐκχυθῆσεται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται). Syn here reads ἀπολλυται καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ, which makes all three dissimilar if ἐκχυθῆσεται in the Lukan parallel is deemed to be sufficiently differentiated from Matthew’s ἐκχεῖται.

5 a) There seem to be no instances where HG prints a text in Mark that has the effect of displaying a “minor agreement” of Matthew = Luke against Mark at a point at which Syn gives a text where Matthew = Mark against Luke (B II 5 a i). Nor is there any instance in my searches whereby HG creates a “minor agreement” of Matthew = Luke against Mark at a point when Syn makes Luke = Mark against Matthew (B II 5 a ii).

b) When HG has Matthew = Mark against Luke
i) Syn makes Mark = Luke against Matthew
   2:26 HG τοῖς ἱερεύσιν Syn τοὺς ἱερεῖς
   13:5 HG ἀποκριθείς Syn omit
   1:2 HG ἐγώ Syn omit
   The LXX of Mal 3:1 includes ἐγώ. This citation occurs in all three synoptics. There is no obvious reason why Matthew (according to HG and Syn) has ἐγώ in conformity with LXX but (according to Syn) Mark does not. The whole question of harmonizing to a gospel parallel is complicated when harmonizing to the LXX also becomes a possibility.

c) When HG has an agreement of Mark = Luke against Matthew
i) there seem to be no instances where Syn prints a reading in Mark that would create a “minor agreement” of Matthew = Luke against Mark.
ii) Syn has Matthew = Mark against Luke
   8:28 HG ἀπεκρίθησαν Syn εἶπαν
   9:5 HG τρεῖς σκηνάς Syn 2 1
   10:13 HG ἐπετίμων Syn ἐπετίμησαν
   11:2 HG λαόν Syn οχλον
   Cf. also Mk 4:38 HG διεγείρουσιν where the compound verb agrees with Luke. Syn ἐγείρουσιν has a simple verb with Matthew.

One freak situation may be noted here. This concerns differing texts of Mark in HG and Syn but where these differences succeed in main-
taining Mark independence from Matthew = Luke. In both printed syn-
opses therefore we find a “minor agreement”. This occurs at Mk 2:10.

HG ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ν ἁμαρτίας  Syn 1 5 2–4

In the Matthaean and Lukan parallels both editions read the order 2–4
1 5 which may have a different exegetical and theological significance
when compared with either of the two printed texts of Mark.

III. Luke

1. In the following examples HG makes the three parallels agree
whereas Syn harmonizes any two against three.

c)25 Where the reading in Syn makes Matthew = Mark against Luke
18:24  HG omit περίλυπον Syn περίλυπον γενόμενον
γενόμενον
The apparatus to HG ignores the v.l. despite its importance,
history, and ms. support of the longer text: Neirynck, Minor
Agreements, p. 59, replaces the words of the longer text with
three dots. To have included them would have indicated the
agreement in omission in Matthew and Mark.
20:9  HG ἄνθρωπος Syn ἄνθρωπος τις

d) There seem to be no instances where Syn has a text making all three
parallels differ at a point where HG has all three the same.

2. In the following examples Syn makes all three parallels agree
whereas HG harmonizes any two against three.

c)26 Where the reading in HG makes Matthew = Mark against Luke
3:22  HG υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἐγὼ Syn σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε ἐν σοί27 εὐδόκησα
[BL = HG]

25 There seem to be no instances where Syn has Mark = Luke against Matthew
(B III 1 a) or where Syn has Matthew = Luke against Mark (B III 1 b).
26 There seem to be no instances where HG makes Mark = Luke against Matthew
(B III 2 a) or Matthew = Luke against Mark (B III 2 b).
27 ὁ in Matthew, σοι in Mark.
Here HG agrees with Ps 2,7(LXX) cf. a similar harmonization by HG to the LXX at Mk 1,2 (B II 5 b ii above).

5:34  HG omit Ἰησοῦς  Syn Ἰησοῦς
      [BL omits Ἰησοῦς in Luke and in Mark, thus making Luke = Mark against Matthew].

6:3*  HG ὁπότε  Syn ὅτε

6:7  HG παρετηροῦντο δὲ  Syn παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν
      [BL = HG]

6:38*  HG τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ  Syn ὃ γὰρ μέτρῳ μέτρῳ
      [BL = HG]

8:32  HG βοσκομένων  Syn βοσκομένη

9:18  HG οἱ ὁχλοὶ λέγουσιν  Syn 3 1–2

17:33*  HG καὶ ὃς ἀν ἢ  Syn ὃς ἢ ἢ
      [BL reads καὶ ὃς ἢν which, like HG, makes this occurrence of the saying in Luke differ from the three other occurrences of the saying, Mt 16:25 = Mk 8:35–38 = Lk 9:24].

18:28  HG Πέτρος  Syn ὁ Πέτρος

20:1  HG ἱερεῖς  Syn ἅρχιερεῖς

22:61  HG λόγου  Syn ῥήματος
      [BL = HG]

23:38  HG γράμμασιν Ἑλλενικοῖς καὶ  Syn omit Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς
      If secondary, this longer text is likely to have come from the Fourth Gospel.

[354] d) There seem to be no instances where HG has a text making all three parallels differ at a point where Syn has all three the same.

3. In the following examples HG makes all three parallels differ.

a) Where Syn makes Mark = Luke against Matthew

8:26  HG Γεργεσηνων  Syn Γερασηνων
      [BL = HG]

20:24  HG ἀποκριθέντες δέ  Syn οἱ δέ

28 q.v. at B II 1 b and B II 2 b.
b) Where Syn makes Matthew = Mark against Luke (a “minor agreement”)

5,13  
HG εἰπών  Syn λέγων  
Cf. 19:30 HG εἰπών  Syn λέγων  
[BL = HG at 19,30]

c) There seem to be no instances where Syn makes Matthew = Mark against Luke.

4. In the following examples Syn makes all three parallels differ but where c)\textsuperscript{29} HG makes Matthew = Mark against Luke

18:22*  HG ἐν οὐρανοῖς  Syn ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς  
Note that HG at Mt 19:21 reads ἐν οὐρανῷ = Mk. Syn has ἐν οὐρανοῖς at Mt 19:21; cf. B I 4 c above.

5. When one synopsis creates a parallel between two gospels against one at a point when the other synopsis creates a different parallel of two against one:

a ii)\textsuperscript{30} HG has a reading that makes Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement” but Syn has Mark = Luke against Matthew

19:36  HG ἑαυτῶν  Syn αὐτῶν  

b) There seem to be no instances when HG has Matthew = Mark against Luke at a point where Syn has either Mark = Luke against Matthew (B III 5 b i) or Matthew = Luke against Mark (B III 5 b ii).

c) When HG has Mark = Luke against Matthew

i) Syn has Matthew = Luke against Mark (a “minor agreement”).

6:5*  HG ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  Syn 6–7 1–4  
καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου  

\textsuperscript{29} There seem to be no instances where HG makes Luke = Matthew against Mark (B III 4 b) with the possible exception of Lk 9:13 HG πέντε ἄρτοι cf. Syn 2 1. The Matthean parallel has the numeral preceeding the noun (in the accusative). There seem to be no instances where HG makes Luke = Mark against Matthew (B III 4 a).

\textsuperscript{30} There seem to be no examples when HG makes Matthew = Luke against Mark where Syn has Matthew = Mark against Luke (B III 5 a i).
By gathering together material under these different heads an overall picture can be created. Thus if, like Professor Neirynck, one is interested in the minor agreements of Matthew-Luke against Mark one can gather together all the references above under the subheading numbers B I 4 b, 5 a (i), b (ii), II 1 b, 2 b, III 3 b, 5 a (ii), c (i).\(^{31}\) It would then be noted that HG has a larger number of such agreements than Syn (actually some 20 in HG avoided by Syn, and about 11 in Syn avoided by HG). Because these differences are due to textual variation, obviously one is at liberty to reject the editor’s decisions and (in theory) choose to accept as the original text those variants that increase—or, if one wishes, decrease—the number of such minor agreements. This procedure would be open to objections on text critical grounds, but it does serve to demonstrate the often fluid nature of statistical bases.\(^ {32}\)

Another exercise would be to follow the lead given by HG and increase the degree of dissimilarity between the parallels. To do this would encourage the acceptance of only those readings that avoid agreements. By so doing, in some cases in the triple tradition one may well create some minor agreements. The results of such an exercise would reveal about 83 harmonizations between two gospels in Syn avoided by HG, but (despite its principles) some 33 harmonizations between two gospels in HG avoided by Syn. Where three gospels are

---

\(^{31}\) Subheadings numbered B I 1 b, 2 b, 3 b, 5 a (ii) c (i), II 3 b, 4 b, 5 a (i, ii) b (ii) c (i), III 1 b, 2 b, 4 b, 5 a (i) b (ii) seem not to display any examples of minor agreements.

\(^{32}\) Neirynck’s *Minor Agreements* (1991) gives an appendix that lists those differences between NA\(^ {25}\) and NA\(^ {26}\) which concern minor agreements. According to his figures about 22 minor agreements in NA\(^ {25}\) are removed by NA\(^ {26}\), but about 27 are created in NA\(^ {26}\) when compared with NA\(^ {25}\). When comparing Greeven and NA\(^ {26}\) over 50 minor agreements are removed by HG and over 60 created by HG. Many of these may be formally correct but I suspect that many do not really concern “minor agreements” (e.g., at Mk 16:2 neither the reading τῆς μιᾶς of HG nor the reading τῇ μιᾷ τῶν of NA\(^ {26}\) tells us much about the parallels).
concerned Syn has about 45 harmonizations avoided by HG, and some 11 in HG avoided by Syn.

A common assumption in work of this kind is that scribes of Mark and of Luke tended to harmonize to Matthew. This assumption was found to be invalid in the recent survey by Wisselink. His conclusions seem to be borne out by the figures above, especially under B I.

For agreements of Mark = Luke against Matthew references need to be consulted under headings B I a, B II 1 a, B I 2 a, B II 3 a, B III 3 a, B II 5 b (i), 5 c (ii), B III 5 a (ii), 5 c (i).34

For agreements of Mark = Matthew against Luke references need to be consulted under headings B I 1 c, B II 1 c, B III 1 c, B III 2 c, B II 3 c, B I 4 c, B II 4 c, B III 4 c, B I 5 a (i), b (ii), B II 5 b (i, ii), c ii.34

Where two gospels are concerned, for examples concerning Matthew = Mark see under A I i a, ii a, II i a, ii a. For Matthew = Luke see A I i b, ii b, III i a, ii a. For Mark = Luke see A II 1 b, ii b, III i b ii b.

**Sayings of Jesus**

The asterisked references in the above lists refer to variants that occur in sayings of Jesus. Despite the impression sometimes conveyed by certain commentators, the sayings of Jesus were not transmitted either in the oral period or in the ms. tradition with any greater degree of fidelity than editorial matter. Thus variation occurs when a saying of Jesus is reported in more than one gospel, even though scribes occasionally tended to remove such differences by harmonizing one text with that of another. In the lists above some 84 differences between the two editions reviewed concern sayings of Jesus (c. 22 in Matthew, c. 32 in Mark, c. 31 in Luke). Scribes and, as a consequence of the manuscript tradition, editors of printed texts do not treat dominical sayings any differently from other material. It is also clear that the pre-literary transmission of gospel material did not generate in either evangelist or scribe a respect for a fixed immutable form for the sayings.

---


34 Only those headings which yield examples have been given.
The above survey has concentrated on the synopses of Aland and Greeven. A full survey should take other synopses into account, not least the recent publications by Orchard and Boismard & Lamouille. Space prohibits this survey here, but a few samples of their editions now follow.

Orchard

The text of J.B. Orchard, *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983) was included in my survey of “Three Recent Greek Synopses” (1986).\(^35\) In it I observed that Orchard’s text occasionally printed as the text a variant that had the effect of destroying the harmony found in either HG or Syn of both. Occasionally in my lists above Orchard’s reading is referred to. We may in addition note the following. In the triple tradition:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Mk 8:34} & \text{Orchard} & \text{HG/Syn} \\
\text{Orchard} & \varepsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu & \acute{\alpha}k\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\nu
\end{array}
\]

Here Orchard makes all three parallels closer.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Mk 11:31} & \text{Orchard} & \text{HG/Syn} \\
\text{Orchard} & \tau\iota \varepsilon\iota\pi\omicron\omega\iota\mu\epsilon\nu; & \text{HG/Syn omit}
\end{array}
\]

The addition of the question characteristic of Markan usage and likely to be original to the text creates an agreement of Matthew = Luke against Mark. HG and Syn have all three parallels the same, but further in that verse a different alliance is created:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Mk 11:31} & \text{Orchard} & \text{HG/Syn}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Orchard} & \eta\mu\iota\nu & \text{HG/Syn omit}
\end{array}
\]


\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Mt 13:7} & \text{Orchard} & \text{HG/Syn}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Orchard} & \omicron\pi\epsilon\nu\omicron\xi\omicron\omicron\nu & \acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\xi\omicron\omicron
\end{array}
\]

\(^{35}\) Cf. above, n. 5.
Orchard again has Matthew = Mark against Luke (HG/Syn make all three parallels different).

In the double tradition we may note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Textual Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:22</td>
<td>Orchard δέ (against Mt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But cf.</td>
<td>Lk 12:22 Orchard υμῶν (= Mt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boismard and Lamouille**

The text of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *Synopsis Graeca Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Leuven-Paris: Peeters, 1986) is close to but not identical with Syn. Neirynck in his article “Le texte des évangiles” (1987)\(^ {36} \) has listed c. 154 differences between BL and NA\(^ {26} \) (= Syn) of which 34 are not to be found in the usual printed editions of the New Testament. Many of course concern parallels (cf. Neirynck, pp. 131–132).

Those working with the BL text will need to take the following verses into account. There they will find BL differs from Syn (= HG) at a place which can effect a parallel in at least one other gospel: Mt 10:42; 14:3; 15:26; 22:35; (23:4); 26:22; Mk 1:6,22,25; 2:10,19; 3:35; 8:35; 9:42; 10:2.7; 12:9,14,30; 13,28,31; 14:2,30; Lk 3:16,22; 6:4; 8:25; 9:16; 11:31–33; 21:27; 22:22; (24:6).

Boismard and Lamouille (p. vii), like HG, claims that many of its changes are to eliminate harmonizing readings, but this is not always shown in the evidence, e.g., Mt 14:3; Mk 12:9; 14:30.

**Postscriptum**

Re the promised companion volume referred to on page 439 see the Postscriptum to chapter 25.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

RESOLVING THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM USING THE TEXT OF PRINTED GREEK SYNOPSES

In the Neirynck *Festschrift*¹ I listed under several categories differences between the Greek text printed in the synopses of Aland² (= Syn) and Greeven³ (= HG) and with cross-references to the synopses of Orchard⁴ and Boismard-Lamouille⁵ (= BL) in order to demonstrate the effect editorial text-critical decisions could have on an investigation into, or on statistics relevant to, the resolution of the Synoptic Problem. In that article I tried to present mere lists without commentary. In the present article I shall endeavour to make the dry presentation of lists into a practical exposition of how these texts (on which most exegetes will base their conclusion about the Synoptic Problem) can lead the unsuspecting along differing paths. For my examples below I shall use samples that reveal different aspects of literary interrelationship. We are concerned here only with those variants that are the cause of differences in the printed editions.

I divide the examples into a) those where the variants printed in one gospel affect the relationship with one other gospel, and b) those where the variants printed in one gospel occur in the triple tradition.

---

1. In Two Gospels

a) Matt. 11:9/Luke 7:26

There are numerous textual variants in these verses but Syn has chosen to print Matt. 11:9 with the same text as the parallel in Luke 7:26:

Matt.: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; νοὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

Luke: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; νοὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

This maintains the close parallelism between Matt. and Luke in this pericope about the witness of Jesus to John the Baptist. If one examines the same verses in HG there are significant differences between the parallels.

Matt.: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξῆλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην νοὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

Luke: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξεληλύθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην νοὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.

Seeing the differences, one is then led to investigate whether Matthew’s version of the first question as printed by Syn is characteristic of the author; and whether Luke’s version of the second question in both Syn and HG is characteristic of that author. But most readers are unlikely to query the text-critical decisions behind these printed texts. As far as the Synoptic Problem is concerned a more usual, albeit myopic, reading of these in HG would encourage the reader to assume either Matt. and/or Luke had deviated from their source (Q?) or that Luke had adjusted the text he found in Matt. Users of Syn could add this verse to others that suggest both evangelists had been faithful to their source. It is also worth noting that not only in these verses but also in Luke 7:24 and 25 ἐξεληλύθατε is found in parallel to Matt.’s ἐξῆλθατε in HG’s text.

Orchard prints the idiosyncratic ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε; ἰδεῖν προφήτην; in both Matthew and Luke which gives the same impression as Syn in displaying identical wording in the verses.


Matt.: καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἔως οὐρανοῦ υψωθήσῃ; ἔως ζῆδον καταβήσῃ.
Luke: καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἔως οὐρανοῦ υψωθήσῃ; ἔως τοῦ ζῆδον καταβήσῃ.

The text thus has the verb καταβήσῃ (= LXX) in both, and the only difference between the parallels is that Matt. has anarthrous ζῆδον. HG prints

Matt.: καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναουμ, μὴ ἔως οὐρανοῦ υψωθήσῃ; ἔως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ υψωθήσῃ; ζῆδον καταβιβασθήσῃ.
Luke: καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἔως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ υψωθήσῃ; ἔως ζῆδον καταβιβασθήσῃ.

The final verb differs from Syn (καταβιβασθήσῃ) but the parallels are still seen in agreement here. In HG ζῆδον is anarthrous in both gospels, but οὐρανοῦ is anarthrous in Matt. not Luke. Whatever one’s conclusions about the originality of the variants, and however one resolves the problem of scribal assimilation to the LXX, the parallels in the printed synopses here do at least show differences in the use of the definite article—and this needs to be taken into consideration.

BL follows Syn except that in Luke καταβιβασθήσῃ is read; in Matt. BL has καταβήσῃ which displays a more substantial difference between the parallels and implies that the citation by one of the evangelists was not as close to the LXX as the citation in the other. Is that likely? If so, could that have been the reason for the change by the other evangelist? Or are the differences due to later, scribal, alteration? (If that is the case we cannot accept the text of Matt. in BL, or the text of Matt. and Luke in Syn as representing the original word of the original author.)

Orchard agrees with Syn in both columns.

A comparable text involving a citation from the OT is at Mark 1:2. Here HG (and Orchard) include ἐγώ. Syn (and BL) omit the pronoun. The citation (from Mal. 3:1) is in all three synoptics although the quotation is given a different context in Matt. and Luke (in Matt. at 11:10; in Luke 7:27). The pronoun is not firmly established in the textual tradition of the LXX of Mal. There is no obvious reason why (according to BL and Syn) Matt. should write ἐγώ but Mark and Luke not, unless each, independently, follows different mss. of the LXX, one agreeing with a ms. with the pronoun, one agreeing with a ms. lacking the pronoun. Reading HG would encourage the conclusion that Matt. and Luke cite the passage according to the same principles. More significant from the point of view of literary interrelationships is the fact that Syn’s text makes Mark and Luke agree against Matt. in this verse. An agreement of Matt. = Luke against Mark can be seen as both
evangelists have transferred the citation as found in Mark to a different context. HG’s text has Mark = Matt. against Luke and this instance can be added to comparable examples where the text of Mark differs in HG and in Syn at Mark 2:26; 13:5 with similar consequences.

c) Mark 11:33/Matt. 21:27

Turning now to a parallel between Mark and Matt. one notes at Mark 11:33 that HG (and BL) have the order λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Syn (and Orchard) print τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγουσιν.

Again we need to assess the originality of the variants by examining Markan usage⁶ and scribal proclivities. But if one accepts the editorial judgements behind the printed synopses then one accepts at the same time the consequences those decisions have for the Synoptic Problem. In Syn Matt. and Mark agree in having ἀποκριθέντες followed by τῷ Ἰησοῦ and the verb of saying, suggesting one text has directly influenced the other without deviation. From the text in HG it might be deduced that one author deliberately adjusted the word order of his predecessor. The change could affect the way in which the verse is understood (and translated). Luke 20:7 can not be claimed as a true parallel because the wording is not sufficiently close to that in Matt./Mark. (Jesus is not mentioned and there is not a second verb of speech.)

d) Mark 6:22/Matt. 14:6⁷

At Mark 6:22 HG reads αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδίαδος, Syn (and HG) αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος. Syn therefore suggests that in Matt. the girl is the daughter of Herodias and in Mark that she is Herod’s daughter with the name Herodias.

HG, although not making the parallels completely identical nonetheless has both agree in saying that the girl is the daughter of Herodias, αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος in Mark probably being a typical example of

---


Mark’s defining an indefinite term (here αὐτῆς) with an editorial explanation (τῆς Ἦρῳδιάδος “that is to say of Herodias”), although it may of course be translated here “the daughter of Herodias herself”.

Orchard prints αὐτῆς Ἦρῳδιάδος in Mark, a reading apparently based on uncial W alone, (a fact not revealed in Orchard’s confusing apparatus). This synopsis therefore implies a different situation, namely that her (sc. Herodias’) daughter is also named Herodias, Ἦρῳδιάδος being in apposition to τῆς θυγατρὸς. The Matthaean parallel here includes only the mother’s name.

Whatever the actual historical facts may have been, from the point of view of the Synoptic Problem one could argue on the basis of HG that Matt. and Mark tell the same story; using Syn it could be shown that one author deliberately changed the facts; using Orchard (and accepting his preferred solution to the Synoptic Problem, namely Matthaean priority and Markan posteriority) what is being suggested is that Mark is adding to information he found in Matt., but if one eschews his solution the conclusion could be drawn that Matt. has clarified the imprecise text he found in Mark.

2. Triple Tradition


There are many variants in all three accounts of Jesus’ famous saying about the camel and the eye of a needle. This suggests a) that differing versions of the saying were in circulation, that the three synoptic writers drew on these separate versions and that it was later scribes who attempted to harmonize the accounts or b) that the original (historically accurate?) version of the saying was cited carelessly by scribes in the copying process. The complications of the verse were dealt with in my paper to the Jerusalem conference on the gospels in 1984.8

As far as the present investigation is concerned, we note that HG (and Orchard) create an agreement of Matt. = Luke against Mark (i.e. a “minor agreement”) in reading διὰ...εἰσέλθειν in Matt. 19:24. Syn (and BL) make Matt. = Mark against Luke by printing διὰ...διέλθειν

---

in Matt. The Markan parallel in both is διὰ διελθεῖν; the Lucan διὰ...εἰσέλθειν. All the synopses have Matt. read τρυπήματος, Mark τρυμαλίας, and Luke τρήματος. Other differences exist as the *apparatus* reveal, including the use of the definite article with τρυμαλίας and ῥαφίδος in Mark which creates a further “minor agreement”, but all four synopses in our survey agree here- Syn, however, brackets the article (*bis*). The issue of a verb compounded with, and followed by, the same preposition is where an author’s style may be consistent and where stylistically conscious scribes often made changes. Thus to find in two synopses that Matt. agrees with Mark in this matter but that in two other synopses that these two gospels differ may or may not contribute to the statistics on minor agreements (cf. Matt. 17:5 HG against the others, or Matt. 19:21 HG against the others).

b) **Matt. 21:44**

Here a whole verse is involved. The verse is included in brackets in Syn (and Orchard), but omitted in HG (and BL). As with so many other variants, the issue to be resolved should be based on the consistency of Matthew’s language and style and on his overall theological stance. One’s preferred solution to the resolution of the Synoptic Problem should take second place to those considerations. Syn creates a “minor agreement” of Matt. = Luke against Mark; HG creates a text in which Matt. = Mark against Luke.

If the verse were added by scribes of Matt. out of Luke (as HG implies) then one needs to ask whether Luke found the words in the source also used by Matthew because the surrounding context has many similarities, or whether he added the words to that source. Adopting another position, one could assume that Luke read Matthew and adapted Matt. 21:44 (if Syn is right) or added the words from his own *Sondergut* (if HG is correct).


At Matt. 22:32 Syn reads:

οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

At Matt. 22:32 HG reads:

οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

Whether the longer text in HG was due to dittography, or the shorter text of Syn due to haplography, the case remains that the separate editorial decisions have resulted in a synoptic presentation that could
affect the statistics assembled about literary interdependence, and, cumulatively, affect a solution to the Synoptic Problem. The double occurrence of θεός in HG makes Matt. and Mark differ. The Lukan parallel (20:38) is rephrased as θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νεκρῶν, and in relation to both HG and Syn must be seen as standing apart from Matt./Mark. The rewriting by Luke here encouraged me to display this text as an example of the “Double Tradition” (A I [i a]) in the Neirynck Festschrift (op. cit.) even though the context as a whole is obviously part of the triple tradition.

Syn makes Matt. disagree with Mark in the matter of the definite article. Orchard has ὁ in both Matthew and Mark thereby making both closer. BL similarly makes the two parallels exact, although in his case ὁ is absent from both Matt. and Mark.

HG makes the parallels different: this is in line with Greeven’s declared policy of presenting a text in which variants are often—but not consistently—chosen to represent the original text of each gospel if they are not harmonizing readings. The differing text of HG here opens up the possibility that Matt. has added θεός to the text to provide a definite subject for ἔστιν despite the resultant repetition of θεός in one verse. Syn tells us that Matt. is faithful to Mark (or vice versa), cf. Mark 14:45 where again Syn makes the parallels differ in a matter concerning the doubling of a title. Here HG repeats ῥαββί: Syn, BL, Orchard have the title once. The text in HG offers possibilities of Mark expanding Matt. or Matt. reducing Mark. From Syn the fidelity of Matt. and Mark is seen. Luke (22:47) again stands apart in ignoring the form of address on Judas’ lips.


HG and Syn print differing texts of Mark but both editions have the effect of maintaining Mark’s independence of Matt. and of Luke. In both these synopses therefore we find a “minor agreement”. HG has:

...ἀφίέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀμαρτίας.

Syn (and Orchard) have:

...ἀφίέναι ἀμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The Matthaean order of the words ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίέναι ἀμαρτίας (Matt. 9:6) is identical with the Lukan order (Luke 5:24) and both are the same in HG and Syn.
The differences in word order can effect the translation and exegesis of the verse. Does the Son of Man have authority on earth to forgive sins or does the Son of Man have authority to forgive sins on earth?

In BL the words in question are the same in both Matt. and Luke but in Mark 2:10 the words ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς are excluded. Once more we see a “minor agreement” of Matt. and Luke against Mark.

It is significant that none of these texts has chosen to follow the reading that would make all three parallels agree.

e) Mark 8:35/Matt. 16:25/Luke 9:24

Here we are concerned with another familiar saying of Jesus: “Whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and for the gospel’s will save it.” In what form was the saying transmitted? (The disputed words +/- καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in Mark do not concern us here as all four synopses in this survey have the longer text.)

In addition to the presence of the saying in Mark 8:35 and parallels (Matt. 16:25; Luke 9:24) it also occurs at Matt. 10:39; Luke 17:33 (and probably at John 12:25). There are significant variants throughout. At Mark 8:35 the major synopses differ in their resolution of the textual variants.

Syn at Mark 8:35 reads:

οὐς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν. οὐς δὲ ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνεκὲν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

HG at Mark 8:35 reads:

οὐς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν. οὐς δὲ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐνεκὲν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, σώσει αὐτήν.

In the case of ἀπολέσῃ/ἀπολέσει2 HG (and BL and Orchard) have all three parallels (Mark 8:35; Matt. 16:25; Luke 9:24) in agreement whereas Syn (and BL) create another “minor agreement” of Matt. = Luke against Mark. When we turn to the order of the words ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν/ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ3 it is Syn (with BL and Orchard) that has these three parallels in agreement and it is HG which has a “minor agreement”!
Note that BL omits ἐμοῦ καὶ at Mark 8:35 thereby enhancing the differences between Mark and Matt. = Luke.

The saying as a whole needs to be taken into account alongside the details already noted, but from the point of view of the printed synopses the differences in the way each prints the Markan version complicates an already complicated verse.

As far as the verse in the other contexts is concerned it is for those interested in the whole question of doublets and the overlaps between Q and Mark to explain the relationship of the sayings. As far as the printed synopsis texts are concerned they will need to ponder the differences apparent in the Lukan version (17:33) between Syn and HG:

HG has: καὶ ὃς ἐὰν.
Syn has: δ᾽ ὃς ἀν.

Syn therefore makes this verse agree with the other three occurrences of the saying, whereas HG makes this occurrence differ from the earlier occurrence in Luke and from the Matt./Mark parallel. Matt. 10:39 stands apart in this matter with its ὁ ἀπολέσας.

BL and Orchard read καὶ ὃς ἀν at Luke 17:33, but this has the same effect as HG, namely to make Luke differ from the three other occurrences of the saying (Matt. 16:25; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24).9

---

9 On ἐὰν/ἀν see Blass-Debrunner para. 107.
PART FOUR

REVIEWS OF RECENT CRITICAL EDITIONS
CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

THE EDITIO CRITICA MAIOR


Installment 1: James (1997)
Installment 2: The Letters of Peter (2000)
A) REVIEWS

I) JAMES

The famous 8th edition of Tischendorf’s Novum Testamentum Graece first appeared in 1869 and is still an indispensable reference tool for all who work on the text of the New Testament. That book was subheaded Editio Octava Critica Maior.

It had been the late Kurt Aland’s lifelong ambition to edit a 20th century replacement of Tischendorf. To that end, as founder and director of the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, Aland initiated a series of projects that ultimately were to produce the “new Tischendorf.” The title of the present series of fascicules does not, however, repeat Tischendorf’s title, possibly to prevent confusion with the title of the Nestle testament.

Aland’s plans were exposed in numerous places, most conspicuously in the volume he co-authored with Barbara Aland. The Text of the New Testament, esp. ET² p. 24. The new Editio Critica Maior (= ECM) was always planned to start with the Catholic Epistles. That is why in recent years the production of several volumes on these epistles in publications emanating from the Münster Institut has been at the forefront of its activities. First came K. Aland (ed.), Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus I Die Katholischen Briefe (Berlin and New York, 1986) = ANTF 6, followed by B. Aland (ed.). Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung I Die Großen Katholischen Briefe (Berlin and New York, 1986) = ANTF 7.

Then in 1987 appeared the highly relevant volumes in the series Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (= T&T) on the Catholic Epistles = ANTF 9, 10a, 10b, 11. Strangely, the references to these publications in the present volume p. 2* and p. 12*¹ give the wrong volume numbers for ANTF. The ANTF series here is referred to by the letters ANTF, following the abbreviation for Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung favoured by Schwertner, whose Verzeichnis is unflinchingly followed in ECM. This

¹ From now on I refer only to the English pages in part I.
is in contrast with the abbreviation ANTF found on the spine of the volumes themselves.

The first distillation of all the years of preparation are these two fascicules, volume IV Part 1 Text and Part 2 Supplementary Material. Part 1 (Text) begins with a Preface in German and in English, followed by an Introduction in both languages. The Introduction describes the goals and structure of the edition, and its textual witnesses Greek MSS., Greek Fathers, early versions. It also explains the construction of the apparatus, and the rules of presentation. Part 2 (Supplementary Material)\(^2\) is also bi-lingual. Its page numbers are prefaced with the letter B, presumably an abbreviation of the German version of the tide (Begleitendes Material). In it are to be found the abbreviations and symbols used in ECM, a list of the MSS. containing the Catholic Epistles and specifically James, a list of uniquely Byzantine readings in James, and a list of Greek Fathers quoting from the Catholics. There is also a List of Lacunae (pp. B10ff.): this contains not only MSS. that are fragmentary but whose text is no longer legible. In it we note, for example, that much in 048 33 400 is illegible and hence the lacunae are labelled “U” (= Unleserlich): it is helpful to have such explanations given here. We also read here that 631 has many inexplicable omissions. The five lacunose papyri containing parts of James are set out in some detail, but for the four published papyri (P\(^{20}\) 23 54 74) it is much easier to see the extent of their text by using the splendidly visual presentation in the Institut’s Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus.

There follows in the Supplementary Material a list of errors in Greek MSS. (amplifying the apparatus where “f” (= Fehler) is suffixed to the number of the faulty MS.). At James 4:2, where a variant is included in the apparatus only because of Fehler in two MSS., the explanation in the list (section 2.4) is uncharacteristically unhelpful, and, after reading the note that the error was “κ (sic),” one is left wondering what cursive 330 actually reads. And surely all the errors in the list qualify for (sic)? Gründlichkeit requires our being told in this section that at 3:8/18 the scribe of 1241 accidentally wrote κακακον for κακον. We are also informed that at 3:18 1881 has ειρηνηνεν for ειρηνην. One wonders how the system will cope with this tiresome exhaustiveness when we eventually reach the Gospels. At 3:12 (22–30) 1243 is said to have the nonsense reading αλυκον for αλυκον, but that Fehler seems

\(^2\) In the text volume pp. 12*, 17* the second part is called simply “Supplement.”
not to be scribal (cf. p. B13): on p. B34 this reading of 1243 is repeated (in a rare example of a Fehler that is also an ambiguous reading) and there 1243 is said to read αλυκον!

Also in Part 2 are detailed explanations of the MSS. and editions used for the versitional evidence in the *apparatus*.

An “Additional Apparatus” being section 5.1 in the *Supplementary Material* pp. B31ff. contains 40 readings found in 29 additional MSS. located in von Soden and Tischendorf, repeated in T&T but not in any of the 182 MSS. used in ECM. This section also adds three notes on the corrections in 04 where the editions of Tischendorf and Lyon differ.

Finally this part has 2 further sections: one (section 5.2) explains the meaning of a double headed horizontal arrow preceding the listing of certain MSS. in the *apparatus*. That symbol is used to alert us to the inability of the editors to assign the reading in these MSS. to one of the listed variants, generally because the MSS. in question contain incomplete words, or, occasionally, because of other ambiguities, e.g. itacism in 01 at James 2:11. Section 5.2 sets out the precise contents of these defective words, or of the ambiguous readings. A further list (5.3) is devoted to versional variants whose attestation in the *apparatus* is in need of further clarification. These comments are most useful. As any one who has tried to assemble an *apparatus* well appreciates, it is not always straightforward setting out certain readings conveniently in the conventions and structures of an *apparatus*. We applaud the editors for these aids.

Parts 1 and 2 are bound and numbered separately thus enabling ready cross reference and easy consultation.

The bulk of Part 1 is a 102 page presentation of the text of James with a full critical *apparatus*. Each page contains the text of James across the top, immediately beneath which is a conspectus of all the variants, each lemma being set out in full. In this way one is enabled to see the nature of each variant alongside the base text. One imaginative novelty here is that each word in the lead text is allocated an even number, beginning with 2 at each new verse. The spaces between the words are allocated odd numbers, starting with 1 for the space preceding the initial word. In this way the variants in the *apparatus* can be related quickly to the lead text. This innovation is to be commended. These numbers are referred to in introductory matter as “numerical addresses” (cf. “letter addresses” which refer to the alphabetical sequences of readings used in each set of textual variants).
The presentation is reminiscent of the layout of the *Vetus Latina* fascicules or of the Itala volumes on the Gospels. The critical *apparatus* is printed in double columns in the lower halves of each page. The units of variation are sensible and clear. If, for example, a lengthy variation unit concerns a change of word order in some MSS., as well as a variation in vocabulary, then a lemma noting the variation in vocabulary may be given separately; if so, the later variant is arrowed to the earlier, longer variant, and the longer variant bears a downwards pointing arrow to alert one to the other variant(s). In this way the reader is encouraged to observe the wider picture when necessary.

All Greek MSS. are known only by number, the common use of letters for certain MSS. having, sensibly, been dropped. Lectionaries are designated by an initial small capital “L,” rather than the more usual italicized lower case “l.” These changes were probably made in the interests of typographical ease.

The quarto pages of text and *apparatus* succeed in keeping verse and *apparatus* together over a double page; there is never a need to turn over to locate the *apparatus* to the text of the previous page. That is good! The editors have succeeded in combining a mass of detail with clarity of presentation, even for such convoluted variants at, say, James 5:10 where over 30 differing readings are given. The construction of a critical *apparatus* is a complicated business if one is striving at exhaustiveness of presentation, as I was all too aware when drafting the IGNTP volumes on Luke.

If there are more than 15 MSS. with a reading that differs from the base text, then a full presentation of evidence, including the MSS. supporting the reading in the base text, is printed. This is the so-called positive *apparatus*. If there are fewer than 15 MSS. then a “negative *apparatus*” is found, in which only variants against the base line are printed. One still needs to keep open pages B33f. to be able to incorporate MSS. whose words are imperfectly preserved, i.e. those whose readings are thereby rendered ambiguous and therefore identified with a double-headed arrow preceding their number in the *apparatus*.

In every case all lacunose MSS. are set out for each unit. This is obviously foolproof and clear. But I do wonder if an economy of space could have been achieved. For MSS. as fragmentary as say P\textsuperscript{20} or P\textsuperscript{23} they must be listed as deficient in every full *apparatus* printed here (perhaps some 600 times, because deficiencies are noted not merely for every verse but for every lemma within the verse). In the International
Greek New Project’s *apparatus* to Luke we printed a list of all MSS. deficient for the chapter at the head of that chapter, and MSS. deficient for a verse at the head of each verse. This device prevented such repetition. In future editions of *ECM* the editors may wish to consider economising on space by doing something similar. Their current practice is one of incredible prodigality.

A comparison of the two publications, *T&T* and *ECM* shows the difference in scale. In *T&T* Teststelle I (James 1:5) has 351 witnesses listed for οὐκ (ὁνειδίζοντος) compared with 15 witnesses plus “Byz” (the “Codices Byzantini”) in *ECM*, and 150 in *T&T* for μή compared with 79 MSS. plus 3 lectionaries in *ECM*. A difference in scale with NA27 is also obvious. At James 2:10 there are 5 variant readings in the Nestle-Aland testament for the first variation unit, including *txt*; in *ECM* (variant numbered 12) there are 8 variants including the base line (plus one reading supported by only a patristic witness). Another indicator of scale is that NA27 has 219 variation units for James, the UBS *Greek New Testament* (UBS) has 23, *ECM* has 800, *T&T* has 25 Teststellen.

A further preliminary comparison of *T&T* with *ECM* reveals certain other differences. Occasionally, the manuscript support differs between the two. At James 1:12 (31)3 *ECM* shows P74 supporting the omission; in *T&T* (Teststelle 2) P74 is shown, alongside other fragmentary papyri, as deficient, not *sine add*. In this variation unit MSS. 33 and 180 are shown in the two *apparatus* to support different readings. Teststelle (= TS) 4 (James 1:20): the reading of 2492 differs in *T&T* and *ECM*. The following brief list identifies other anomalies in the readings given for certain MSS. in the two works (*T&T* compared with *ECM*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>James 1:17</td>
<td>40–46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>James 1:25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>James 1:26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2544</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>James 2:4</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>James 3:3</td>
<td>22–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>James 3:8</td>
<td>8–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>James 3:8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>James 4:4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The number in brackets following the references in this paragraph is the “numerical address” given beneath the base line in *ECM*. 
1831 at TS 19 cf. James 4:9 (6–10)  

Are we to accept the greater accuracy of ECM whenever such discrepancies or refinements occur? Corrections have obviously been made to T&T, e.g. at TS 10 the lemma in T&T is given there as το κωσμω, but now see ECM.

It was always intended that the Editio would be more than just a thesaurus of variants from which a critical edition could be built at a later stage. The Introduction makes it absolutely crystal clear in its opening words (p. 11*) that we have here presented to us by the Minister Institut a new text “established afresh” and that it is “established on the basis of all the evidence presented.” In other words our new Tischendorf is to give us a newly constructed text—unlike the International Greek New Testament Project, which was criticized by the Münster team (on more than one occasion) for not itself having constructed a new text of Luke. But nowhere are we informed how and on what principles the ECM text was established! Considering how much in the Introduction to NA27 is concerned with the history of the editing of that text, its goals and methods, and considering the great play made in K. Aland and B. Aland, The Text of the New Testament (= A&A Text) on the principles of the new Nestle, our new Editio Critica is launched with no explanation of the ways in which its text was arrived at!

Edited as it is by a different team from that behind UBS4 = NA27, with now only Barbara Aland common to both committees, an excitingly different new text of James was anticipated. But it is immediately obvious that what we have in the much vaunted new text is a damp squib—merely a very modest revision of the UBS text! It rather looks to me as if the editors took the text in UBS/NA as their working text and only gently or reluctantly adapted it. In James there are only two differences in text from NA27! At 1:22 the new critical text prints ἀκροαταὶ μόνον with 03 instead of μόνον ἀκροαταὶ with P74 01. At 2:3 we now read ἦ κάθου ἐκεῖ with 03 instead of ἐκεῖ ἦ κάθου. This latter reading was rated “B” in UBS4 (having been upgraded from “C” in the earlier editions). The increased confidence in the reading ἐκεῖ ἦ κάθου by UBS4 (= NA27) has now been exposed in this recent publication as unjustified, and is yet one more nail in the coffin of the discredited and arbitrarily applied ratings system characteristic of the whole apparatus in UBS. Apart from those two alterations to the text, we are told
somewhat dismissively but tellingly (p. 11*) that “there was no need to alter the text” (scil. of NA²⁷)!

One minor but important change is the abandonment of square brackets around words in the text in ECM. The use of brackets was an unhelpful practice confusingly overdone in the Nestle-Aland text. Now James 4:12 and 5:14 appear without brackets. At 5:14 αὐτόν² was bracketed in NA²⁷; the pronoun is read by 01 02 048 and the majority of MSS., but the word is absent in 03 025. ECM at location 30 prints αὐτόν without brackets; the omission is relegated to the apparatus as variant e, and there is no bold dot to signify that the variant is an acceptable alternative. Thus the dilemma experienced by the editors of NA²⁷, who resolved their quandary by resorting to their usual “solution” of adding brackets, is not a dilemma recognised or accepted by the current editorial team behind ECM.

The changes may be slight, but the fact that any change has been made to a text that at one time was being promoted as an immutable “Standard Text” is highly significant. ECM also signals 11 places in the base text where an alternative reading in the apparatus merits “equal value” (see p. 11*). These are as follows (the MSS. in brackets represent the main support for the alternative reading): 1:20 v.l. 12–14 (04* Byz); 2:3 v.l. 44–48 (02); 2:19 v.l. 8–14 (03); 3:4 v.l. 18–20 (02 plus 85 minus-cules—the Byzantine text is divided here); 3:8 v.l. 8–14 (01 02); 3:15 v.l. 6–14 (04); 4:12 v.l. 6 (P⁷⁴ P¹⁰⁰ 03); 4:14 v.l. 8 (02); 4:14 v.l. 15 (P⁷⁴ P¹⁰⁰ 01 02); 5:10 v.l. 26–32 (02); 5:18 v.l. 14–16 (02). The stranglehold on the text by 01 03 would be loosened just a little if these alternatives were to be adopted, but I am not sure if the editors really intend those readings deemed “equal” in value ever to displace the readings in the base text. There is no signal (a bullet point black dot) at 1:22 to indicate that the now jettisoned reading of NA²⁷ is a variant of “equal value” (although that is provided at 2:3)! We have already noted the same at 5:14 in respect of the omission of the pronoun.

We have referred above to the fanciful ratings system in UBS. The committee responsible for ECM seems to have been very much more confident than the editors of UBS³ and more confident even than those behind UBS⁴ (a text, which generally upgrades the ratings in the previous edition) in accepting “C” rated readings into their new text. “C” readings in UBS³ (now upgraded to “B” or, in one case (James 5:4), to “A”) are at James 1:17; 4:5, 14 (τὸ τῆς αὔριον), 14 (ποία); 5:4, 20 (γινωσκέτω ὅτι). These are printed in ECM without question, that
is without their signalling that any other reading is of “equal value.” Only at James 2:19 (“C” in UBS3, now “B”) is an alternative highlighted. At 5:4 the reading by 018 020 33, accepted as a proper reading ἀποστερήμενος by Bruce Metzger in his companion Commentary to the UBS apparatus, is now labelled “f” (i.e. an error). Metzger’s own signed dissentient note in the 2nd edition of his Commentary (a rare change to a note surviving from the first edition) advocates printing the v.l. ἀφυστερημένος; that variant is not accorded any special attention in ECM.

The following “C” rated readings in UBS⁴ are also retained by the editors of ECM without any apparent qualms, that is, again, without signalling any other reading as of “equal value”: James 3:3 εἰ δέ (originally “D” in UBS³!); 4:14 ἀτμὶς γάρ ἔστε ἡ (“D” in UBS³); 5:20 αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου (“D” in UBS³), although at 4:12 the “C” rated ὁ (a reading not even included in UBS³ nor in the first edition of the Commentary!) is one of those readings actually given an alternative of “equal value.”

On pp. B9–10 are listed 69 places in James where the Byzantine text differs from the majority. (The Introduction makes it clear that in this edition “majority” is strictly a quantitative term and that “Byzantine text” refers to a stage in the history of the text. Thus “majority” differs from the significance of the siglum M in NA.) We are encouraged to use those 69 places in any consideration of or research on the character of the Byzantine witness. It may well be that some of these 69 readings (e.g. those listed for variants at 1:19(1); 2:20; 3:8(1), 9, 12(1); 4:4, 5; 5:7(2)) should merit consideration as variants of equal value with the base text.

As a result of the Institut’s investigation of the 550 or so MSS. in the 98 Teststellen in T&T, 372 of the 522 complete MSS. and larger fragmentary MSS. were shown to agree with the majority of MSS. in at least 90% of the Teststellen (according to ECM p. 12*). (T&T had considered some 550 MSS. of the 600 or so that are registered as containing the Catholics.) MSS. now lost such as 101 255 1525 are not considered here. It now seems as if MSS. that agree with the Majority in at least 90% of all the Teststellen include not only readings designated

---

⁴ K. Wachtel, Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995) = ANTF 24 p. 55 refers to these 522 MSS. and places them into 5 categories based on their percentage of agreement with the majority text type. The totals in each category are 45 + 19 + 34 + 53 + 372, which give a grand total of 523!
“1” in T& T but also those identified there as “1/2” when these are in agreement. From these a selection was made to use in the present volume on James. According to p. 12* all the MSS. differing from the majority of MSS. in more than 10% of the Teststellen are included “without exception.” Although the Byzantine MSS. are identified on p. B8, it is to be regretted that the other categories of MSS. qualifying for selection as explained on p. 12* are not revealed. In other words, it is not clear how the 85 non-Byzantine plus the 97 Byzantine MSS. were selected on the basis of the percentages discussed in the Introduction p. 12*. All we read on p. 12* are tantalizing remarks that a small selection of the MSS. attesting the majority text are represented (but which MSS. are in this “relatively small selection”?); and that “several manuscripts which attest an almost pure form of the Byzantine text are also included” (again: Which are they?).

In an apparatus that has had the benefit of many years of the Institut’s sophisticated screenings and analyses behind it, we ought to be convinced that all the MSS. included here are the most important or representative of the entire range available. Time will tell if such confidence is justified or misplaced.

The non-Byzantine MSS. comprise 5 papyri, 10 uncials, and 70 cursive. Of the 97 Byzantine MSS. 5 are uncials, 19 are lectionaries, the rest are cursive. In A&A Text MSS. classified as “V” are said to be Byzantine: among them are 69 (in the 2nd editions of both the German and English), 206, 218, and (in both English versions and in the second German edition) 2523. In the more recent T& T 69 supports the Byzantine texttype 64 times out of the 89 Teststellen for which it is extant in the Catholics; 206 supports Byz 39/75, 218 62/97, 2523 77/97! But all of these are “non-Byzantine” in ECM.

By contrast one would expect all 97 “Codices Byzantini” to be labelled “V” in A&A Text, but among the 97 that are included there with a category number by no means all are “V.” Some are “III” (i.e. MSS. of a distinctive character with an independent text) such as 61, 94, 104, 181, 254, 307, 326, 424, 431. The Byzantine MS. 442 in ECM agrees with the “Byz” text only 42 times of the 98 Teststellen in T& T.

Although the Introduction speaks of the edition’s being concerned with establishing the text and reconstructing the history of the NT text during its first thousand years, the MSS. used in the edition are themselves from way beyond the first millennium. Non-Byzantine MSS. come from all centuries including even the 15th and 16th (e.g. 69, 322, 522, 918, 1661, 1751, 2523, 2652). The lectionaries are from the
10th century (l156) to the 15th (l593, l1281) and 16th century (l2087). The Byzantine MSS. come from the 9th–17th centuries.

All 182 manuscripts are cited fully throughout ECM. Some are newcomers to any apparatus known to me. Of the non-Byzantine MSS. 400, 631, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1359, 1409, 1490, 1598, 1609, 1661, 1718, 1799, 1831, 1842, 1890, 2377, 2523, 2541, 2652 are not found in the apparatus of NA or UBS. Many of the Byzantine MSS. are new to any apparatus (e.g. 676 1848 2186 2197). One very welcome newcomer is P100, which reached the editors so late that its deficiencies could not be added to the apparatus. It is a 3rd–4th century papyrus containing James 3:13–4:4; 4:9–5:1, and is the earliest known witness to these verses in James. Its text seems to be allied to that known in 01. The editio princeps will be included in the next edition in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus series (volume 65) as P. Oxy. 4449.

Page B10 tells us that the “selected apostolos lectionaries contain the complete Letter of James.” But the evidence suggests that several are cited only for the pericope in James 5:10–20. See the list of lacunac on pp. B11f. for l60, l156, l170, and l1126. l1142 and l623 are also very lacunose. Some lectionaries here are known to us from UBS but the following are new to any edition, as far as I am aware: l427, l623, l1126, l1141, l1281, l1440, l1442, l2087.

The versional evidence has been restricted to the Latin, Coptic and Syriac, with occasional support from the Ethiopic, Slavic, Georgian, and Armenian. The last three are treated with particular restraint, but all versional evidence is used with proper caution to eliminate the recording of purely innerversional variants. Thus the versions are cited only where they unambiguously support a reading known in Greek or (occasionally) potentially from the underlying Greek. This is wise.

For the Latin, the editors have taken advantage of the text types established in the Vetus Latina volume that covers James (VL 26/1) and the principal text types are cited consistently. It remains to be seen what the editors will do if ECM reaches the Gospels before the relevant VL editions are published.

For the Coptic the Sahidic has been based on collations made by Schmitz and Mink from the Münster Institut, whose work on the Sahidic manuscripts of the Gospels has been roundly praised. Schüssler’s pioneering work in this area is referred to (see p. 14* footnote 6). The 19 Sahidic MSS. used are given in Part 2 pp. B29f. but the ages of the MSS. are not provided. The only Sahidic MS. of any size is sa33 (Pierpont Morgan M572). It is not stated that sa15, sa291, sa293,
sa305, sa310 are lectionaries; to have been so alerted would have made the explanatory notes on p. B38 more readily comprehended, where Sahidic readings are labelled 291/1 or 291/2, a practice explained with reference to the *Greek* lectionaries on p. 19*. If the *apparatus* has to specify $S^ms$ or $S^mss$ the actual manuscripts are set out on pp. B30f., where, again, it would have been useful there to know that certain Sahidic MSS. are lectionaries, because the unexpected abbreviations, L1, L2 and L3, occur on those pages. Horner was used for the Bohairic and Rösch for the Akhmimic.

Andreas Juckel of the Münster Institut was responsible for the work on the Syriac version. The edition gives details about the Peshitta, Philoxenian and Harklesni readings. Whenever it is necessary to refer to individual MSS. these are not specifically identified. Thus the Syriac is treated differently from the Sahidic Coptic in this regard. However, in the case of the Syriac one can consult the Institut’s edition of the Syriac of the larger Catholic Epistles.

The Patristic evidence has been restricted largely to the Greek Fathers, it being wisely noted that versional patristic witnesses are doubly difficult to interpret for inclusion in an *apparatus* to the Greek NT. Even the Greek Fathers need careful handling in an *apparatus*. Taking a leaf out of the IGNTP volumes on Luke, and no doubt heed- ing the frequent cautions published over the years by G.D. Fee, this edition gives us the source for the patristic citation and bibliographical references where possible to modern printed editions. This information is set out on pp. B14–26, which include helpful indexes of the quotations in James, first in the order of James’ chapters and verses, and second, in the alphabetical sequence of Fathers’ names. Cyril of Alexandria and Didymus of Alexandria are the most prolific Fathers to cite from this epistle, but 58 of the 107 Fathers (represented in 364 writings culled for this edition) who quote from the Catholics have at least one quotation from James. Only Fathers to the time of John of Damascus are included (7th–8th century) although an exception is made to include Photius (9th century) for James. The Preface p. xi credits Holger Strutwolf with having been responsible for this material. Latin Fathers are named only where they occur in the lines of Latin text identified as text types in the Vetus Latina edition.

The care and restraint of *ECM* throws into contrast the overblown and apparently arbitrary use of Fathers’ names (without references to their works) in UBS.
The *apparatus* identifies readings where the variant may have been encouraged by lectionary considerations. That is a helpful warning. The apparatus also makes clear readings found in the original hand, and care has been taken to specify each corrector in MSS. subjected to the activities of more than one correction. The edition relates the current sigla for the correctors of the great uncials (01 03 04) to the sigla previously used in earlier editions (see the chart on p. B7). The corrections once labelled א now known as 01C1 and are dated to the 4th–6th century and not therefore necessarily contemporaneous with the original MS.—at one time א was considered to have been undertaken by several scribes before the MS. left the scriptorium. At James 2:6 for variant 20 readings by 01C2 and 01* are given. Likewise at James 3:6 variant 2–8. Nevertheless, occasionally, the suffix “Z” is found relatively frequently after 01. This symbol, according to p. B4, is used to identify “an additional reading, interlinear or marginal, which is neither a correction (C) nor an alternative reading (sic)” and is used in opposition to the suffix “T” which is the reading of the text. One example of this strange practice is at James 2:2 variant 9, where surely the text marked Z is actually an “alternative reading”—and one attributed to א in NA27. See also James 3:14 variant 28–36 where the reading here designated 01T is said in NA27 to be that of א(2) and 1:14 variant 15 where the reading of 01Z is attributed to א(2) and 1:14 variant 15 where the reading of 01Z is attributed to א2 in NA27. Details such as this can be over-subtle in an apparatus. For example, when dealing with an erasure can one ever be sure who made that erasure? How may one be confident at James 1:27 variant 12 om. τῳ 04C2 (to take one example at random) that this is clearly the work of corrector 2?

The Inscriptio (set out on p. 1) is found in 35 differing forms. All 181 MSS. are set out separately (P100 is ignored): there is no siglum “Byz” 104* and 104C are given separately. 30 MSS. have lacunae at this point: the list here includes 18 of the 19 L MSS., but surely these should more properly be *omissions*. In the List of Lacunae (*Supplementary Material* 2.3 pp. B10ff.) the Inscriptio is properly identified as (S) i.e. an *omission* due to the requirements of the lectionary system. L921 is the missing lectionary on p. 1; on p. B12 L921S i.e. a supplement to the original MS., appears to have the Inscriptio, although nowhere is it shown for any form of the Inscriptio on p. 1. (It is only in the list of lacunose MSS. on p. B12 that l921 and l921S are listed separately—p. B8 alerts us only to l921.)
The *apparatus* on the *Subscriptio* p. 102 contains 141 MSS. “Byz” occurs as a siglum, but 57 of the 97 “Codices Byzantini” (including 18 of the 19 lectionary MSS.) do not support “Byz” in omitting the *Subscriptio*. Among these are 617 and 2423, two of the MSS. which form the solid basis for the Byzantine text according to p. B9. The missing lectionary is L921. As with the *Inscriptio* p. B12 shows l921S reading the *Subscriptio*, so its absence from p. 102 cannot be explained by its being subsumed under “Byz.” What does it read? We would not, of course, expect a lectionary or even a supplemented lectionary MS. to have either an *Inscriptio* or a *Subscriptio*. Perhaps the omissions of both by l921 and marked as (S), i.e. system-related omissions, on p. B12 are intended to be understood as applying to the line following (l921S), although we are not prepared for such an understanding with 2718 and 2718S earlier in the same list. The alleged lacuna in the 18 other lectionaries is indicated on p. B12 with the suffixed (S) to denote that the “omission” is due to the requirements of the lectionary system.

Both parts of *ECM* are given in German and English. Letters used as abbreviations are based on the German (F = Fehler is used of errors; Ä = Ethiopic version; A = Auslassung, for senseless omissions etc.) The English translations of what are sometimes fiendishly convoluted German constructions have been made by Erroll Rhodes with his customary skill and care. American spellings are used, hence this first fascicule is an “installment.” Only occasionally do we cavil at his decisions, e.g. “Apart from…” (p. xi) might have read more appropriately as “Had it not been for….” The English translation of the versional material on pp. B35ff. seems to have been made from the German rather than direct from the version, and this does not always lead to a satisfying result. *ut videtur* is said (p. B4) to mean “evidently,” but “apparently” would be better; the German “wie es scheint” is right. It is not easy to grasp the explanation of “T” (p. B28 under the sigla for the Latin versions). English translations of isolated German words have been ignored at e.g. p. B30: Kl (= Kleine); p. B32 footnote 5 o.O. Thomas of Harkel now appears *passim* in the preferred German form of the name Harqel. Buchstaben (p. B13) is left untranslated. Jak is the abbreviation for James throughout. The necessary qualification that lacunae labelled H are senseless is given in the German but not in the

---

5 o.O. itself is not appropriate as the “Ort” is known—the University of St. Andrews.
English (p. B11). I assume from the (original) German that omissions in MSS. that make sense, but could theoretically have been encouraged by homoioteleuton and the like, are not so labelled. The English introduction to section 2.4 (p. B12) says that the list to follow contains “all the scribal readings”; the key word in the German, “fehlerhaften,” is inexplicably avoided.

Although Anglicized forms of place names have usually been given Moskau (p. 16*), Strassburg (p. 14*), and Venedig (p. 15*) have slipped through the net. There is inconsistency with Tiflis/Tbilisi in the English p. 15* but not on the German pages where Tbilisi occurs throughout. [On pp. B14–20 in the bibliographies of patristic works the place of publication as given on the title pages is preferred, thus we have Napoli, Venetiis, Athenis, Città del Vaticano etc., which, one fervently hopes, will assist librarians find the texts the more easily, but even here the German slips through—see “Rom” p. B15 footnote 15 and p. B18 footnote 225.]

Where Biblical cross references are given to the text of James (in the footnotes to the pages of text or in the apparatus) the name of the Biblical book is given in its German form only. There is no table of abbreviations for Biblical books, even in their German form.

“Characterize” and “Homoioarcton” have gone astray on p. B11. See also homoiarkton p. B10. The German editions of A&A Text prefer homoioarkton (which Rhodes renders as homoioarcton in his translation of that work). B15 footnote 30 read Homilies. Unnecessary figures 2 and 4 have crept onto the end of the line of numbers accompanying the base text in James 3:8 (p. 55).

Page 12* states that 20 lectionaries are incorporated in ECM: this must mean for the Catholics as a whole. In James only 19 are cited (see p. B8), l1575 (said, rather implausibly, to subsume, among others, 0205) is not extant for this epistle.

The introductory matter particularly in the Text fascicule often speaks of ECM as a whole as well as of James in particular, In the Supplement, e.g. sections 2.1 and 3.1, comment is directed at both ECM as a whole or the Catholics, as well as at James specifically. This means that these introductory sections cannot serve as they stand in future fascicules. Adapted versions will need to be prepared for each successively published Catholic epistle. There could be unnecessary complication or duplication when the two parts for all the fascicules in volume IV have been published and need to be collected and bound together.
The table of abbreviations on pp. B3f., is generally full and clear but there is no explanation what “Lekt 3:S” means on p. B12 (following L156). There is a slight inconsistency on pp. B3f. in that superscript “T” after S:H is explained under “T” as well as under “S:H,” but under superscript “A” or “M” after S:H we are merely referred to “S.”

For the clarity of the presentation, for the comprehensiveness of the MS. attestation, for the care taken in presenting the patristic and ver-sional evidence, and for the illuminating introductory matter we give thanks. The editors obviously breathed a sigh of relief when this first fascicule was published after a long gestation period. We congratulate the editors for their achievements so far, and we await (with impatience) the remaining fascicules.

II) THE PETRINE EPISTLES

[328] In 1997 Editio Critica Maior. Installment 1: James was published. NovT carried an extensive review in vol XL (1998) pp. 195–204. I shall not repeat the comments about the general lay-out of the Editio Critica Maior (= ECM), its principles and intentions, but I would like to repeat in the context of this review of the second volume (now correctly printed as ‘2’ on the label affixed to the cover of both parts, Part 1 Text and Part 2 Supplementary Material) that this publication leaves all its users in the debt of the editors, especially in the way it has revolutionized the setting out of an apparatus criticus. ECM is a fine achievement. We salute the arrival of the instalment on the Petrine epistles. Anyone requiring a full, up-to-date, reliable and, above all, a crystal-clear presentation of the textual variants for these letters must now consult ECM. We merely point to the complicated sets of variations clearly displayed at 1 Peter 3:16 (18 different readings in number address 32–42), 1 Peter 3:18 (numbers 10–14) with 20 alternatives and 1 Peter 5:10 (38–44) with 22. Such clarity demands a certain generosity of space and some repetitiveness. For example, as before, all deficient mss. are noted at every variation unit. This means that a very lacunose ms. like P81, which does not begin until 1 Peter 2:20 is reported as deficient a couple of hundred times in all the variants up to that point.

This is not to say that we can abandon Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece (= NA27). In NA quotations, e.g. from the LXX, are carefully noted and the edition contains an index in LXX order.
None of this is in ECM. The detailed lists of Greek and Latin mss. with their dates and content are fuller in NA. NA also contains the useful appendix, ‘Editionum Differentiae’. All these, outside the scope of ECM, are useful, and scholars will need NA27 to hand even for work on the Catholic Epistles.

**General Overview**

Part 1 *Text* begins with a forword in German and English, and four pages (also bilingual) continue the introductory matter. Recent research on the reconstruction of 1 and 2 Peter is explained. The bulk of the volume is the text and *apparatus* to the Petrine Letters. The lay-out used in James applies here too. Part 2 *Supplementary Material* is also in English and in German. Here Section 1 ‘Abbreviations and Symbols’ is not included—instead we are referred to instalment 1 although the English form of the abbreviations (slightly changed from pp. B1–4) is helpfully inserted as a loose page. Then follows the list of Greek mss., including the ‘Codices Byzantini’ and the distinctively Byzantine readings in the two letters. After that comes a section on the lectionaries used. Here subheadings on 1 Peter and 2 Peter would have been helpful signposts. The editors were aware that there exist repeated lections for 2 Peter 1:10; 2:9.

Section 2.3 is a list of lacunae. 2.4 gathers together all the nonsense readings found in the *apparatus*. (I fail to grasp the need for this.) Section 3 lists the patristic quotations. The bulk of abbreviations remains as on pp. B14–20 but we now have three additional Fathers (Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus and Nestorius) and further works by three previously listed Fathers. This brings the total number of Fathers who quote from the Catholic Epistles to 110 of whom 53 quote from 1 Peter (principally Cyril of Alexandria, Didymus and Origen) and 26 quote from 2 Peter (mainly Cyril and Didymus).

Section 4 deals with the versions. The Latin again relies on the *Vetus Latina* edition, although, strangely, the number of the relevant volume (*VL* 26) is not given. For the Coptic we have a somewhat different set of mss. from those used in James. The dates of the mss. are not given, but this time those mss. which are lectionaries are identified as such by a suffixed (L) after the ms. number—that is useful additional information. The other main versional witness used in ECM, the Syriac, now contains additional information for the Philoxenian and Harklean
because 2 Peter (and the other ‘minor’ Catholic Epistles) are absent from the Peshitta. Much needed new editions of these two versions of the Syriac are under way in the Münster Institut. In the meantime ECM has used Gwynn (1909) as its base for the Philoxenian. 1 Peter in Syriac is of course set out in the Institut’s Die großen Katholischen Briefe (ANTF 7) in the series Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus.

Section 5 begins with additional Greek readings (about which see below). This section now also contains a list of Patristic allusions. The need for such a section and the requirement to have genuine quotations in Patristic works separated from allusions were desiderata noted when James was published. We are promised a further discussion in volume IV 3. 5.2 explains why certain Greek mss. were shown in the apparatus accompanied by a double-headed arrow. This section explains that these witnesses had to be isolated in that way usually because of lacunae. The final section (5.3) is a long and detailed explanation why versional evidence is sometimes similarly ambiguous in an apparatus; these careful and succinct comments elucidate these ambiguities.

**Manuscripts**

From the total number of papyri and majuscule mss. containing the Catholic Epistles listed on pp. B5–7 (in the James volumes) the following are cited in I Peter: three papyri (P72, P74, P91) and fifteen majuscules now excluding 056 which is not used beyond James, according to p. B41. For 2 Peter there are two papyri (P73, P74) and 14 majuscules.

As far as minuscules are concerned, in 1 and 2 Peter there are fewer mss. cited than in James—only 115 compared with 143 in James. Minuscule 1881, not extant for James, has been used for 1 and 2 Peter, but 197 and 1846, used in James, are not extant here. The use of twenty-seven other minuscules, used in James and extant for 1 and 2 Peter, has been discontinued. The list appears on p. B41 and we are told that the reason for their exclusion will be explained in Supplementary Studies (by which we are to understand that this is not the ‘Supplementary Material’ of part 2 but ‘Begleitende Untersuchungen’) said on p. B42 to be ECM IV, 3 (although the Table of Contents suggests these Studies will be IV, 4!). Another anomaly is that of these twenty-seven minuscules, 38 is to be found in 1 and 2 Peter in the ‘Additional Apparatus’ set out on pp. B68f. The statement on p. B41 must therefore be under-
stood to mean that certain mss. have not been cited consistently beyond James, rather than that they are never to be found in ECM IV beyond James. We await IV, 3 sic for the explanation.

There are ten lectionaries used in 1 Peter and nine in 2 Peter. James used nineteen, but eleven of those have been jettisoned beyond James (and are so listed on p. B41). Lectionary 1575 is used in 1 Peter: this is a lectionary independent of the Byzantine system and is an 8th-century Greek-Coptic bilingual ms.

The extent and age of all these mss. is found only in Installment 1, pp. B5–7.

The list of mss. used in the “Additional Greek Readings” in Section 5.1 (pp. B68f.) reveals other oddities, in addition to the inclusion of minuscule 38, noted above. For example, a bizarre reading attributed to 88 at 2 Peter 1:15 (‘number address’ 4) seems not to have come from von Soden, from Text und Textwert I,3, nor from Tischendorf (the alleged sources for these additional readings), but—even odder—88 is one of the Byzantine witnesses regularly used in these epistles and included on p. B42, thereby contradicting the statement on p. B68 that the mss. in Section 5.1 are “not already represented…in the edition”. The “Additional Readings” includes variants found in mss. 256, 393, 1599 which do not appear on any lists in this edition. Conversely 2474 is in the list on p. B68 but no reading(s) attributed to this ms. occur in this section!

Among the 142 mss. containing 1 Peter and the 140 containing 2 Peter listed on p. B41 (excluding the LXX Prophetologium used for lections in 1 Peter) are 53 mss. identified as Byzantine witnesses in 1 Peter and 54, somewhat different mss., used in 2 Peter. These are listed separately on p. B42 under ‘Codices Byzantini’. No explanation is given why these (and not others) have been selected. We are told that in 1 Peter the undivided witness of the Byzantine text differs from the primary text (i.e. the recommended, critically-established text of the edition), printed at the head of the pages of the critical apparatus, in only 52 of the 700+ variants in 1 Peter and only 33 out of 400+ instances of textual variation in 2 Peter. (That compares with 69/800 in James).

The use of the siglum ‘Byz’, to mean the ‘Codices Byzantini’, listed on p. B42, has changed since the James fascicule. There ‘Byz’ was abandoned in the apparatus if three or four of the solid core of seven ‘nearly pure’ Byzantine witnesses, listed on pp. B8–9, do not agree with the others. Now we learn that the siglum is relinquished if more
than one differ from the others. The actual ‘pure’ mss. are not identical for James, 1 Peter or 2 Peter, but, as it happens, there are seven for each epistle. As usual, it is possible to detect how many mss. are included under the siglum ‘Byz’ on those occasions when it is utilised in an *apparatus*. For example, at 1 Peter 2:8 (numbers 14–16) we can eliminate all the Byzantine mss. listed on p. B42 actually cited individually in the different readings, or deficient at this point. That leaves 45 mss. not accounted for, and these, therefore, must be the mss. subsumed under ‘Byz’.

No mention is made in ECM of the Textus Receptus.

No editorial changes have been made to the details about the correctors of א as set out on p. B7, which is still referred to on the inserted blue slip containing abbreviations used. For Sinaiticus the editors repeat Tischendorf and do not refer to Kirsopp Lake’s reclassification of the ‘A’ or ‘B’ correctors, nor do they refer to the discussion by Milne and Skeat in their *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*, esp. pp. 40–5, in which it is argued that the corrections were all the work of the scribes of the manuscript. If Milne and Skeat were correct, then ECM is wrong to suggest (p. B7) that the correctors ‘A’ and ‘B’ were from the 4th–6th century rather than exactly contemporary with the ms. itself.

**The Apparatus**

The careful scholarship behind ECM should mean that where we detect discrepancies between earlier *apparatus* and that in ECM the latter ought to be the more reliable. Spot checks may be made. I have noted that in a comparison with UBS⁴ at 1 Peter 5:8 *v.l.* τινα καταπιεῖν the UBS and ECM differ over the reading of א and 1241. At 2 Peter 3:10 *v.l.* κατακαήσεται the way in which 81 is reported differs. Comparisons with NA²⁷ reveal the following: 1 Peter 2:5 εἰς includes 33 in NA; this ms. is deficient at this point according to ECM. In the same verse P⁷2 is said by NA to omit θυσίας ECM shows the reading of P⁷2 to be ambiguous about word order because of an accidental omission. (That judgement in NA agrees with *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus, I Die Katholischen Briefe* (= ANTF 6)). Comparisons with *Text und Textwert, I Die Katholischen Briefe* 1 (= ANTF 9) at 1 Peter 3:16 (ECM ‘number address’ 24) give different readings for 996 and also cf. 61. At 2 Peter 1:17 (34–48) ECM and *Text und Textwert* differ in the readings of 1751.
Changes to the Text

As its name suggests, the ECM is no mere thesaurus of variants. The editors have taken advantage of their researches into mss., and ms. groupings in order to reevaluate the earlier text-critical decisions underlying UBS⁴/NA²⁷ and to reestablish the printed text of the NT. For James I was disappointed that ECM made only two changes to the text in UBS/NA: James 1:22; 2:3. Since then, continuing work on that Epistle has resulted in one further suggested change. A footnote in the fascicules on the Petrine Letters (p. 22*/p. 24* note 4) states that James 2:4 (number address 2–4) should now read καὶ οὐ διεκρίθητε at the beginning of the verse with 025 Byz against the earlier reading found in UBS⁴/NA²⁷ read by A B² C al.

There are seven changes to the text of 1 Peter. In the list following column one is the new reading in ECM, the second column has the text of UBS4/NA27:

1:6 λυπηθέντας
1:16 γέγραπται
1:16 ἐγὼ ἅγιος
2:25 ἀλλα
4:16 ἐν τῷ μέρει
5:9 τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ
5:10 ἐν χριστῷ

There are eight changes to the text of 2 Peter:

2:6 ἀσεβεῖν
2:11 παρὰ κυρίῳ
2:15 καταλείποντες
3:6 δι᾽ ὅν
3:10 οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται
3:16 ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς
3:16 στρεβλώσουσιν
3:18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος

Let us see what the nature of these changes is. Six involve the removal of a word (or part of a word) bracketed in UBS/NA (1 Peter 1:16bis; 5:9, 10; 2 Peter 2:6; 3:18). Of these the inclusion of [ἀμήν] in UBS⁴ at 2 Peter 3:18 was given the low rating letter, ‘C (previously ‘D’ in UBS¹³⁸). The removal of the word there makes 2 Peter agree with the conclusion
of 1 Peter; NA/UBS, by following certain favoured mss., made the two Petrine letters inconsistent. At 2 Peter 3:18 thoroughgoing eclecticism dictates that the reading of B, virtually alone, om. ἀμήν is preferable to the longer reading in P\textsuperscript{72} Α A. On 1 Peter 5:10 Metzger, Commentary\textsuperscript{6} in a signed note rightly states that the shorter text was to be preferred because scribes tended to expand sacred names. Five of the above 1 Peter 1:16 secl.; 5:9, 10; 2 Peter 2:6; 3:18 (i.e. not 1 Peter 1:16 pr.) offer an alternative reading marked by a dot (about which see further below).

The reading at 2 Peter 3:10 is a conjecture (see Introduction p. 24* where it is stated that “Hitherto sic there has been no known Greek evidence for this reading” as if some new Greek witness(es) were produced in the apparatus in ECM. That is not the case (although the note on p. 24* tries to argue that the variants ἀφανισθήσονται and κατακαήσεται in effect agree with οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται). Metzger, Commentary\textsuperscript{2} argues that no reading here seems original, and the UBS text rates this with a rare ‘D’. At 1 Peter 2:25 ECM has moved away from ἄλλα, a reading read virtually by B alone. Likewise at 1 Peter 1:16 ὃτι in UBS/NA was the reading of B, virtually alone. In general, the fifteen changes to the text have been away from the readings supported by B.

More significant changes are μέρει/ὄνόματι at 1 Peter 4:16 and κυρίῳ/κυρίου at 2 Peter 2:11.\textsuperscript{8} It is worth noting that the reading now at 4:16 has no majuscule or papyri support and is a Byzantine reading. At 2 Peter 3:6 δι᾿ ὃν is read by only P, eight minuscules and one lectionary—none of them ‘special’ mss. in 2 Peter according to Introduction pp. 21*ff.

The resultant text is still a fully eclectic text. The newly introduced readings in the text still present a printed edition which appears in no single Greek manuscript.

\textsuperscript{6} B.M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994). Hereafter Commentary\textsuperscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{7} The translation of the German (p. 22*) may be the cause of the confusion: ‘bis-lang’ should be ‘as yet’, and ‘immerhin’ in this context should be ‘however’ or ‘nevertheless’.

\textsuperscript{8} It is interesting to see that B.M. Metzger, Commentary\textsuperscript{2} in a dissentient note signed by Metzger himself argued for the omission of the words or, as the ‘least unsatisfactory’ alternative, to read παρὰ κυρίῳ and place the words in square brackets. The reading selected on the basis of majority voting within the UBS committee resulted in παρὰ κυρίου being printed with the rating ‘D’, subsequently upgraded to ‘C’ in UBS\textsuperscript{4}.
In addition to these actual changes to the text of UBS/NA itself the ECM fascicule on 1 and 2 Peter also includes a number of noteworthy alternative readings to the ones printed. These are signalled by bold dots in the primary line around the word(s) for which there is a significant alternative (or by a single dot in the primary line where the alternative, longer text stands at the end of 2 Peter). In James there were 11 such places (including one of the two—now three—places where the printed text had changed). In 1 and 2 Peter there are many more such passages where there is a bold dot, but the meaning of the alternative signalled by a dot against the so-called letter address has changed. I count twenty-five places in 1 Peter:

1 Peter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Alternative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:8 ἰδόντες</td>
<td>εἰδότες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9 τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν</td>
<td>om. ὑμῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12 ἐν πνεύμα</td>
<td>om. ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18 ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου</td>
<td>1, 3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22 καθαρὰς καρδίας</td>
<td>om. καθαρὰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5 οἰκοδομεῖσθε</td>
<td>ἐποικοδομεῖσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5 τῷ θεῷ</td>
<td>om. τῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:6 ἀκρογονιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμον</td>
<td>2, 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:11 ἀπέχεσθαι</td>
<td>ἀπέχεσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:16 ἀλλ᾽ ὡς θεοῦ δούλοι</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 παρὰ θεῷ</td>
<td>παρὰ τῷ θεῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25 ἐπεστράφητε</td>
<td>ἐπεστρέψατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1 αἱ γυναίκες</td>
<td>om. αἱ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1 καὶ εἰ τινὲς ἀπειθοῦσιν</td>
<td>2, 1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:22 τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>om. τοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:5 ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι</td>
<td>ἐτοίμως κρίνοντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων</td>
<td>om. τῶν αἰώνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:14 ἀναπαύεται/ἀναπέπαυεται</td>
<td>ἐπαναπαύεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17 ὁ καυρός</td>
<td>om. ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19 ἀγαθοποιία</td>
<td>ἀγαθοποιίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2 κατὰ θεόν</td>
<td>om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5 ὁ θεός</td>
<td>om. ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:8 τινα καταπιεῖν</td>
<td>om. τινα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας</td>
<td>eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:14 ἐν χριστῷ</td>
<td>ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition we mention five other places\(^9\) where the text itself has changed: 1 Peter 1:6, 16 sec; 4:16; 5:9, 10.

In 2 Peter there are 16 places marked with a bold dot:

2 Peter

1:2  Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου
1:4  τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν  
1:4  τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ  
1:9  ἁμαρτιῶν  
1:12  διὸ μελλήσω  
1:21  προφητεία ποτέ  
2:6  καταστροφῆς κατέκρινεν  
2:13  ἀγάπας αὐτῶν  
2:18  ἁμαρτημάτων  
2:18  ὄντως  
2:19  καὶ δεδούλωται  
2:20  κυρίου ἡμῶν  
2:22  κύλισμα  
3:3  ἐν ἐμπαίγμονε  
3:3  κατὰ τὰς ἑδούλωται  
3:18  αὐξάνεσθε  

In addition there are another five places where the text was changed: 2 Peter 2:6 sec., 15; 3:16bis., 18. The other three places where the text was changed (2:11; 3:6, 10) appear without a dot signifying that no alternative is contemplated.

In the Introduction to James (p. 11*) we are told that the dots signify places where the alternative reading so marked in the overview of variant readings is ‘of equal value’ with the text in the primary line. Now (The Letters of Peter, p. 24*) we are given the disconcerting information that the use of the dot is “not governed by any absolute or precise definition”! The variant marked with a dot may sometimes be ‘of equal value’, but may merely indicate that the primary line of text

---

\(^9\) The changed text at 1 Peter 1:16 pr. and 2:25 is therefore printed confidently without a bold dot. The former readings in UBS/NA in these verses are not signalled now as possible alternatives.
has not been printed with complete confidence or that an alternative may merit special attention. Thus we must guess which category of dot we are dealing with. With the exceptions at 1 Peter 4:14 and 2 Peter 1:4 only one alternative reading in the list printed below the primary line qualifies for a dot.

What may we deduce from the lists above?

1.) First it is clear that, where brackets have now been removed from the text, the reading giving the shorter text (an omission that occasioned the use of brackets in UBS/NA) has been compensated for by the identification of that shorter text as a recommended alternative reading still worthy of consideration. This accounts for the dots at 1 Peter 1:9*, 12*, 22*; 2:5 sec.; 3:1* pr., 22; 4:17; 5:5, 8*; 2 Peter 2:6*, 20*; 3:2pr. (References followed by an asterisk indicate that UBS rated its chosen reading ‘C’). As one who has consistently criticised editions of NA and UBS for the overuse of brackets, I am pleased to see their removal from the text in ECM. Strangely, not all places where brackets have been removed merit a dot in ECM. At 1 Peter 1:6 ἐστὶν is printed unbracketed. Similarly 1 Peter 5:2 ἐπισκοποῦντες is now without brackets. (In Metzger, Commentary this reading is rated ‘C’ because it is said the decision about which textual variant to print as the text was ‘difficult’: the dilemma of that committee seems therefore not to have been shared by those preparing ECM.) At 2 Peter 3:11 ὑμᾶς is printed without brackets.

2.) Second, some variants involving a changed word-order now bear a dot (1 Peter 1:18; 2:6, 16; 3:1; 2 Peter 1:4 pr., 21; 3:3 sec.).

3.) Others concern a choice between a longer and a shorter text. (These are passages not bracketed in UBS/NA): 1 Peter 4:11 and 5:11 (+/- τῶν αἰώνων) and where consistent usage within the Petrine letters should be restored; UBS/NA inconsistently print the longer doxology at 4:11 and not at 5:11. We also note 1 Peter 5:14 (+/- Ἰησοῦ): the latter is printed in UBS with complete confidence, denoted by its being rated ‘A’—the decisions and dilemmas of that text as exemplified by the often arbitrary and inevitably fatuous rating letters have obviously been ignored or disregarded by the ECM committee. To that list we

---

10 Surprisingly, the conjectural reading printed as the primary line at 2 Peter 3:10 is not marked with a dot: such is the confidence with which our editors print that text!
add 1 Peter 4:5 (*om. ἔχοντι*); 5:2 (*om. κατὰ θεόν*); 2 Peter 1:2 (add χριστοῦ); 2:19 (add καί).\(^{11}\)

4.) It will also be seen from the list above that some alternatives concern orthographical, or grammatical variation.

5.) The alternatives dotted at 2 Peter 1:12 and 2:18 (*ὀντως*) are interesting—the latter, in particular, because, once again, the reading of UBS (*όλιγως*) was a confidently printed ‘A’ reading.\(^{12}\)

We noted three places involving the deletion of brackets where no dotted alternatives were signalled. There are other places where we might have expected dots. I refer to those readings printed in UBS where, despite its general tendency to move previously low rating letters up, some ratings below ‘A’ still mark the following:

1 Peter
2:3 εἰ ‘B’
3:7 συγκληρονόμοις ‘B’
3:18 περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν ‘B’, over which reading Metzger, *Commentary*\(^2\) claims that the UBS committee had great difficulty ascertaining the original text.
3:18 ύμᾶς ‘C’
5:10 καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει ‘B’
5:11 τὸ κράτος ‘B’

2 Peter
1:1 Συμεών ‘B’
1:3 ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ ‘B’
1:17 ὁ γιὸς μου ὁ ἄγιος μου οὐτός ἐστιν ‘B’ (a reading found in only Π\(^72\) B 1751).
2:4 σειροῖς ‘C’ where Metzger, *Commentary*\(^2\) claims that “the textual evidence is singularly evenly balanced”.
2:13 ἀδικοῦμενοι ‘B’.

The Introduction pp. 21*ff. states that work on ECM has revealed that about a dozen mss. allegedly contain the hypothetical ‘A’ text = the supposed *Ausgangstext*. The mss. may differ from book to book (and we ought to ask why that should be so—no answer is proffered yet).

---

\(^{11}\) The omission of καί is read by Π\(^72\) Λ B only.

\(^{12}\) Possibly we may deduce that this reading is dotted here merely “for special consideration” (p. 24*).
Among the ones identified for James, 1 and 2 Peter (but not necessarily in all three) are P72, ℞, A, B, C, D, P(025), 5, 623,13 1175, 1243. We ought to see how and if these discoveries have effected the changes to the text in ECM.

As far as the manuscripts supporting a dotted primary text and the dotted alternative are concerned, there is a general tendency in 1 and 2 Peter to suggest that an alternative read by ℞, A, C and sometimes Byz is dotted if the primary text is supported by B. This suggests, again, a move away from B. At 1 Peter 4:14 one of the dotted variant readings (ἀναπέπαυται) is supported only by forty-one minuscules and four lectionaries, but among them are 5, 623, 1175. At 2 Peter 2:18 the alternative ἀσελγείας is found in some of the mss. identified on p. 24* as distinctive for 2 Peter, especially 1175, 1243. We may assume that the presence of 1243 1852 among the eleven witnesses supporting ἐπεστρέψατε dotted at 1 Peter 2:25 was the reason for this selection.

**General Remarks**

A blue slip inserted into Installment 2 contains a helpful summary of the edition’s abbreviations, abstracted mainly from the Introduction to the Catholic Letters as a whole (found in the volume on James). This insert is in English only. There is an inconsistency: SHA is not described under A nor is SHM described under M, although SHT is described under T. The slip also contains errata and addenda for the first instalment (including corrections already incorporated into its second printing).

The Table of Contents gives the wrong page numbers for the Vorwort and for the Preface.

Although Erroll Rhodes’ English translation of the original German used for this bi-lingual edition is excellent, there are a couple of oversights: On p. B47 fehlerhaft is not translated into English; this is an omission which may mislead readers dependent on the English. On p. B45 in the section on omissions due to hom. sinnentstellende is not translated. On p. B45 read homoioarcton.

Oddly, p. 24* speaks of 623 as a new witness ‘absent from James’—yet 623 is used in James!
III) 1 JOHN

The splendidly clear *apparatus* printed in the *Editio Critica Maior* (= ECM) has already justifiably been praised in reviews of the fascicles on James and on 1 & 2 Peter (my reviews of the earlier volumes are to be seen in *NovT* 40 [1998] pp. 195–204; 42 [2000] pp. 328–339; see also *ThLZ* 127 [2002] col. 297, and J. K. Elliott, “The *Editio Critica Maior*: One Reader’s Reactions” in: Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch [eds.], *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature* [Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2003] pp. 129–144 [= *Studies in Theology and Religion*, 8]), as have its other commendable features. We now welcome the instalment on 1 John. Originally it was intended that the 3rd instalment would contain all four remaining Catholic Epistles. In the event an extra fascicule will contain them as a newly inserted instalment. The clarity of presentation is of course maintained. For instance, as far as the *apparatus* is concerned, see the way in which the following are exhibited: fifteen choices at 3:21; the nine alternatives at 3:23; the twenty eight (!) readings at 5:13 (including two marked as faulty). All these are crystal clear. Once again, we congratulate the editors at the *Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung/Münster* for their praiseworthy achievement.

The text and *apparatus* to 1 John have been created using 143 witnesses (including the LXX lectionary, the Prophetologium). As is usual in this series, these are divided into non-Byzantine witnesses (comprising in 1 John: 2 papyri, 9 majuscules, 80 minuscules) and Byzantine manuscripts (4 majuscules, 37 minuscules and all 11 lectionaries). The *apparatus* also contains versional and Greek patristic evidence. The number of Greek mss. is not dissimilar to that used for the earlier fascicles, although the mss. differ somewhat. Among newly cited witnesses we now meet P9 0245 0296 1836 as well as 1523 1844 (neither of which has appeared in the apparatus to any other critical edition to my knowledge). 1881, introduced in 1 & 2 Peter, reappears here. Descriptions of those mss. appear in the volume on James pp. B5–7, showing that users of the fascicles on the Catholics require the James volume’s general introduction. L921S is used in 1 John although we had been informed in vol IV,2 p. B41 that this witness was not to be used beyond James! 025, described as Byzantine in 1 & 2 Peter, is now

---

14 The first two and the last are reprinted in this chapter (28a and 28bi)
no longer so. 61 is now not described as Byzantine, contrary to its status in the earlier fascicules. 69 400 1270 1297 1609 1661 1842 1890, now Byzantine in 1 John, were not so in James. 876 996 1175 1751, now Byzantine in 1 John, were not so in James or 1 & 2 Peter. 1832, Byzantine in 1 John and James, was not so in 1 & 2 Peter.

The seven ›nearly pure‹ Byzantine witnesses in 1 John are 18 35 319 424 468 617 2423. Some of these figured as ›nearly pure‹ in the earlier fascicules. We are informed (as in 1 & 2 Peter; the rule was different in James) that if more than one of these seven differs from the others then the Byzantine witness is divided and the siglum ›Byz.‹ jettisoned. In 1 John there are 47 out of 700 + v.ll. in this epistle where the united Byzantine manuscripts have a reading different from the leading text-line (cf. 69/800+ in James, 52/700+ in 1 Peter, and 33/400+ in 2 Peter).

Many readers will be interested in the differences in the lead-text of ECM from the UBS (=NA) text. As usual, there are disappointingly few changes. In 1 John there are only three (on pp. 29* f. is an indication of the manuscripts considered by the editors to be of especial importance. Their influence is seen in the first two v.ll. to follow):

1:7 om. δὲ with 044 6 323—a change from + δὲ
5:10 ἐν αὐτῷ (the reading of NA23!) with 03 436 442 468—a change from ἐν ἐαυτῷ (signalled as category ›B‹ in UBS4rev; Metzger’s Commentary2 stated that at 5:10 a minority of its committee had seen ἐαυτῷ as a secondary development from αὐτῷ read in a reflexive sense)
5:18 ἐαυτῶν—a change from αὐτῶν read by B et al. (a reading rated ›B‹ in UBS4rev). ECM shows A* as reading αὐτῶν as in NA; it does not specify any difference between B* and B. UBS says A* B* have αὐτῶν »without accents (sic)«, thereby implying that it may have been read as if it had a rough breathing to indicate a reflexive. (However, Metzger’s Commentary2 says αὐτῶν is read with a smooth breathing by A* B.) This changed text in ECM now means that ὁ γεννηθεὶς is understood as the believer, not as Christ, even though our author prefers ὁ γεννημενος of the believer elsewhere!

Somewhat apologizing for so few changes, the introductory Notes (30*) say that »more use has been made of a bold dot to indicate a possible alternative reading«. »More« here must be in relation to the
three actual changes to the reconstructed text, rather than in relation to the alternatives signalled with a bold dot in the volume on 1 & 2 Peter, where there are fifty one such places marked. In 1 John there are only thirteen, but at least we are reassured that these are places where a genuine alternative is proposed. (I had been rather disconcerted by the different and nuanced explanation of the presence of the bold dot given in the introduction to the fascicule on 1 & 2 Peter.)

These are the places where the lead text has a bold dot in 1 John and the main manuscripts in support of the reading. Again, one may see how the influence of the editors’ favoured manuscripts made clear-cut decisions difficult in the places listed here. (The reading in brackets below shows the editors’ suggested alternative and the main mss. in support):

1:4 ημων with 01 03 044 (υμων with 02 04 025)
1:7 om. δε with 044 6 323 1243 (δε with 01 02 03 04 025)
1:8 ουκ εστιν εν ημιν with 01 03 044 6 81 (3–4, 1–2 with 02 04 025 1243)
2:4 (pr.) οτι with 01 02 03 044 6 (om. οτι with 04 025 1881)
2:4 (sec.) και with most mss. (om. και with 02 025 044 33 323)
2:29 οτι και with 01 02 04 025 (οτι και with 03 044 6 81)
3:13 και with 01 04 025 044 323 (om. και 02 03 81 436)
3:19 πεισομεν with 01 02 03 04 025 (πεισωμεν with 044 442 1739)
3:23 πιστευσομεν with 03 (πιστευωμεν with 01 02 04 044)
5:5 δε εστιν with 01 025 6 1739 (εστιν with 02 044 5)

[1070] 5:6 εν3 with 03 044 (om. εν before αιματι with 01 442)—among seven v.ll.!

5:11 ημιν ο θεος with 01 02 044 (2, 3, 1 with 03 1739 1881)
5:21 εαυτα with 01* 03 6 (εαυτους with 02 025 5)

(v.l. + αμην at 5:21 is now no longer offered as a possible alternative [cf. 2 Peter in ECM])

Note that in six places above (1:7; 2:4 (pr.); 2:29; 3:13; 5:5; 5:6) the possible alternative has the support of ›Byz‹ (= Codices Byzantini). Note also that most of the changes above make no material difference to the meaning—five concern the omission or inclusion of a particle.

When we look at the two passages above that appear in the apparatus to UBS we find 1:4 was rated ›A‹ in UBS4rev (having been upgraded from ›B‹ in earlier editions). Now that confidence is seen to have been
misplaced; another possible reading is now offered in ECM. At 3:13 the ›D‹ rating in UBS1-3 and ›C‹ in UBS4e display a genuine doubt.

The dots at 1:7 mark one of three places where the text was changed from UBS/NA. But it is interesting to see that the other two places where the text was changed from that in UBS/NA (i.e. 5:10; 5:18) have no such dots—the change has therefore been made in ECM with supreme confidence and no doubt about the editors’ decisions is raised.

One might have expected to see bold dots at 2:6 [οὐντως]; 3:19 [καὶ]; 3:21 [ημων]; 5:1 [και] where the word is bracketed in UBS/NA, indicating that their editors were in a dilemma whether or not to support the long or the short reading and where they hedged their bets by bracketing the disputed word. The UBS Commentary at these places shows what the dilemmas were. That overuse of brackets is a deplorable feature of these editions. ECM uses the bold dot to indicate some disputed readings but at these four places ECM drops the bracket and thus reads the longer text without raising any doubts about its decision.

Readers of this fascicule may well wish to see the evidence for the Comma Johanneum (1 John 5:7–8). The Greek apparatus shows the readings of six of the manuscripts that support the longer text (often as a variant reading in their margins): 61 88 429 629 918. The supplementary apparatus (B112) has the reading of 636. (The other manuscripts that support forms of the longer reading, 221 2318 2473, are not used in ECM in 1 John.) For the Latin evidence one needs to turn to Section 5.3 (B124), and for the reading in the Complutensian Polyglot to p. B107.

As is normal in these instalments, there are additional readings in the first part of subsection 5.1 in the volume entitled Supplementary Material. These are mainly drawn from the Text und Textwert volumes that formed the preliminary survey of the manuscripts selected for ECM. In the case of 1 John some 58 occasional mss. are listed on p. B111. These are said to be mss. »not included in this edition«. It is therefore somewhat disconcerting for readers to encounter in that list 1735 which is among the mss. cited consistently throughout 1 John (and shown on p. B91). Even more disconcerting is it for readers to meet 490 (a Gospel ms.!) and 1774 (a ms. of Revelation!) in the list on p. B111. And what help does a reader get to explain the appearance of ms. 1743 in support of the additional reading at 1 John 5:8/18–30? That witness is not in the list on p. B111 nor elsewhere in ECM!
Some of the occasional manuscripts shown in *v.l.l.* on pp. B 111 f. were among the main witnesses used in the volume on James but subsequently abandoned: 631 1509 1765 1893 2180 2242 2495 2674 (this one is also a supplementary ms. in 1 & 2 Peter).

Differences in the manuscript attestation between ECM and the appropriate entry in the Teststellen in *Text und Textwert* are seen in, among other places: 2:10 (1523); 2:14 (2544); 2:19 (621; and added reading by 1799); 2:23 (1837 1838); 3:1 (1845Z added); 3:14 (add 623corr2). At 4:3 (*Teststelle 1*) 330* previously »unleserlich« now appears as 330*V. At 4:3 (*Teststelle 2*) there is a different reading for 2344 in ECM. Several of the above concern the first hand and correctors of mss. These refinements found in ECM imply that greater care and investigation has gone into making ECM the more reliable of the two *apparatus*.

In brief: 1) Among Patristic witnesses there are 48 cited in 1 John, mainly Cyril of Alexandria, Didymus and Origen. The original lists of Fathers on pp. B14–20. B50 have now been supplemented on p. B98. 2) In the section on the Latin version the reference to VL p. 240 (on pp. B105 and B106) should be completed as VL vol. 26. 3) A loose page inserted lists the main abbreviations but also contains *addenda* and *corrigenda* to the earlier fascicules in the series. 4) The Table of Contents in Part 1 shows the incorrect order of the Vorwort and Preface.

**IV) 2, 3 JOHN AND JUDE**

This is the fourth instalment in the volume on the Catholic Epistles. The original plan to have only three instalments was abandoned when it was decided to publish 1 John separate from 2, 3 John and Jude. The earlier fascicules on 1 John were reviewed in ThLZ 129 (2004) cols. 1068–1071. Those familiar with ECM are appreciative of the spacious presentation, careful setting out of the alternatives and a well-controlled apparatus criticus. Complicated variation units like Jude 5 (words 12–20) throw up 30 *v.l.l.* and Jude 23 (words 2–22) 15 *v.l.l.* The clarity with which these, and all, alternatives are set out continues to serve as a model of how an apparatus ought to be constructed. At 2 John 8 a cross-reference to link *ἀπολέσωμεν* at word 10 with *ἀπολαβωμεν* at word 22 may have been useful. The edition of ECM
under review now has 68 quarto pages of text and apparatus. Compare that to the 7 cramped pages for 2, 3 John and Jude in the Nestle hand edition.

From the list of 142 manuscripts listed on p. B127 135 have been used in the apparatus to 2 John, 135 in 3 John and 138 in Jude. Of these 142 manuscripts (3 papyri, 14 majuscules, 119 minuscules, 6 lectionaries) in 2, 3 John and Jude, 44 are Byzantine (p. B128) of which one (365) is used only in 2, 3 John; these Byzantine mss. are 5 majuscules, 33 minuscules and all 6 lectionaries. (Those figures compare with 167 in James, of which 97 are Codices Byzantini; 152 in 1 Peter [54 Byz.], 149 in 2 Peter [54 Byz.]; 143 in 1 John = 2 papyri, 13 majuscules, 117 minuscules, 11 lectionaries [52 Byz. = 4 majuscules, 37 minuscules and all 11 lectionaries].) A fragment of Jude, 0316, is newly added to the list of mss. used in the Catholics. Compared with the immediately previous fascicule (on 1 John) 206S is used (not 206—do we need to be told about the nature of this supplement and its date here?), 181S (not 181); L921 (not L921S). 1831S for 2 John-Jude is another later supplement to an earlier manuscript. And what is the significance of the bracketed S after 1831? (That siglum is not in the tables of abbreviations.) L60, L590, L1126, L1442S no longer appear beyond 1 John.

Some mss. which in 1 John were Byzantine are not so labelled in 2, 3 John, Jude: 69, 93, 431, 665, 876, 1270, 1297, 1751, 1842, 1845; conversely, the following are now Codices Byzantini, not having been so in 1 John: 025, 0142, 206S, 398, 429, 522, 1448, 1490, 1799, 2718 and 1831S. If these have been correctly judged, then it shows just how the influences on mss. from one book to another fluctuate, even in the same corpus.

Of the six lectionaries one (L596) is, according to the Kurzgefasste Liste, lSEL. The others are all lae. Page B129 links L596 with L921, L938, L1141, L1281 and separates these from L156. The reason for this is not clear.

The new introductory matter (pp. 35*–48*) explains how the editors are well satisfied with the coherence-based genealogical method (CBGM) adopted here; there is much talk about textual flow. The methodology has identified different manuscript allegiances in 2 and 3 John compared even with 1 John. If this approach is sound, it certainly behoves us to treat all mss. carefully as we move from book to book, and even within one book in the larger texts, of course. For example, 1845, as will be seen above, was Byzantine in 1 John; now it is one of the 15 closest allies of A (= Ausgangstext) in 3 John, and one of the 9 second closest to A in 2 John. Cf. also how 431, previously Byz., is now among the mss. next closest to A in 3 John and among those closest to A in Jude. 025, now Byz., is listed on p. 36* as among the 3rd–5th
most closely related to A in 3 John alongside seven other Byz. mss. We must, however, not be mesmerized into concluding that the Ausgangstext is necessarily the »original« text, but merely the text that seems to explain the origin of the variants deviating from it.

The seven manuscripts described as »nearly pure« Byzantine mss. in the three letters are 18, 35, 319, 398, 607, 1175, 2423. Several of those differ from the seven isolated in 1 John. We are told (p. B128) that there are only 37 variants (out of 400+) where the undivided Byzantine witnesses differ from the primary line of text printed here as the Ausgangstext. (In the event, the list following gives us only 36!) Thus, apart from those places, the Byzantine mss. witness to the »early« text. In James the figures are 69 distinctive Byzantine readings out of 800 variants; cf. 1 Peter 52/700; 2 Peter 33/400; 1 John 47/700.

Although the main benefit of the ECM edition is the display of variants, there will be those who turn to it to see how its running line (a) compares with the text of the Nestle edition. As usual, the number of changes is disappointingly small.

There are no alternatives from the Nestle text in 2 or 3 John. In Jude only 3 changes occur:
1) Jude 5 (words 12–20). This is a notorious textual crux and the text in UBS Greek New Testament is rated ›D‹. The running text now reads ιμας απαξ παντα οτι Ιησους, although a question mark still surrounds ’Ιησους (see below). The new reading has the effect of removing brackets from the Nestle edition, which is no bad thing.
2) Jude 18 (word 7—not word 8 as announced on p. 37*). ECM here removes a word previously bracketed (οτι).
3) Jude 18 (words 8–18, not 10–18 as announced on p. 37*). Here too a word previously bracketed now disappears (του).

These changes in v.18 are hesitant because in both bold dots occur (see below).

What is perhaps of greater interest than these tentative changes to the text of the running line are those places where the editors place a bold dot against the text in the running line and (in all cases, bar one) indicate an alternative reading which may be of equal value—although in some cases need only be of interest or »special critical consideration«. (The explanation of the significance of the dot on p. 24* in the fascicule on the letters of Peter is preferred to the earlier explanation on p. 11* in the James fascicule). We are told (p. 37*) that there are »many« places where dots are to be found. »Many« here means 15 in
the 53 verses of the three epistles, cf. 41 dotted places throughout 1 and 2 Peter.

The following occur in the present volume (the word in brackets here being the highlighted alternative): 2 John 2 μενοῦσαν (ενοικοῦσαν); 9 καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εχέι (καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα εχεῖ); 3 John 3 γαρ (om.); 9 τι—rated ›B‹ in the UBS edition and Metzger’s companion Commentary (om.); 10 εκ (om.); Jude 5 δὲ (οὐν); 5 Ἰησοῦς ([ὁ] Κυρίος), but no alternative is indicated in the overview of variants. The new word order is not being questioned. This complicated variant merits special attention in the Introduction (p. 37*). The matter concerns not the changed word order but hesitation which divine name should appear in the primary line of text, and whether it should be arthrous or not. The variant adding the article to Ἰησοῦς is not referred to here, only the article with Κυρίος but there is no variant shown with Κυρίος or ὁ Κυρίος in the new, preferred position after παντα οτι; 14 αγιαις μυριαις αυτου (2, 1, 3); 16 επιθυμίας εαυτον (επιθυμίας αυτων); 17 ρηματων των προειρημενων (3, 1); 18 om. οτι = changed text here (+ οτι); 18 επ εσχατου χρονου εσονται = changed text (ἐπ εσχατου του χρονου εσονται); 20 εποικοδομουντες εαυτους τη αγιοτητη υμων πιστει (1–4, ημων, 5); 21 τηρησατε (τηρησομεν cf. v.l. at v. 20, although this edition prints υμεις at v. 20 word 2, without having a bullet point indicating v.l. ημεις); 25 προ παντος του αιωνος (om. του).

There are no matters of great moment here, although the change at 3 John 9 is of interest. At Jude 5 authorial style should decide in favour of δὲ (C. Landon, A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude, p. 68); and the recognition that scribes often avoided Semitic word order should favour the running line at Jude 17. It is of interest to see in the list above how often the alternative represents a reading by Ν or B or both!

68 extra mss., appear in the additional apparatus found in section 5.1, two of them, 209 and 2242 occurring for several variants. These are mss. and readings taken, for the most part, from the Teststellen in the Text und Textwert volume on the Catholic Epistles I (ANTF 9; Berlin, 1987). Not surprisingly, most concern additional variants in Jude. As is often the case, there are problems between the list of mss. and the apparatus following. Among the mss. listed I have been unable to locate any readings attributed to 133 or 592 (although 582, found at Jude 5, is probably intended). Among the mss. in this additional list are 456, 631, 676, 1066, 1367, 1509, 2180, 2242, 2523, all said on
p. B127 not to have been included in the apparatus beyond James!
(I assume therefore that that statement must refer only to the *main*
apparatus, not to this supplementary apparatus.)

The apparatus now benefits from work being undertaken in Münster
on the Harklean and Philoxenian Syriac. 11 Philoxenian witnesses
have been added to the 19 used by Gwynn. Harklean mss. too have
been added to this fascicule. 14 Sahidic Coptic mss. are utilized for 2,
3 John and Jude. The selection differs somewhat from those seen in the
previous fascicule on 1 John. Work on these versions should therefore
eventually yield *addenda* to the introductory matter and apparatus of
the earlier fascicules. The Latin Vulgate is close to the Greek and is to
be found regularly in the apparatus supporting a Greek reading. The
Old Latin occurs in 3 John 11–15 in Codex Bezae. (The abbreviation D
after L[atin] here needs to be added to the lists of abbreviations (Latin
R is also missing from those lists.) There are few Patristic citations to
include in these books.

We observe several changes in ECM from the *TuT* Teststellen in
the 1987 edition (cited above), especially regarding the readings of
first hands, e.g. ms. 326* 2 John 8 (words 10–14 e and f); 2 John
9 ff. where 048 now seems to have been available; previously it was in
the category »Lücke«; the readings of 629 and 1523 differ at 2 John 9
(words 20–22); 1678 and 2186 differ at 2 John 12 (word 26) etc. One
may assume that the Münster Institut’s ongoing investigation into all
readings found in the ECM apparatus is more accurate, but a state-
ment to confirm that hunch would be helpful.—*Corrigenda* to the ear-
lier fascicules in this series are to be found added to the inserted blue
sheet, »Abbreviations and Symbols«. (That sheet is only in English, in
contrast to the rest of the edition where all editorial matter is bilingual
[German and English].)
B I) REACTIONS TO JAMES AND 1, 2 PETER

The *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM hereafter) is a modern-day replacement for Tischendorf’s monumental *Novum Testamentum Graece* of the 19th century. The first volume (IV) of ECM is The Catholic Epistles. Part 1 gives the Text. Part 2 is entitled Supplementary Material. The next volume planned will be vol. II, The Acts of the Apostles. Eventually we should see I Gospels, III Pauline Corpus and V Revelation. The present article looks at this new edition from a reader’s viewpoint.

The first and most obvious impression given, even on first opening the edition, is the spaciousness of the *apparatus*. It is a model of clarity and has set a standard by which all other *apparatus* will now be judged. Not only is it easy to consult, thanks to the numbering of every word and space in each verse which permits an unambiguous cross-reference to the relevant part of the *apparatus*, but the setting out of the sense units beneath the line of text to display the precise context of complicated variants gives the reader an overview of variants differing from the primary text and enables him to see the wood from the trees. Usually in other critical editions the atomized presentation of variants, even when these may be represented sometimes by the same MS(S), makes it difficult to appreciate the overall significance of the changes individual variants introduce.

Another reason for the clear presentation is that this is an uncluttered *apparatus*. The ambiguities inherent in many variants represented in versions are signalled but are not discussed *ad loc.*: instead these (and other ambiguities) are collected together in part 2 sections 5.2 (“Further Information on Greek witnesses” i.e. those marked by a double-headed arrow) and 5.3 (“Further Information on Versional Witnesses [marked ? or >]”). Greek patristic evidence only is recorded: that wise decision removes another layer of potentially misleading or, at best, ambiguous readings from the *apparatus*. Problems caused by lacunose Greek MSS are also dealt with separately (in section 2.3). Nonsense readings are avoided in the *apparatus* although are collected together in another place (2.4: “List of errors in the Greek manuscripts”).

1 I am not convinced of the value of this list.
My first and main interest in the edition is the changes to the text when comparing it with the standard hand editions, Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* \(^{27}\) and the United Bible Societies’ *Greek New Testament* \(^{\text{revised}}\) (hereafter NA and UBS). Unlike the IGNTP edition of Luke, \(^2\) which is a thesaurus of variant readings, the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) is, as its name suggests, an *edited* text.

When the first volume of ECM was published I expressed some disappointment that the critically edited text of James resulted in only two changes from the text of NA/UBS. \(^3\) Since then the fascicule containing 1 and 2 Peter has been published: here we see that more changes to the text have been made, although these are still relatively modest. A judgement on the overall text in ECM may remain the same as that made on NA/UBS, namely that it reproduces a text similar to that circulating in the 4th century, and does not replicate a text of an earlier century.

*James*

In James the following changes are made: \(^4\)

1:22 ἀκροαταὶ μόνον (μόνον ἀκροαταὶ)
2:3 ἢ κάθου ἐκεῖ (ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθου [B]) \(^5\)

An additional change was made subsequent to the publication of the James fascicles and was announced only in a footnote in the Petrine volume (IV, 2 part 1 p. 22* note 4 and p. 24* note 4):

2:4 καὶ οὐ διεκρίθητε (οὐ διεκρίθητε)

(It is encouraging to note that the editors are still reconsidering their earlier judgements. That is healthy, but indicates that the primary text is still in a state of flux while investigations into the textual complexion of the MS witnesses are still being undertaken.)

---


\(^4\) In each case the earlier reading (in NA\(^{27}\)/ UBS\(^{\text{rev}}\)) is given in brackets.

\(^5\) These letters are the rating letters in UBS\(^{\text{rev}}\).
1 Peter
In 1 Peter the following changes are made:

1:6 λυπηθέντας (λυπηθέντες)
1:16 γέγραπται (γέγραπται [οτι])
1:16 ἐγὼ ἄγιος (ἤγο ἄγιος [εἴμι])
2:25 ἀλλ’ (ἀλλά)
4:16 ἐν τῷ μέρε (ἐν τῷ ὠνόματι)
5:9 τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ (ἡ ἐν [τῷ] κόσμῳ)
5:10 ἐν Χριστῷ (ἐν Χριστῷ ['Ἰησοῦ] [C])

2 Peter
There are eight changes to the text of 2 Peter:

2:6 ἀσεβεῖν (ἀσεβέ[σ]ίν[C])
2:11 παρὰ κυρίῳ (παρὰ κυρίου[C])
2:15 παραλιπόντες (παραλείποντες)
3:6 δι’ ὅν (δι’ ὤν)
3:10 οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται (εὑρεθήσεται[D])
3:16 ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (ἐπιστολαῖς)
3:16 στρεβλώσουσιν (στρεβλοῦσιν)
3:18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνος (εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος [ἀμήν] [C])

The nature of those changes is worth exploring. The two changes found in the fascicule of James alter the meaning and thus affect translation. At James 2:3 the (now jettisoned) reading of UBS was rated B in the 4th. edition (having been upgraded from C found in the earlier editions). The decision by the ECM committee to print as its primary text a different reading is yet another nail in the ludicrous rating letter system. The rejected reading is now earmarked as an alternative. However, there are no bold dots and thus no alternative readings are proffered for the readings at James 1:22; 2:4 and therefore the jettisoned readings in NA/UBS are not highlighted. (On the bold dots see below.)

We were not informed if the changes here were occasioned by a reexamination of the alleged reliability of the MSS of James in reproducing “A” (the Ausgangstext or hypothetical initial text, otherwise

---

5 This change is wrongly reported in IV, 2 part 1 p. 21* and p. 23*. 
known in some quarters as the original text of the Biblical author). Only in the “Notes on the Reconstruction of the Text of 1 and 2 Peter” found in “Installment 2” (part 1, p. 24* cf. p. 22*) do we belatedly have information on “special” MSS that swayed editorial decisions in James! We are told there that the primary witnesses are 01 03 04 025 81 307 (a Byzantine MS in James according to IV 1 pt. 2 p. B8!) 1175 1243 1739 1852. Let us now check on how this newly acquired information has affected the new texts in James. At 1:22 the new text is indeed found in 03, but all the other “A” category MSS except 1852 read the old, rejected text found in NA/UBS. At 2:3 the new text has the support of only half of these “A” rated witnesses, namely 03 1175 1243 1739 1852. The newly added changed reading at 2:4 is read by only 025 from among these favoured witnesses. (No dots had alerted us to the fact that that reading was being earmarked as uncertain.)

When we turn to 1 and 2 Peter we see that the significance of the changes is that six involve the removal of a word (or part of a word) bracketed in NA/UBS. These are at 1 Peter 1:16 bis; 5:9, 10; 2 Peter 2:6; 3:18). Of these the inclusion of ἀμήν in UBS⁴ at 2 Peter 3:18 was given a low rating letter, “C” (previously “D” in UBS¹-³⁸): the removal of the word now allows 1 and 2 Peter to be consistent in their endings. NA/UBS made the two Petrine letters differ in this regard, a phenomenon that causes exegetes unwarranted heartache. The new reading at 2 Peter 3:18 is made on the evidence of the reading of 03. On 1 Peter 5:10 B.M. Metzger in his Commentary⁷ in a signed note rightly stated that the shorter text was to be preferred because scribes tended to expand divine names: that view has now been accepted. Several of the new readings in 1 and 2 Peter (1 Peter 1:6, 16sec; 4:16; 5:9, 10; 2 Peter 2:6, 15; 3:16bis, 18) are printed surrounded by bold dots and a suggested alternative reading is given. On this siglum and its significance see below.

The reading at 2 Peter 3:10 is a conjecture. In the Introduction p. 24* it is stated that “Hitherto there has been no known Greek evidence for this reading” as if some newly discovered Greek reading were available. This is not the case,⁸ although a footnote on p. 24* tries to argue that the variants ἀφανισθήσονται and κατακαήσεται in

---


⁸ The translation of the German (p. 22*) may be the cause of the confusion: “bis-lang” should be “as yet,” and “immerhin” should be “however” or “nevertheless.”
effect agree with οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται. Metzger, Commentary (2nd ed.) argues that no reading here seems original, and the UBS text rates εὑρεθήσεται with a rare “D.” Disquiet may greet this change. There is often hesitation about accepting a reading not found in Greek manuscripts—it smacks of modern rewriting of the text especially of a text deemed to be “holy writ.” NA/UBS prints as the supposed original text of Acts 16:12 a conjectural reading. Similarly, the reading πλὴρης σῖτον at Mark 4:28 is often questioned because the MSS in support of the longer text are according to NA only C* and 28 and 2542, a combination seemingly unlikely to inspire many readers’ confidence.9

At 1 Peter 2:25 ECM has moved away from ἀλλὰ, a reading read by 03 virtually alone. Likewise at 1 Peter 1:16 the reading with ὅτι is the reading of 03, virtually alone. In general, many of the changes to the text have been away from the readings supported by this MS.

More significant changes are the ones at 1 Peter 4:16 and at 2 Peter 2:11.10 It is worth noting that the reading now at 1 Peter 4:16 is largely a Byzantine reading, although MSS 025 307 1735 and 2298 were important MSS for the editors, according to a private communication from one of them, Dr. Gerd Mink.11 At 2 Peter 3:6 δι’ ὅν is read by only 025, eight minuscules and one lectionary. One of the minuscules, 1175, is a “special” MS in 2 Peter according to Introduction p. 21* f., pp. 23* f.

9 This is not the place to investigate the role of conjecture in textual criticism, but the Nestle editions have often carried in their apparatus a number of conjectures attributed (usually) to a modern scholar. Even ancient scholars made conjectures and it may well be that the reading Γεργεσηνῶν at Matt 8:28 and parallels now found in continuous text Greek witnesses began with Origen’s conjectural emendation. Even ὑσσῷ found in 476* b ff n v at John 19:29 may have been the result of a conjecture. In fact we may say that many deliberate changes made by scribes to the MSS they were copying are conjectures, in the belief that their exemplar did not represent the author’s intended reading at that point. A critical apparatus to the NT is the place to reproduce the alternative readings of all MSS (and versions and conventionally Patristic citations) that are copies of the original text, however flawed. Modern conjectures have no place in an apparatus, although some may merit inclusion and discussion in a learned commentary.

10 It is interesting to see that B.M. Metzger, Textual Commentary (2nd ed.), ad loc., in a dissentient note signed by Metzger himself argued for the omission of the words or, as the “least unsatisfactory” alternative, to read παρὰ κυρίῳ and place the words in square brackets. The reading selected on the basis of majority voting within the UBS committee resulted in παρὰς κυρίον being printed with the rating “D,” subsequently upgraded to “C” in UBS 4.

11 This information is not yet published and is certainly not divulged in IV 2 part 1 p. 21* and 23* where similar information about “special” MSS is revealed.
In 1 Peter and in 2 Peter the high ranking MSS differ not only from those identified as A or “A-related” in James but also from each other. 02 and 5 are said (on p. 24*) to be specially related to the “A” text in 1 Peter, and $\Psi$72 $\Psi$81 and 623 are of high rank. In 2 Peter the editors alert us to the high rank of 1 665 1448 2423 among others. I am not sure of the extent to which the readings of MSS such as these have occasioned the changes to the text, but we suspect they ought to have exercised an important role.

Whatever one’s judgement on the changes, the most significant consequence that needs to be fully recognised is that the text as printed in NA is not now to be seen as an inviolate text whose readings are to be thought of as being as close to the original text as it was once claiming to be. The changed introductory matter in NA27 opened the way to this liberalization of that text: “The purpose of the 27th edition remains the same as that of the 26th edition. It intends to provide the user with a well-founded working text together with the means of verifying it or alternatively of correcting it” (pp. 45*ff., italics mine). And that of course is what has happened in the creation of ECM, even though its editors (from the Münster Institut, the body also behind the NA/UBS editions) were not deliberately reediting NA of course, but were, we understand, starting with a tabula rasa. We await a fuller explanation of the processes behind the establishing of the text in this edition.

In so far as the new readings will increasingly be adopted by commentators and translators of the books appearing in ECM it may be worth the while of the publishers of NA to signal in their apparatus (by means of an added special siglum, comparable to the dagger indicating a change from the text printed in NA25) where the ECM text has opted for a different reading.

**Bold Dots**

Not only is the text of ECM different from NA—albeit not in as radical a way as some of those who identify themselves with thorough-going principles of textual criticism might have liked—but certain other readings printed as the text are queried by means of having a bold black dot (or “bullet point”) inserted on the running line. There are normally two dots: these surround the questionable words. In 2 Peter 3:18 (the end of the book) one dot occurs after the last word. If an addition is being indicated as an alternative reading then one dot is
placed in the relevant space between words in the running text (e.g. James 4:14/sec). In all instances the dot(s) draw(s) our attention to an alternative reading, or in two cases (1 Peter 4:14; 2 Peter 1:4) more than one alternative reading, in the apparatus: this is then marked with another dot alongside the alternative reading(s) beneath the primary text.

The places concerned are as follows, with the suggested alternative(s) after the solidus:

James

1:20 ὃυκ ἐργάζεται/ ὢ κατεργάζεται
2:3 ἡ κάθου ἐκεῖ (changed text)/(3,1,2) [B]
2:19 εἶς ἔστιν ὁ θεός [B]/(1,4,2)
3:4 ἀνέμους σκληρῶν/(2,1)
3:8 οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων /1,(3,2,4)
3:15 αὐτὴ ἡ σοφία ἀνωθεν κατερχομένη /2,3,1,4,5)
4:12 [C]/om.
4:14 τὸ [B]/ τὰ
4:14 ποία [B]/ ποία γάρ
5:10 ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι κυρίου/ τῷ ὄνοματι κυρίου13
5:18 ὑπετὸν ἐδοκεῖ/ (2,1)

1 Peter

1:8 ἰδόντες[A]!/ εἰδότες
1:9 τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν[C]/om ὑμῶν
1:12 ἐν πνεύματι[C]/ om. ἐν
1:18 ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου[C]/(1,3,2)
1:22 καθαρᾶς καρδίας[C]/ om. καθαρᾶς
2:5 οἰκοδομεῖσθε/ ἐποικοδομεῖσθε
2:5 τῷ θεῷ/ om. τῷ
2:6 ἀκρογονιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμοῦ/(2,1,3)
2:11 ἀπέχεσθαι/ ἀπέχεσθε

12 These readings are not mentioned in UBS1-3A nor are they in Metzger, Textual Commentary, first edition.
13 This alternative is a rare instance of the omission of a word not bracketed in NA/UBS.
14 C is the conventional letter applied to variants where the editorial committee could not decide between a longer and a shorter reading and resolved their dilemma by resorting to the placing of the disputed word(s) in square brackets in the text. Most of the examples of C ratings in the list are of this type.
2:16 ἀλλ’ ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι (1,2,4,3)
2:20 παρά θεῷ / παρὰ τῷ θεῷ
2:25 ἐπεστράφητε[C]/ ἐπεστρέψατε
3:1 αἱ γυναῖκες[C]/ om. αἱ
3:1 καὶ εἰ τινὲς ἀπειθοῦσιν[C]/(2,1,3,4)
3:22 τοῦ θεοῦ / om. τοῦ
4:5 ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι / ἑτοίμως κρίνοντι
4:11 εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων / om. τῶν αἰώνων
4:14 ἀναπαῦεται[A]/ ἀναπέπαυται / ἐπαναπαύεται
4:17 ὁ κοιρῶ[ om. ὁ
4:19 ἀγαθοποιίς / ἀγαθοποιίαις
5:2 κατὰ θεὸν[C]/om.
5:5 ὁ θεός / om. ὁ
5:8 τίνα καταπιεῖν[C]/om. τίνα
5:11 εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας [B]/ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων
5:14 ἐν Χριστῷ [A]/ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

[It is surprising how many readings given an A rating by UBS, thereby expressing that committee’s confidence in the originality of the reading, here show that that confidence was profoundly misplaced. This reenforces our dissatisfaction with the fatuous rating system.]¹⁵

In addition we repeat the five places in 1 Peter where there is a new text, and a bold dot:¹⁶

1:6 λυπηθέντας / λυπηθέντες
1:16 ἐγὼ ἁγιός / ἐγὼ ἁγιός εἰμι
4:16 ἐν τῷ μέρει / ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι
5:9 τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ / τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
5:10 ἐν Χριστῷ / ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

2 Peter
1:2 Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου [A] / Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου
1:4 τῆς καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα (1,4,2,3,5,6)/(3,2,1,4,5,6)
1:4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ / om. τῷ

¹⁶ Places where there are changes for which no bold dot appear at 1 Peter 1:16 pr. And 2:25. The earlier, now rejected, readings of UBS/NA for these verses are not therefore signalled as potential alternatives or even as interesting readings.
In addition we repeat the five places in 2 Peter\textsuperscript{17} where the text was changed, but where an alternative is proffered by means of the bold dots:

2:6 \textit{ἀσεβεῖν/ἀσεβέσιν}
2:15 \textit{καταλιπόντες/καταλείποντες}
3:16 \textit{ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς/ἐπιστολαίς}
3:18 \textit{οτος/όμην}

Again, this reader is pleased to see that important readings are being drawn to our attention in this way, especially as it seems that these are being flagged as genuine alternatives to the text printed. Anyone who has tried to wrestle with text-critical variants is all too aware that, frequently, the balancing of probabilities, be they based on internal or on external criteria—or a mixture of the two—sometimes results in stalemate. The editor has to make a decision and print one reading but this is not always done with confidence. The lack of confidence and the inability to make a watertight case for the printing of reading x rather than reading y or z may manifest itself in marginal notes, bracketed words (where the choice is between a longer or a shorter text) or rating

\textsuperscript{17} The other three places where the text was changed (2 Peter 2:11; 3:6, 10) appear without a dot signifying that no alternative is contemplated. The earlier reading in NA/UBS is rejected entirely. The new text is therefore printed confidently.
letters, signalling the relative degree of confidence with which the text is printed (as in the UBS edition). Here the dots serve that purpose.

However the instruction how to interpret the dot is confusing. In the Introduction to James (p. 11*) we are told that the dots signify places where the alternative reading so marked in the overview of variant readings is “of equal value” with the text in the primary line. In The Letters of Peter p. 24* we are given the disconcerting information that the use of the dot is “not governed by any absolute or precise definition”! The variant marked with a dot may sometimes be of equal value, but may merely indicate that the primary line of text has not been printed with complete confidence18 or that an alternative may merit special attention. Thus we must guess which category of dot we are dealing with.

Part of the confusion may be explained by a translation error. The German on p. 1* says that the suggested alternative readings are “etwa gleichwertig,” by which we must sometimes imply that “ähnlich” rather than “gleichwertig” is meant. “Etwa” has been left untranslated on p. 11*! Thus even in James these suggested alternatives may vary in their likelihood to be deemed as equivalent in value to the primary text—some may, some may not. This clarification means we are all at sea for James as well as for 1 and 2 Peter, and we are at the mercy of the editors’ subjective judgement. Perhaps all we may do is to take comfort that certain variants of text-critical importance are drawn to the readers’ attention in this way. But even when that is taken into account, we now must reckon that the alternative readings marked with a dot need not, in every case, be offered by the editors as genuine replacements for the text printed as the running line. They are merely telling us that the passages call for special consideration and reexamination.

This new explanation is understandable and reasonable, but we do need to be alert to the change from the explanation in the James volume, which was perhaps seen as too simplistic.

When we look in detail at the places where the device of the dots has been utilized the following deductions may be made:

---

18 Surprisingly, the conjectural reading printed as the primary line at 2 Peter 3:10 is not marked with a dot: such is the confidence with which our editors print that text!
1) One result of the newly edited text of which I am wholeheartedly in favour is the abandonment of bracketed words within the text.\(^{19}\) Whether this was explicitly intended as a conscious policy decision by the editors remains to be seen, but that is not important; the importance lies in the fact that users of ECM do not have to scratch their heads in bewilderment as they all too frequently have to do when consulting the text in NA/UBS.

The presence of a word or words (or, occasionally even parts of words!) surrounded by square brackets inevitably raises the question whether the reader should ignore the presence of the brackets (and thus accept the longer text) or overlook the word(s) bracketed and therefore accept the shorter text. In the present volumes brackets in the NA/UBS text have been abandoned thus giving us a longer text. In some places we see that the alternative, i.e. the shorter, text is earmarked with a bold dot in the letter address. In some ways the device of introducing the bold dots replaces brackets.

It is clear that where brackets have now been removed from the text the reading giving the shorter text (an omission that occasioned the use of brackets in UBS/NA) has been compensated for by the identification of that shorter text as a recommended alternative reading still worthy of consideration. This accounts for the dots at James 4:12; 1 Peter 1:9, 12, 22; 2:5; 3:1, 22; 4:17; 5:5, 8; 2 Peter 2:6, 20; 3:3.

Strangely, there are four places where brackets have been removed but they do not merit a dot in ECM:

i) James 5:14: \(\alpha ντόν\)
ii) 1 Peter 1:6 \(\dot{\varepsilon}στιν\)
iii) 1 Peter 5:2 \(\ἐπισκοποῦντες\) (In Metzger, Commentary, 2nd ed., this reading is rated “C” because it is said the decision about which textual variant to print as the text was “difficult”: the dilemma of that committee seems therefore not to have been shared by those preparing ECM.)
iv) 2 Peter 3:11 \(\ψύμαξ\)

The variants giving a shorter text, signalled as important to the editors of NA/UBS have therefore not been deemed worthy of note by the ECM committee.

2) Some variants involving a changed word-order now bear a dot (James 2:3; 3:4, 8, 15; 5:18; 1 Peter 1:18; 2:6, 16; 3:1; 2 Peter 1:4, 21; 3:3).

3) Others concern a choice between a longer and a shorter text (These are passages not bracketed in UBS/NA): James 5:10; 1 Peter 4:11 and 5:11 where consistent usage within the Petrine Letters should be restored. UBS/NA also inconsistently print the longer doxology at 4:11 and not at 5:11. We also note 1 Peter 5:14 where, again, the rejected text was printed in UBS with complete confidence, denoted by its being rated “A”—the decisions and dilemmas of that text as exemplified by the often arbitrary and inevitably ludicrous rating letters have obviously been ignored or disregarded by the ECM committee. To this list we add 1 Peter 4:5; 5:2; 2 Peter 1:2; 2:19.20

4) It will also be seen from the list above that some alternatives concern orthographical, or grammatical variation.

5) The alternatives dotted at 2 Peter 1:12 and 2.18sec. are interesting—the latter, in particular, because, once again, the reading of UBS was a confidently printed “A” reading.21 James 2:19 is theologically significant. At James 4:14pr. the reading τὰ is a scribal assimilation to Proverbs 27:1.

As far as the MSS used are concerned I have been most interested in the way the selection has been made. On the basis of the results of the Teststellen in the Text und Textwert volumes on the Catholic Epistles22 a number of Byzantine and non-Byzantine MSS have been identified in as objective and verifiably statistical way as possible.

The edition has a controlled selection of continuously cited witnesses. As a result of the Münster Institut’s investigation of the 550 or so MSS in their 98 Teststellen selected for the Catholic Epistles, 372 of the 522 or 52323 complete MSS and larger fragmentary MSS

---

20 The omission of καὶ is read by P72, B only.
21 Possibly we may deduce that this reading is dotted here merely “for special consideration” (p. 24*).
22 K. Aland (ed.), Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (ANTF 9, 10a, 10b, 11; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987).
23 K. Wachtel, Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe (ANTF 24; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), p. 55 refers to 522 MSS, and places them in five categories, but the total of these categories is 523. [As noted on p. 479.]
were shown to agree with the majority of MSS in at least 90% of these Teststellen (see also ECM p. 2* and p. 12*). That includes the readings designated 1 as well as 1/2, when these are in agreement in Text und Textwert. All MSS differing from the majority of MSS more than 10% are included “without exception” (according to p. 12* with specific reference only to James, although we must assume that were these introductory pages to be made applicable to other letters in volume IV then the same would be true for 1 and 2 Peter and the other letters as well).

In James 182 MSS are used. The non-Byzantine MSS comprise 5 papyri, 10 majuscules and 70 minuscules. Of the 97 Byzantine witnesses 5 are majuscules, 19 are lectionaries, 73 minuscules.

Among the 142 MSS containing 1 Peter and the 140 containing 2 Peter listed on p. B41 (excluding the LXX Prophetologia used for lections in 1 Peter) are 53 MSS identified as Byzantine witnesses in 1 Peter (6 majuscules, 38 minuscules and 9 lectionaries) and 54, somewhat different MSS, used in 2 Peter (5 majuscules, 40 minuscules, and 9 lectionaries). The non-Byzantine in 1 Peter are three papyri, 9 majuscules and 77 minuscules; in 2 Peter there are 2 papyri, 9 majuscules and 75 minuscules.

As far as minuscules are concerned, James uses 143. In 1 and 2 Peter there are fewer MSS cited than in James—only 115. The use of twenty-seven other minuscules, among thirty-nine MSS used in James and extant for 1 and 2 Peter, has been discontinued. The full list appears on p. B41 and we are told that the reason for their exclusion beyond James will be explained in Supplementary Studies (by which we are to understand that this is not the “Supplementary Material” of part 2 but “Begleitende Untersuchungen” said on p. B42 to be ECM IV,3).24 On the face of it, and in the light of the selection processes described on p. 2* and p. 12*, we ought to assume these thirty-nine MSS failed to reach the required percentage agreements as Byzantine or as non-Byzantine representatives. Another anomaly is that of the twenty-seven minuscules, MS 38 is to be found in 1 and 2 in the “Additional Apparatus” set out on pp. B68f. The statement on p. B41 must therefore be

---

24 I had been confused by the numbering of these parts when I wrote my reviews. Part of the confusion occurred because p. 11* says “An additional volume offers supplementary studies....” On the basis of the present tense I took that to refer to the supplementary material already published as part 2 rather than a forthcoming volume “Supplementary Studies” part 3. I should have checked the German original, which on p. 1* makes it clear that it is a future, planned, volume that is referred to. It is always worth double-checking the English translation in such instances.
understood to mean that certain MSS have not been cited *consistently* beyond James, rather than that they are never to be found in ECM IV beyond James. We await IV, part 3 for the explanation.

There are nineteen lectionaries in James, ten lectionaries are used in 1 Peter and nine for 2 Peter. (Eleven of those used in James have been jettisoned beyond James and are so listed on p. B41.) Lectionary 1575 is used in 1 Peter: this is a lectionary independent of the Byzantine system and is an 8th. century Greek-Coptic bilingual MS.

The extent and age of all these MSS is found only in *Installment 1* pp. B5–7.

The Byzantine MSS are listed separately on p. B8 (James) and on p. B42 (1 and 2 Peter) under “Codices Byzantini.” The explanation why these have been selected seems, on the evidence of the Einleitung/Introduction (p. 2* and p. 12*) to be that the *codices Byzantini* are all the MSS that agree with the undivided Byzantine text in at least 80% of the passages.25 The passages themselves are set out on pp. B9f. for James and on p. B43 in the fascicules for Peter. In James there are only 69 passages where the undivided Byzantine text occurs, out of a total of 800+ instances of textual variation. In 1 Peter the undivided Byzantine text differs from the primary line (i.e. the critically established text) 52 times from a total of 700+ variants. In 2 Peter there are 33 instances of Byzantine readings from a total of 400+ variants.

The use (but NOT the meaning) of the siglum “Byz” in 1 and 2 Peter to mean the “Codices Byzantini” listed on p. B42 differs from the James fascicule. There “Byz” was abandoned if three or four of the solid core of seven “nearly pure” Byzantine witnesses, listed on pp. B8–9, do not agree with the others. Now we learn that the siglum is relinquished if more than one differ from the others. This decision was reached after the committee analyzed the Byzantine support throughout each epistle and differing results are only to be expected. The actual “pure” MSS are not identical for James, 1 Peter or 2 Peter, but, as it happens, there are seven for each epistle. As usual, it is possible to detect how many MSS are included under the siglum “Byz” on those occasions when it is utilised in an *apparatus*. For example at 1 Peter 2:8 (numbers 14–16) we can eliminate all the Byzantine MSS listed on p. B42 actually cited

---

25 I am grateful to Dr Gerd Mink of the Münster Institut for drawing my attention in a private communication to these explanations, which I failed to appreciate when I wrote my reviews.
individually in the different readings or deficient at this point. That leaves 45 MSS not accounted for and these therefore must be the MSS subsumed under “Byz.”

Although the Introduction speaks of the edition’s being concerned with establishing the text and reconstructing the history of the New Testament text during its first thousand years, some of the MSS used in ECM are themselves from outside that first Christian millennium. Non-Byzantine (MSS come from all centuries including the 15th and 16th. The lectionaries are from the 10th (l156) to the 15th (l593, l1281) and 16th (l2087). The Byzantine MSS are from the 9th–17th centuries.

* * *

We noted four places involving the deletion of brackets where no dotted alternatives were signalled. There are other places where we might have expected dots. I refer to those readings printed in UBS4 where, despite its general tendency to move previously low rating letters up, some ratings below “A” still mark the following:

**James**

1:17 παραγγαλή ἡ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμο[B]
3:3 εἰ δὲ[C]
4:5 κατῴκισεν[B]
4:14 ἀτμῖς γὰρ ἐστε Ἡ[C]
5:20 γινωσκέτω ὅτι[B]
5:20 αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου[C]

**1 Peter**

2:3 εἰ[B]
3:7 συγκληρόνομος [B]
3:18 περὶ ὁμορριοτόν ἔπαθεν[B], over which reading Metzger, Commentary (2nd ed.) claims that the UBS committee had great difficulty ascertaining the original text.
3:18 ὑμᾶς [C]

---

26 At James 5:4 the reading ἀποστερημένος by 018 020 33 is accepted as a proper reading by Metzger, Textual Commentary (2nd ed.) ad loc., but labelled here “f,” that is an error. Metzger’s own dissentient note—a rare change to a note in Textual Commentary 2nd ed. surviving from the previous edition—advocates printing ἀφυστερημένος; that v.l. is not accorded any special attention in ECM.
5:10 καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει [B]
5:11 τὸ κράτος [B]

2 Peter
1:1 Συμέων [B]
1:3 ἰδία δόξη κοι ἀρετῆ [B]
1:17 ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὕτως ἐστιν [B] (a reading found in only P72 B 1751)
2:4 σειραῖς [C] where Metzger, Commentary (2nd ed.) ad loc. claims that “the textual evidence is singularly evenly balanced.”
2:13 ἀδικομένου [B]

* * *

The reliability and usefulness of ECM have certainly not been exhausted in the above brief sketch. My notes and observations represent but one reader’s interests in this splendid new series. Others may rightly find much of value and interest in the references in the apparatus to Greek Patristic citations, for, unlike other hand editions which unhelpfully merely give a father’s name, ECM allows the source of the reference and its location in a printed edition of the patristic work to be verified. A fuller discussion into the Patristic material is promised for the Supplementary Studies (= IV part 3). Others may profit from the ver- sional evidence presented here, possibly to verify an often ambiguous reference in another apparatus, knowing that any such ambiguities are spelled out in part 2 section 5.3. Still others may use the edition to reconstruct the contents of each of the Greek MSS used for the edition. In so far as these are cited consistently and their lacunae listed (under Supplementary Material 2.3) such a task is theoretically practicable although this was not the editors’ intended use for such an edition.

II) CHANGES TO THE EXEGESIS OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEXT IN THE EDITIO CRITICA MAIOR

Most exegetes and commentators on the Greek New Testament typically use the United Bible Societies’ Greek text found in either its own The Greek New Testament (= UBS4rev) or in the Nestle edition, Novum Testamentum Graece 27. That text is not immutable. Recently the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, which edits the Nestle edi-
tions and which collaborates in the UBS editions, has begun issuing its *Editio Critica Maior (= ECM*)⁷. To date most of the Catholic Epistles have been published in separate fascicules. The clarity of the presentation of the Greek text, and its critical *apparatus* in the text fascicules and the helpful information in the companion section entitled *Supplementary Material* have been receiving favourable notices, not least in my own reviews.²⁸ Its commendable features should make this edition the text which future exegetes and commentators will turn to for their base text. But it needs to be noted that this text differs from the UBS text.

Although a counsel of perfection proffered by a textual critic would be that every scholar of the Greek testament should use not only the edited text but the subjoined *apparatus* at all times, in practice time or other constraints mean that for (too) many scholars only the edited text is consulted. It is with those users in mind that this section will repeat the changes in the text of ECM compared with UBS⁴rev/NA²⁷, as well as those highlighted recommended alternative readings printed in the *ECM apparatus*, for those books published so far, namely James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and 1 John, and we shall try to show where and how these readings may be of significance, especially for exegesis, translation or for scholarly commentaries. Thus we shall append brief notes that may be taken into account by readers assessing the changes and recommendations; we shall not, however, be providing an exhaustive textual commentary.

A. Here are the places where the text of ECM has changed:⁹⁹

(James)
1:22 ἀκροαται μονον / μονον ἀκροαται.³⁰ Obviously this is important for translators. The text with μονον qualifying ἀκροαται (“Be doers not only hearers of the word”) may be secondary in order to call to mind James 2:24.

---
²⁷ Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft). We discuss here volume IV 1, 2, 3 published in 1997, 2000 and 2003 respectively.
²⁸ Above, A 1, 2, 3.
²⁹ The first entry gives the new text in ECM; the second gives the UBS text.
³⁰ As is conventional in works on textual criticism, accents and breathings are not printed.
2:3 η καθου εκει / εκει η καθου B.31 These variants occur in a difficult sentence. The protasis is in v. 2, but it is not clear where (if anywhere) the apodosis begins, v. 4 (“yet among yourselves you make no distinction”; but see v.l. [= varia lectio] + και beneath); or v. 5 (“If a man . . . then listen . . .,” thus making v. 4 parenthetical); or unexpressed (in which case v. 4 is the last part of the protasis). The punctuation is also disputed. With these interpretative difficulties it is not surprising that scribes tried to make improvements. But in which ways? Our discussions ought to also take into account the v.l. +/- ωδε and that variant should qualify for a bold “bullet” point in ECM.32 Is the speaker making a contrast between standing there, i.e., at a distance, and sitting albeit in a humble position, and if so is that balance authorial or scribal? And whichever is deemed to be the answer to that question, our next question asks why the changes were made.

There is also a change to the text announced subsequent to the publication of the James edition:33 2:4 και ου/ ου. This v.l. is related to that in 2:3 above. The omission of και may have been made by scribes to indicate the apodosis concludes the conditional sentence which began in v. 2. Dibelius’ commentary34 includes references to patristic discussions about the superfluous και in the apodosis.

(1 Peter)

1:6* 35 λυπηθεντας / λυπηθεντες. The reading -ας seems to require a translation “Since it is necessary if you be afflicted…” rather than “You, being afflicted, as is necessary,” which is clumsy. But may it be that the clumsiness is the author’s and that later scribes ameliorated the sentence?

1:16* [ ] 36 γεγραπται / γεγραπται οτι. Διοτι γεγραπται οτι is cumbersome and as well as the dispute over the inclusion or exclusion of οτι it will be seen in the apparatus that some mss. omit διοτι

---

31 The letters A B C D following a reading are the rating letters found in the apparatus of UBS 4rev.
32 On the “bullet” points in ECM, see section B below.
33 Found in the volume on the Petrine epistles pp. 22*, 24*.
35 * indicates that the alternative is also highlighted by means of a bold dot. For the significance of this, see section B below. Thus the references here and elsewhere in section A without an asterisk mean that the editors print the new text with confidence and do not privilege any alternative.
36 [ ] throughout means that the longer text contains bracketed words or parts of words in UBS/NA.
γεγραπται too. A resolution of the variants here needs to take the author’s and New Testament practice of γραφω +/- οτι into account.

1:16  [ ] εγω αγιος / εγω αγιος ειμι. Ειμι is clearly emphatic and also makes a neat parallelism to αγιοι εσεσθε. Has the emphasis been supplied by scribes possibly in the light of Lev. 11:44; 20:7 (v.l.) 26 (v.l.) in the LXX or by the author? The shorter text conforms to the wording in the LXX of Lev. 19:2, in which case has an original ειμι been omitted to make the citation conform precisely to that quotation?

2:25  αλλα / αλλα. This v.l. is included because ECM has moved away from the reading αλλα found in B only.

4:16*  εν τω μερει / εν τω ονοματι. The reading of the majority text (μερει) may well be original here. If μερει is original then the change may have been encouraged by ονοματι in v. 14.

5:9*  [ ] τη εν κοσμῳ / τη εν τω κοσμω. If the article was original then its omission may be explained as a way of encouraging υμον to be understood with αδελφοτητι, but such an explanation is not strong.

5:10*  [ ] εν Χριστω / εν Χριστω Ιησου C. The statement that scribes tended to expand divine titles is a useful rule of thumb. It is substantiated here by the facts that Χριστος occurs 22 times in this epistle, 9 of them preceded by Ιησους but never with Ιησους following. See v.l. at 5:14 under section B below.

(2 Peter)

2:6*  [ ] ασεβιν / ασεβεσιν C. The context has the author either warn the ungodly (i.e., the noun ασεβης) about what is in store for them or address those about to do wrong, i.e., the verb ασεβεω, which occurs elsewhere only at Jude 15—an epistle with many, significant parallels to 2 Peter. The noun is found a few times in the NT including significantly—and probably decisively—for our resolution of this unit of variation—in 2 Pet. 2:5. Commentators need to assess the extent to which v. 5 has influenced either the original author or a subsequent scribe.

2:11  παρα Κυριω / παρα Κυριου C. Παρα Κυριου is the more difficult reading as it seems to attribute βλασφημον κρισιν to God (“...a slanderous judgement from the Lord”) which is perhaps the original reading that scribes altered relatively easily either by omitting the phrase (a v.l. that may be seen in the appara-
tus) or by altering the case to Κυριω, a change of one letter only if, as is most likely, the contracted form of the nomen sacrum was employed (i.e., “...a slanderous judgement before the Lord”). New Testament usage is balanced here (παρα + genitive is found some 78 times; παρα + dative some 50 times (παρα + accusative occurs 60 times). Critics are encouraged to weigh up the choices and those facts.

2:15* καταλειποντες / καταλειποντες. Again, readers are invited by the editors of ECM to discuss the choice. Here the present tenses in v. 14 may be significant if one considers the reading καταλειποντες is original. Itacism may be a relevant argument to introduce into the resolution of this variant.

3:6 δι’ ον / δι’ ον. The latter seems to be the lectio difficilior in that it is not clear what precisely the pronoun refers to, whereas δι’ ον refers to the word of God and could have been introduced by scribes.

3:10 ουχ ευρεθησεται / ευρεθησεται D. This is a contentious reading in ECM, in that it is a conjectural reading,37 there being no ms. support for it, although the editors’ claim (pp. 22*, 24*) that this reading is to be understood as αφανισθησονται or κατακαησεται is difficult in the context. In favour of ευρεθησεται also is that this is a Semitism. Turner, Style, notes that the verb is a favoured Hebraism in the NT.38 “Will be found” is strange even if one punctuates the sentence as a question. Hence the many emendations.

3:16* ταις επιστολαις / επιστολαις. This v.l. is important not only for translation but for exegesis too. Hom39 may have been responsible for the accidental shortening of the text πασΑΙΣτΑΙΣεπιστολΑΙΣ. NRSV, apparently accepting the article, has “in all his letters” even though + αυτου is read only in 2544 according to ECM. An investigation into the variant here requires a study of our author’s (and NT) usage of πας with or without anarthrous nouns.

37 See ECM, 24*: “Hitherto there has been no known Greek evidence,” a sentence which implies some such evidence has now been discovered. “Hitherto” is clearly a mistranslation of “bislang” on p. 22*; “not yet” would be better.


39 To borrow A.C. Clark’s term, used of ms. written in scriptio continua when the precise terms homoiooteleuton or homoioarkton are less appropriate.
3:16* στρευλωσουσιν / στρεβλουσιν. Is our author aware of the reality of Paul’s letters being misinterpreted, or merely anticipating such a possibility? Whatever one’s answer the question to follow is: Why did a scribe think otherwise in making the change?

3:18* [ ] εἰς ἡμεραν αἰώνος / εἰς ἡμεραν αἰώνος αμήν C. In 1 Pet. 5:14 ECM does not print αμήν as its text nor does it include the v.l. as a privileged (dotted) reading. If original here in 2 Peter, it is difficult to argue why scribes would have omitted the word.

(1 John)

1:7* omit δε / add δε. NT usage in general and the usage in 1 John in particular regarding αι or εαν with a particle following need to be investigated. See in the immediate context 1 John 1:6, 8, 9 and v.l.

5:10 εν αὐτῳ / εν εαυτῳ B. The pronoun has to refer to τον υιον. As in the variant discussed next, αυτω may have been read as αὐτω and, as a consequence, taken as a reflexive. Cf. 1 John 3:15 (εαυτων; εαυτω) where the variants are not given bold dots in ECM. The reflexive form is found at 1 John 1:8; 3:3 v.l.; 5:21 v.l. There are similar v.ll. elsewhere e.g., James 1:18, 26 bis; Jude 20.

5:18 εαυτου / αυτου B. ο γεννηθεις was understood by copyists as “the believer” not as “Christ” (even though our author prefers ο γεγεννημενος not ο γεννηθεις for ‘the believer’). Αυτον if it is to be read as αυτον not as αὐτων would not give a natural sense there. Perhaps that encouraged the change to a reflexive form. Bultmann40 sees a problem with εαυτον, arguing that that would seem to require a predicative such as ασπιλων or αγνον. If ο γεννηθεις is Christ then αυτον(i.e., with a smooth breathing) is what is needed. But is that how scribes thought?

B. In addition, there are places where the text contains a bold dot (“bullet point”) which signals a variant that merits attention as potentially original.41 In most cases I append a few random observations


41 The explanatory notes vary according to the fascicule. The volumes on James and on 1 John say that the dotted readings are possible and viable alternatives to the text printed on the leading line. In the volume on 1 and 2 Peter it is said that the dot
that may help in opening discussion on the variants. These dots may be seen at the following places:42

(James)

1:20 οὐκ εργαζεται / οὐ κατεργαζεται. The meaning of the simple verb seems to have been problematic, hence the alternative reading.43

2:19 εἰς εστίν ο Θεος /1, 4, 2. Here the issue revolves around whether the form that is closest to the shema is original but was later altered to reflect primitive Christian gentile faith. There are several v.11. here but ECM privileges the variant read by B pc. There the reading seems to imply that only a simple monotheism is being professed, as in 1 Cor. 8:4, 6; Eph. 4:6. Logic here seems to require a belief that there is one God rather than a detached affirmation in the unity of the Godhead. But if that reading is to be accepted then the anarthrous use of Θεος in the NT needs to be considered too.

3:4 ανεµων σκληρον / 2, 1.

3:8 ουδεις δαµασαι δυναται ανθρωπον / 1, 3, 2, 4. δυναµαι precedes the infinitive at Jas. 1:21; 2:14; 3:12; 4:2, 12.

3:15 αυτη η σοφια αναθεν κατερχοµενη /2, 3, 1, 4, 5.

4:12 [ ] ο C/ om. o. A discussion over this v.l. requires a consideration whether the anarthrous νουθετης as predicative is more expressive than the arthrous form, and, if so, whether that refinement belongs to the author or a subsequent scribe.

4:14 το B / τα. The singular looks to the transitory nature of life in general; the plural would emphasise the range of unknown possibilities to affect the merchants’ lives. Exegesis of the passage should resolve the textual variant.

4:14 ποια B / ποια γαρ. The particle splits the verse and the second half would be, as in the KJV, a question “For what is your life?”

---

42 The first entry has the text, the second the reading of the suggested alternative. Places where the text in ECM has changed from that in UBS/NA and where an alternative is marked with a bullet point have already been noted above in section A.

43 See Dibelius, James (note 8).
NT usage of ποιος with a verb of knowing (as at Matt. 24:42, 43; Luke 9:55; 12:39; Rev. 3:3) would need to be considered; without γαρ ποιος is far removed from ἐπιοτάσθη.

5:10 en τῷ ονοματὶ Κυρίου / τῷ ονοματὶ Κυρίου.

5:18 ὑπότον ἐδωκέν /2, 1.

(1 Peter)

1:8 ἴδοντες Α / εἰδοτες. Has εἰδοτες been introduced to avoid an apparent pleonasm (ὡς ἴδοντες ...μὴ οροντες)? Does εἰδοτες make sense before αγαπάτε?

1:9 [ ] υμων C /om. Again, the reading has been highlighted in ECM only because B has the shortened form, but readers are obliged to ask if the more general statement resulting from that is due to scribes broadening the original meaning. Alternatively one may argue that the pronoun is understood in the context and that its later inclusion was due to scribes making that link more explicit.

1:12 [ ] en C /om. The ambivalence of arguments over this variant is clear from Metzger’s Commentary (see n. 20) where the split in the UBS editorial board is exposed with a signed dissentient opinion.

1:18 σαναστροφὴς πατροπαραδοτου /2, 1.

1:22 [ ] καθαρὰς C /om. The adjective may have been seen as redundant in view of the clause preceding, or its omission may have been accidental due to hom: ΚΑθαρὰςΚΑρδιας. The longer text though may have been influenced by Christian terminology, cf. 1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:22.

2:5 οικοδομεῖσθε / εποικοδομεῖσθε Cf. 1 Cor. 3:10–17; Eph. 2:20; Col. 2:7 and especially Jude 20 for examples of the compound form.

2:5 [ ] τῷ /om. The inclusion of the article would make the verse consistent with 1 Pet. 2:12, 17; 3:4, 18; 4:11, 16, and elsewhere at Rom. 12:1; Phil. 4:18; Heb. 13:15.

2:6 ακρογωνιαῖον εκλεκτὸν εντιμον /2, 1, 3. Here we need to consider the part played by scribes in conforming texts. If we do so, then parallels with the LXX of Isa. 28:16 need to be seen alongside the word order two verses earlier in the present context.

2:11 ἀπεχεισθαί / ἀπεχεσθε. Note the presence of an imperative after παρακαλῶ in 1 Pet. 5:1–2 compared with the infinitive of
this verb found outside 1 Peter (Acts 15:20, 29; 1 Thess. 4:3 cf. 1 Thess. 5:22; 1 Tim. 4:3).

2:16 Θεου δουλοι /2, 1. A consideration of this v.l. ought to look at our author’s use of post-positional genitives.

2:20 omit τω / add τω. Cf 2:5 above. ECM is not consistent in its practice here.

2:25 επεστραφητε / επεστρεψατε. See Turner, Syntax.44

3:1 [ ] αι C /om. Does the omission of the article make the noun more clearly a vocative? If so, would such a move be scribal? Ανδρασιν and γυναικων are arthrous here and so in v. 7 is ονδρες. Thus the article is expected—but is that how scribes thought, before adding the article?

3:22 [ ] του /om. “At THE right hand of God” is the standard formula at Acts 2:33; Rom. 8:34; Col. 3:1; Heb. 10:12. This suggests the article should be read as original here.

4:14 αναπαυεται A/ αναπεπαυεται / επαναπαυεται. The verb ανα-παυεται is probably original, although the v.l. by P72 N (επαναπεπαυεται), itself deserving a bullet point, is also worth considering—especially as there is a reason for scribes to remove the apparently redundant compounded prefix in view of εφ’ preceding.

4:17 [ ] o /om. Examples of anarthrous nouns followed by a genitive are to be found at 1 Pet. 1:5, 11; 5:6 and these ought to be brought into any discussion of this variant.

4:19 κατα Θεον /om. The inclusion of the words causes interpretative difficulties and to that extent may have been removed by

---

scribes. Also their removal makes the two contrasting adverbs more effective.

5:5 [ ] ο /om. The author of 1 Peter has a mixed pattern of placing an article with divine names. Perhaps the issue here may be resolved by an appeal to scribal harmonising to the LXX. Jas. 4:6 also quotes Prov. 3:34 LXX with Κυριος (as in the LXX) and v.l. o θεος.

5:8 [ ] τινα C /om. The absolute use of καταπιειν is difficult. If original, one can see why an object was sought, however weak, be it τίνα or τίνα. The v.l. τινα καταπιη deserves a bold dot to indicate that it too is a worthy contender to be original.

5:11 om. των αιωνων B45/add των αιωνιων. See above 4:11.

5:14 εν Χριστω Α / εν Χριστω Ιησου. Cf. 5:10 above, in section A.

(2 Peter)

1:2 ΙΥ / ΙΥ XY. As often with such formulae there are several variants. Again, we may be tempted to argue that the shorter form is original and that expansions were encouraged by liturgical influences, but here it is to be noted that Ιησους is followed by Χριστος 9 times in 2 Peter including one such reference in the preceding verse.

1:4 τιμια και μεγιστα ημιν /1, 4, 2, 3 /3, 2, 1, 4. Metzger’s Commentary46 discusses the main v.l., but, as the apparatus is not given in the text volume, no rating letter is applied.

1:4 τω /om.

1:9 αμαρτιων / αμαρτηματω. The latter, if original, may have been altered to conform to Heb. 1:3.

1:12 μελλησω / ουκ αμελησω.

1:21 προφητεια ποτε /2, l.47

2:6 [ ] καταστρωφη Α /om. There seems to be no reason why the word would have been added. Its omission may have been accidental, facilitated by hom: ΚΑΤαστρωφη ΚΑΤεκρινον, or


deliberate to avoid an unclassical construction. Cf. Mark 10:33
v.l. omits a dative after κατακρινω.

2:13 απαταις B / αγαπαις. If love feasts became the object of sus-
picion then a change would have been sought. The influence
of Jude 12 needs to be considered, especially in view of our
author’s links with that epistle.

2:18 ασέλγειαις / ασέλγειας. The genitive (“…lusts of fleshly wan-
tonness…”) recalls 2:10.

2:18 ὀλιγώς A / ὀντώς. ὀντώς seems more difficult after δὲλεαξονσιν
and, as such, may be considered as original. ὀλιγώς does not
occur in the NT or LXX (except Isa. 10:7 in Aquila).

2:19 om καὶ / καὶ.

2:20 [ ] ἡμὼν C / om. As earlier, a full investigation into the form of
liturgical formulae needs to be undertaken to see the extent to
which the possessives are fixed and firm in the ms. tradition.

2:22 κυλίσμα / κυλίσμα. This noun in either gender is rare in Greek
literature.

3:3 [ ] ev / om. Hom may have facilitated the accidental omission of
the preposition.

3:3 επιθυμίαις αυτῶν /2, 1. It would have been better if ECM had
dotted the v.l. read by P72 044 without a possessive! For that
reading, if original, could have been the reason for the two read-
ings adding a possessive in differing positions. On the other
hand 2 Pet. 3:16 shows that in some mss. at least a possessive
appears alongside ἰδιος as here.

3:18 αὐξανετε / αὐξανεσθε. The intransitive meaning is not found in
the LXX or in Classical literature. Could that be a reason why
scribes altered the text to αὐξανεσθε?

(1 John)

1:4 ἡμὼν A / νμὼν. There is much scribal interchange over these
pronouns because of their similar pronunciation,48 thus the
decision as to which is appropriate in any given context where
textual variation occurs must be based on internal criteria. Here
the common formula with νμὼν may be considered the more

---

difficult reading in the context and thus be the original text. An ecclesial “we” is expected and has therefore been provided by a scribe.

1:8 οὐκ εστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν /3, 4, 1, 2. For other v.l. regarding order, see at 1 John 1:5; 2:10, 19; 4:12 under section D below.

2:4 οτι /om. Usually in 1 John verbs of speech are followed by οτι e.g., at 1 John 1:6, 8, 10; 2:4; 4:20 but this is not so at 2:6, 9. A full investigation into the author’s style that would include the Fourth Gospel may help resolve the variant here.

2:4 καὶ /om. The removal of καὶ to create an asyndetic sentence may have been stylistic. See the following two variants.

2:29 οτι καὶ / οτι. If καὶ here is emphatic then it may be secondary. On the other hand asyndeton may be seen as more dramatic and therefore secondary on that account.

3:13 [ ] καὶ C /om. We need to ask if the addition was to provide a clearer contrast with the preceding ideas (and therefore a scribal improvement) or if the particle was removed to improve the style because an imperative in an anarthrous phrase is more effective.

3:19 πεισομεν / πεισωμεν. The future in v. 19a may have influenced scribes but the ο/ω interchange is common throughout the manuscript tradition.

3:23 πιστευσομεν / πιστευομεν. ινα + aor. subj. is very common in the NT but the present subj. is also found, so New Testament usage may not help in resolving this v.l. We note that αγαπωμεν follows but, as is usual in such situations, we cannot be sure if that indicates our author’s consistency or a later scribe’s conforming the text.

5:5 [ ] δε εστιν / εστιν. ης appears without a particle following at 1 John 2:22 and may indicate our author’s style and practice.

5:6 εν (3) /om. Elsewhere in the manuscript tradition there are many examples where it seems that scribes were tempted to remove apparently redundant prepositions. That may be so here.

5:11 ημιν o Θεος /3,2, 1.

5:21 εαυτα / εαυτους. εαυτα looks like a grammatical improvement.

Some of the changes above involving a longer/shorter reading are places where brackets are found in the UBS text around the longer text. What the ECM editors have sometimes done is to show their
C. In addition to the variation units listed under sections A and B where UBS may provide an *apparatus*, a perceptive reader of the UBS text would of course be alert to all other places where that edition provides an *apparatus* and as a consequence where B.M. Metzger gives a concise textual comment in his companion volume and the reasons that swayed the editorial committee to print what they did as the text. Those decisions are accompanied by a rating letter to indicate the relative degree of confidence with which that committee reached its decision. The letters run from A, the most certain, to D, the least certain. Many of these rating letters changed between the 3rd edition of the text and the 4th revised edition and these appear in the 2nd edition of the *Commentary*. The changes are in an “upward” direction, i.e., the later edition looks as if it is more confidently established than its predecessor, even though in the main the textual witnesses in the *apparatus* remain the same. This means that readers of ECM should also look at those readings in UBS that are rated C and D and because of the inflation in the ratings at those rated B as well. (I would also argue that even A rated readings are worthy of second opinions too, and for the sake of completeness I include A rated readings in the following lists too.) Many of the alternative readings, especially in the discussions where the printed text is not printed with confidence,
could and should have qualified for inclusion among the alternative readings signalled by a bullet point in the *ECM* edition. Readers may choose to mark up their own copy of the *ECM* text by placing a bold dot against a possible alternative reading given in the UBS apparatus and discussed in the *Commentary*.

Variants worthy of comment found in the apparatus of UBS⁴rev not already considered in sections A and B above are:


D. In a review⁴⁹ I complained that the small number of proposed changes of text was a disappointment, a “damp squib” I opined! So, where else would I have made changes? Obviously from what has been said above in section B, there are places where I would readily have printed the suggested alternative, dotted reading as the text. But in addition to the references in section B the following is the result of a trawl through the *apparatus* of four Catholic Letters to show other variants that ought to have been considered as potentially original, meriting a dot. (Obviously the editors of *ECM* would not necessarily countenance their worth if they are not supported by the mss. which they deem especially significant.)⁵⁰ In all but a few cases I append some random points in favour of highlighting the alternative reading, realizing of course that a more fully fleshed-out textual

---

⁴⁹ A I, above.

⁵⁰ Some insights into these decisions are revealed in the section “The Reconstruction of the Text” in the fascicules containing 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John but we are told we must await a forthcoming exposé to enlighten us more thoroughly.
commentary would be required to defend the inclusion of these readings as genuine alternatives.

(James)

1:25 Add οὐτὸς before οὐκ. Here hom could have caused the accidental omission of οὐτὸς after οὐκ. As at v. 23, the inclusion of οὐτὸς to enhance the apodosis is characteristic of our author.

1:26 Add εν υμιν after εἰναι. Cf. 1 Cor. 3:18.

2:2 Add την after εις. Cf. 2:20 for an example of a dependent genitive following an anathrous noun.

2:3 Add αὐτῷ after εἰπῇ. A resolution of this variant requires an investigation into our author’s, and NT, usage of pronouns after verbs of speech. To encourage such an investigation the v.l. should have been dotted.

2:3 Add ωδὲ. See above in section A. Note that v. 3b has ωδὲ.

[337] 2:6 γὰς for γων. In the LXX καταδυναστευω is followed by the accusative of the person (see Mic. 2:2; Amos 8:4; Wis. 2:10), but elsewhere the genitive is found too.

2:13 Add καὶ before κατακαυχαται. Hom could have caused the accidental omission of καὶ. Asyndeton seems not to have been a characteristic of this letter (cf. 3:17; 4:2, but against that see v. 6 and 1:19); by highlighting this v.l. such an investigation may be encouraged.

2:18 The addition of σου after εργῶν and of μου after πιστίν and the position of σοι merit attention. The ambiguous and confusing text here is compounded by problems how best to punctuate the verse. The contrast intended may be between “Show me your faith (apart from your works)” and “I shall show you my faith.”

3:12 Add οὐτὸς before οὐτε. Although this v.l. may have been the result of a scribal addition to enhance the comparison being made (“…and in the same way, neither does a salt spring…”), the accidental omission of οὐτὸς through hom is also worth flagging up (ΟΥΤωςΟΥΤε) especially as Jas. 1:11; 2:17, 26; 3:5 use οὐτὸς with comparisons. UBSrates the shorter text B.

4:4 Add μοιχοὶ καὶ before μοιχαλιδες. Again hom may be considered as the reason for the creation of the shorter text. There is no reason why only females were addressed here. A more inclu-
sive μοιχαί καὶ μοιχαλίδες seems likely. Most commentators argue that the reference to “adulteresses” parallels references to the OT where unfaithful Israel is equated to a faithless wife (Isa. 54:1–6; 57:3–9; Jer. 2:2; 3:6–14, 20), especially as the church is sometimes seen as the bride of Christ. Hort is an exception in doubting if such a figurative meaning would have been abruptly inserted here. In this context it is not the church as such but the individual members who are “(adulterers and) adulteresses.” UBS rates the shorter text A.

4:13 Add ενα after ενιαυτόν. Is the emphasis on one precise year authorial or scribal? I do not know, but both readings are worth emphasising as possible candidates to be the original text.

5:5 Add ως before εν. Once more the shorter text may have been the result of hom (ΩΝΩΣ). The day of slaughter seems to have been thought of as a definite, eschatological point in time by James (as in Jer. 12:3) and therefore would have been read as literal, i.e., without ως. The longer text may then be seen as having weakened that idea by making it merely comparative.

(1 Peter)

1:16 Read γενεσθε for εσεσθε. γενεσθε appears in v. 15 and either influenced a scribe to write this verb in v. 16, or to remove a second occurrence of the same verb on stylistic grounds. εσεσθε is used as an imperative in the LXX (see Lev. 11:44; 19:2; 20:7, 26). The readings γινεσθε or γενεσθε may have been written later to make imperative in form what was imperative in sense.

1:21 Read πιστευοντες for πιστους. The latter is less usual, and in fact this example is the only NT occurrence with εις. The former, if secondary, would be an accommodation to a commonplace of Christian language.

3:9 Add ειδοτες before οτι. Hom may have caused the shortened text. The verb used in a context of recalling traditional Christian

---

51 Our modern translations with their “politically correct” inclusive language requirement when working from a Greek text that has only μοιχαλίδες tend to take the feminine as inclusive of male and female adulterers!

teaching may be seen at 1 Cor. 15:58 and see also 1 Pet. 1:18 (cf. Eph. 6:8–9; Col. 3:24; Jas. 3:1).

3:18 Read επαθεν for απεθανεν. This reading certainly merits a dot! Πασχω occurs 12 times in 1 Peter (and is rare in Paul); επαθεν seems appropriate in this context and was probably the cause of the other v.ll., especially if it was not understood that our author implied a suffering to death. Cf. 2:21 (v.l.). There is no example of αποθνησκω in 1 Peter although it is very common in the NT (some 111 times), and θανατωθεις follows here. Απεθανεν may be seen as a Pauline idea in this sense (cf. Rom. 6:10; 1 Cor. 15:3) and may have influenced scribes of 1 Peter. UBS⁴rev prints επαθεν with a B rating.

4:3 Add ημιν after γαρ. The addition may be seen as an attempt to personalize Peter’s style which is otherwise quite general.

4:3 The addition of του βιου after χρονος may have been an attempt to make it clear that it is behaviour before conversion which is being discussed; it thus clarifies the end of the verse preceding.

4:14 Add και δυναμεως after δοξης. The shortened text may, once again, have resulted from parablepsis encouraged by hom. UBS⁴rev prints the shorter reading with an A rating.

5:5 Add υποτασσομενοι after αλλοις. The longer reading follows on from the same verb in v. 5a.

5:8 Add οτι before ο. Again, hom may have been at work to create the shortened reading. Or οτι may be seen as an addition to smooth the transition from the imperative to a declarative sentence.

(2 Peter)

[339] 1:18 Read τω ορει τω αγιω for τω αγιω ορει. Semitic word order would favour the originality of the former reading.

3:3 Read εσχατων for εσχατων. Cf. Acts 13:47; Jude 18; Heb. 1:2 for other examples of the singular. The plural is a predicative adjective, and our author’s (and the NT’s) use of such a feature needs to be investigated.

(1 John)

1:5 and 2:10 v.l. ουκ εστιν εν ανω. The order is worth considering as a worthy alternative, and cf. 1 John 2:19; 4:12.

2:2 Read εστιν before, not after, ἵλασμος.
2:7 Add απ’ αρχής after ηκούσατε. The text may have been shortened on stylistic grounds as the same phrase has just appeared. It must be remembered that 1 John is filled with repetitions.

2:18 Add o before αντιχριστος to identify the Antichrist more emphatically. UBSrev rates the shorter text B.

2:28 Read εχομεν for σχωμεν.

3:5 Add ημων after αμαρτιας. Cf. 1 John 2:2; 4:10. UBSrev prints as its text αμαρτιας with an A rating.

3:16 Read τιθεναι for θειναι.

3:18 Add εν before αληθεια. The removal of the repeated preposition would be for stylistic reasons.

3:19 Read γινωσκομεν for γνωσομεθα to conform to 1 John 2:3; 3:24; 4:2, 13; 5:2. UBSrev prints γνωσομεθα with an A rating.

4:19 Add αυτον after αγαπωμεν. An accusative object is required after the verb, especially if it is read as a hortatory subjunctive. UBSrev prints the shorter text with an A rating.

5:2 Read τηρωμεν for ποιωμεν. Note especially the verse following but see also 1 John 2:3, 4, 5; 3:22, 24 where τηρομαι is found. τηρομεν ought to be dotted and even to stand in the lead text as the Ausgangstext. UBSrev prints ποιωμεν with a B rating.

5:20 Add θεον after αληθινον. Hom could have shortened the text but UBSrev prints the shorter text with an A rating.

Postscriptum

The companion volumes, Supplementary Studies, will appear as volume IV, 3 and not as announced in the Contents Page in Part 2 of the fascicule on James where these studies were to form the 4th instalment.
The United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (= UBS) was first published in 1966 followed by a second edition in 1968, which incorporated minor changes. The third edition appeared in 1975 and offered a changed text which was adopted by Kurt Aland for the 26th edition of the Nestle text (= NA²⁶). A corrected third edition (3A) made minor changes, especially to the apparatus in the light of the publication of NA²⁶.² The UBS texts are intended primarily for translators but the edition has established itself throughout the world as a convenient and reliable hand edition for students and teachers. Now we have a fourth edition which is qualified as ‘revised’ (the major changes in UBS³ were not so described). This edition was anticipated in the 3rd edition’s Preface of 1975. The delay in the appearance of UBS⁴ seems to have been due to technical not academic considerations; I gather the revised edition had been prepared and ready for some time. In this article we shall concentrate on the new features in the 4th edition.

The first change that strikes a reader on opening the new edition is the different typeface. The distinctive, and clear, 11 point Porson of the earlier editions has been abandoned. The second obvious change is that the old punctuation apparatus has been significantly revamped. Advances in discourse analysis have resulted in rethinking matters of punctuation, hence this reshaped apparatus (now restyled the “Discourse Segmentation Apparatus”!) in which differences in the segmentation of the text at different levels (e.g. sections, paragraphs, clauses) are noted. These are

taken from several editions of the Greek text (including the TR, Westcott and Hort and the Patriarchal text\textsuperscript{3}) and from a selection of modern versions, English, French and German. The editors of this apparatus, principally Roger Omanson and the UBS Translations Department in New York, have been concerned to concentrate only on punctuation that affects the interpretation of the text.

The introductory matter has been rewritten and the Bibliography extended to include the editions of manuscripts referred to in the Introduction. After the text come the Index of Old Testament quotations in OT and NT order, and the Index of allusions and verbal parallels in OT order only. On pp. 903ff and on a loose card inserted into the book appears a convenient list of the principal manuscripts and versions cited in the apparatus and also symbols and abbreviations. The lists of symbols and abbreviations no longer explain the use of parentheses within the text. Although this device was abandoned at John 4:9; Luke 2:35 parentheses still survive at 1 Tim 3:5 and John 20:16.

We are told on p. 1\textsuperscript{*} that the text itself has not been altered since UBS\textsuperscript{3A} and that it claims to be identical with NA\textsuperscript{26} apart from some punctuation and capitalization (cf. also the paragraphing at Col 1:11 and Gal 5:1).

At Mark 10:51; John 20:16 Ραββουνι [Διδάσκαλε] are capitalized in UBS not NA; Χριστός is always capitalized in UBS, in NA only when it is a proper name; Mark 3:17 Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς is capitalized in UBS not NA. A closer inspection reveals that there are at least two places where UBS\textsuperscript{4} has reversed changes found in UBS\textsuperscript{3A} that did indeed make the UBS and Nestle texts identical in other respects. At 1 Cor 9:1 UBS\textsuperscript{4} (= UBS\textsuperscript{1–3}) reads ἑώρακα, UBS\textsuperscript{3A} (= NA\textsuperscript{26}) reads ἑόρακα. At Acts 7:16 UBS\textsuperscript{4} (and UBS\textsuperscript{1–3}) reads Ἕμμωρ, whereas UBS\textsuperscript{3A} reads Ἕμμωρ which is the same as NA\textsuperscript{26} and is the form favoured by Bauer, the arbiter recommended in the Preface p. ix for standardizing orthography. A minor change at Acts 18:8 Κρίσπος in UBS\textsuperscript{4} brings the UBS texts back to the form in NA (cf. UBS\textsuperscript{3A}).

The more substantial changes are to the first, text-critical, apparatus and it is to these that we turn for the bulk of this review. Although we have a similar number of variation units (1437 according to the

\textsuperscript{3} In this and in other ways (such as the citation of lectionaries) the needs of Orthodoxy are addressed in this edition. The cooption of Johannes Karavidopoulos to the editorial committee for this edition and of course the contribution he and his colleagues at Thessalonica have made are intended to increase this edition’s sales and broaden its influence.
Preface, 1438 according to p. 2*!4) many of these are new. Some 284 variation units appear here for the first time in the UBS editions. Some 293 units (not 273 as stated on p. 2*) previously included have been removed5. We shall examine the character of these changes shortly. Suffice it here to applaud the new committee6 for having reexamined its original selection and for having decided to select what I think will be agreed is a wise set. Several reviewers expressed serious reservations about the original choice: certainly many units did not meet the declared intention expressed in the Preface to the first edition that only those variants that were of relevance to translators are to be included.

Variation Units


4 My own count agrees with the Preface. The figures are as follows and give an indication where the variants are concentrated: Matt. 159; Mark 142; Luke 167; John 155; Acts 202; Rom 85; 1 Cor 61; 2 Cor 40; Gal 28; Eph 35; Phil 21; Col 28; 1 Thess 15; 2 Thess 8; 1 Tim 19; 2 Tim 8; Tit 4; Phm 5; Hebr 44; Jas 23; 1 Pet 38; 2 Pet 24; 1 John 32; 2 John 6; 3 John 2; Jude 13; Rev 73.

5 This is the distribution of the gains and losses throughout the NT. Deleted variants: Matt 50; Mark 44; Luke 29; John 46; Acts 40; Rom 20; 1 Cor 10; 2 Cor 4; Gal 1; Eph 1; Phil 4; Col 1; 1 Thess 1; 2 Thess 1; 1 Tim 1; 2 Tim 2; Heb 3; Jas 1; 1 Pet 2; 2 Pet 1; 1 John 1; 3 John 1; Rev 29. Added variants: Matt 25; Mark 16; Luke 19; John 30; Acts 47; Rom 14; 1 Cor 12; 2 Cor 10; Gal 7; Eph 13; Phil 9; Col 7; 1 Thess 5; 1 Tim 9; 2 Tim 2; Phm 1; Heb 9; Jas 6; 1 Pet 13; 2 Pet 5; 1 John 8; Jude 7; Rev 10. There have thus been significant overall increases in Eph, 1 Peter and Jude.

1 Pet 2:19; 5:13; Jude 4; 12; 24 (although that same v.l. at 1 Tim 1:17 has not been considered!); Rev 11:12 (rated B in Metzger and UBS³); 18:2 (rated “C” in both). At least for these additions one can consult Metzger’s Commentary.⁷ We remain puzzled why some other significant variants added by Metzger such as at 1 Pet 2:5 have not been added to UBS⁴. Among newcomers I was pleased to see the important v.l. at Acts 3:14.

I had suggested in a review of the earlier editions that this should have qualified, but a reply by one of the former editors, Matthew Black, in BiTr 28, 1977, 118 rejected my suggestion stating that variants at Acts 3:14 are certainly not appropriate or eligible: the reconstituted committee has different views.

J.M. Ross’ review in JBL 95, 1976, 112–121, esp. pp. 113f justifiably regretted the absence of other variants, among them those at Matt 27:35 (added in Commentary) and Heb 9:1, 17; over 25 years and three editions later these are now included, although some other valuable v.ll. are still ignored. I still regret the omission of doctrinally significant variants at Luke 2:5, 41, 43. The unique use of the plural ὀχλοι at Mark 10:1 is not firm in the MS. tradition, but this edition, regrettably, does not provide an apparatus here. Such examples could be multiplied. In his Bible Translator article (op. cit. 118) Matthew Black stated that the v.l. πίστεως/χάριτος at Acts 6:8 would be included in UBS³: it appeared neither there nor in UBS³a and has still not appeared except as an addition in Commentary. In any selection it is difficult to get it right. But what is clear is that the new edition has striven to produce a better selection of variation units.

Among the important new additions the following are striking, because they seem to have been included in order to display particular readings of particular manuscripts: Mark 1:6 τρίχας v.l. δέρριν added because of D; Mark 6:45 +/- εἰς τὸ πέραν added to reveal the reading of P⁴⁵; Luke 5:39 (καὶ) to record the omission by P⁴ 𝔓⁴ B; Luke 6:4 to show the famous agraphon in D (cf. Luke 15:1 [W]; 1 Cor 2:16 [1165 l593!!]; 3:2 [𝔓⁴ B]). At 2 Cor 11:17 the variant serves to display the readings of l170 and of 69! Other variants seem to have been

---

⁷ For other new variants we await a revised companion volume that will be based on the variation units in UBS⁴. I understand Bruce Metzger is preparing a revised Commentary.
added to match a similar variant in a synoptic parallel e.g. Luke 7:32

If Matthaean parallel and see also Luke 9:49; 13:35; 17:3. That seems
a good practice, although there is scope for expansion in this area e.g.
the v.l. at Mark 13:32 is not shown although the Matthaean parallel
(24:36) is included: as we have just seen, a reading by a minority of
MSS is no bar to inclusion in this revised apparatus. A very significant
reason for the addition of new variants has been the recognition that
words enclosed within square brackets in the text (when this involves
a choice between a longer and a shorter text, rather than the rare use
of brackets in the text to indicate doubt about the position, not the
presence, of the word bracketed) deserve an apparatus in the edition.
The lack of such provision was a justifiable criticism against the earlier
editions, as in my NovT review of 1978, 255f. I warmly applaud this
change.

The variants are at Matt 18:19; 20:10,23; 24:38; 28:15; Mark 4:28; 6:51;
19:24; 20:21; 21:23; Acts 8:5; 11:22; Rom 7:20; 8:34; 11:25; 1 Cor 4:17;
11:15; 13:4; 2 Cor 8:19; Gal 5:24; Eph 1:18; 3:1; 4:9; Phil 3:12; Col 4:12; 1
Thess 4:11; 1 Tim 6:13; Heb 2:8; 4:3; 9:1; Jas 4:12; 1 Pet 1:9; 3:1; 1 John
2:6; Rev 18:2; 21:12. Most of them qualify for a “C” rating letter. (Further
on the rating letters below.) An apparatus has been provided for [αὐτῆς]
at 1 Cor 11:15 but not for [αὐτῷ] at Matt 9:27; Mark 8:20 nor for [ταύτῃ]

It is still a cause for regret that not all bracketed words in the text merit
an apparatus, but this edition has taken, albeit belatedly, a brave step
in the right direction in helping readers and translators cope with the
confusion brackets often cause.8

2). Deletions. As one may see in footnote 5 above the gospels have
shed the highest proportion of variants, Matthew loses one third, Mark
one quarter, John one quarter compared with, say, Hebrews which loses
only 3/44 or James 1/23. Taking Matthew as a test case the majority of
those variation units now deleted in the 4th edition are understand-
able given the aims of the apparatus in this edition, e.g. those at 3:12;
4:23; 5:13, 25, 37; 7:18; 8:8 etc., and one is left wondering why these
were ever included in the first place. Many less significant variants in
Revelation have been jettisoned and that too is wise. But not all the

---

8 See my “The Use of Brackets in the Text of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New
deletions are welcome. Given the likelihood that μαθητής was likely to have been qualified by a possessive in the gospels it is disappointing that several variants that treat of this matter have been removed (at Matt 14:22; 15:36; 16:5; 17:10; 19:25; 20:17), especially as comparable variants have been retained at Matt 8:21; 19:10; Mark 6:41; Luke 12:22; John 20:30, where the possessives are bracketed in the text.

The Critical Apparatus

It is not only the selection of variation units that makes this edition different from its predecessors. The units have in many cases been redrafted and betray a greater clarity in presentation. Some (e.g. Mark 4:20; the endings to Mark; John 6:1; 18:13–27; Tit 3:15) have been significantly expanded or refined; others have given the variants a more logical sequence within the unit in order to achieve a better impact (compare for instance the new Matt 19:9 or John 8:25 with the earlier). Some additional variants now appear within retained units e.g. John 1:3–4, 13). Many minor variants, especially of an orthographical nature, have been subsumed within the wider variant. These are all welcome, and Klaus Junack is deserving of our congratulations as the one who (according to the Preface) drafted the materials in the apparatus. The work of K. Witte and his coworkers at Münster is acknowledged in the Introduction. Only occasionally does the rewriting create queries:

At Rev 18:3 it is difficult to see which MS(S) read πέπωκαν. In UBS that reading is shown to have been printed in the text on the authority of 1828 alone! That MS is not cited in the new edition and the apparatus does not specify which MSS support πέπωκαν/πέπωκεν or πέπωκασιν.

An even more fundamental change is that all the MS evidence in the apparatus has been revised or checked. Work on the continuous text Greek MSS (in Münster) and on a more scientifically based selection of lectionary texts (in Thessalonica) has resulted in a more reliable display of evidence. The Introduction p. 1* tells us that all MSS were repeatedly collated and double checked against photographs and films:

---

one must conclude that this applies even to those MSS noted in the handlists as "lost", and to those MSS for which the Münster holding of microfilms, as listed in their various publications, is deficient (such as 0159, 0229, 0234, unless photographs survive elsewhere). In addition the versional and patristic evidence has been completely reevaluated with the help of several world experts (named in the Introduction and Preface). Such revision is warmly welcomed. It was long felt that these areas were not as reliable or as consistently displayed as one would wish. For this evidence alone the 4th edition is to be recommended.

It therefore behoves us to turn to the MSS and to the versional and patristic evidence in some detail.

**Papyri**

94 papyri\(^{10}\) are listed on pp. 903f and on the loose card under the heading “Principle Manuscripts… *Cited in the Apparatus*” (italics mine). The following papyri are added to a UBS text for the first time: 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 42, 43, 44, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 62, 69, 73, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97\(^{11}\).

K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* et. 2nd. Edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Leiden: Brill, 1987) (= *Text*\(^2\)) does not give Category numbers (about which more below) for the papyri numbered 89 onwards. Despite the apparent intention that all the papyri are to be found in an apparatus I have located only 60 of these 94, in other words over 1/3 are absent.

Obviously many are tiny fragments and they are extant at verses for which there is no variation unit, but the question must be asked: What is the point of merely window-dressing in the introductory matter as if these lists were registers of MSS.? We are given a warning on p. 4\(^*\) not to expect all papyri to be cited in the apparatus but that does not adequately explain their inclusion in the introductory lists of MSS.

\(^{10}\) If we take P\(^{11}\) = P\(^{14}\). The link is queried in the lists but the old P\(^{14}\) is now cited as P\(^{11}\) at e.g. 1 Cor 6:14. We also exclude P\(^{58}\) and P\(^{67}\) now subsumed under P\(^{33}\), and P\(^{64}\) respectively. The only variant where the fragment originally numbered P\(^{60}\) occurred in UBS\(^{1-3a}\) (Matt 26:14) has been removed.

\(^{11}\) P\(^{67}\) was included in UBS\(^{1-2}\): a correction is needed in my: A Survey of Manuscripts used in Editions of the Greek New Testament. (Leiden: Brill, 1987) (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 67) p. 280 (= Survey).
The papyri missing from the apparatus are Papyri 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 42, 43 (despite there being several v.l. given for Acts 15:8–16:2 where this MS is extant), 44, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 68, 73, 77, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97. In some cases a papyrus was cited in an earlier edition but in the 4th edition the relevant variant has been deleted.

One anomaly has now been removed. UBS3a cites P5 at John 3:31–2 but this MS is not extant in John 3!. D36 was intended (as in UBS3). NA26 cites P5 and P36 for the v.l.13

The introductory lists do not give the precise contents of the papyri, merely stating if they are e (Gospels), a (Acts), p (Paulines), c (Catholic epistles), r (Revelation). This is of little value for fragmentary texts. We need to seek the details elsewhere, which is unfortunate. The same criticism can be levelled against the list of uncial MSS and for the same reasons. Non-experts may be misled expecting a MS that contains the gospels to be complete even when it is a fragment with only a couple of verses.

**Uncials**

Unlike the papyri, only a selection of uncials is included. The Introduction lists 188 MSS up to 0300 (excluding those MSS now identified as forming part of another MS and whose number has now been subsumed under another).14 Unlike the papyri, the category numbers allocated to the MSS by the Alands has determined the way in which uncials are selected and cited. These categories (I–V) are explained to a certain extent in their Text 159ff. Basically, category I = a MS of “special quality”, II = “important”, III = a MS of distinctive character, IV = the D text-type, V = the Byzantine text-type. The edition makes use of all MSS in categories I–IV, but category V MSS are represented by the symbol Byz (that also covers minuscules of this text-type), the more
“important” uncials when agreeing with Byz are included in square brackets after that siglum.

Those uncials classified III/V (067, 078, 097, 0105, 0130, 0132, 0161, 0209, 0249, 0269) are included. 0246 is now category V (according to Aland and Aland, Text in the second edition of the English translation—and it is to that edition we are referred (4*) in this particular context) but is still being treated as if it were III, i.e. it is not bracketed in the list and is cited as a non-Byzantine witness! M. Holmes in his review of Aland and Aland Text in JBL 108, 1989, 139ff pointed out difficulties in the way the categories have been arrived at. With Holmes, we await the long-promised experts’ companion volume on textual criticism that may inform the professionals how the categories were formed. In the meantime we must take the results on trust especially as the drafting of this apparatus is based on these categories.

Uncials newly listed in a UBS edition are:

057, 069, 072, 077, 089, 094, 098, 0101, 0118, 0127, 0145, 0147, 0160, 0163, 0164, 0166, 0167, 0169, 0173, 0184, 0185, 0188, 0198, 0199, 0200, 0204, 0205, 0213, 0218, 0219, 0222, 0227, 0228, 0231, 0233, 0239, 0240, 0241, 0244, 0245, 0247, 0249, 0251, 0252, 0254, 0256, 0259, 0260, 0261, 0262, 0266, 0269, 0270, 0271, 0274, 0275, 0276, 0277, 0298, 0299, 0300.15

(I exclude MSS now known by another number, e.g. 0123 = 095.) Aland and Aland Text do not give us the categories of uncials with a number above 0274. We assume none of those included in the list is V. 0293, subsumed together with 092a under 089, is the only MS from the recent Sinai find included. The Sinai MS.0285 is found under that number (thereby subsuming the old 081, and thus creating another example where the higher number has survived) in NT auf Papyrus II, 1. In that volume 081 is renumbered 0285 in 2 Cor 1:20–2:12. Oddly, 0285 is not referred to in UBS4 although 081 is included and cited as such in 2 Cor. Why is 0285 ignored in the lists in UBS4? And why do two different Münster publications treat 081 = 0285 differently?

Not all the uncials in the lists are cited in the apparatus. The earlier criticism must be repeated: Why list a MS if a reader is not going to encounter it in the apparatus?

The extensive 014 (H) and 036 (Г) seem not to be in the apparatus. (H was linked with LP in UBS3 at Acts 21:8, but is not in UBS4; 036 is now

---

15 The following, listed but not cited in UBS1–3a, are found in the apparatus of UBS4: 035, 075, 0150. 075 and 0150 are now to be seen in the newly added apparatus at Phil 3:15. My Survey was wrong to state that 060, 0175 were not cited in earlier editions. 0238 should have appeared in Survey as a MS not cited in UBS1–3a.
absent even from the apparatus to the *Pericope de Adultera*). Similarly, the following do not appear in the apparatus—in most of these cases the MS is a small fragment extant for verses without variation units in this edition: 057, 069, 071, 072, 077, 089, 094, 0101, 0114 (\(? = l\ 965\) ), 0127, 0128, 0143, 0145, 0147, 0155, 0160, 0163, 0164, 0166, 0169, 0173, 0175, 0182, 0184, 0188, 0200, 0204, 0213, 0214, 0216, 0221, 0222, 0225, 0227, 0228, 0231, 0236, 0238, 0239, 0240, 0244, 0245, 0247, 0252, 0254, 0260, 0271, 0275, 0277, 0299. There are thus 52 uncials of the 188 listed that are not cited in the apparatus. In some cases earlier editions used the evidence of these fragments in a variant now deleted in UBS\(^4\) (e.g. 071, 0128, 0143, 0155, 0175, 0214, 0236). 0182 was included in the lists in the earlier editions but not used there; 0238 had been used in UBS\(^1\)–\(^3\) but not in UBS\(^3a\), although it remained in the introductory lists.

If an uncial MS is used, it is used consistently in those sections where it does not generally support the Byz. text-type. Also, where a MS covers more than one section of the NT, it is to be found in the apparatus to all the sections whatever its category.

I have found the following in all the named sections: א 01 eapcr(I), A 02 e(III–V)apcr(I), B 03 eapc(I), C 04 eapcr(II), D 05 ea(IV), K 018 pc(V), L 020 apc(V), P 025 a(V)pc(III)r(V) (the fact that the MS contains Revelation is omitted in the Contents column of the list!), Ψ 044 eap(III)c(II), 048 apc(II), 0209 pc(III/V).

We have noted at the end of the section on papyri that the contents column for uncials is not sufficiently detailed, but in addition it is confusing as far as the uncials are concerned.

It is helpful to have the fivefold division of MSS (eapcr) as used to be the case only for the Old Latin, but it is not always consistent. It is not helpful when a is used for a and/or c. In UBS\(^3a\) p. 913 and the loose card in the Introduction) א for instance was shown to contain eapcr, now UBS\(^4\) has only eapr (cf. A 02 is eapcr; B 03 is eapc; C 04 is eapcr). K 018ap is actually pc; L 020 ap is apc; P 025 cp is apc and r as we have noted; Ψ 044 eap is eapc. The conventional sequence whereby p precedes c is wrong in the case of 048 and 0209, but this is a mere quibble because 0209cp in the new edition is more helpful than 0209ap given in the previous edition.

Introduction p. 5* allows for MSS to be cited occasionally in the apparatus but which are not included in the lists. As far as uncials are concerned I have spotted 046 (V) at Rev 19:11 and 061 (V) at 1 Tim 3:16. Others may lurk.

The Byzantine uncials (i.e. category V) are itemized on p. 4* and included within square brackets in the lists. This is a representative selection of Byzantine uncials (“the most important” p. 4*); the major-
The list on p. 4* does not tally completely with the MSS bracketed on pp. 10*ff.

Was there confusion in the editorial ranks? It is significant that 014 and 036, not found in the apparatus, are bracketed on pp. 10*ff but excluded from the examples on p. 4*. F(010) is bracketed on p. 10* as if it were category V; in fact it is II and is so used in the apparatus. P (025) by contrast should be bracketed on p. 10*; this MS is category V in ar according to Text and as such it is frequently to be seen following Byz in brackets in Acts (as one would expect), but also in Paul (as predicted on p. 4* despite its category III!) and, very strangely, in the Catholics where p. 4* cannot be appealed to and where again it is category III in this section; in Rev it is not treated as Byz! Page 4* is not quite clear in implying that the “important” Byzantine uncial are only to be found in brackets after the siglum Byz. because obviously if the uncial is independent of Byz its attestation will support an alternative reading. Thus at 1 Pet 3:18 (pr) L stands apart, and at 1 Pet 3:18(sec) KL are independent.

Another anomaly—again in the Introduction—is confusing. We are warned on p. 9* that a new numbering system is under way to cope with those MSS that were originally allocated the same number as another and that this renumbering anticipates the registration in the long-awaited second edition of Aland’s Liste.

The example given is 0121a to be known as 0121, and 0121b in the future to be assigned the number 0243 (as part of the Venice MS—included in this edition). We are informed that the traditional numbers are used in UBS4. The compiler of the apparatus and the writer of that note seem not to have consulted one another because at Heb 2:7 we find not 0121b as promised but 0243 (cf. 0121 not 0121a at 1 Cor 15:54)! For accuracy and consistency p. 13* should include “0121b cf. 0243” and p. 16* “0243 p Venice; Hamburg” and “+0121b”.

I have criticized the lack of precise, detailed contents. A similar complaint may be levelled at the somewhat exiguous information under “Location”: occasionally one is told the MS is in Oxford and elsewhere, or in St. Petersburg and elsewhere.

**Minuscules**

Unlike the earlier editions the 4th prints only one list of cursives. 81 are included. The following are new to a UBS edition: 597, 1067, 1292 (in no other printed Greek NT to my knowledge), 1409, 1506, 1709
(f³), 1735, 1846, 2200, 2377, 2427. The following now in UBS⁴ were listed but not cited in the apparatus in earlier UBS editions: 180, 610, 1243, 1573, 1678, 2050. Unlike the lists of papyri, uncial, and Old Latin MSS the locations of the minuscules are not given.

These are carefully selected and consistently cited throughout the apparatus. Many reviewers criticized the mesmeric effect the long chains of minuscule MS numbers in the apparatus of the earlier editions may have had on the uninitiated reader. The actual number of minuscules in the new apparatus may not be conspicuously reduced, but those that are there are logical and carefully controlled, even if the Introduction does not altogether divulge just how well edited this section is.

All the minuscules that are category I and II are included; there is a small selection from category III (ten for each of the sections eapcr according to p. 5*—although we dispute that figure as will be shown below). There are no category IV minuscules. Category V minuscules appear under the siglum Byz. There are some anomalies. 180 e is included although it is V. So too are 597, 1010 (Aland and Aland Text⁳ demoted it to V. cf. first German ed. [Perhaps the apparatus was compiled when this MS was still deemed to be III]), 1292, and 1505. I have bracketed these numbers in the category III subheadings below. 424 appears as 424c in the lists but simply as 424 in the apparatus.

The window-dressing of the earlier lists has gone. The MSS included now are all to be found in the apparatus, with the understandable exception of the constituent MSS of family 1 and family 13¹⁶. They are indeed “regularly (scil. consistently) cited” (p. 5*). Our earlier criticisms in this matter concerning papyri and uncials do not apply here.

In the list under “Contents” only those sections of a MS are given that qualify for inclusion because there they are category I or II (or possibly III). Thus 1891 which is II in a but V in cp is quoted only in a and its contents are so described in the list; 1854 (a MS containing apcr) is said to contain r because here it is category II, its other sections are V. So “Contents” here covers only those contents made use

¹⁶ 1, 13, 828 appear, as p. 6* tells us, in certain circumstances in the apparatus in their own right. Note that 1582 has now been added to the MSS making up family 1 (cf. UBS¹⁶).
of in this edition. Where several sections of the NT are included under “Contents” the apparatus in all these sections cites the MSS.\textsuperscript{17}

The reader is not told which MSS belong to which category. The following may be deduced:

Category I (no letter follows the MS number below if the MS contains only that relevant section. If letters follow one may trace to see if any other section is found in this or in a different category. If a section does not appear under I, II, III then one may assume the other section(s) are in category V):

\begin{itemize}
  \item e: 2427
  \begin{itemize}
    \item a: 33eapc, 1175apc,
    \item p: 33eapc, 1175apc, 1739apc
    \item c: 33eapc, 1175apc, 1241eapc, 1243eapc, 1739apc, 2344 apcr
    \item r: 2053, 2062, 2344apcr
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Category II:

\begin{itemize}
  \item e: 33eapc, 579, 892, 1292eapc, 1342
  \begin{itemize}
    \item a: 36ac, 81apc, 610ac, 945eapc, 1409eapc, 1739apc, 1891apc, 2464apc
    \item p: 81apc, 256apcr, 1506ep, 1881pc, 1962, 2127eapc, 2464apc
    \item c: 81apc, 322apc, 323apc, 945eapc, 1067apc, 1292eapc, 1409eapc, 1735apc, 1852apcr, 1881pc, 2464apc
    \item r: 1006er, 1611apcr, 1841apcr, 1854apcr, 2050, 2329.
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\[442\ upgraded\ from\ III\ to\ II\ in\ Aland\ and\ Aland\ Text\ is\ not\ included\ despite\ the\ statement\ on\ pp.\ 4^f,\ thus\ providing\ another\ indication\ that\ the\ apparatus\ and\ introductory\ matter\ are\ out\ of\ step\]

Category III:

\begin{itemize}
  \item e: 1eapc, 13, 28, 157, (180e; apr), 205eapcr, 565, (597), 700, 1006er, (1010), 1071, 1241eapc, 1243eapc, (1292eap), 1424eapcr (in Mark only according to Text\textsuperscript{2}), (1505eapc)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item a: 181apc; r, 307, 453, 614, 1678eapcr, 2344apcr
    \item p: 6eapc, 104apcr, 263eap, 365eapc, 424apcr, 436, 459apcr, 1319eapc, 1241eapc, 1573eapc, 1852apcr, 1912, 2200apcr
    \item c: 436, 1243eapc, 1505eapc, 1611apcr, 1846apc, 2138apcr, 2298apcr
    \item r: 205eapcr, 209e(f)ap;r, 2030, 2351, 2377
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

(Not all these sections have the ten representatives promised on p. 5\textsuperscript{a})

[MSS designated III are not used in the following sections: 6c, 36c, 69p (although it appears as a ‘sundry’ at 2 Cor 11:17), 104c, 180a, 181pc, 322ap, 323ap, 424acr, 1243ap, 1505ap, 1611ap, 1678epcr, 1735ap, 1846p, 1852a, 2138ap, 2200ac, 2298a, 2344p. These sections are]

\textsuperscript{17} These MSS are 33, 81, 205, 209 (f\textsuperscript{1} in e), 436, 945, 1006, 1175, 1241, 1243, 1292, 1409, 1505, 1611, 1739, 1852, 1881, 2344, 2464.
as a consequence not included in the “Contents” in the Introduction. Other MSS categorized as III are excluded from the representative sample. These include 88, 451p, 849, 1910, and several others—about 46 in my count.]

Some of the ‘sundry’ MSS which occur in a particular apparatus are 274, 304 in the endings to Mark; 61, 221, 429, 629, 918, 1846, 2138 for the Comma Johanneum; 407, 435 at Luke 9:2 (although it is not clear what is so special about these two cursives: one could equally well have cited other minuscules such as 2643 or 2766 as sundry witnesses here).

**Lectionaries**

This edition marks a major advance in the display and reliability of this often neglected evidence. The work has been undertaken by the Lectionaries Research Center at Thessalonica. A good, representative, sample of lectionaries that are normal and Byzantine stand alongside some lectionaries that display a measure of independence. To make the figures on p. 20* more precise we need to show that 69 lectionaries are listed. (29 are Gospel lectionaries, 39 Apostolos lectionaries and one, l751 is ea). All are cited in the apparatus, although frequently all or most are in agreement and as a consequence are subsumed under the sigla Lect or Lectpt. This consistent display of lectionary evidence is welcome. The Patriarchal text is now also included.

Some lectionaries have daily lessons, others Saturday/Sunday lessons, and one MS has only weekday lessons “for this period”, to quote the enigmatic statement on p. 20*. This far from the Introduction. What the Introduction fails to do is to tell us which lectionaries in its list belong to each type. The information seems to be as follows: The 14 Gospel lectionaries with Saturday/Sunday lessons are ll 127, 253, 524, 547, 563, 672, 751, 858, 859, 866, 899, 1016, 1074, 1627. The 13 apostolos lectionaries with Saturday/Sunday lessons are ll 60, 597, 598, 599, 751, 895, 1021, 1298, 1356, 1365, 1439, 1443, 1977. (Page 20* states that these 13 Apostolos MSS. correspond with readings from Matthew and Luke) The one MS with weekday lessons is 1596. The rest contain daily lessons.

Of the Gospel lectionaries collated by Antoniades for his Patriarchal text of 1904 the following are in UBS: ll 384, 672, 770, 773, 1552, 1780 and of his Apostolos lectionaries the following are used: ll 884, 895, 921, 938, 1154, 1156, 1159. A few of the lectionaries were met in other UBS
editions, and a few are in the IGNTP volumes of Luke\textsuperscript{18}, but the selection here was made \textit{ab initio}.

\textbf{Versions}

A radical pruning of this evidence has meant that in this edition we find evidence from Latin, Syriac, Coptic (including now the Proto-Bohairic and Middle Egyptian), Slavonic, Ethiopic, Georgian (though not for Revelation) and Armenian. A thorough revision by the appropriate authorities means that we have more reliable and judiciously selected evidence, often from better critical editions and MSS. The Diatessaron is given special treatment; its peculiar problems are well set out on pp. 38*-39*. Gothic, Nubian, Arabic and Persian have now been jettisoned. So too have the Old High German and Provençal—thus no longer are these two Medieval versions used to support the conjectural reading printed in the text at Acts 16:12. Note that Sahidic is misspelt on p. 27*.

The separate MSS of the Old Latin are listed on pp. 24*ff: 63 items are included. All are to be found cited in the apparatus in each of the sections of the NT as shown in the Contents column pp. 14*-16*, although frequently the Old Latin evidence appears \textit{en bloc} under the siglum ‘it’. The evidence has been culled from the files of the Vetus Latina Institut in Beuron and is based on editions of the MS or from a standard critical edition, the names of the editors are added to the list on pp. 24*ff.

Only ρ 88, and w 58 lack an edition. My own investigations into the whereabouts of w have drawn a blank. It is said to be in Prague at the old Comenius Faculty, but this is apparently not the case.

Among Old Latin MSS newly cited in this edition are the Pauline readings from the Balliol Pelagius (B) MS., w 32, sa 60, ro 62, sin 74, μ 82, s 87, ρ 88, comp 109, λ, μ, and the newly discovered b 89 and φ.

The Contents column in the Introduction gives only those sections where the MS has an Old Latin text, thus dem 59 is not shown as containing cr, where its text is Vulgate (cf. also ar 61 e, c 6 pcr, d 5 c, div c, g' apcr, gig 51 epc, l 67 pr, p 54 pcr). This is really a tidier and more pre-

cise designation of the contents by comparison with the earlier editions, which cited those MSS in the sections where the text is predominantly Vulgate. MSS r² 28, e 76, w 83, haf, x¹² have been deleted from the list for the same reason.

(Ps-Augustine) Speculum is now included with the Patristic witnesses not the Old Latin MSS.

The Introduction gives the location of the MSS (in their English form) rather than as previously, the Latin name of the MS.

We congratulate Dr. Frede of Beuron for the conspicuous care he has lavished on this part of the enterprise.

Fathers

This is another major area where the evidence has been carefully revised. There has been an attempt, particularly for the Greek fathers, to restrict citations up to the 5th century.

Instead of the previous total of about 200 fathers, now just over 100 Greek and about 60 Latin are included. (No Syriac or other Eastern fathers are included, but this is understandable given the particular problems they add to an already difficult area to handle within the context of a critical apparatus to a Greek testament.) Special attention has been given to the work of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Methodius, Eusebius, Didymus, Epiphanius and Cyril of Alexandria. Later fathers, which generally cite the Byzantine text are only included sporadically for significant places. John of Damascus is however regularly cited because of his importance in the Orthodox church, whose interests are again being considered in this edition. The number of fathers has been significantly increased in the apparatus, and all have their name written in full at each mention. Thirteen early texts or fathers are listed separately as yielding no citations significant for this edition. These include Papias, Ignatius and Aristides, all of whom figured in the earlier UBS editions.

Despite the splendid efforts that lie behind the patristic evidence in the apparatus I am unhappy with the use of the time-honoured practice of using fractions after a father’s name to indicate the relative frequency with which he supports a particular variant. If we were confronted with a Gildas or an Optatus there is a chance one could track down the citations, but if it were an Origen or an Augustine one is at a loss. Origen"vid and the like is similarly unhelpful. The only solution to this, and a solution to the citing of all patristic evidence would be to do as is done in the IGNTP Luke, namely to give the source of the patristic
citation together with a reference to a printed edition. Only then can one trace the alleged citation and see its validity within its own context. This would obviously increase the size of the apparatus. In the meantime we have to take the evidence on trust—it is reliable as far as it goes, and for that we must be truly grateful!

Ratings

The bizarre and often criticized system of allocating rating letters to each variation unit has been preserved. These letters (A, B, C, D) indicate the editors’ judgement on the certainty of the text printed. (‘A’ indicates “certain” down to ‘D’ a “high degree of doubt”).

The new editorial team voted on all the variation units and not merely on the ones new in this edition. As a result many of the rating letters in UBS³a have changed, thereby confirming our already formed opinion about the arbitrariness of the whole procedure.

Many readings in the first two editions were downgraded in the 3rd edition. In the 4th edition there are fewer ‘D’ rated variants. This however must not be understood that the text as a whole is to read and accepted with a greater confidence in the editors’ decisions. Some of the variation units rated D in the previous edition(s) have been deleted, for example at Mark 5:32. An uncertain reading is thus merged unidentified into the text, thereby increasing the overall unreliability of the text. Other D readings have survived (Matt 23:26; Mark 7:9; John 10:29; Acts 16:12; Rom 14:19; 1 Cor 7:34; 2 Pet 3:10; Jude 5; Rev 18:3). Some readings previously B are downgraded (e.g. Mark 4:20). An A reading at Mark 7:24 is now B. Generally though there have been more upgradings than downgradings. Taking Matthew’s gospel as an example we have some B readings in UBS³a transformed with a wave of the magician’s wand into an A reading (1:11, 16; 4:10, 17; 7:14; 9:8; 14:3; 17:20(bis); 18:26; 19:16, 17; 21:39; 23:13; 27:4; 28:9, 20); readings transmogrified from C to B are at 1:18; 2:18; 5:22, 32; 7:13; 9:4, 34; 11:9, 15, 17; 13:9, 43; 15:4; 17:22, 26; 19:9 (bis); 20:26; 22:30; 23:19, 38; 24:36; 25:1, 15–16; 26:27; 27:2, 10, 40. Upgrading from D to C occurs at 5:11; 6:15; 11:23; 14:24; 15:6; 16:2–3, 12; 20:30. At Mark 1:41 we can witness a spectacular leap from D to B without any real change in the attestation.

To be told that the ratings result from a simple majority vote among members of the committee does not satisfy the requirements of a critical edition which, in the words of A.E. Housman (Introduction to his edition of Manilius, Astronomicon p. xxxiii), is an inappropriate name if an editor is not “called to account and asked for his reasons”. Until
Metzger’s revised Commentary is published to reveal the reasons for some of these changes in the voting for the rating letters, we are left wondering what the new committee’s motives were.

In the previous edition we read that Matt 21:44 was omitted with a C rating; now the verse is included with a C. The Pericope de Adultera seemed to be included with an A despite the double brackets; now the apparatus makes it clear the omission merits an A (cf. also Luke 23:34a omitted with A but previously included with A). Those were perhaps due to careless drafting. More pertinent here is the rethinking about the so-called Western non-interpolations that has caused the following big upgradings: Luke 24:12, 36, 40, 51, 52 all up from D to B.

We noted above that some D rated variants are no longer included in the revised apparatus. This disproves the mistaken assurance given readers in the introductions to the earlier editions (e.g. UBS¹ p. xi) that the bulk of the text for which no v.l. is printed may be presumed to be of an A degree of certainty. The bluff of this over-optimistic statement is called when we look at several of the newly added variants, many of which show that the text printed is revealed as uncertain.

Many are rated C (e.g. Matt 18:19; 20:10; 23:23 etc.). I have counted some 55 such additions, 46 of them deal with words bracketed in the text.

These rating letters are an unnecessary intrusion. It seems unlikely that a translator (or student), able to read the critical apparatus would base his judgement on the arbitrary and fluctuating rating letters.

Let us suppose that he is not sure what to do about νῦν at Rom 11:31. In UBS¹,² he could accept it as a B rated variant; if he bought UBS³,³a where the same variant is D he might be more hesitant; the new edition has a C rating. What is the poor man to deduce from all this?

Other fluctuating rating letters set to confuse the reader who purchases each edition of the UBS testament as it appears are at Matt 11:9 (B–C–B); 11:23 (sec) (C–D–C); 16:2–3 (C–D–C); 19:9 bis (B–C–B); 23:38 (B–C–B) etc.

Apparatus

All the MSS extant and eligible for citation were included as constant witnesses. A comparison with the equivalent apparatus in UBS3A shows just how precise and controlled the new edition is.

In UBS4 I think it is relatively safe to assume that if one of the apparently constant witnesses is absent from a given variation unit it is either not extant or legible, or that at this point its reading is a nonsense unworthy of being recorded.

Conclusions

This edition is to be welcomed as a worthy replacement for the earlier editions. The sheer amount of work behind the revised edition is self evident. The text itself is of course still open to earlier criticisms, but even here the editors acknowledge (vi) that this _quondam_ “standard text” is in flux and may be changed when the time is right (but not before NA27 appears!). We may therefore still query the inclusion in the text of certain readings, we may still doubt the wisdom of incorporating double-bracketed passages within the text proper, and we still dislike the rating letters, but as far as this edition’s apparatus is concerned we have nothing but praise. The main problems outlined in this brief review result from an imperfect Introduction. With these qualifications we commend the revision and congratulate all those concerned with the enterprise, particularly the editorial committee and their co-workers, the printers and proofreaders. UBS4 is likely to maintain the preeminence of the Bible Societies’ editions in the world market.
B) THE TWENTYSEVENTH EDITION OF NESTLE-ALAND’S
NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE

1993 saw the publication of the 4th edition of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (= UBS4) and this 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland text (= NA27). The Greek text remains unaltered in these new editions, so, once again, the two are virtually identical in this respect. There are a few minor differences between NA27 and UBS4 involving punctuation, paragraphing and capitalization (e.g. at Mark 3:17; 10:51; John 20:16). Two orthographical differences at Acts 7:16; 1 Cor. 9:1 survive. It is surprising that the opportunity was not taken to make the Greek text in these two influential editions completely identical.

The major differences in both basically concern their respective apparatus. As is well known, the purpose of the UBS texts is to serve translators; NA has a wider readership in mind. These aims are preserved in the latest editions (see my review above). My purpose here is to examine the main changes to be seen in NA27.

The immediate and obvious physical difference is that NA27 is some 4 cm (1") wider and 3 cm (1") longer. This change in format is welcome. The page numbers for the text remain the same. The number of textual variants (given by Kurt Aland in the Black Festschrift as c. 15,000) remains the same; the quantity of textual witnesses cited is about the same. What we have therefore is a rather more spacious layout, and with it increased legibility. This has been a wise move; the text is still a hand edition.

There has been a slight rearrangement in the way some variation units are set out (e.g. Mark 7:30; Rom. 15:18; Jude 5) and occasionally some old variants have been jettisoned and some new ones introduced, but overall the selection of variants remains as before. We are told (46*) that with rare exceptions “paragraphing and punctuation remains (sic) the same” (as NA26).

What is it therefore that qualifies this as the 27th edition and not merely a modified reprint like the 4th and 7th printings of NA26?

First, it is clear that there has been a major overhaul of much of the material in the apparatus, especially the Greek, Latin, Coptic and

---

Syriac evidence, as well as the Patristic citations. This results in many small but important changes.

For instance for the papyri some evidence now disappears (e.g. Matt. 19:17; 23:37; 26:38; Mark 2:4 or a vid appears e.g. Matt. 26:43; 26:44); at other times the evidence of a papyrus (with or without vid) is added to the apparatus (e.g. P88 now appears in the apparatus at Matt. 5:13; P87 now appears in the apparatus at Phm 25. Likewise P83 now appears at Matt. 24:1. P84 is added at Mark 2:3. P45 at Mark 6:16 now supports the text; in the previous edition this witness appeared against txt.)

The patristic evidence is more closely controlled. There are significant changes in the evidence of the oldest, Greek-based, versions (e.g. Latin, Coptic, Syriac).

All such changes, however modest many may seem to be in isolation, add up to a significant number of alterations, all of which makes the citation of witnesses that much more relevant and accurate. In so verifiable and scientific an instrument as a critical apparatus we always need to consult the most reliable information. For this reason alone readers of Novum Testamentum Graece will require this latest edition. The bulk of the work of assembling, verifying and organising this work fell on the capable staff at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research at the University of Münster in Germany.

The introductory chapter (in German and in English) has been completely rewritten. Gone are the penny lectures, the bombast and the self congratulation. Instead we have a splendidly lucid and objective explanation of and reference manual for the text, apparatus and other marginalia, and the appendixes. The Introduction reads well and is a model of clarity. There is no further talk of the text being “standard”; instead there is a more honourable and realistic expectation that the text will be seen as a useful base which together with the apparatus will serve readers well even where they disagree with the editors’ chosen text. We read on p. 45*: “(The edition) is not to be considered as definitive, but as a stimulus to further efforts toward defining and verifying the text of the New Testament”, and on p. 46* that this is to be a working text which provides through the apparatus the means whereby a reader can verify the editorial decision or alternatively correct it. This in practice is of course how many users treated the text anyway but it is now to be applauded that the Introduction recognises the reality. This honesty will be rewarded: readers who would have
preferred other editions, such as the Majority Text lobby as well as more open-minded scholars, should now feel comfortable using the NA text in the way that its editors now commend.

The Introduction spells out very clearly the categories into which many MSS cited are classified.

The classification is based on the level of their difference from the Byzantine, majority (= M), text-type. As before, we have the “constant witnesses”, which are at furthest remove from M. These are always included in all variation units, even though the warning is sensibly given (50*) that one must not try to reconstruct the text of an individual MS on the evidence of the text and apparatus in this edition: the evidence here is not exhaustive—this is a select apparatus. The first order witnesses appear in the Appendix with an asterisk next to their number and they are listed on pp. 58*–63*. MSS. with an asterisk enclosed in round brackets are cited only when their reading differs from M: these are constants “of the second order” and are also listed on pp. 58*–63*. MSS with an asterisk enclosed in square brackets in Appendix I are cited as “constant witnesses of the first order” in only part of their contents, or as “constant witnesses of the second order” in only part of their contents, the relevant parts being identified with * or (†). These too appear on pp. 58*–63*.

In addition there are some MSS which are cited frequently because of their importance for the history of the text or because they have readings of significance: those falling into this category are given on p. 59* for Acts, on p. 61* for Paul and on p. 62* for the Catholics. This category does not occur in the Gospels and Revelation. (Erroll Rhodes’ otherwise impeccable English translation of the Introduction lets him down here when he renders the unambiguous German “No witnesses are cited only frequently for Revelation” (63* italics his). Other MSS found in the apparatus are listed only in the Appendix. There is also a list of M MSS in the Appendix (see further on this below).

It is inevitable that a select apparatus must function in this way, although the selection differs somewhat from that used in the UBS editions. The categorization outlined in the Introduction, and summarized here, seems to be consistently applied: spot checks throughout the apparatus reveal no inexplicable deviations, and we must congratulate those who assembled the apparatus on their organizational abilities.

All the papyri fragments regardless of age (!) are now given the status of constant witnesses, and many of their singular readings are recorded. This reflects the importance the Alands attach to this category of witnesses, although (48*) they recognise one must not be mesmerized by the writing material alone. As yet the uncials have not
been treated in quite so thoroughgoing a manner. P7 P73 P83 P84 are upgraded to Class 1 since NA26.

There are one hundred and seventy two uncials of the first order, including 025 for the Catholic letters and 075 for 1 Cor., Phil., Col. (newly promoted), and eleven of the second order, including 025pr.20 All the uncials newly added in this edition i.e. those numbered between 0277–0301 are of the first order21 except 0292 which is of the second. 0244, 0269 and 0270 have been upgraded to first order in this edition. Correctors of Β A B C 05 06 are shown in a simplified manner.

The reshaped apparatus takes into account the different classifications and the addition or subtraction of MSS. All these changes reflect the Institute’s concern to display all the relevant evidence not only as economically as possibly but in order to show the major differences from the Majority text-type.

For the Gospels there are nine extra constant papyri (all Class 1): 7, 73, 83, 84, 90, 93, 95, 96, 97 in Matthew; four additional uncials of Class 1 (0277, 0281, 0293, 0298) and five deletions (064, 0104, 0135, 0136, 0197). 0292 is added as a second order uncial in Mark (but is not cited in the apparatus—despite its special mention on p. 47*) Minuscule 33 is upgraded to Class 1 throughout the Gospels. 1010 is now no longer cited as a second category MS.; 579 now appears as a second order witness throughout. 2542 is added as a second order witness in Mark and Luke. Lectionaries 844 and 2211 become second order witnesses throughout the Gospels. For Mark we lose 064 0103 0104 0134 0135 0255 0263. 28 appears as a second class MS in only Mark. In Luke we gain first order MSS. 0279 0291 and lose 027 053 063 0253 0265 0267 0272. In John we gain class 1 MSS. 0299 0301 and lose 054 063 065 0264 0268 0273. In Acts we gain P91, 0294 as a Class 1 MS; 0120 disappears; 33 and 1739 become first order, 1505 becomes Class 2; 2495 is demoted. In Paul we gain first order MSS. P98 075 (for 1 Cor., Phil., Col.) 0278 0282 0285 0289 0296 33 1739 1881 and lose 061 0174 0230; in the second order we gain 1505 l249 l846 and demote 2495. In the Catholics we gain Class 1 MSS. 0296 33 1739 and lose 093; 2495 is demoted. In Revelation we gain Class 1 MS. P98 and lose 052 as Class 1. 025 and 046 are cited now only when they differ from MA and MK respectively.

20 It is not obvious from p. 692 that 026 is a constant of the second order only in Luke, although p. 59* is clear about this.
21 We are told (47*) that these MSS claim our attention because of the text, age or (!) the circumstances of their discovery.
The *appendixes* (written in Latin) cover 1) Greek and (Old) Latin codices; 2) the differences between the Nestle text and other major printed editions (repeated from NA 26); 3) OT citations and allusions found in the NT (repeated from NA 26); 4) sigla and abbreviations. There is a new appendix of twenty eight closely printed pages: *Variae Lectiones Minores*. This is a welcome addition because it gives the reading of those MSS printed within parentheses in the *apparatus* proper. One is often curious about the nature of a minor difference read by a bracketed MS: now we can find out. This appendix explains only Greek readings. We remain in the dark about other bracketed material in the *apparatus*. Thus we are not shown what Clement of Alexandria actually reads when his qualified support is printed as (Cl) at Matt. 5:36. Nor is it obvious why Baldensperger’s name is bracketed at John 3:25.

In the appendix of abbreviations the explanation of vg⁵⁴ (808) is still out of step with the Introduction (65*) which is literally more up to date.

The *appendix of Greek and Old Latin* MSS (Appendix I) is still somewhat of a register of MSS Date, library and contents are all up to date. Thus we see that 0220 has changed location, now being split between Oslo and London (cf. UBS 4).

The MSS listed are:

*Papyri*: There are ninety six papyri with P⁹⁸ being the highest numbered (two MSS given a number in earlier listings, P⁵⁸ and P⁶⁷, have now been subsumed under other numbers, but P¹¹ and P¹⁴ are treated as two, despite ANTF 12, xxxiv). NA 26 listed eighty eight separate papyri with P⁹³ being the highest numbered. The newly added papyri are P⁹⁰, 91, 93–98. P⁷, newly upgraded as a constant witness, is dated as 3rd–4th century on the enclosed card, although the age is queried in the list in Appendix I and given as 4th–6th century in UBS 4. There are new fragments of P⁴¹ (including Luke 1:54–5; 2:29–32; Acts 20:28–35; 21:26–7) and P⁷⁵ (including John 13:2–7; 14:31–15:6, 9–10) and the Cologne fragments of P⁶⁶ although it is not clear from the contents column of Appendix I where the additions in P⁶⁶ occur.

Although all papyri appear in the list in Appendix I the following seem not to be in the critical apparatus: P¹⁴ (identified here as a MS in its own right) P²⁹ P⁴² P⁴³ P⁷⁵ (upgraded to Class 1 in NA 27?) P⁸⁰ P⁸² P⁹³. Most are very small fragments but presumably they were examined as constant witnesses even if their evidence was not usable in the variation units printed or (as seems to be the case with P⁴² at Luke 1:55) the papyrus supports txt (= the reading printed as the text) in places where the edition prints a negative *apparatus* i.e. only the evidence against the reading of the printed text.

*Uncials*: There are two hundred and thirty nine separate MSS listed (twenty nine others are now subsumed under different, usually lower
numbered, uncialis) and there are MSS that were previously numbered as uncialis but which are now identified as lectionaries (0100 = 0195; 0114, 0129, 0276); these numbers and their new lectionary numbers are printed in this Appendix. The highest numbered uncial is now 0301, sixteen MSS (0150, 0277ff.) having been added since the last edition. NA₃⁶ listed two hundred and fifty six uncialis (including six added after the 1st printing), twenty seven of the MSS there are subsumed under other numbers. Among the uncialis omitted from the list in NA²² are of course those originally wrongly assigned a number among the uncialis (055, 0152, 0153), and those which are inaccessible (0144, 0154, 0157, 0158, 0258). The absence of 0205 is less explicable. The Sinai MSS 0280 0283 0284 0286 0287 0288 0290 0295 are absent although eleven others from the same (decreasingly) recent find are included. I am not sure why we lack 056 0142 0149²³ 0211 0248 0257 0297 0300 (in UBS⁴). Some seem to be absent because they are representatives of the Byzantine, majority, text but surely they should have been added to the list of M text MSS on p. 713 (about which see below). Also there are other Byzantine type uncialis in the list which are absent from the apparatus (see below). These too could have appeared under M on p. 713: this siglum need not be reserved exclusively for minuscules, especially as p. 51* tells us that M in an apparatus subsumes all Koine witnesses. Aland, Synopsis¹-¹² and the old Nestle apparatus included uncialis and minuscules under the siglum K (= Koine). 0194 is part of 0124 (= 070) so its absence from the list, even under 070, is explained.

MSS which are in Appendix I but which do not occur in the apparatus are the following: 027* 031 045 052* 053* 054* 057 (Class 1) 061* 063* 064* 065* 077 (Class 1) 080 093* 0103* 0104* 0118 (Class 1) 0120* 0133* 0134* 0135* 0136* 0155 0164 (Class 1) 0166 (Class 1) 0174* 0197* 0200 (Class 1) 0230* 0253* 0255* 0256 (Class 1) 0259 (Class 1) 0263* 0264* 0265* 0267* 0268* 0272* 0273* 0292 (Class 2). We are warned on pp. 46*-47* that twenty eight of these uncialis, asterisked above, are “no

²² That is because NA³⁶ included these in its list of uncialis. Thus 0192 = l1604; 0195 = l983 or 0203 = l1515 are not given because those uncialis were not included in the earlier edition. 0129 vide l1575 is once again given, presumably because this lectionary is included in this appendix among the lectionaries used for the edition. On p. 712 l1575 should carry a reference to 0129 as is the case with other “vide” references. The bi-lingual 0276 is now to be known as l962; there has been hesitation about this MS for some time—ANTF 3 pp. 7 fn. 2, 17 seemed to be suggesting it was to be identified as another Paris lectionary l963 (+ l1353). UBS⁴ was happy to maintain 0276 as a Gospel uncial!

²³ This is added in UBS⁴ (cf. 3rd ed.). The MS is published by J.K. Elliott in NT 36, 1994, under the title “A Greek-Coptic (Sahidic) Fragment of Titus-Philemon (0205)” Reprinted as chapter 7 above. The Introduction (46*) advises us to consult Aland, Liste² to check on uncial numbers missing from the current list.

²⁴ = 0187, a rare example of the lower number being identified now by the higher: this MS is added in the list in UBS⁴.
longer cited” (i.e. since NA 26), but we may well ask why they are still in the main list in the appendix. Many of the twenty eight are M MSS in Aland, Synopsis 13. We may be perplexed that 0133 is included on p. 46* because that MS was not previously Class 1! Some are indeed small fragments and it is right that we know, as with the papyri, that their readings were considered by the editors. But not all these twenty eight are tiny fragments (pace 46*). Most have been demoted from having previously been constant witnesses because they are now seen as being predominantly related to M. It is interesting to note that 0155, a lost MS, is not in the apparatus, but that 0156 and 0159, which are also lost, are in. The uncial numbers italicized in my list above were absent from the apparatus in NA 26 so their continuing absence is no surprise.

Some uncials have been upgraded to class 1 since the previous edition: 0244 0269 (absent from the apparatus in NA 26) 0270.

Some of the uncials that are not identified as first or second class constants are to be found in passages of special textual importance such as the pericope of the adulteress or Matt. 16:2–3 for example.

Minuscules: Two hundred and nineteen separate minuscules are listed (plus five subsumed under other numbers), the highest number now being 2818, but, as 2814ff. are used for renumberings of MSS previously allocated to other numbers, the highest “new” number is 2805. Four separate MSS are of the first order (33 1739 1881p 2427 [Mark]) as well as fam. 1 and fam. 13. Thirty two are of the second order including nineteen which are second order constants in only part of their contents. There were two hundred and three minuscules in the previous edition, 1r 2ap 4ap 7p 36a are given their new numbers in the Appendix but the old numbers are retained in the apparatus (e.g. Rev. 15:3; Acts 17:18; 1 Tim 2:8). In the future we would expect these numbers to change. Old 0121b is now part of 0243 by which number the MS is to be known and it is cited as such at Heb. 2:7; this leaves 0121a to be known as 0121 (see for instance at 1 Cor 15:54).

Newly added MSS are 71 72 137 (also in M) 185 (also in M) 206 242 485 547 (in M) 1555 1574 1689 1709 2412 2427 (as Class 1) 2542 (as Class 2 in Mark and Luke) 2805. Most of them are in UBS. I am not sure why some MSS are listed twice, once in the main list and once under M.

As noted above 33 1739 1881 are raised to be constant witnesses. 2344 and 2377 are constants in Revelation. 579 is upgraded to a second order witness 1505 becomes second order in apc and 2495 is demoted. (These changes result from work explained in B. Aland, Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung I, 41–90).

All asterisked minuscules and fam. 1 and fam. 13 are to be found in the apparatus as specified. Of course MSS. may also occur in parts of the NT not singled out for special attention, e.g. 2464 is a second order witness in Paul but as an “ordinary” minuscule it is also to be seen in the apparatus of 1 John. The bulk of the remaining minuscules appear only intermittently in the apparatus, many are to found only in variations
units of special significance such as the endings of Mark, the pericope of the adulteress, or the Comma Johanneum. The constituent members of fam. 1 and fam. 13 are listed but are generally not cited in their own right in the *apparatus*.

*Lectionaries:* Nine lectionaries are listed compared with five in NA²⁶. The four newcomers, all second order, are l²⁴⁹ l⁸⁴⁴ l⁸⁴⁶ l²²¹¹ and are all found as specified in the *apparatus*. The number of lectionaries used in the NA edition remains remarkably low, especially when one observes the great progress that work in this area has achieved in the latest UBS edition.

*M.* Page 713 displays all the minuscules that are subsumed under the siglum *M*, meaning the majority text-type. This list has not grown as quickly as in the past despite the work of the Institute in its work for the Münster series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* which has as one of its benefits the demonstration of MSS that conform to the majority text, but according to p. 81* the lack of expansion in this list is deliberate. There are now eight hundred and ninety five minuscules listed here (eight hundred and ninety eight in NA²⁶ 7th printing, compared with six hundred and twenty two in the original printing), including newcomers 1170 (replacing 1177, which was perhaps a misprint in NA²⁶) and 1515. Absences in NA²⁷ compared with the list given in the 7th printing of NA²⁶ are 1876 2090 (which certainly should be deleted according to K. Aland, *Liste*) 2378 2568 in addition to 1177. One wonders why they were included in the earlier edition. *M* has the status of a constant witness of the first order. When divided within itself *pm* and other less precise abbreviations *pc al rell* are used as explained in the Introduction.

*Old Latin:* Twenty one e, eleven a, fourteen p, nine c and 5 r MSS are listed (as in NA²⁶). Two MSS appear in the list in Appendix I under new sigla: a (Paul) is now ar although in the *apparatus* a is still used, as at 1 Cor. 14:10; m (Paul) is mon in the list but m at Rom. 7:3, as before.

*Fathers:* The number of patristic references to be found in a Nestle edition has never been great. In NA²⁷ the total number listed is slightly lower (c. 70), but all “critically significant” evidence is presented. Only Greek and Latin patristic evidence is used, and those only sparingly. The Introduction admirably sets out the limitations and the principles behind this selection. This narrower focusing is cautious but wise: patristic evidence is notoriously difficult to interpret. Fuller patristic evidence may be seen in the variation units in the UBS text. In both editions we may take the evidence with a high degree of confidence.

*Other Evidence:* The apocryphal text known as the Fayyum fragment is no longer cited, but another NT apocryphal text, P. Egerton 2 appears at John 5:39. Some warning about this appearance could have been given in the Introduction or in the Appendix of abbreviations.

*Apparatus:* The overall construction of the *apparatus* is basically as before. Some punctuation v. *ll.* survive (e.g. at John 1:3). Generally
the clarity and precision of the variants and readings are even better, although some ambiguities occur (e.g. it is difficult to determine which MSS support txt at Rev. 18:3; it is not obvious what we should deduce from Ψ h.t. at Philm. 11 or 630 h.t. at Rom. 7:17). I still have doubts about the need to include in a critical edition a number of conjectures. Such speculations by past scholars may have their place but only in an historical commentary. Nestle25 contained nearly 250 conjectures from over 90 authors. Despite his general misgivings over the matter of conjectural emendation, Kurt Aland maintained this bizarre tradition although he reduced the number of conjectures in the apparatus of NA26 to c. 130 but even he added some new ones (e.g. at Matt. 5:6). The latest edition has maintained most of the conjectures found in the 26th edition although that at Luke 19:41 has been removed.

Card Insert: As usual a selection of MSS and other sigla is reproduced on a loose card inserted into the volume. Unlike the appendixes from which the selection is abstracted the card is in German.

Conclusions: Obviously the changed printed text made the differences from NA25 to NA26 greater than the more technical changes made for the 27th edition, but we applaud the new edition for the clarity of its Introduction, for the refinements to the apparatus, the greater precision in its use of Greek MSS and its rechecking and reviewing the versional and patristic citations. That the text remains the same may be a case for regret in some quarters although to leave it as it is means that the companion concordance, lexicon and synopsis text remain in tandem. Aland and Aland, The Text of the New Testament which in many ways is an introduction to NA26 is, however, now out of step insofar as copious examples there are drawn from the Introduction and apparatus to the old edition: that textbook will need updating to take account of the changes. In time we await a new text but “for a variety of reasons” (43*)—none given!—no textual changes are introduced. One possible explanation may be found on p. 49* namely that the time has not arrived for a comprehensive theory of the textual tradition to be formulated that accommodates the results of recent textual research. Perhaps Eldon J. Epp was not wrong to speak of the twentieth century interlude in textual criticism after all! Meanwhile the Foreword encourages readers to communicate suggested further improvements to the editors.
The publication in 1993 of new editions of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (= UBS⁴) and Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece (= NA²⁷) prompts the question: Do we need both? The short answer is probably “Yes”. Both seem to be successful in commercial terms. The UBS text has been through five editions since 1966. NA²⁶ went through twelve reprints from 1979 to 1991 and has sold 170,000 copies. Both UBS⁴ and NA²⁷ are revised editions of their respective predecessors in so far as Introduction, apparatus and some editorial matter are concerned. The New Testament text in these new editions is the same as in the editions each supersedes. More significantly, the text in UBS is identical to that in NA, with the exception of a couple of minor details and some differing punctuation. Both publications have a life of their own. The UBS edition is marketed at translators; NA has the general student of the New Testament in mind.

It is in the apparatus that the major differences are to be seen. First, UBS gives greater prominence to significant punctuation variations (or ‘discourse segmentation’ as the 4th edition now prefers to call it) and relates these variants to the ways in which five Greek testaments, and eleven recent translations into English, French, Spanish and German have reacted to these differences. This new edition has a completely new apparatus here. NA has some significant punctuation variants in its textual apparatus but not many. This evidence in UBS is arguably only of historical or exegetical interest and I do wonder just how frequently translators, particularly those working in non-European languages, need to discover how a select number of, say, English or French versions punctuate certain problematic verses. If I were translating into a newly written tongue, or even revising an existing version, I may well consult a favourite printed translation or two but I do not think that I would need at such a point to be told how a selected number of European translations had coped with a problem.

A similar situation concerns the main, textual, apparatus. UBS⁴, like its predecessors, prints only a limited number of variation units. There are 1437 such units in the new edition, but the selection differs from that found in UBS³⁴. Some 284 units appear in the new edition for
the first time; 293 are deleted from the previous edition. Although we have been told in each edition that its selection was carefully chosen to reflect variants of relevance to translators, obviously the slightly revamped committee responsible for UBS\(^4\) disagreed with the earlier choice. B.M. Metzger, a committee member, in the companion volume to UBS\(^3\), *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* was himself dissatisfied with the original selection and therefore added a further 600 variants for discussion. The conclusion to be drawn is the obvious one that it is a thankless and delusive task to try to restrict the number of variants too narrowly or to try to define which 1400 or so variants are “of interest to the translator”.

If one examines many of the variation units within UBS one sees that quite often there is a full display of all variants, however minor, within many units. I doubt if the professional translator (as opposed to a text critic—for whom an exhaustive *apparatus* is always a *desideratum*) is really interested in all the sub-variants printed in UBS. The *apparatus* in NA gives the main reading(s) against the printed text (together with the supporting evidence against, and regularly for, the printed text) in sufficient detail to satisfy even the most fastidious translator.

UBS is a clearly printed and sparsely set out edition. Doubtless these characteristics enhance its attractiveness and explain why it sells well outside its intended market. All over the world students find UBS a convenient edition to handle. By contrast, those unfamiliar with scholarly critical texts may initially be daunted by the sheer density of print and quantity of sigla on the pages of text in NA\(^27\), notwithstanding the slightly larger format introduced for this new edition. But the spaciousness of UBS is somewhat deceptive and in any case is there at the expense of absent material. Let us take a verse at random. The two variants shown for Matt. 3:16 in UBS take up 1 1/2 inches (5 cm.) compared with two lines in NA. In both variation units a similar number of uncials and ancient versions are included in NA as in UBS but UBS includes a larger number of fathers, all given in full, and a longer list of minuscules. For the second of the two variation units in UBS a minor sub-variant is given with the support of one minuscule, one lectionary and two Coptic versions; this is ignored in NA\(^27\). Is the translator’s text critical decision likely to be greatly influenced by the additional witnesses in UBS\(^4\) or be any different were he using only NA\(^27\)? Also it is obvious that in any 1 1/2 inches the *apparatus* in NA contains a dozen or more important variants!
The editors of UBS assume that, if a translator is to be bold enough to desert the printed text and allow his eye to feast (1437 times) on the *apparatus* provided, the factor that ought to influence him is not the character of the alternative reading(s) or the quality of the supporting evidence—factors that are the normal considerations for a textual critic—but the editors’ own confidence in printing the reading adopted as the text. This confidence, or lack of it, is shown in the rating letters, A, B, C, D attached to each variation unit. (A = a high degree of confidence down to D = a reading printed after the committee had “great difficulty in arriving at a decision”.) Such guidance may seem to be helpful to non-experts, but the fluctuations in the letters attached to the same variant over the different editions is more likely to confuse the user than help. UBS¹ differed from UBS² largely in this area of differing rating letters. This reassessing the confidence of the readings selected for the *apparatus* has been a recurring feature of successive editions. UBS⁴ continues the habit of changing the rating letters. Reasons behind the committee’s new voting may become clear when a new *Commentary* appears as a companion to this 4th edition, but, in the meantime, what is a hapless translator (or student) to do when he sees that a B reading in UBS³ is now upgraded to A, or a reading previously C is now B? At Mark 1:41 a reading previously D is now B! For the readings involving the so-called Western non-interpolations the printed text is now rated B not, as before, D. At Rom. 11:31 a reading designated B in UBS¹ ² was declared D in UBS³; now it is C! (Cf. other fluctuations from UBS¹ ² to UBS³ ⁴ to UBS⁴ at Matt 11:9 B’ C’ B; 11:23 (sec.) C’ D’ C; 16:2–3 C D’ C; 19:9 (bis) B’ C’ B; 23:38 B’ C’ D). Again, I doubt if a translator should set much store by the imprecise and fluctuating system to help him decide on the reliability of the printed text. If I were a free agent, able to part company with the UBS/NA text for my translation, I doubt if the editors’ volatile voting for A, B, C or D would sway my interpretation of the *apparatus* at that point.

As far as the manuscript, versional and patristic evidence is concerned any compiler of an *apparatus* has to decide on the scale and number of witnesses to be cited. Both UBS and NA have carefully controlled and faultlessly executed *apparatus*, in accordance with the clearly set out descriptions in their introductory pages. The new editions of both are exemplary in their explanations of the range of their
textual witnesses. The resultant apparatus in both editions are splendidly clear and logical. The new editions contain many improvements in their apparatus including some redrafting. In the Greeven Festschrift (Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments ed. W. Schrage [Berlin and New York, 1986] = BZNW 47) I tried to set out in my article “The Purpose and Construction of a Critical Apparatus to a Greek New Testament” (pp. 125–43) some of the aims and desiderata in drafting an apparatus to a critical edition. More recently, E. Güting in his article “Der editorische Bericht als Kommentar zur Textkonstitution und zum Apparat in Editionen des Neuen Testaments” in Editio: Internationales Jahrbuch für Editionswissenschaft 7 (1993) pp. 94–108 also offers advice on apparatus building. As an erstwhile Mitarbeiter in the Münster Institute, his suggestions are well grounded in experience. In the light of these two articles one may judge that, in general, the apparatus in NA27 fulfils the standards required. UBS fails only because it is too limited in the number of variants selected. The problem is, as we have already stated, that the reader of UBS has access to an apparatus less than 1437 times; the user of NA has access to the range of textual variation ten times more often. The selection of variants in an edition should be broad enough to include not only those readings deemed to be of particular concern for translation (i.e. longer versus shorter texts, certain word order variants, tense fluctuations) but other variants as well, such as harmonizing readings that affect the interrelationship of the gospels, deliberate grammatical and linguistic variants, and accidental readings occasioned by palaeographical considerations, in addition to readings that reflect the development of Christian doctrine and history.

NA27 includes ninety six papyri up to P98 (although papyri 14, 29, 42, 43, 73, 80, 82, 93 are not cited in its apparatus); UBS4 has ninety four up to P97 (in this edition P11 = P14, but thirty four of these papyri are not in the apparatus). UBS4 uses more uncials than NA27. There are two hundred and thirty nine separate uncial texts up to 0301 in UBS of which forty one are not in an apparatus; there are one hundred and eighty eight separate uncial texts up to 0300 in NA of which fifty two are not cited. Only eighty one minuscules up to 2464 are listed in UBS4 compared with two hundred and nineteen up to 2805 in NA27. By contrast UBS4 scores better in the use made of lectionary texts—sixty nine are regularly cited; NA27 lists only nine, and not all these seem to occur in the apparatus. So, if one is tracing the readings of a particular manuscript or group of manuscripts, then, for the places where
TWO NEW EDITIONS

UBS prints the variants one may well benefit from different attestation compared with that in NA. UBS is also fuller in its citation of patristic evidence and later versions. The new NA has restricted its evidence in these areas to early fathers whose quotations are recognisably from a particular New Testament passage, and to those versions dependent on the Greek (Latin, Coptic and Syriac). It states in its Introduction that only when the underlying Greek text can be determined with confidence are the version or father cited and then generally only when their readings are attested by some other Greek or independent variant evidence. The Introduction to UBS\(^4\) makes similar claims but its practice is to include more and later versions, as well as a more complete survey of Greek and Latin patristic evidence up to the mid-fifth century. This means that, for those with an interest in the patristic or later variant evidence, UBS is a more profitable port of call, but, to repeat the recurring theme running through this assessment of the two editions, one can only use it for comparatively few variants.

Given the fact the NA and UBS have the same text, and given my observation that UBS may not satisfy the requirements of the clientele to which it is directed, it may be concluded that there seems to be no practical or academic reason for the continued separate existence of the UBS edition. Reaction to this article might prove me wrong, and I am open to persuasion to the contrary. But if I am correct, then the specific needs of translators could be met by modifying the NA edition, perhaps by highlighting with a distinctive typographical marker readings in an apparatus which are of especial importance for translation. But even that concession could be interpreted (alongside the rating letters) as patronizing spoon-feeding. If a translator is to be entrusted with an apparatus, then he must be allowed to set his own terms and to be encouraged to have full access to an apparatus without arbitrary limitations. Too rigorously controlled or restricted an apparatus deprives the intelligent user of a critical edition from exercising his own editorial judgement. An apparatus in a critical edition is not there merely to enable readers to select a supposed “original” text, as is admitted by the choice of variants even in UBS; it also exists to enable one to plot the history of that text. The reasons why one turns to a critical apparatus are more complex than merely for the evaluation of the editorial text-critical conclusions. These varied aims are more properly met in NA\(^{27}\). By using UBS not only translators but the students, academics and clergy who undoubtedly buy this edition are denying themselves exposure to the riches and variety to be found in
NA\textsuperscript{27}. Perhaps publicity for UBS\textsuperscript{4} ought to carry a strong health warning to that effect!

**Postscriptum**

Recent editions of the UBS and the Nestle texts take the number of papyri used up to P\textsuperscript{116}.

When the above chapter was first published the second edition of Metzger’s companion *Commentary* had not appeared.
CHAPTER THIRTY

THE INTERNATIONAL GREEK NEW TESTAMENT PROJECT’S VOLUMES ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

When I came to reassess the work on Luke published by Oxford University Press in 1984 and 1987 I read through old correspondence, minutes and progress reports. In so doing I was all too conscious of a sense of *déjà vu*. Attempts at Anglo-German cooperation, links between Anglo-American committees, debates about whether or not to establish a critical text as well as assemble a thesaurus of variant readings, what collating base to use and print and so on recur—and still are recurring. The history of the project and its predecessors have also been plagued by repeated errors of judgement, delays, indecision and false decisions, lack of cooperation, occasional attacks of mumpsimus and all too often ill-feeling on a personal and institutional level.

Having read the reports and reactions to Legg’s editions of Mark and Matthew, and having been the editor responsible for bringing the Luke material through the press, and now being intimately involved in the John project have enabled me to see that history has a nasty habit of repeating itself.

The pre-history of the IGNT project is sufficiently well known that a mere sketch will probably suffice to refresh our memories. Fuller reports are available in articles by Neville Birdsall, Eldon J. Epp., David Parker and myself.¹

Our story begins in the 1920s. German scholars at annual conferences that had begun in 1922 had decided that the time had come to consider bringing out a ‘New Tischendorf’ especially as von Soden’s

---

edition in the preceding decade was flawed and had not succeeded in updating the *apparatus* in Tischendorf’s 8th. edition in a reliable and usable way. And this is one of the leading leitmotifs in our continuing saga: the unassailable and continuing preeminence of Tischendorf’s edition, and the trail of bungled and inadequate or only partial attempts to supersede that edition.

These German conferences in the 1920s and their desires seemed not to be known to a British delegation prior to its attending the German conference in 1926 in Breslau. The British team comprising such luminaries as Kenyon, Streeter, Souter, and Burkitt, under the chairmanship of Headlam, the Bishop of Gloucester, proposed a similar enterprise and the Germans seemed to go along with the British plans largely because the carrot of a willing publisher, namely OUP, was dangled before them. The German scholars, however, were not happy with all aspects of the plan and had special misgivings about the British desire to use the Textus Receptus (= TR) as a collating base. Streeter in his *Four Gospels* pp. 147f. had already written that Tischendorf’s edition needed updating but that a thesaurus of readings produced from collations of manuscripts against a “Byzantine text” was needed.

In the event that Anglo-German cooperation seemed not to materialize. The project fizzled out after the Germans withdrew as no agreement could be reached over the text to be used as a collating base. It was a British committee which soon afterwards set to work on an *apparatus* to the Gospels with S.C.E. Legg as its editor, employed initially with a stipend of £250 *per annum*. Ironically the TR was not printed in the volumes on Mark (published in 1935) or on Matthew (in 1940). What seems to have been agreed—and certainly what was printed as the collating base—was the text of Westcott and Hort’s edition of 1881. In a prospectus appealing for funding to finance the project issued in Oxford in 1929 Legg writes that as early as 1927 Westcott and Hort’s text had already been selected for use. In effect what Legg provided was a belated *apparatus* to the WH text. Westcott and Hort did not print an *apparatus*, possibly because they believed that as they were publishing the original text of the Greek New Testament then secondary scribal aberrations in the footnotes were redundant, illogical and liable to befog their readers’ minds.

The scholarly world was not impressed with the results of Legg’s labours. G.D. Kilpatrick expressed misgivings about Legg’s volumes in *JTS* 43 (1942) pp. 30–4. T.W. Manson picked up on Kilpatrick’s lead in a review in a later issue of the same volume of *JTS* pp. 83–92. In warm-
ing to his subject Manson in an excoriating review declares that Legg’s task was ‘completely beyond his strength’, that ‘the work had better be done over again from the beginning’, that ‘the whole thing as at present conceived and executed is a makeshift and at this time of day scholars have neither the time nor the money to spend on make-shifts’, and that the whole lacked completeness and accuracy. Although Professor Kurt Aland in an article in *Theologische Revue* (= *ThRv*) in 1984 referring to Manson’s review expresses his surprise at Manson’s ‘milder Tön’, Epp (op. cit., p. 5) speaks of Manson being “unmerciful in his critique”. Certainly what strikes one today is the vigorous and vicious attack on Legg’s volumes, more vituperative and vindictive than one normally finds even in reviews written in the 1940s.

Manson in this review was not only attempting to trample Legg’s life work into the mud (and by implication of course the plans of the sleeping partners who had hired Legg), but to stifle any further work along the same lines. Instead, what Manson proposed was a radical new approach to presenting an apparatus. Undeterred, Legg plodded on strangely oblivious to the import of Manson’s rubbishing of the enterprise which he had already devoted 20 years of his life to. He seemed to be unaffected by Manson’s review or the likely consequence this might have on the next volume. So he manfully continued preparing his third volume—on Luke—and he presented copy to OUP in 1948. Not surprisingly, the Press remembered Manson’s review of 1942 and took it seriously. Legg’s manuscript was returned to him as unsuitable for publication.

Legg’s subsequent life is not known to me. In fact I know precious little about his earlier life—other than that he had been on the staff of King’s College, London up to the end of the first world war and that he served as an assistant to White in the preparation of the Wordsworth and White Vulgate. Apart from his work on the Vulgate and an article jointly written with Kenyon, Legg seems only to exist on the pages of the volumes which were condemned by Manson. He devoted 20 years of his life to preparing the volumes on Mark, Matthew and Luke. All I can add to this episode is to say that the three boxes containing Legg’s handwritten copy of the rejected apparatus to Luke survived

---

better than the memory of its author. The complete copy containing
his pages is now in my possession and it languishes in my study.

Meanwhile Manson and a British committee considered how best
to implement the proposals he had outlined in the 1942 review. One
thing that needed redoing was the work on Luke. But salvation was at
hand from a new quarter.

Since 1942 an American team under Colwell and including Parvis
and Wikgren had been contemplating preparing a new Tischendorf.
Once again the same clarion call using Tischendorf’s example was
sounded. And once again scholars in one country seemed unaware
that similar plans were afoot in another country. The repetition of
this piece of history may, in view of the date, be excusable as Anglo-
American cooperation in the early forties was concentrated on more
pressing matters than textual variation in the Greek New Testament.

Eventually contact was made between the British and American
scholars, cooperation was established in 1948 and from it the IGNTP
was born in 1951. Forty years after this cooperation began the first fasc-
cicule of the collaborative work—our volume on Luke—was published.

For Luke the decisions were that collations were to be made against
the TR and its text was to be printed as the running text. We shall
return to the brouhaha that these decisions caused. But it needs to be
pointed out that although Manson seems to have gone along with the
decision of the Anglo-American committees once these had been for-
mally established from 1952 onwards, his original proposal in the 1942
review was that an early Byzantine text should first be established—an
easy task according to him—and that that should be the collating base.
Quite what Manson envisaged is not clear and how it would be done
is not certain. In the event that plan did not happen. Kilpatrick in his
article (op. cit., p. 33) had suggested that the TR be printed above the
apparatus, and, presumably, that collations were to be made against
that base text. At any rate the TR was chosen as the collating base and
printed in the published volumes.

[5] Ground rules were laid down, collating began in earnest, teams of
volunteers were recruited, experts were appointed to work on the ver-
sional evidence, and samples were eventually prepared. Details of who
did what are set out in the introductory pages of Luke vol. I. But work
was painfully slow and criticisms about the delay in publishing this
much vaunted project were voiced.

To make a short story long, we come now to the appointment of my
predecessor as editor of the Luke volume—Prof. Neville Birdsall. His
period as editor originally seemed full of promise. He was granted a
three year secondment from his university from 1971 and the British
Academy was persuaded to offer support for replacement teaching in
Birmingham during that period. At last the Project had a full time
professional textual critic employed and tasked with the completing
of the project on Luke. But, as he would be the first to say, the task he
encountered when he took over proved overwhelmingly difficult and
impossible to complete in the timescale expected, nay demanded.

I have read the reports which Birdsall submitted to the Academy
and to the British Committee. These give an agonized catalogue of
woes in an ongoing saga of problems and difficulties encountered.

May I give a flavour of these by quoting from his Report of 1974
at the end of the three-year period of secondment? Assessing those
three years he notes that the Greek patristic evidence he inherited was
deficient, not least in its comprehensiveness, and that much of the ver-
sional evidence was still awaited. The Latin patristic index and evidence
continued to plague him. The main complaint was the lack of foresight
and financing. British amateurism and American difficulties in raising
public funds for what some in the USA would see as a religious exer-
cise could no doubt be blamed, but Birdsall’s main complaints were to
be levelled at the unrealistic obligations imposed on him by his British
colleagues at the behest of the British Academy. Birdsall reminds us
that the early enthusiasm that we were to produce a new Tischendorf
had alerted him to the incredible accuracy of the old Tischendorf and
the implications of living up to that standard. More time was needed,
more helpers and, above all, more money. The problem seemed to
be that we, unlike von Soden, were unable to seduce a Fräulein Elise
Koenigs.

Despite valiant efforts on his part, Birdsall did not deliver on time.
This seemed to confirm the prejudice of certain in the Academy that
the project was not worth their support. Birdsall himself felt that he
was being treated as a scapegoat for the shortcomings of the project
itself and for the unrealistic expectations of outsiders.

It was into that situation that I was catapulted in 1978. Although I
had not previously been involved in the work on Luke, I was invited to
join the committee as its executive editor. The committee duly agreed
to my membership and appointment. It was made crystal clear to me
that the Academy wanted to see results and would brook no further
delays. The Academy continued to offer financial support to cover the
committee’s operating expenses, and we were still recognised as an
official project of the Academy, thanks to the strong support exercised within the Academy by one of two weighty friends who were Fellows.

The work I inherited was indeed as patchy as Birdsall had alerted me to. Much needed doing although some six chapters had been drafted in part. I made it my business to chase up overdue collations especially on the versions and to try to ensure that all outstanding work was completed. By 1982 or so all of the raw materials were to hand, and I set about drafting the rest of the Gospel. The American collations were checked, the evidence of the versions and fathers was added. The Patristic citations were added and the lectionary details as well as all the other paraphernalia we had agreed to include in the *apparatus*. The variation units were written out, working down from the long phrase to the individual words within that phrase.

Much of this was handwritten. I photocopied my drafts chapter by chapter and circulated the sheets to members of the committee and a range of competent friends for their comments, corrections and addenda. Several read through the drafts and offered constructive advice and criticism.

As a result of receiving reaction to the drafts I then prepared the material for the Press. Eventually three of us proofread the printed galleys. The first twelve chapters were published in 1984; the second half followed in 1987.

For reaction to Luke I rely now on the published reviews. The most thorough reviews came not surprisingly from the Münster Institut, first from Kurt Aland and then from Barbara Aland. The Alands, being intimately involved in New Testament textual criticism and as editors of the *Editio Critica Maior* (= ECM) in preparation, were possessed of a judgement and experience that were particularly authoritative. They were the most appropriate scholars to contribute reviews of our work and assess its significance. Rereading their reviews alongside Manson’s we again have a sense of *déjà vu*—and in addition some of the sentiments expressed and even the vocabulary used in one of Kurt Aland’s reviews echoes von Dobschütz’s report of the Breslau conference of 1926.³

---

It will be important now to isolate the main points raised mainly by Kurt Aland. He allowed himself the luxury of two reviews. His longer review appeared in the Classical journal *Gnomon*.\(^4\) It had originally been written for the Münster Roman Catholic theological periodical *Theologische Revue*\(^5\) but they deemed it too long. A shorter version, incorporating the main points from the *Gnomon* review was subsequently accepted by *ThRv*. Thus his views received wide dissemination in both the classical and theological worlds.

I pick out a few important points from those reviews, beginning with the *Gnomon* piece where it was tactfully suggested that the whole of the work on Luke be redone. Repeating the language used by Nestle in the fourth edition of his *Einführung* (1923) which referred to von Soden’s edition, and applying it to the IGNTP Luke Aland writes (p. 497): “Man sagt—leider—schwerlich zuviel, wenn man behauptet daß das Ganze noch einmal gemacht werden muß.” This would then put us back to 1942. Aland also made use of another early criticism: this time he lifted Kirsopp Lake’s comment in his 1904 *Influence of Textual Criticism* with reference to Westcott and Hort which Lake judged “a failure though a splendid one” and applied this (p. 496) to the IGNTP Luke. Once more, words from one text-critical context were made relevant to a later situation. The review in *ThRv* opines that IGNTP Luke has dismally failed to provide an adequate replacement for Tischendorf and reaches a climax with the words: “…das angestrebte Ziel eines kritischen Apparates als Grundlage für die Feststellung der Textgeschichte des Lukasevangeliums wie seines ursprünglichen Wortlauts ist verfehlt worden. Den seit Jahrzehnten erhofften “neuen Tischendorf” stellt der vorliegende Band nicht dar, nicht einmal einen Ansatz dazu, auf dem sich aufbauen ließe” (col. 448).

The main reasons for Aland’s conclusion are manifold.

One overriding problem for him is the perennial objection to the use of the TR as the collating base and the reprinting of that text, which gives the unfortunate impression that we were in a sense rehabilitating that text. Although several of us have pointed out on many occasions that we had no intention of reestablishing the TR, this message was not appreciated or understood. David Parker in his article on


\(^5\) See note 2.
the plans for the ongoing IGNTP work\(^6\) reminds his readers that we only used the TR, a universally acknowledged bad text, to be a commonly known and unchanging text to base collations on, and one that if one was applying the Subtraktionsprinzip, would require less space to display the alternative readings, in so far as most witnesses agree with the Byzantine text of which the TR is a flawed example.

But I realise that it must seem peculiar that we adopted a reprinting of a 1873 edition of the TR that goes back via two intermediate stages in 1828 and 1707 to an edition of Stephanus’ edition of 1550 (with his versification of 1551), and I shall return to this issue shortly. (Oddly enough, a special reprinting had to be undertaken for IGNTP by the University of Chicago precisely because the chosen text was NOT readily available!) But whatever justification can be given for our practice of reproducing the text of the TR in our volumes on Luke, I shall concede now that it is unfortunate that our readers may have been mislead by the title to our work, The New Testament in Greek III, to expect a new critical edition of the Greek text of Luke. It is only in the course of reading our introductory matter (actually when they eventually reach section 2 ‘General Principles of the Edition’ para. 2 on p. vi) that readers are disabused and learn that what they have bought is a mere assemblage of variant readings. I am not sure at what stage OUP adopted this series title. Even now with the published volume on the Papyri to John and with a different publisher we have persisted in giving this wrong impression by entitling the book, The New Testament in Greek IV. We also thereby suggest continuity with the doomed volumes by Legg—even though nothing in their titles (which are in any case different from the Luke volumes) suggests they were identified as volumes I and II in an ongoing series. As we were not intending a critical edition, the title of the Luke volumes should have been something like A Thesaurus of Textual Variants in the Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke.

Not unconnected with Aland’s objection to our apparent rehabilitation of the 1550 text (and it is there that the word “Anakronismus” reappears, having first been heard in this context in von Dobschütz’s report of the Breslau conference’s reaction to the British delegation’s proposal to work with the TR) is his complaint that we missed the opportunity to edit a critical text. Gregory in his Vorschläge für eine

kritische Ausgabe des griechischen Neuen Testaments (1911) envisaged that the duty of an editor was twofold: the assembling of an apparatus and the preparation of a critical text. We felt that the two activities could be divorced and should not necessarily be part of the same enterprise. We never intended to edit a text—merely to provide a thesaurus of readings from which ultimately a critical text could be built, to supply material, not to interpret it. Aland however quashes any hope that that course of action might bear fruit when he writes in his ThRv article that no one would ever dream of considering utilizing the IGNTP apparatus to construct a critical text.

The example of the ECM fascicule for James now lies before us. There the editors are doing both tasks simultaneously—establishing a new apparatus and a new critical text—although the principles for establishing its critical text are not (yet) spelled out for readers to assess. We merely note that the resultant text of James happens to be identical with the UBS text in all but two places (James 1:22, 2:3), that words bracketed in the UBS text at 4:21; 5:14 are now printed without brackets in the ECM, and that 11 v. ll. in its apparatus are signalled to be of “equal value” to the readings printed as the text.

Perhaps I can insert here a citation from José O’Callaghan’s review of our work on Luke in Biblica: “Pero, aun respetando la finalidad de la obra, claramente expresada en los prenotandos, es decir, de no establecer un texto nuevo del NT, uno se atrevaía a preguntar: Después de un esfuerzo tan desmesurado y laudable, ¿Puede aceptarse que en 1984 no convenga modificar nada de un texto neotestamentario aparacido en 1550?”

I shall return to those two major criticisms later when I make some suggestions about the future of IGNTP as we move into John, because my purpose in resurrecting these reviews on the Luke volumes is to learn from them for our present planning.

But now back to Kurt Aland’s reviews, this time to his objection that our selection of minuscules was inadequate and that the Claremont Profile Method, by concentrating on certain Byzantine groupings, resulted in an apparatus comparatively thin in reporting cursive witnesses compared with the weighty evidence of the versional and

---


The reading here, now in the Editio Critica Maior, had stood as the text in NA.

patristic variants reported throughout. Barbara Aland in her review of the Luke volumes in *JTS*, to which I shall turn shortly, makes the same point. We can perhaps concede that the Claremont method, criticised in among other places by Richards in *NTS* did not give us as wide a representation as we needed. Certainly our readers have not been informed how and why the 128 minuscules ultimately reported were singled out for selection. Perhaps with the methodology adopted in the *Text und Textwert* series we can at last achieve a more adequate sifting. That methodology can now be judged in the fascicules of the Catholic Epistles appearing in the *ECM*, although even there one could voice criticism about the lack of information about how its final selection of their “Codices Byzantini” used in its *apparatus* was arrived at.

I now intercalate collaborative criticism of our use of the Claremont method, this time by C.-B. Amphoux, who in a review in *ETR* 61 (1986) pp. 448–50 declares that this sampling is quite inadequate for enabling one ultimately to work back to the original, differing, forms of the text. This deficiency, coupled with only second-hand reporting of much of the versional evidence, make him conclude “L’enquête documentaire est donc doublement défectueuse”.

A recurring criticism voiced by Aland, Amphoux and others is that we relied too heavily on sometimes old and inadequate editions for the versional evidence. The *ECM* has set a splendid example in James on how MSS. of the Coptic, Syriac and Slavic versions can be used. One of the areas in which we did use MSS. was the Coptic, where we included two Coptic MSS.—but we were at fault even here in not stating in our Introduction the age of these witnesses, which happens to be four centuries apart from each other (as O’Callaghan pointed out). Another area where we did report the readings of individual MSS. was that of the Old Latin. We are also criticised (by Kilpatrick)
that for the Old Latin we were too reliant on only Jülicher’s choice of MSS. plus two MSS. not found in Jülicher. These are details, albeit important, and obviously such shortcomings should not be repeated for John. Certainly we should follow the good practice in ECM and not rely on printed editions if this can be avoided. (ECM itself uses the evidence of the Vetus Latina for the Catholics rather than cite the Old Latin MSS. themselves. One wonders what ECM will do if it reaches the Gospels before the Vetus Latina does.) We need to emulate the practice in ECM of concentrating on the Latin, Coptic and Syriac as primary versions to the underlying Greek and be more sparing with our use of the secondary versions.

Kurt Aland also criticised the drafting of our apparatus using the so called Subtraktionsprinzip in which (as in von Soden’s edition) only witnesses differing from the collating base are printed. This method demands that readers of IGNTP Luke look at the list of MSS. deficient for the chapter, then for the verse, then at the index of fragmentary witnesses in the verse, then to identify the MSS. with variants before calculating which MSS. support the collating base. This he quite correctly says is tedious and liable to create error. I note in passing that the first ECM fascicule does not apply the alternative principle—Oppositionsprinzip (found in Tischendorf 8)—in its entirety. But this preferred method of recording variants is a consistent preoccupation of German scholars, and again we are reminded of the same concern voiced in the proceedings of that Breslau conference. The ECM uses what it pleases to dub a ‘positive apparatus’ if more than 15 witnesses are against the base text; otherwise the Subtraktionsprinzip (known here as a ‘negative apparatus’) is applied, where only the witnesses against the base text are quoted.

The manner of presenting the evidence as fully and as unambiguously as possible, and in a way that may be easily consulted is one that must be resolved when we get round to drafting the apparatus in John. One place where Aland is clearly correct is that we are at fault in applying the Subtraktionsprinzip to the versional evidence. He gives good and telling examples where the assumption that a particular version not cited in a given variation unit must by implication and e silen-tio support the TR is not always necessarily true or, if it is true, is only partially true. Here again the ECM shows us how ambiguities in the versional evidence can be satisfactorily resolved. Apparatus builders of the future have a great deal to learn from the carefully constructed apparatus to James in ECM.
I merely list some of the other criticisms voiced by Aland. First, the Luke volumes fail to explain how the lectionaries were selected and it is also difficult to verify the evidence, especially where a lectionary MS. contains the pericope in more than one lection. We are also criticised for not explaining the lectionary system in our introductory matter and for failing to present our evidence with adequate completeness or accuracy. The arbitrary cut-off date of 500 A.D. for Greek Fathers is objected to, a limitation actually imposed on the project unilaterally by the American committee of its day. Aland judged our presentation of the fragmentary MSS. as ‘worthless’ because of the absence of any indication of the amount of text likely to be missing in the lacunae, and because we cite in the index the contents of the extant text, quoting from the collating base, even if the apparatus reveals the MS. in question has a variant here. This creates a misleading impression of the actual text of the fragmentary MSS. in the index of fragmentary texts. The same problem occurs for the fathers where the extent of their citations is conformed to the wording in the collating base. Aland is particularly critical that we did not provide a separate index for patristic citations. Again ECM in relation to Greek fathers shows what was expected and this new edition once more serves as an ideal edition.

Other issues such as the way to represent variants in oriental languages (in English, in Latin or in original scripts) keep being raised—as they were in Manson’s 1942 review. The request constantly to check that patristic citations are being culled from the best and most up to date editions also regularly appears in reviews.

Barbara Aland’s review appeared in JTS. Some of her points were similar to those we have already noted. Among distinctive criticisms are her complaint that our apparatus is “schwer zu lesen”, being too “atomisiert”, that our patristic evidence needed greater control, and that there are serious deficiencies in the citing of versional evidence, especially the Syriac.

---

16 For the most part ECM quite sensibly avoids using citations in languages other than Greek because the significance of their relationship to the New Testament Greek text is doubly secondary (see ECM IV, 1 p. 13*).

17 Even though I have voiced some criticisms of that edition (in NovT 40 (1998) pp. 195–204) I salute the construction of its apparatus as a splendid achievement, and one we should seek to emulate, as I shall reiterate below.
The reaction from Münster was not unexpected in that Kurt Aland published a preview review in 1965 when he allowed himself the liberty of commenting publicly on an early sample of the IGNTP apparatus that had been circulated privately and in confidence to interested parties. Whereas most replied privately, Aland’s reasons were trumpeted in NTS 13 (1965–6) pp. 176–85. His response to the sample was similar to the comments in the reviews of 20 years later which we have just noted. Having written his reactions, he concluded his article with the words “Dixi et salvavi animam meam”. These same words appear at the end of his ThRv review.

We should not neglect reviews from outside Germany.

Pride of place must go to the review which my predecessor as editor, Neville Birdsall, contributed to the Classical Review. What a difficult task that must have been to write for an expert who had been on the inside, trying to remedy shortcomings that proved endemic! Although he tactfully calls our errors and blunders ‘blemishes’, he still writes (p. 200): “Careful revising of many details is necessary before this can be the tool it is intended to be”. He reveals to the readers of this journal the constraints that he, above all, was so painfully aware of, namely that “the editorial work was done in the intervals of teaching duties” and that “there was no base of operations where the necessary works of reference were concentrated”, and that “there was constant pressure to go to press, from sponsors, from critics of the project and even within the committee itself”.

The American scholar W.L. Petersen’s review in JBL drew attention to what he, like others, saw as fundamental weaknesses especially the apparentachronism of collating against the TR which he describes as an abandonment of responsibility and as “deplorable”. His checking of a sample of Patristic evidence bears out Birdsall’s earlier judgement that this area was flawed. He writes (p. 761) that “the hap-hazard citation of Patristic witnesses raises questions about the use of non-experts in such an endeavor”. Petersen even calculated that some 60% of verses from his survey contained error in this area, a percentage even higher than Manson found in Legg’s work. Petersen allows himself to say that the apparently tendentious selection of evidence

is intolerable and unacceptable. In so speaking out, he too wished to save his soul; he speaks of needing to “keep clear his scholarly conscience”! Petersen wants to see a greater assessing of the earliest witnesses. He berates the IGNTP edition because, instead of doing that, we merely “reprint a 435-year-old edition, recollate MSS., reproduce some of the new evidence (while ignoring other evidence), relocate Patristic citations from the claves to the apparatus, and remove some errors (while, of course, introducing new ones”). He concludes that the IGNTP Luke’s achievements were merely equivalent to rearranging the deckchairs on the Titanic.

Shortly after he published that review Petersen was invited by the N. American committee of IGNTP to turn from poacher to gamekeeper by joining the committee. I was delighted to note that he accepted; he has special responsibility for preparing and presenting the Diatessaron material for the John volume. No doubt he will also see to it that the Patristic evidence in John will be flawless, and that the other faults he detected in Luke will never be repeated in John. A watchman as staunch as he could prevent history from being repeated by default. We also have another watchman on the N. American committee, Carroll D. Osburn, who also contributed a critical review. He concluded that “it is disappointing that the apparatus, though largely comprehensive and accurate, contains a higher incidence of inexactitude than is tolerable in a research tool and cannot be trusted, requiring verification at each point” and that “a careful and exacting revision could yet make these two volumes into the tools they were intended to be”. Here we have echoes of Birdsall’s criticisms. Osburn also asked for more precise work from collaborators on the John project and for significantly greater editorial control of material submitted. Fortunately he, like Petersen, is now (as secretary to the North American committee) in a position to exert an influence over these concerns.

As far as continuing use of these volumes is concerned, from time to time I come across researchers, scholars and commentators who refer to our apparatus, and even refer to its utility for their work. Many of these are not textual critics, but readers of the NT text for whom we text critics have a responsibility. One particular scholar, who is a textual critic and who has used and subjected our Luke volumes to his exacting investigations, is Tjitze Baarda. In a recently published

---

article in a collection of essays. Baarda finds the IGNTP Luke falls far short of his needs. In addition he complains that the jungle of variants in our *apparatus* must bewilder every user. To demonstrate the problems in the creation of a critical *apparatus*, Baarda takes as an example throughout his article just one verse (Luke 23:48) from the IGNTP Luke and, among other things, sets out a more logical arrangement of all its variants, signposting each variant with numbers. The ease of presentation and referencing there is noteworthy and remarkably similar to the *ECM* edition which was to appear a few years later. Although Baarda is sympathetic to our difficulties and indeed to any building of a full, accurate and meaningful *apparatus*, he is strongly critical of our past efforts but positive in suggesting ways in which *apparatus* building in the future might progress. The cautious way in which he urges Patristic citations to be presented, the requirement to treat the versional evidence separately from the Greek and the need to describe in a companion volume ambiguities in the presentation of this and other evidence are points taken notice of for the *ECM*. IGNTP should follow suit.

We deduce that, for work of the detailed precision he looks for, the IGNTP Luke volumes as established and published are woefully inadequate.

Obviously, all the major reviewers drew attention to errors and omissions of the sort any work as complex as a text critical *apparatus* is prone to. We cannot have too much accuracy in textual criticism.

The critics have spoken. We the editors have listened. The judgement of our jury is that despite the 40 year long wait for the Luke volumes—or probably because of this lengthy period with the inevitable loss of quality control and lack of consistency and with changes in the committees and personnel—there is much disappointment and

---


23 Not all Baarda’s suggestions are used by *ECM*, e.g. the suggestion that Patristic citations be printed out in full or the desire that retroversions be translated into Latin. Among Baarda’s other requests are that IGNTP should include among its minuscule witnesses all those MSS. which appear in the major critical *apparatus*, that the Arabic version and the Western Diatessaronic witnesses should be included. His is a stimulating and important article even though sheer pragmatism may dictate that some of his worthy suggestions be shelved as impracticable; not all his *desiderata* can be implemented easily.
dismay. Efforts to replace Tischendorf have resulted in a line of failures stretching back to von Soden’s day.

I must now therefore turn to the future. Can this apparently constant cycle of ambitious planning and scholarly endeavour, followed as it inevitably seems to be by delay and failure, be avoided?

There is at long last a glimmer of optimism as we enter the next millennium. And that is the possibility of genuine cooperation between the IGNTP enterprise and the Münster Institut. Our British committee was very heartened when we received the Minutes of our North American colleagues’ meeting held during the 1997 SBL conference in San Francisco. That meeting of the North American committee was attended by Barbara Aland and Klaus Wachtel from Münster and David Parker from the British IGNTP committee. Their Minutes report a willingness to collaborate and share information. There has already been some progress in the sense that both sides have since discussed the way in which the choice of minuscule witnesses may be selected. What I want to urge now is that this willingness be acted upon more vigorously. Baarda’s concluding remark in the article we were just considering is to urge the IGNTP committees towards a “closer harmony with the Textual Institute of Münster”. That was written in 1993. He would have been heartened by the tone of the 1997 meeting in San Francisco, but the “close harmony”, so properly pleaded for there, needs to be fostered.

The willingness to cooperate can and must be developed. Many of the criticisms of our Luke volumes which I have been elaborating are merely procedural—the layout of the apparatus, the way in which Patristic and versional evidence is collected and displayed fully and unambiguously, the use of Oppositionsprinzip or not. These can be resolved. The ECM now provides us with a working exemplar, as I have mentioned, and it is one with a conspicuous ease of presentation and display. Its appearance has marked a new standard—one to be emulated. The publication of its first fascicule and the approaches made at the San Francisco Meeting are the new elements in our saga—elements that give us the reason for our optimism.

The way of dealing with the fragmentary MSS. has I think been solved by IGNTP with the separate publication of our volume on the papyri and the comparable one in preparation on the majuscules.

The selecting of minuscules is problematic for all concerned in such endeavours, but satisfactory solutions are capable of being found. The two big stumbling blocks remain the issue of the collating base and the question of editing a text.

I would like to conclude my presentation by referring to these two issues in a spirit of trying to resolve an impasse that goes back to the Anglo-German meeting at Breslau. The plans of those delegations came to nought. The goodwill of the San Francisco discussions must not evaporate in the same way.

The fact that some Greek witnesses have been and are being entered electronically against the TR need not tie our hands. As our computer-literate colleagues will no doubt wish to remind us the collating base itself becomes irrelevant once the collation has been entered. The text of any witness can thereafter become the lead line—its readings can be displayed in full. Obviously I can see why one would not wish to collate a MS. against another MS., but I see no reason why any recent printed edition should not be used as the collating base.  

If, for the sake of argument, we printed at the head of our apparatus UBS⁴ that would not canonize that text as a new TR. Perhaps it was once the case that UBS/NA was intended as a Standard Text or even as a new textus receptus as some observers mischievously suggested, but that is no longer the case. Its introductory matter (p. 45*) makes it quite clear that NA²⁷ is merely a working document and that its readers are positively encouraged to use its apparatus in effect to construct their own text or at least to monitor the editors’ work. The changes to the UBS/NA text in the ECM fascicule on James, microscopic though they are, nonetheless follow this advice—the UBS/NA text is thereby toppled from its pedestal. No longer is it being promoted as the unchanging, unchangeable, inviolate text that some had at one time hoped it might be.

But this more open approach to the text of canonical scripture is compatible with the published work of D.C. Parker²⁶ and Bart D.

---

²⁵ As long as we strive to record each and every deviation from the collating base in full, whatever that base might be, then we have achieved our purpose of recording completely all the evidence to be included in the apparatus. Whatever the collating base, we must continue with our policy of avoiding the haphazard and partial citing of witnesses which pocket editions inevitably require. Even von Soden and Tischendorf cited their witnesses irregularly. There is no dispute over the need for thoroughness.

Ehrman. Both emphasise the living and therefore changing text of the New Testament and the needlessness and inappropriateness of trying to establish one immutable original text. That changeable text in all its variety is what we textual critics should be displaying.

Nevertheless the huge responsibility of leaving ‘ordinary’ readers the task of editing the text is too onerous. Even the average scholar who consults a Greek New Testament is usually all too willing to accept the printed text at face value without bothering to read the hieroglyphics in the marginalia. Baarda in the article we have already referred to asks that the future work of the IGNTP committee should grasp the nettle and produce a critical edition, saying that an apparatus without an edited text resulting from it makes the apparatus a mere torso (p. 96). Again, he is tune with the views of the Münster Institut. In the 1998 Bericht from Münster we read the address entitled “100 Jahre Neutestamentliche Textforschung (1898–1998)” delivered by Barbara Aland in the Villa Hammerschmidt in the presence of the President of the Federal Republic of Germany. In the course of some very generous and sympathetic words about the IGNTP, she repeats there the longstanding request that we should be establishing a text.

Despite my own published work in trying to prove the originality of the text in selected areas of textual variation, that is, trying to pronounce on the likeliest direction of change when confronted by two or more alternative readings, I agree that the task of trying to establish the original words of the original authors with 100% certainly is impossible. More dominant in text critics’ thinking now is the need to plot the changes in the history of the text. That certainly seemed to be the consensus at one of the sessions of the 1998 SBL conference in Orlando, where the question of whether the original text was an achievable goal received generally negative responses. This thinking lies behind at least two other ongoing text-critical projects at the present time. One is the apparatus to Mark which C.-B. Amphoux and I are engaged on.

Reuben Swanson’s singlehanded attempts to display the textual variants in the Gospels and Acts, however limited his enterprise perforce must be, nonetheless once again also puts the emphasis firmly on

actual MSS., and the differences between them without his attempting
to establish an original text or even a pecking order of probabilities.

Enterprises such as these are symptomatic of the growing disillu-
sionment with trying to establish a monolithic quasi-original text and
Teach us that IGNTP would probably be ill-advised to attempt to pro-
duce a critical text in its entirety.

To put it another way: there is no need nowadays to establish a
critical text, because any attempt to create such an ‘original’ text is an
elusive and illusory task.

So, how are we assist readers who want to consult a printed Greek
New Testament?

A compromise might be the introduction of bold dots (‘bullet points’) against all variants in an apparatus that could merit consideration as
representing at least another one of the earliest attainable forms of
the text even though something approximating to the autographs is
beyond our aspirations and reach. If such variants were earmarked
in such a way then the non-expert would at least have the significant
readings drawn to his attention and be spared ploughing through the
inevitable mass of trivia in any apparatus. In addition to this proposal,
a textual commentary could be written to accompany such passages.

A collaboration between IGNTP and Münster ought to be able to
proceed and to do so proactively. The pressures on a part-time edi-
tor have already been highlighted by Birdsell in the Classical Review.
His 1974 editor’s report, to which we also referred earlier, states that
“almost everything, British and American, has been attempted on a
part-time, even an amateur basis. It is this that has led to poor work-
manship, neglect of crucial areas, and so on”. To have the full-time pro-
fessionals at an established base, which is the Münster Institut, at our
elbow strikes me as the only antidote to that situation and one which
should enable us to prevent a repetition of our earlier experiences.

I see no reason why the UBS text cannot be printed as our lead
text with all variations displayed with their witnesses using the posi-
tive and negative approach of ECM, as long as it is made crystal clear
that the collating base is immaterial, arbitrary and as flawed as any
other critical text—and that it is merely an agreed peg on to which the
alternative readings are displayed. And, as stated above, some of these
variants would be identified by a typographical mark as possible con-
tenders to represent a text as early as, or as reliable as, the text of the
collating line. Nor need it be a problem that the UBS text or the NA
text have gone through differing editions with a different text printed,
as long as we work consistently with only one chosen edition. Neither do I see a problem in our jettisoning the text we printed in the Luke volume—it does not strike me as the loss of a long held conviction or cherished principle.

In conclusion I must make it clear that my remarks are personal ones: I do not speak here as the secretary of the British IGNTP committee, but it seems as if the overtures made at the San Francisco conference and the reactions to our Luke volumes should encourage those initiatives to develop into full scale cooperation that will be able to avoid the pitfalls that our historical survey has all too painfully revealed. To have been judged that our Luke project has been an abject failure and that the work needs redoing is one thing. To set about publishing a comparable apparatus to John along the same lines and applying the same principles, which will as a consequence be doomed to a comparable fate, is feckless and foolish.
Among the many presentations of the Gospel text of the New Testament, whether synopses of the Greek, facsimile transcripts of a particular manuscript, an edited critical edition or horizontally printed lines of text from particular manuscripts (such as the *Itala* fascicules or *Das neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*), nothing so far published enables the historian of the text to have an objective presentation of all of the earliest materials. The *Marc multilingue* project sets out to serve such a need.

The project is a Francophone enterprise originally led by Prof. Christian-Bernard Amphoux (CNRS, Lunel) until June 2001, by J.-C. Haelewyyck (Louvain-la-Neuve) since then and by J.K. Elliott (Leeds) with collaborators in France, Belgium and Switzerland. The project now functions under the banner of the ‘Société d’histoire du texte du Nouveau Testament’.

This article attempts to describe the aims and methods of a project-in-progress.

The project arises from a recognition that printed editions of the Greek New Testament are unsatisfactory. None actually represents exactly the text of any one manuscript and certainly does not restore the autograph, which is irrevocably lost. All editors of ancient texts strive to reconstruct the supposed original of the text in question, but in the case of the New Testament the history of critical editions has made the

---

1 With contributions from Christian-B. Amphoux and Jean-Claude Haelewyyck.
practice of textual criticism rather more complicated. That is because the first printed editions, since Erasmus’ edition of 1516, were based on a distinctive form of the text that was in general use throughout the middle ages, based largely on medieval manuscripts, whereas editors from Lachmann onwards (that is since 1831) contrived to base the printed edition of the Greek New Testament on the most ancient manuscripts available. Adherents of both camps, that is, supporters of the so-called Majority text (more narrowly known as the Textus Receptus) and of the ‘critical’ edition, continue to have influence nowadays. And that debate, often conducted in an acrimonious or parti-pris manner, has skewed the objective presentation and discussion of the evidence.

Readers of printed editions can therefore be divided into two: (a) those who have access in the TR and more widely the so-called Majority text to a form of the New Testament that was the one used and commented on by the Reformers and whose text can be traced probably to the fourth century; and (b) those who use a critical text, like the UBS Greek New Testament or Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, which favours the readings of manuscripts copied around 350 A.D., in other words soon after the conversion of Constantine (313 A.D.) and the recognition of Christianity as a major religion. Neither approach and neither type of printed edition enables the reader to appreciate the diversity of the New Testament textual transmission. And that is why a third way is needed. The Marc multilingue project takes into account the types of text in existence prior to 200 A.D., types which tended to be eclipsed in copies made in the two following centuries, although the witnesses of these earlier forms, from the 5th.–15th. centuries, are often incomplete and imperfect. Marc multilingue does not aim to produce an edited text or texts. Rather, it aims to present the existing documentation in an attempt to enable the history of the changing text to be recognised.

The quantity and variety of manuscript witnesses to the Greek New Testament text as potential bearers of the actual wording employed by the original authors are welcomed by those who seek to establish the foundation documents of the Christian faith. But the aim of restoring one, original text is impossible. The earliest witnesses display a variety of text-types, which some speak of as a ‘free’ text. That fact can be dis-

---

concerting for those who would wish to find a unified tradition or to see the same text being read throughout Christendom. The facts point to a variety of text-types in Christianity’s formative centuries, a variety that sees divergences in text between Christianity’s ancient centres and even within one centre as the years advance, to the extent that the Gospel text read in Alexandria in 200 A.D. differs from that read there in 350 A.D. The same may be said of Caesarea or Antioch. The evolution of the Greek text is a fact that needs to be recognised and reacted to. This project allows that developing tradition to be readily recognised in a distinctive visual presentation.

If each major text-type can be defined with variations from those traditions in allied manuscripts then research into the history of the text can be facilitated. That help is offered by the presentation of the evidence in the *Marc multilingue* project.

For those whose task it is to edit a critical printed edition of the text the multifaceted evidence can be daunting. An editor (or, more probably in view of the mass of material, an editorial committee) not only has to decide which manuscripts to use but then to read, compare and evaluate them, before attempting to establish the supposed original text. Finally the editors have to display in an *apparatus* those alternative, 'secondary', readings deemed important or significant.

These dilemmas are well known.

Printed editions of the Greek New Testament give us a text that does not exist in any one extant manuscript witness, and probably never existed in any one manuscript—even the autograph—of the particular text being established. All printed testaments are recent editorial creations. Most printed editions of the Greek New Testament are clones of either (a) Westcott and Hort, the title to whose edition of 1881 was, significantly, “The New Testament in the *Original* Greek” (implying of course that their edition reproduced the original Greek New Testament, not that it was an edited form of the New Testament in its original tongue), or (b) the TR, such as *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text*. Either the text is close to (a) the (combined) witness of Codex Sinaiticus (א 01) and Codex Vaticanus (B 03), or (b) Erasmus’ edition of 1516. No critical edition merely

---

reproduces as its New Testament the entire text of any one particular manuscript.

The Textus Receptus, as its name was meant to suggest, was an edition that was “acceptable (to all readers),” to quote from the preface to the Elzevir edition of 1633. The Nestle text, as a representative of Westcott and Hort redivivus, was at one time promoted as a new TR, and actively advertised as a so-called “standard” text, as close as possible to the supposed original. The recent reprinting of the 27th. edition of the Nestle text in 1993 is less dogmatic: it now presents itself realistically in its introductory matter (pp. 45*f.) as merely a working text, capable of being changed, the reader being invited to make use of its apparatus so to do.

The recent fascicules of the Editio Critica Maior (= ECM) on James and the Petrine epistles6 give us a newly edited text of these three epistles. The text differs somewhat from the Nestle text, edited under the auspices of the same institution (the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster, Germany). The editors of ECM anticipate future changes as they work through the New Testament. And even for the books already published they are aware that further changes may occur, as their understanding of the manuscripts and the interrelationships of certain witnesses are better plotted and analyzed. We may already see such a development in an addendum to the fascicule on the Petrine epistles which draws our attention (ECM IV, 2 part 1 p. 24*) to one further change to the text of the earlier published fascicule at James 2:4.

In a normal pocket edition of a critical text one encounters the variants deemed important by its editors together with a selection of ‘important’ manuscript evidence in support. What one cannot do, because the manuscript evidence is presented piecemeal and inconsistently, is to reestablish from such apparatus the running text of any one manuscript, even if it is a consistently cited witness. Such an enterprise should however be possible, at least in part, for the manuscripts selected for display in the relatively exhaustive apparatus in ECM, although not all variations are given even there, and purely orthographical variants are avoided. It should be even easier to do

6 Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio Critica Maior IV Catholic Epistles 1 James (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997); 2 The Letters of Peter (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000).
this in Swanson’s display of variants *in extenso*. He enables us to see in his horizontal lines of variants the actual running text of the thirty or so manuscripts for Mark which he prints, and for the other New Testament books published to date.

Electronically stored collations, such as those currently being undertaken by the International Greek New Testament Project in its on-going work assembling a full *apparatus* to the Fourth Gospel, will eventually enable the user to recall the actual text of each manuscript collated, regardless of the collating base originally used by the collator when entering the evidence for each manuscript.

But what one cannot do, even with the clearly displayed (and highly accurate) material in Swanson, is to observe in any meaningful way the principal divergences between the texts.

And there are important and significant variants that belong to the earliest centuries of the New Testament text. Some would rightly say that the most important text-critical variants occurred in the century or so before the canon was fixed (by, say, 200 A.D.) or before a standardized ecclesiastical text established itself. (Whether such a text merely evolved or was formally encouraged by church decree is disputed.)

This is not the place to rehearse the recent history of textual criticism’s findings about text-types. The standard introductions set out the various theories. Over the past century the nomenclature of these types and the proliferation of their sophisticated sub-divisions may vary and be debated, but what is beyond doubt is that the texts of the earliest witnesses differ. The early papyri and Codex Bezae, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus etc. display differences—often sharp divergences from one another. For those whose mission it is to find from within this morass of evidence at each point of variation the ‘original’ text and to jettison the alternatives as scribal

---


aberrations, the resultant eclectic text will overshadow all the differences from the printed text they establish.

But for those whose interests are in the evolution of the New Testament text or in the importance of all such changes then previous methods of publishing the New Testament text are dissatisfying.

The *Marc multilingue* project was set up a few years ago to satisfy the needs of New Testament textual critics (initially of Mark’s Gospel) who require and may benefit from a visual presentation of the earliest surviving forms of the New Testament text as we have these in extant manuscripts.

This means that the readings of the earliest witnesses to Mark must be set out in full throughout the Gospel.

As may be seen from a prototype page (Table 1) certain witnesses to the Greek have been selected. These are the so-called Western-type manuscripts D 05 (Codex Bezae), and, in Mark, W 032 (Codex Washingtoniensis); the so-called Caesarean text-type, Θ 038 (Codex Koridethianus), along with the allied minuscules in the family groupings fam' and fam' and 28, 565, and 700; two types of the ‘Alexandrian’ text-type then follow: (i) א 01 (Codex Sinaiticus), and B 02 (Codex Vaticanus); (ii) A 02 (Codex Alexandrinus), chosen as a distinctive and different form of the text, sometimes called (Syro)-Byzantine. The texts as printed are not of course exact transcripts of the manuscripts; orthography has been standardized to conform to modern conventions and modern punctuation has been introduced. Lacunae have been filled from the wording in allied texts—a procedure identified by the use of brackets in the text and by the *apparatus*. Careful corrections of transcriptional errors such as examples of haplography or ditography have been made. However, for each manuscript in the lines of text and in the *apparatus* the evidence has been based on a new collation.

We can readily identify important differences between witnesses merely by looking at, say, the divorce saying of Mark 10:11–12, the endings to the Gospel, the opening verses, Mark 1:8 or Mark 2:14

---


Conventionally, editors select, reading by reading, one text that is then printed as the original, the alternatives being dismissed as scribal aberrations, harmonisations to a parallel, liturgical glosses or the like. Such explanations for the secondary variant may well be correct, but in relegating all the supposed later forms to the margin, the history of the developing New Testament textual tradition is obscured and sight is lost of the fact that all the readings of each New Testament manuscript would have been accepted by its readers as their canonical text, however ‘secondary’ modern critics may brand some readings. Without passing judgement on the originality or not of each reading, the presentations in Marc multilingue set out the earliest forms in their likeliest chronological sequence. (We return to this shortly.)

‘Text forms’ is the preferred description. There is no doubt that what we have are differences in the form of wording. The term ‘text-types’ may imply redaction or editing. However, C.-B. Amphoux, who has his own, often idiosyncratic theories about this history, feels able to speak of B 03 as an ‘edited’ text\footnote{C.-B. Amphoux, “Les premières ‘Éditions’ des Évangiles” in C.-B. Amphoux and J. Margain (eds.), Les premières traditions de la Bible (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 1996) pp. 139–62 (= Histoire du texte biblique 2).} rather than as a representative of an evolved tradition. His theories were set out in part in his revision of Vaganay’s Initiation,\footnote{Op. cit.} and have been developed in his La parole qui devient Évangile,\footnote{Paris, 1993.} as well as more recently in ‘Le texte grec de Marc’ in Mélanges de science religieuse 56 Évangile de Marc: Recherches sur les versions du texte pp. 5–25. Other users of the essentially objective displays in Marc multilingue may well reach different conclusions about the historical sequence of the text forms and the reasons for the developments.

The relative sequence as presently set out starts with D followed by W. Both of these have Mark’s Gospel in fourth position, and may reflect the earliest form of Mark that we have. Amphoux is convinced
that the text now found in the 4th-century manuscript D is no mere maverick text of the Gospels and Acts but one of its earliest forms. It is thus virtually a sole survivor of a text that had been abandoned as the tradition developed.\textsuperscript{15} Some recent work on the Western text of Acts\textsuperscript{16} collaborates his arguments. W is often close to D in Mark but is not an exact copy. Whether we may speak with Amphoux of W as a revised form of D or, better, as a developed form of the text remain to be discussed further, but by printing these two forms in full in contiguous sections readers will be able to make their own judgements on these early and differing text forms.

Θ as an example of another distinctive text form possibly of Palestinian or Syrian origin stands next. Its evidence, often supplemented by the evidence of the minuscule groupings, family 1 (fam\textsuperscript{1}) and family 13 (fam\textsuperscript{13}), as shown in the accompanying apparatus (see below), stands in the section following. Recent researches by Didier Lafleuer on family 13 have resulted in a more accurate presentation of this evidence.

ב and B stand next; B is a kind of base text or at least (with ב) a highly influential text. These two could have originated in Alexandria or, if Skeat’s latest arguments are accepted,\textsuperscript{17} in Caesarea.

The sixth section is given over to A, as an early representative of the Byzantine text form.

This sequence is defensible but need not be the only order that could be produced.

The Table also includes the lay out of the apparatus to accompany the text. This includes variants in D W, the few papyri of Mark where extant, especially of course P\textsuperscript{45}, ב C L Δ 33 579 892 fam\textsuperscript{1} (= 1, 118, 131, 209) fam\textsuperscript{13} (mainly 13 69 124 346 543 plus 174 230 788 826 828 983) 28 565 700 1424 (all of which are well known to be allies of man-


uscripts from a much earlier date). There will be no attempt to exhibit an exhaustive critical apparatus, but merely to show significant variants as appropriate on each page between the normal allies of the six representative text-forms.

Patristic citations are not included in the apparatus, but readers are to be encouraged to relate patristic quotations and allusions to the wording of a particular text form. It is, however, well known that unambiguous citations from the Gospel of Mark are few and far between. Two tools may help: the SBL series, *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* attempts to relate patristic citations to known manuscripts and text-types of the New Testament. The series *Biblia Patristica* serves to highlight quotations in certain periods.

So far we have concentrated on the Greek text of Mark—and for most users of Mark it will be the Greek text that is of paramount importance. The early versions of the New Testament text are, however, supremely important. The arguments for this do not need rehearsing in this context. The early versions are paramount in this project, hence the name “Marc multilingue”. Rather than combine the evidence found in all these early translations and subsume them in the apparatus to the Greek text, each language will have a volume on its own—ten in all, including the Greek. It is recognised that each version has its own distinctive history often quite independent of the Greek original, on which many are directly based.

Table 2 shows sample pages from the projected fascicule on the Latin.

In several ways the situation in respect to the Latin is more favourable than it is in the case of the Greek, especially as far as the Vetus Latina is concerned. The manuscript tradition as a whole is of manageable proportions; it consists of only thirteen witnesses and the texts are accessible, thanks to photographs made available by the Vetus Latina Institut in Beuron. The Old Latin witnesses may be divided as follows. The African tradition is in two forms. Manuscript *k* (attested in the second half of Mark, but with lacunae) contains an ancient and pure form of the African text and one that antedates Cyprian;

---

18 This is set out in *Mélanges de science religieuse* 56 pp. 42–5. The mss. *aur* and *l* should not be retained among the Vetus Latina witnesses as their text is Vulgate in Mark, and *f* ought also be set aside.

19 See Table 2.
manuscript e (lacunose in the second half of Mark) also reproduces an African type of text, but one that betrays several levels of revision during which European readings have been introduced. The European tradition itself is best represented by the text in ms. b, to which ff² and i may be allied. It is in these three witnesses that one may find the kernel of the European text, or to be more precise the Italian text of c. 350–380. Manuscript d often has unique readings which justifies its text appearing on its own. Amongst other European mss., which will be shown in the *apparatus*, one ought to note on the one hand c and on the other a (with n and o) because these mss. stand in varying degrees on the hinge of the two traditions— their text is European but they contain many African readings. Finally, the Vulgate concludes the development of the Latin tradition although one needs to remember that this is merely Jerome’s somewhat hasty revision of one form of the Old Latin. Patristic citations have already been subjected to a preliminary study—but for practical reasons this evidence will not appear in *Marc multilingue* and awaits the Beuron edition of Mark.

Each version has been allocated to a researcher who is responsible for the separate fascicule to be dedicated to that version. The collaborators recruited so far are Jean-Claude Haelewyck (Latin), Christian Peeters (Gothic), Anne Boud’hors (Coptic), Bernard Outtier (Georgian and with oversight of the Armenian), Samir Arbache and Adel Sidarus (Arabic), Alain Desreumaux (Christian-Palestinian Aramaic), Alain Martin and Albert Frey (Syriac) and José Johannet (Slavic). Work on the Armenian and Ethiopic has still be assigned, but work on the other versions is in progress. The collaborators meet on a regular basis to discuss matters of common concern for *Marc multilingue*. Some of their results may be seen in the volume of *Mélanges de science religieuse* referred to above. A conference on the early history of the New Testament text was held in Lille in July 2000, attended by (among others) several members of the *Marc multilingue* team. Issues relevant to the versions of Mark were presented by collaborators on the project.

---


21 The proceedings of this conference are being published and they include contributions by several of the collaborators of *Marc multilingue* by Zèbre (Lausanne) under
Where the fascicules on the Greek and the versions may be seen to be related is in the French translation facing each page of the Greek, Latin, Coptic etc. Table 2 shows a French translation that will face a page of the Latin text. (This Table and Table 1 are, of course, merely samples of work in progress and are not to be seen as definitive, final versions.) Where more than one form of the text is printed, a French translation accompanies each form. If it is judged that the Greek sub-stratum is the same then the same French word(s) will be employed. (As this is a collegial enterprise the information is shared and collaborative agreements reached between those responsible for each version.)

This French translation needs to be as literal as possible to reflect the underlying language but all the translations need to be standardized so that readers dependent on the French (it being readily acknowledged that those turning to each version and comparing all these volumes will not have an equal facility in the languages concerned) will not be mislead by any slight differences in the translations if these do not in fact reflect differences between the originals. Care will be exercised in this area to ensure coherence.

The first four chapters in Greek and in most of the versions have been drafted and are discussed at regular conferences and consultations. It is to be hoped that the first fascicules can be published before too long.

---

Marc 1, 40–45—La guérison du lépreux (1)

D\textsuperscript{40}\textsuperscript{40} Καὶ ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων·ἐὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι 41 καὶ ὀργισθής εἰκεῖνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἔσωκατ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—θέλω, καθαρίσθητι 42 καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη 43 καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν. 44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—ὅρα μηδενὶ εἶπῆς, ἀλλὰ υπάγει δείξαν τις καὶ προσέγγεικεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ὁ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ. 45 ο δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρετα κηρύσσει καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μὴκετί δύνασαι φανερῶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πόλιν, ἀλλὰ ἐξὼ ἐν ἐρήμοις τούποις ἦν καὶ ἤρετον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

W\textsuperscript{40} Καὶ ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτόν καὶ λέγων·κύριτε, ἐὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι 41 ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς εἰκεῖνας τὴν χεῖρα ἔσωκατ’ αὐτοῦ λέγει·θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. 42 καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ κηρύσσειν. 43 καὶ ἐμβριμησαμενος αὐτὸν εὐθέως εξέβαλεν αὐτὸν, 44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδενὶ εἶπῆς, ἀλλὰ ὑπάγει σπαστὴν δείξαν τῷ ἵρει καὶ προσέγγεικεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ὁ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ. 45 δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρετα κηρύσσει καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μὴκετί δύνασαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐξὼ ἐν ἐρήμοις τούποις ἦν καὶ ἤρετον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

Θ\textsuperscript{40} Καὶ ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτόν καὶ γονυπητῶν καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ·κύριε ἐὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι 41 ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς εἰκεῖνας τὴν χεῖρα ἔσωκατ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. 42 καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ κηρύσσειν. 43 καὶ ἐμβριμησαμενος αὐτὸν εὐθέως εξέβαλεν αὐτόν, 44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδενὶ εἶπῆς, ἀλλὰ ὑπάγει σπαστὴν δείξαν τῷ ἵρει καὶ προσέγγεικεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ὁ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ. 45 δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρετα κηρύσσει πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μὴκετί αὐτὸν δύνασαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐξὼ ἐν ἐρήμοις τούποις ἦν καὶ ἤρετον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.
Marc 1,40–45—La guérison du lépreux (2)

Χ 40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι έὔν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαί 41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθείς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤματο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. 42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκκαθαρίσθη. 43 καὶ ἐμβρυμισάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν. 44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—ὁρα ἐρήμοις καὶ δείξον ὅτι ἄλλα ὑπάγει σαυτόν δείξων τῷ ιερεί καὶ προσένεγκεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἀ προσέταξεν Μωύσης εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 45 ὅ δε ἐξέβλησαν ἤρεξαν κηρύσσειν πολλά καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὅταν μηκέτι δύνασθαι αὐτῶν εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς εἰσελθένειν, ἀλλ’ ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

B 40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτῶν λέγων αὐτῷ· κύριε ὅτι έὔν θέλης δύνη με καθαρίσα 41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθείς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤματο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—θέλω, καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκκαθαρίσθη καὶ ἐμβρυμισάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὁρα ἐρήμοις καὶ δείξον ἃπ’ ὑπάγει σεαυτὸν δείξων τῷ ιερεί καὶ προσένεγκεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἀ προσέταξεν Μωύσης εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 45 ὅ δε ἐξέβλησαν ἤρεξαν κηρύσσειν πολλά καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὅταν μηκέτι αὐτῶν δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθένειν, ἀλλ’ ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

A 40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτῶν καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι έὔν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσα 41 ὅ δε Ἦσος σπλαγχνισθείς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤματο αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—θέλω, καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκκαθαρίσθη καὶ ἐμβρυμισάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὁρα ἐρήμοις καὶ δείξον ἃπ’ ὑπάγει σεαυτὸν δείξων τῷ ιερεί καὶ προσένεγκεν περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἀ προσέταξεν Μωσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 45 ὅ δε ἐξέβλησαν ἤρεξαν κηρύσσειν πολλά καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὅταν μηκέτι αὐτῶν δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθένειν, ἀλλ’ ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.
Et venit ad eum leprosus obsecrans eum et genibus volutans dicens illi:
Domine, si volueris, potes me mundare. 41Et misericordia actus extendens
manum suam ei tetigit eum et dixit illi: Volo, mundare. 42Et continue abit
ab eo lepra. 43Et eiecit eum 44et ait illi: Vide ne cui dicas sed vade et ostende
te sacerdoti et offeret pro emundatione tua quae praecepit Moyses in testi-
monium illis. 45Ille autem exiens coepit praedicare et diffamare verbum ita
ut iam non posset manifeste in civitatem introire sed foris in desertis locis
conveniebant ad eum.

Et venit ad illum leprosus deprecans eum et dicens: Si vis, potes mundare
me. 42Et extendens manum ei dixit: Volo, mundare. 43Et discessit ab eo lepra. 44
Et ait illi: Vide nemini dixeris sed demonstia te sacerdoti et
offeres pro purgatione tua quae praecepit Moyses in testimonium illis. 45Ipse
autem egressus coepit praedicare et diffamare sermonem ita ut iam non pos-
set palam in civitate introire, sed foras in deserta loca veniebant ad ilium.

Et venit ad eum leprosus deprecans eum et dicens: Si volueris, potes me
mundare. 41Et iratus extendit manum suam et tangens eum ait illi: Volo,
mundare. 42Et statim decessit ab eo lepra, et mandatus est. 43Et comminatus
ei statim dimisit illum 44et dicit ei: Vide nemini dixeris sed vade ostende te
ipsum sacerdoti et offeres pro emundatione tua quae praecepit Moyses in tes-
timonium illis. 45At ille egressus coepit praedicare et diffamare sermonem ita
ut non posset manifeste introire in civitate, sed foris in desertis locis esse.
Et conveniebant ad eum undique.

Et venit ad eum leprosus deprecans eum et genu flexo dixit: Si vis, potes
me mundare. 41Iesus autem misertus ei extendit manum suam et tangens eum
aite illi: Volo, mundare. 42Et cum dixisset statim discessit ab eo lepra, et
mandatus est. 43Et comminatus ei statim eiecit illum 44et dicit ei: Vide nemini
dixeris sed vade ostende te principi sacerdotum et offer pro emundatione tua
quae praecepit Moses in testimonium illis, 45At ille egressus coepit praedicare
et diffamare sermonem ita ut iam non posset manifeste in civitate, sed foris in
desertis locis esse. Et conveniebant ad eum undique.

Traduction

Et vient vers lui un lépreux, l’implorant et s’agenouillant, lui disant:
Seigneur, si tu veux, tu peux me purifier. 41Et poussé par la pitié, étendant sa
main et il le toucha et lui dit: Je (le) veux, sois purifié. 42Et aussitôt s’en alla
de lui la lèpre. 43Et il le renvoya 44et lui dit Veille à ne (le) dire à personne,
mais va et montre-toi au prêtre, et il offrira pour ta purification ce qu’a pre-
scrit Moïse en témoignage pour eux. 45Lui alors sortant se mit à prêcher et
divulger la parole, au point qu’il ne pouvait plus ouvertement en ville entrer,
mais dehors, en des lieux déserts, ils se joignaient à lui.
b 40Et vient vers lui un lépreux, l’implorant et disant: si tu veux, tu peux me purifier. 41Et étendant la main il lui dit: Je (le) veux, sois purifié. 42Et s’en alla de lui la lèpre. [om. v. 43] 43Et il lui dit: Veille à ne (le) dire à personne, mais montre-toi au prêtre et tu offriras pour ta purification ce qu’a présent Moïse en témoignage pour eux. 44Lui alors, étant sorti, se mit à prêcher et divulger la parole, au point qu’il ne pouvait plus ouvertement en ville entrer, mais dehors, en des lieux déserts, ils venaien vers lui.

d 40Et vient vers lui un lépreux, l’implorant et disant; Si tu veux, tu peux me purifier. 41Et irrité il étendit sa main et le toucha et lui dit: Je (le) veux, sois purifié. 42Et aussitôt s’en alla de lui la lèpre et il fut purifié. 43Et, l’ayant rabroué, aussitôt il le renvoya 44et lui dit: Veille à ne (le) dire à personne, mais va, montre-toi toi-même au prêtre et tu offriras pour ta purification ce qu’a préservé Moïse en témoignage pour eux. 45Mais lui, étant sorti, se mit à prêcher et divulger la parole, au point qu’il ne pouvait pas ouvertement entrer en ville, mais (seulement) être dehors, en des lieux déserts. Et ils se joignaient à lui de partout.

Vg 40Et vient vers lui un lépreux, l’implorant et, s’étant agenouillé, il dit: Si tu veux, tu peux me purifier. 41Alors Jésus, apitoyé sur lui, étendit sa main et le touchant lui dit: Je (le) veux, sois purifié. 42Et, après qu’il eut parlé, aussitôt s’en alla de lui la lèpre, et il fut purifié. 43Et, l’ayant rabroué, aussitôt il le renvoya 44et lui dit: Veille à ne (le) dire à personne, mais va, montre-toi au chefdes prêtres et offre pour ta purification ce qu’a préservé Moïse en témoignage pour eux. 45Mais lui, étant sorti, se mit à prêcher et divulger la parole, au point qu’il ne pouvait pas ouvertement en ville entrer, mais (seulement) être dehors, en des lieux déserts. Et ils se joignaient à lui de partout.

Apparat Critique

e 44 offerer] offert e, correxii
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Postscriptum

1. Re footnote 7: Since this article was published two further volumes by Swanson have been published (by Tyndale Press, Wheaton and by Carey, Pasadena): 1 Corinthians in 2003 and 2 Corinthians (2005).

2. The list of co-workers given above has changed slightly.

3. Samples of the work on the project may be seen online http://www.safran.be/marcmultilingue
CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

MANUSCRIPTS, THE CODEX AND THE CANON

In any discussion of the canon of both Old and New Testaments patristic evidence is recognized as having crucial importance. Equally significant sources of information—all too frequently neglected—are extant biblical MSS. As far as the New Testament is concerned it was not until the fourth century that relative agreement was reached about precisely which books should be in the canon. Books that fell outside that canon were branded as apocryphal in the sense of ‘spurious’, ‘secondary’, ‘of dubious value’. The books accepted as the canonical scriptures of the church for its new testament were in general those that were ancient, of apostolic authority and had received universal Christian acceptance. As for the Old Testament, this canon was never drawn so precisely. This article will investigate the evidence of MSS and versions concerning the contents of both testaments. First we turn to the New Testament.

English versions of the New Testament and modern editions of the Greek New Testament contain the same 27 books usually in the same sequence. The order of the books has become standardized. The four Gospels in the sequence Matthew, Mark, Luke, John followed by Acts form as it were the history of Jesus and the church. These are followed nowadays by the Paulines separated by Hebrews from the Catholic epistles in a fixed order; then comes Revelation at the end. There is little logic, chronological, theological or historical, in the sequences of books within each section. The normal order of Gospels seems to place one of the longer Gospels first; the order of the Paulines seems to be based on the decreasing length of the individual books. But as we shall see below, other sequences have been followed in manuscripts and in printed editions of the Greek.

However authoritative the opinion of the synod or the church leader about what was and what was not canonical, it is likely that

---

the codex form in which the Christian scriptures circulated helped to promote the establishment of the definitive, fixed canon of the 27 books we know.

When each book circulated as a separate entity, obviously there was no limit to the number of texts that could be received. When certain, approved, texts were gathered into small collections this had the effect of ostracizing and isolating texts which were not deemed suitable for inclusion. Some early church authorities knew of and cited Gospels that were later branded as apocryphal. According to Eusebius the Gospel of Peter was read by the church at Rhossus. Jewish Christian Gospels like the Gospel according to the Hebrews were quoted by Fathers such as Clement, Origen and Jerome in the same way as they cited works that were later to be in the canon. All these Gospels, canonical and apocryphal (to use these terms anachronistically) presumably circulated originally as separate items. Christianity soon began to distinguish between the various Gospels then in existence. Patristic citation and Christian preference generally agreed that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John were the authoritative foundation documents for the faith. Eventually it was these which were the four that were gathered into a single codex.

The oldest New Testament manuscripts extant today generally contain (or, appear to have contained) only single books (e.g. second century: ℓ52 John; third century: ℓ1 Matthew; ℓ5 John; ℓ7 Luke; ℓ9 1 John; ℓ12 Hebrews; ℓ13 Hebrews; ℓ18 Revelation) but that does not tell us much because these very fragmentary manuscripts may originally have contained more than one text. In fact, some papyri surviving from the third century do contain portions from more than one text (e.g. ℓ20 1 and 2 Thessalonians; ℓ53 Matthew and Acts; ℓ72 1 and 2 Peter and Jude; ℓ92 Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians).

The oldest known manuscript that contains all four Gospels (and Acts) is the third-century Chester Beatty papyrus ℓ45. Luke and John survive in ℓ75 of the third century, but this manuscript may originally have contained more than two Gospels. The well-known papyrologist and palaeographer T.C. Skeat is of the opinion that the manuscripts numbered ℓ64 (fragments of Matthew), ℓ67 (fragments of Matthew), and ℓ4 (fragments of Luke) originally belonged together and should

now be registered under one siglum. He claims\(^2\) that it can be proved statistically that Luke did not follow Matthew—another Gospel must have intervened. In other words he argues that this manuscript was possibly originally written as a four-Gospel codex and that if the second-century date for \(\text{P64}\) and \(\text{P67}\) can be maintained, then this would be our earliest known example of such a codex. (\(\text{P4}\), usually given a third-century date, may in fact be much older: the fragments were found in the binding of a manuscript of Philo, which itself has been dated as third century. \(\text{P4}\) must therefore be older than that; and some time must be allowed for a well-written codex to have deteriorated to such an extent that it was torn up and used as waste. All in all \(\text{P4}\) can hardly be any later than 200 C.E.)

Collecting the four chosen Gospels into one codex had the effect of according a special status to those four but, possibly more significant, helped to limit the number of Gospels to these four and no more! The fourfold Gospels could fit into one codex, but not onto one roll, so the adoption of the codex would itself have had the effect of enforcing the fourfold Gospel canon as a fixed entity. The Gospels that were rejected from that fourfold collection were never bound together with any or all of those four. There are no manuscripts that contain say Matthew, Luke and Peter, or John, Mark and Thomas. Only the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were considered as scriptural and then as canonical. It could be that the reason why the Christians adopted the codex long before anyone else was to safeguard the four Gospels from either addition or subtraction. This is in effect the operation of a ‘canon’. Unlike the writing of a roll, when a codex was planned one had to decide what was to go into it, particularly if it was a single-quire codex where the number of leaves has to be fixed in advance.

It is interesting to note that the Gospel of Mark was included right from the beginning, despite the fact that nearly all of its contents are to be found in at least one other of the canonical Gospels. The belief that Peter’s authority lay behind Mark may have helped its reputation as an indispensable source (although that tradition may only have originated after Mark was already bound in as one of the authoritative

four). Once the quartet of Gospels had been established the figure four was itself seen to be of significance as Irenaeus is at pains to point out. In his *Against Heresies* he refers to the four winds, the four points of the compass and the four covenants between God and humankind as precedents for the inevitability of the fourfold Gospel canon. As is also well known, Irenaeus compares the four Gospels to the living creatures of Ezek. 1.1–21 (called cherubim in Ezek. 10.20) in which the sequence of man (= Matthew), lion (= John), ox (= Luke), eagle (= Mark) is the so-called Western order of the Gospels. That Irenaeus was able to argue in favour of the fourfold Gospel canon in c. 170 suggests that such a collection was already well in existence by then, although the establishment of the collection was in need of defence.

Our surviving manuscripts that contain the four canonical Gospels do not have them in only one fixed order. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John was the most common sequence, but other sequences exist. The order known as the Western order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, has just been referred to. This sequence is found in Codex Bezae and several so-called Western manuscripts such as W X and several minuscules, as well as in Old Latin manuscripts and the Peshitta. One reason for such an order may be that in the Western order the Gospels attributed to two leading apostles are given pride of place. Various other sequences occur in manuscripts but it is interesting to see that no sequence has Luke first. The following orders are found in manuscripts, in canonical listings or in versional evidence: 1432, 1423, 1243, 1324, 4123, 4132, 2134, 2314, (where Matthew = 1, Mark = 2, Luke = 3, John = 4).

As well as the fourfold Gospel codex other collections of Christian scriptures were issued. Some manuscripts contain the Catholic Epistles; other manuscripts contain the Pauline corpus. There is an equally arbitrary sequence in those manuscripts too.

As far as the Pauline collection is concerned, the various patristic and other early lists of canonical books show that there was hesitation especially in the West over Hebrews. The letter is absent from the

---

3 For the identification with the creatures in Ezekiel in preference to those in the book of Revelation see T.C. Skeat, ‘Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon’, *NovT* 34 (1992), pp. 194–99. Reprinted as chapter in J.K. Elliott (ed.), *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) (= *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 113). The importance of the number as well as the order makes sense only when all four are contained in a codex. If the identification were with Revelation various problems with Irenaeus’s parallels occur, as Skeat makes clear—not least the resulting order of the gospels, John, Luke, Matthew, Mark, which is unique.
Manuscripts, the codex and the canon

Muratorian canon (of the second or, more probably, the fourth century) and even from the tenth-century Cheltenham canon, although it seems as if there are no Greek manuscripts of the Pauline corpus extant that excluded Hebrews. The Muratorian Fragment finds it significant that Paul, like the seer, wrote letters to seven churches (Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colossae, Galatia, Thessalonica, Rome) and that was the justification for publishing for general reading correspondence that had been addressed to individual churches. The addition of Hebrews to the Pauline corpus was a problem that needed explaining. A justification was found in the total of 14 letters (including 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus and Philemon): it was then possible to see in that total the significant number seven doubled!

The order within the Catholics was also not invariably fixed. Decreasing length of the letters may have made the sequence James, Peter, John, Jude a popular one (this order is found in Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus), although the order John, Peter, James, Jude is also to be found (in Innocent's list of c. 405 C.E.). The motive there may have been to include the three letters (those by John) before two letters (attributed to Peter) and to leave the single compositions until the end. Other sequences found in canonical lists and/ or manuscripts (where Peter = 1; John = 2; James = 3; Jude = 4) are 1234, 1324 (as in the list found in Codex Claromontanus), 1243, 1342, 3412.

Mostly what was copied was either the four Gospels only (some 2122 manuscripts survive), or the Pauline corpus only (there are about 714 manuscripts extant).

---

4 The position of Hebrews varies in the Greek manuscripts. (1) In the third-century 46 it follows Romans in number two position, possibly because of its length. (2) In some minuscules Hebrews follows 2 Corinthians. (3) It followed Galatians in an ancestor of Codex Vaticanus (B 03), although the manuscript itself has Hebrews after 2 Thessalonians. The consecutive chapter numbers found throughout the Pauline epistles in B 03 have Galatians end at ch. 58. Next comes Ephesians beginning with ch. 70. Hebrews begins at ch. 59. (4) Hebrews follows 2 Thessalonians in Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus, i.e. it comes immediately before the letters to individuals. This is the position printed in Greek New Testaments that favour not only the text but the order of contents in their preferred manuscripts. Such a sequence may be found in the editions of Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and von Soden. (5) Hebrews follows Philemon in Claromontanus, the Latin Vulgate and most modern translations.

5 The Muratorian canon list refers to Jude and two of the letters by John.

292 surviving manuscripts), or Revelation only (139); or Acts plus the Catholic epistles (86).\footnote{All these figures are approximate and are taken from K. and B. Aland, \textit{The Text of the New Testament} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill) with the MSS available to them in the preparation of the 2nd English edition in 1989.}

Up to the third century no surviving codex is known to have had more than 300 pages. After that the codex grew: B, Codex Vaticanus (fourth century), had 1600 pages; Sinaiticus (fourth century) 1460 pages; Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century) 1640 pages. (All these figures are \textit{minima} because all three are defective at the end.) This meant that more than one section of the New Testament could be included within one set of covers.

The following contents of extant manuscripts are found\footnote{These figures now need some re-adjustment.}: 

79 manuscripts contain the New Testament minus the Gospels, i.e. a/cpr

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ea/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ea/cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>a/cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>a/cp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (e = \text{Gospels}, a/c = \text{Acts and/or Catholic Epistles}, p = \text{Paulines}, r = \text{Revelation}) \)

Only about 60 of our 3000 or so surviving continuous-text Greek New Testament manuscripts were written as complete New Testaments, that is with all 27 books included. Some 150 contain the whole New Testament minus Revelation (which was looked upon with some suspicion by the church in the East for some time, before being eventually admitted into its canon). Even today the Eastern Orthodox churches do not include readings from Revelation in the lectionary.

In total 2361 manuscripts including fragmentary manuscripts contain the Gospels, 662 including fragments contain Acts and the Catholics, 792 contain Paul and 303 Revelation.

Where we have manuscripts containing more than one section of the New Testament the precise order of the sections was no more fixed than the sequences within each section. Thus we find manuscripts with the order ape, acp (as in manuscripts Alexandrinus, Vaticanus...
and Ephraimi Rescriptus and the Majority Text), pac (as in Codex Sinaiticus\(^9\) and some minuscules), pca. What is not clear is whether this was because of a perceived ranking of the sections’ theological significance.

The sequence Acts with the Catholic Epistles following directly is found in the printed Greek testaments edited by Tregelles, von Soden and Tischendorf. Three of the writers of the Catholics were the so-called pillars of the church, Peter, James and John. Perhaps it was felt that their works should follow on naturally from Acts.

It is tempting to surmise that those great codices, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, which are our earliest examples to contain the Old Testament and the New Testament, were designed specifically to demonstrate and encapsulate the established Christian canon of scriptures. It was by the dates these manuscripts were written that a general consensus had been established in churches East and West about the canon. Roberts and Skeat\(^{10}\) remind us that the adoption by Christians of the codex did not in itself create the fourfold Gospel canon. That observation applies to the other sections of the New Testament as well. The New Testament canon was decided by Church authorities on theological and historical grounds, but canon and codex go hand in hand in the sense that the adoption of a fixed canon could be more easily controlled and promulgated when the codex was the normal means of gathering together originally separated compositions. (On the other hand, we also need to remind ourselves that the Jews had a canon but not the codex.)

It is also interesting to see that Codex Sinaiticus contains more than the New Testament as we know it. After the New Testament come the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas. Alexandrinus contains 1 and 2 Clement after the New Testament. We must assume that the authorities behind Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus considered these works canonical and wished to promote them as such. Certainly the user of these codices would have accepted all the texts in their Bible codex as having equal status.

There is evidence that these ‘extra’ writings were influential. The canon of the Coptic church includes 1 and 2 Clement (and the

---

\(^9\) The order epacr of Codex Sinaiticus is also found in the sixth-century Latin manuscript Codex Fuldensis and also in the Complutensian Polyglot.

Apostolic Constitutions) after Revelation. Jerome hesitated about the status of the Epistle of Barnabas (‘almost a New Testament book’ De Vir. Ill. 6). He also knew that the Shepherd of Hermas was read in some churches (De Vir. Ill. 10). The Shepherd of Hermas is included in the ninth-century Latin Codex Sangermanensis. 1 and 2 Clement are included within the Paulines in one Harclean Syriac MS. This varied testimony shows how these texts were on the fringes of the New Testament canon for many centuries. However, the canonical list in the sixth-century Codex Claromontanus marks the Epistle of Barnabas and The Shepherd of Hermas together with the Acts of Paul and the Apocalypse of Peter as works of doubtful canonicity. The influence of these ‘extra’ books seems thereafter to have been curtailed.

In the Latin field the Epistle to the Laodiceans, normally considered as a worthy contender for inclusion in New Testament apocryphal collections, is found within the New Testament proper in Codex Fuldensis, Codex Ardmachanus and some 100 other Vulgate mss. On their authority Laodiceans is found in the appendix of modern printed editions of the Vulgate. (All 18 German printed Bibles prior to Luther’s translation include it too.)

In the Armenian version printed by Zohrab 3 Corinthians (now considered as part of the apocryphal Acts of Paul) occurs as an appendix to its New Testament. The broader canon of the Ethiopic church has 35 books in its New Testament but the extras are books of church order. In any case no Ethiopian manuscripts contain more than one part of the New Testament so the tradition of a complete codex of the 27 normative New Testament books does not apply here. Of more significance is the Syriac. For a time the Syriac included 3 Corinthians. Of particular importance is the canon of the fifth-century Peshitta which omits four short epistles (2 and 3 John, Philemon, 2 Peter) and Revelation. All 27 New Testament books ultimately appeared in the Philoxenian version, yet the official lectionary of both East and West Syrian churches uses only the 22 books found in the Peshitta.

One sideline to be mentioned here is that the text of the New Testament that was found in the manuscripts was not of importance to those who pronounced on the canon. Jerome, Origen and others recognized certain books as approved, canonical scripture, but they did not try to specify a particular or precise form of the text to be found in the manuscripts even though these Fathers were alert to textual variation in manuscripts. As we know, the surviving manuscripts exhibit a marked difference between themselves—and this is especially
true of the earliest manuscripts (precisely in the centuries before the canon was fixed). So what was fixed as canonical was ‘Mark’ without further qualification. The question was not raised whether Mark is to include 16.9–20 or not. ‘John’ was approved without a word being said about the inclusion or exclusion of the passage about the adulteress (Jn 7.53–8.11). In effect, the manuscript an individual church possessed was canonical; a neighbouring church may have had radically different forms of the same books and these would be its canonical scriptures.

We have seen that from the fourth century onwards the New Testament canon was, with a few exceptions in Syriac or Ethiopic, generally agreed. That meant that one could expect that a complete New Testament would contain the same 27 books, and a Pauline manuscript would contain the same 14 books, or a manuscript of the Catholic Epistles would contain the same 7 letters. Since the invention of printing an edition of the New Testament always contains the same 27 books.\(^\text{11}\) Obviously the same text is not always to be found: the Textus Receptus and Westcott and Hort’s Greek testament do not agree throughout. In English the text in the AV (KJV) on one side and modern editions like RV, RSV, NIV, GNB on the other side differ in their textual base and textual decisions. But the titles of the works included in the New Testament are the same on the contents pages of all these editions.

But when we turn to the Old Testament the situation is far more fluid. There is far less uniformity. Titles on the contents pages vary depending on which printed edition one consults and in which language. Not only is there a Hebrew Old Testament, which differs from a Greek Old Testament, which differs from a Latin Old Testament, but even our modern versions are often not in agreement about what constitutes the Old Testament canon proper (by which is normally meant the Hebrew scriptures of the Palestinian Jews), and what are apocryphal or deuterocanonical works.

\(^{11}\) Luther’s printed New Testament included Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation after 3 John—an order without manuscript precedent. He separated them by a line on his contents page from the rest of the New Testament to show his disapproval of these books in the canon! Unlike the other books in his New Testament these four are unnumbered.
The Apocrypha in the AV (KJV) used always to be printed as a separate section between the Old Testament and the New Testament. (It was only in the nineteenth century that Protestant Bibles began to print the Hebrew scriptures [the Old Testament] alone without following them with the Apocrypha.) In this section are to be found 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, the extra portions of Esther, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Ben Sira (or Sirach or Ecclesiasticus), Baruch including the Epistle of Jeremiah, the extra portions of Daniel, the Prayer of Manasseh, 1 and 2 Maccabees. (1 and 2 Esdras are not found in Luther's Bible. The Prayer of Manasseh is not allocated a number in Luther's apocrypha).

These so-called apocryphal books were not originally separated in the codices. In Greek and/or Latin manuscripts they are dispersed throughout the whole testament in order (presumably) to allow them to accord to some extent with other books that are in close proximity. The practice of gathering them into a separate unit, the form in which English readers are used to seeing them, dates from about 1520.

As for recent English editions, GNB transfers 1 and 2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh from its ‘Apocrypha’ to a separate section with the sub-heading ‘Some Additional Books’. NRSV divides its apocryphal/deuterocanonical books into four sections:

12 Some modern editions now give a translation of the whole of the Greek version of Esther in the apocrypha so that the additions can be read in context.
13 Other modern English versions also print these texts in the same order (e.g. RSV, NEB). For Tobit AV translated the text of Vaticanus, the RV of 1894 followed Alexanderinus, the RSV used both these MSS from Rahlfs’ edition of the LXX. NEB and NRSV based their translations on the text in Codex Sinaiticus.
14 Luther’s Bible of 1545 includes the following apocryphal texts in the following order:

I  Judith
II Wisdom
III Tobit
IV Ben Sira
V Baruch (and Epistle of Jeremiah)
VI 1 and 2 Maccabees
VII additions to Esther
VIII additions to Daniel
The Prayer of Manasseh

The Confessio Belgica of 1561 was another influence on Protestant thinking about the apocryphal books on the continent. In its Article 6 it lists the following as apocryphal: 3 and 4 Ezra, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ben Sira, Baruch and Epistle of Jeremiah, additions to Esther, additions to Daniel, Manasseh, 1 and 2 Maccabees. The Zürich Bible of 1907–31, however, contains only 1 and 2 Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, Ben Sira and Wisdom.
a. those recognized as deuterocanonical by the Roman Catholic, Greek and Russian Orthodox churches (i.e. Tobit, Judith, additions to Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Ben Sira, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, additions to Daniel, 1 and 2 Maccabees);

b. those recognized by the Greek and Russian Orthodox churches but not by the Roman Catholic church (i.e. 1 Esdras, the Prayer of Manasseh, Psalm 151, 3 Maccabees), although the Latin Vulgate includes the Prayer of Manasseh and 1 Esdras (numbered there as 3 Esdras)\textsuperscript{15} in an appendix where it is treated as ‘Apocryphal’ as opposed to ‘Deuterocanonical’;

c. 2 Esdras, recognized as canonical in the Slavonic church (where it is numbered 3 Esdras). The Latin Vulgate includes 2 Esdras in its appendix (where it is numbered 4 Esdras);

d. 4 Maccabees, which appears as an appendix to the Greek Bible.

The effect of these decisions in modern printed editions is well summarized by Torrey. Writing of the books printed as a separate ‘Old Testament Apocrypha’ he says, ‘Just as in the early centuries the codex had guaranteed to these particular books (the apocrypha) enduring recognition by the church, so now the printed Bible assured to them for all the future an inferior place in the public estimation’ and ‘No reader of the Catholic Bible would henceforth see divine authority in the two Esdras books and the Prayer of Manasseh; nor would

\textsuperscript{15} There is much confusion over the various books called Esdras or Ezra. We are dealing with four books, Ezra and Nehemiah in the Hebrew canon, the Greek Ezra, which retells part of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, and the so-called Ezra Apocalypse. The Hebrew canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah are called 1 and 2 Esdras in the Vulgate and are combined in the lxx under the name 2 Esdras. The Greek Ezra is 1 Esdras in the lxx. It is 3 Esdras in the Latin Vulgate, which took over one of the two available Old Latin versions, and which prints it as an appendix after the New Testament. (It had been in the Latin Bibles of 1474 and 1480 but was rejected by Trent.) In the Great Bible and in the Anglican Articles of Religion VI it is also called 3 Esdras, although the Bishops’, and Geneva Bibles and kJV (av) have it as 1 Esdras. The Ezra Apocalypse does not occur in Greek mss, except for one fragment containing only a few verses, or in the lxx. In the Latin Vulgate it is 4 Esdras, although the first two chapters and the final two chapters, seen as separate entities originally and not a part of 4 Esdras, are named respectively 5 and 6 Esdras (Ezra). In kJV (av) 4 Ezra is called 2 Esdras. To make confusion worse some Latin manuscripts call Ezra-Nehemiah 1 Esdras; the Ezra Apocalypse chs. 1–2 = 2 Esdras; the Greek Ezra = 3 Esdras as in the Latin Vulgate; Ezra Apocalypse chs. 3–14 = 4 Esdras; Ezra Apocalypse chs. 15–16 = 5 Esdras. The Russian Orthodox tradition names Hebrew canonical Ezra 1 Esdras; its 2 Esdras is the Greek Ezra and 3 Esdras is the Ezra Apocalypse.
Protestants, except by occasional inadvertence, quote their apocrypha as holy scripture.  

Let us look at the reasons why certain Old Testament books were separated from others in modern versions. First we turn to the Hebrew. In many ways modern readers of the English Old Testament are familiar with the contents of the Hebrew scriptures in the Palestinian canon—the Law, the Prophets and the Writings.

The English sequence, however, divides the books of the Hebrew Old Testament into four: the Law, the historical books, the Wisdom literature, the Prophets. To be precise: Pentateuch (books 1–5 in the Hebrew scriptures); Joshua (book 6), Judges (book 7), Ruth (31), 1 and 2 Samuel (8–9), 1 and 2 Kings (10–11), 1 and 2 Chronicles (38–39), Ezra (36), Nehemiah (37), Esther (34), Job (29), Psalms (27), Proverbs (28), Ecclesiastes (33), Song of Songs (30), Isaiah (12), Jeremiah (13), Lamentations (32), Ezekiel (14), Daniel (35), the 12 Minor Prophets in the order Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachai (15–26). The order of the Minor Prophets is the same in the English versions as the Hebrew; a different order is found in the LXX (see below). The Major Prophets seem to be ordered by length, as we suspected was the case for some arrangements of the Pauline Letters in the New Testament. Elsewhere the Hebrew differs.

There is a great difference in the sequence. Hebrew and English agree up to Judges, then the standard printed Hebrew Bible has the Former Prophets, minus Ruth. The numbers in brackets above show the Hebrew order. (1–5 = the Law; 6–11 = the Former Prophets; 12–26 = the Latter Prophets; 27–39 = the Writings.) Note that 1 and 2 Chronicles and Daniel appear in the third section, ‘Writings’. In the English versions all the prophets including Daniel and Lamentations come at the end.

The order in Hebrew manuscripts has itself not always been constant. After 2 Kings there are several differing arrangements. The Leningrad manuscript of the eleventh century has Chronicles at the beginning, not the end, of the Writings. It has Psalms, Job, Proverbs,

---


17 For fuller details see Swete, Introduction, p. 200.
Ruth*, Song of Songs*, Ecclesiastes*, Lamentations*, Esther*, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah. The books asterisked in the list are known as the Megilloth. They are sometimes grouped in the order in which these books were read at Jewish festivals. Thus one finds within the Writings the sequence Song of Songs (Passover), Ruth (Weeks), Lamentations (Anniversary of the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem), Ecclesiastes (Tabernacles), Esther (Purim).

It is not clear quite when the Hebrew canon was closed. Possibly it was the Christians’ use of the lxx with its wider Old Testament canon that persuaded Jews to specify their own canon, restricted to certain books known in Palestine. Josephus in 100 C.E. suggested that the Hebrew canon was closed, but precisely what books were contained in that canon is not specified. The Council of Jamnia (c. 90) is often referred to as the time when the Jews settled the matter of the canon, but one ought not equate the meeting at Jamnia with Christian councils convened to establish a canon. Although the Law and the Prophets were fixed by the second century C.E., the third section, the Writings, remained undefined for a longer time. The New Testament refers to books outside what became the Hebrew canon: Jas 1:19 alludes to Ben Sira 5:11; Heb. 11:35 knows 2 Maccabees 6–7; Mt. 27:43 cites Wis. 2:13, 18; Jude 14–15 cites Enoch. The New Testament regularly refers to the Jewish scriptures conventionally only as the Law and the Prophets (e.g. see Mt. 5:17; Lk. 16:29; Jn 1:45; Acts 28:23). In Lk. 24:27, 44 the common phrase ‘Law and Prophets’ occurs but, with the exception of the Psalter, the Writings are left undescribed.

The Dead Sea Scrolls seem to have had a canon wider than that conventionally known as the Hebrew canon. At Qumran not only have manuscripts been found of all the books of the Hebrew canon, except Esther and Nehemiah, but other scrolls containing Ben Sira, Tobit, Epistle of Jeremiah, Jubilees and Enoch have been discovered.

Just as the Writings may have remained a relatively fluid section of the Hebrew canon for several centuries, the whole of the Old Testament in Greek remained unsettled. In many ways the issue still remains unfixed: the Greek Orthodox church has never satisfactorily settled the status of the deuterocanonical/apocryphal texts. We can see this instability as early as the Eastern Fathers’ lists. Gregory of Nazianzus’s list of 374–79 C.E., for example, in effect follows the Hebrew canon. But the lists produced by Epiphanius are more extensive. The second Trullan Synod of 692 recognized six differing canon lists.
The list in the Stichometry of Nicephorus\textsuperscript{18} includes the following as ‘not recognized’: three books of the Maccabees, Wisdom, Ben Sira, Psalms and Odes of Solomon, Esther, Judith, Susanna, Tobit. The ‘Catalogue of the Sixty Books’\textsuperscript{19} has the following outside the 60 (34 Old Testament; 26 New Testament): Wisdom, Ben Sira, 1–4 Maccabees, Judith, Esther, Tobit. More recently the Eastern churches at the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672 used the LXX but rejected all the books not in the Hebrew canon except Tobit, Judith, Ben Sira, Wisdom. In 1950 the Holy Synod of the Greek Church authorized an edition of the Old Testament which contains the entire apocrypha, but with 4 Maccabees in an appendix. (The 1913 Russian Bible has the same contents but adds the Ezra Apocalypse, 3 Esdras.)

By adopting the LXX—the product of Alexandrian Jews—the church did not inherit a fixed canon of Scripture. The LXX is not a tripartite Old Testament like the Hebrew is. That might suggest that when the LXX was being translated such an arrangement in the Hebrew was not fixed. There is little in common in the relative order or indeed in the contents, if one compares the Hebrew and various Greek editions, which may also show that the Hebrew scriptures were not settled when the Greek translations were being undertaken.

The books that occur in the Greek but not in the Hebrew were not regarded as different in the LXX; they were not separated from each other. In the LXX, for instance, Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle of Jeremiah follow Jeremiah. A longer form of Daniel is associated with the three Major Prophets (who follow the 12 Minor Prophets). Wisdom, Ben Sira, Judith, Tobit all come before the prophets, as in the Latin Vulgate. (They follow in the LXX Codex Alexandrinus.)

The 12 Minor Prophets occur in a different order in the LXX and Hebrew. In the latter Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah are second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, but in the Greek they come in the order fourth, second, fifth, sixth, third. The Latin and English follow the Hebrew.

But the differences between the LXX and Hebrew are not just a matter of contents and sequence but of text as well. Greek Esther and Hebrew Esther are significantly different even where they run in par-

\textsuperscript{18} A ninth-century catalogue found in Nicephorus’s Chronology. See C. de Boor, Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opusula historica (Leipzig, 1880), p. 132.

\textsuperscript{19} A seventh-century Greek list. See T. Zahn, Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Leipzig, 1888–92), II. 1, pp. 290–92.
allel. Job is one sixth shorter in the LXX compared with the Hebrew. There are significant differences also in Joshua, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Proverbs and Jeremiah. There are also differences between the Hebrew texts from Qumran and other Hebrew texts. Also note that NRSV adds a paragraph at the end of 1 Samuel 10 found in one of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Unlike in the New Testament where the earliest complete manuscripts agree in including the same 27 books, these same manuscripts (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus) differ considerably in what was and what was not included in their Old Testament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaticanus</th>
<th>Sinaiticus</th>
<th>Alexandrinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>(Genesis)</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>(Leviticus)</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>(Numbers)</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>(Deuteronomy)</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>(Joshua)</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>(Judges)</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–4 Kingdoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>1–4 Kingdoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 Chronicles</td>
<td>(1 Chronicles)</td>
<td>1–2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 Esdras</td>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms + Ps. 151</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Micah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
<td>1, 4 Maccabees</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Epistle of Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaticanus</th>
<th>Sinaiticus</th>
<th>Alexandrinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>1–2 Esdras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1–4 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps. 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle of Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Table above\(^{20}\) one may see the following:

1. Alexandrinus has Psalm 151 and 14 liturgical Odes (which include the Nunc Dimittis and the Magnificat from the New Testament, several Old Testament hymns as well as the Prayer of Manasseh and the poetic additions to Daniel 3 from the non-Hebrew canon). The Odes are not in Sinaiticus or Vaticanus but they regularly appear in Greek manuscripts from the fifth century onwards. All the Wisdom literature is placed at the end. 1–4 Maccabees appear after 1 Esdras. Eighteen Psalms of Solomon are listed in the contents to appear after the New Testament but they are now no longer extant. These Psalms remained only on the fringes of the Greek Bible.\(^{21}\)

2. Codex Vaticanus is virtually complete. It never contained Manasseh or 1–4 Maccabees.\(^{22}\) 1 and 2 Esdras occur after Chronicles. Psalm 151 is included.

---


\(^{21}\) Swete’s edition includes in an appendix these Psalms from Codex Gamma, the Odes from Codex Alexandrinus and Enoch from ms P. Such texts are now normally found in the so-called Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, e.g. J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–85). Enoch is found in H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). This latter title is confusing, because what the book contains are texts conventionally known as pseudepigrapha.

3. In Codex Sinaiticus 2 and 3 Maccabees are not present. 1 Esdras is not extant, but the existence of 2 Esdras presumes 1 Esdras would have been included.

Among other Greek manuscripts Codex Ephraimi Rescriptus now contains only Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Wisdom, Ben Sira. Most early witnesses, especially those on papyrus, contain only parts of individual books.

The differences between the texts and contents in these complete Christian Bibles has affected modern printed editions of the Greek Old Testament. Most editors follow the text, order and contents of their favourite manuscripts. In the Old Testament not only have the separate codices defined the canon but they have influenced printed editions of the Greek Old Testament! There is less text-critical eclecticism in the classic printed editions although the Gottingen edition of the LXX is attempting in its ongoing series of volumes to print an eclectic text of the LXX. The Complutensian Polyglot used Vatican manuscripts (not Vaticanus), the Sixtine edition of 1587 followed Vaticanus, the Oxford edition of 1707–20 used Alexandrinus. Swete (1887–94) followed the order, contents and text of Vaticanus, adding from Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and others only when necessary (although their variants are given throughout in his apparatus). In Daniel, for example, Swete printed the text of ms 87 (Codex Chisianus, one of the few surviving manuscripts of Daniel witnessing to the LXX text) in parallel with Alexandrinus and accepted the position of Susanna following Daniel with ms 87, although he placed it in a section by itself. (Theodotion’s text has Susanna, in a longer form, at the beginning of Daniel, which is the position found in Old Latin mss). The Latin Vulgate placed Susanna and the story of Bel and the Dragon as Daniel 13–14. For Tobit Swete (as usual) followed Vaticanus but also printed (in smaller type) the text of Sinaiticus. For 1–4 Maccabees he relied on Alexandrinus.

Swete’s edition differs from Rahlfs’s edition of 1935. Its editor did not slavishly follow Vaticanus in text or sequence—nor any other single codex for that matter. The order of the books in Rahlfs’s edition is distinctive and follows neither Sinaiticus, Vaticanus nor Alexandrinus. Rahlfs even adds the Psalms of Solomon (after Wisdom and Ben Sira) as if these were part of the canon of the Greek New Testament. Rahlfs prints two parallel versions of Daniel: one is the LXX version,
the other is that by Theodotion. For Tobit he printed Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus combined with Vaticanus.

Bratsiotis’s edition is similar to Rahlfs’s but has only 1–3 Maccabees: 4 Maccabees is in an appendix. Rahlfs’s order of Tobit, Judith and Esther is reversed in Bratsiotis. Job precedes Proverbs. Neither the Psalms of Solomon nor the Odes are included.

The contents of the Latin Vulgate were determined at the Council of Trent in 1546. Eventually the Clementine edition became the official Vulgate in 1592. It contains the following: the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1 Esdras (Ezra), 2 Esdras (Nehemiah), Tobit*, Judith*, Esther (and additions*), Job, 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom, Ben Sira, Isaiah, Jeremiah (plus Lamentations, Baruch* with the Epistle of Jeremiah attached), Ezekiel, Daniel (and additions*), the Minor Prophets (in the Hebrew order), 1–2 Maccabees*, with the following in an appendix: Prayer of Manasseh, 3–4 Esdras, Psalm 151. The texts in this appendix are ‘apocryphal’, the texts asterisked in my list are designated ‘deuterocanonical’ in the Roman Catholic tradition. Jerome had translated only the Hebrew texts of the Palestinian canon. He removed the additional portions of Esther and relegated them to the end of the book with the result that the story of Esther in his sequence is unintelligible. The additional texts from the Alexandrian Jewish canon were added from the Old Latin. The Vulgate then supplanted the LXX as the Bible for Western Christians. This means that, for readers of the Vulgate, 3–4 Maccabees were removed from their Bibles, and the books in the appendix were accorded a lower status than the rest of the Old Testament.23

23 As far as other canonical lists are concerned we note that there are differences between the Coptic, Ethiopic, East Syrian and Armenian. The biblical canon of the Coptic Orthodox Church includes the following writings: the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Job, 151 or 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Minor and Major Prophets, Wisdom, Judith, Tobit, Esther, three books of Maccabees and Sirach. The most extensive biblical canon is that of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, which itself distinguishes between a wider and a narrower canon. The wider canon has only theoretical significance since it has never formed the basis of a printed Bible. By contrast the 1927 diglot Geez-Amharic edition and the 1953 Amharic edition are both based on the narrower canon, which includes the following: the Pentateuch, Enoch, Ezra, Nehemiah, 3–4 Ezra, Tobit, Judith, Esther (including the additions), 1–3 Maccabees, Job, 151 Psalms, Proverbs, Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Sirach, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch and Epistle of Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel (plus additions), Minor Prophets. In addition is the Prayer of Manasseh after 2 Chron. 33:12.
MANUSCRIPTS, THE CODEX AND THE CANON

POSTSCRIPTUM


It is not strictly true that it was only in the 19th. C. that Protestant Bibles omitted the Old Testament apocryphal books. An edition of the 1640 Geneva Bible omitted the OT apocrypha with the exception of the Prayer of Manasseh, and a four page note after Malachi explains the omission of apocryphal books, based on the Decree of Dort. Other editions of the AV were published without the apocrypha before the 19th. C.

Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah must have come immediately after Lamentations in Codex Sinaiticus, according to Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors.

Thus the Ethiopic Bible contains the entire LXX including 3 Ezra, 3 Maccabees and Psalm 151, and also the Prayer of Manasseh and 4 Ezra, found in the appendix to the Vulgate. It also includes Jubilees. On the Syriac side it is worth emphasizing that the complete Bible text, or even complete Old Testament and New Testament text, is a rarity, partly because of the great cost and labour of producing such a thing, and partly because convenience led to a preference for single books, small groups of books or lectionaries containing only extracts. The Syriac canon has been influenced, as far as contents but not order are concerned, by outside ecclesiological concerns; the manuscript collections of the Old Testament Peshitta (and New Testament Peshitta) by the Greek canon; the generally available printed collections of the Old Testament (and New Testament) Peshitta by Protestant canons, as a consequence of the editions produced by the American missionaries at Urmia and the London British and Foreign Bible Society. The Mosul edition shows the influence of the work of the Dominicans and the background of the Latin Vulgate. The (East) Syriac canon is: the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, Proverbs, Sirach, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, Song of Songs, Job, Isaiah, Minor Prophets, Jeremiah (including Lamentations and the Prayer of Jeremiah), Ezekiel, Daniel (plus additions but not Susanna), Psalms, 1–3 Maccabees, Chronicles, Ezra, Wisdom, Judith, Esther, Susanna, Letter of Jeremiah, Syriac Baruch, Baruch. The Armenian canon is: the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1, 3, 4 Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther (plus additions), Judith, Tobit, 1–3 Maccabees, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom, Sirach, Job, Isaiah, Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Baruch with the Letter of Jeremiah, Lamentations, Daniel (with additions), Ezekiel (3 Maccabees and 3–4 Ezra are called ’extra-canonical’). Some details in this footnote are drawn from H.P. Ruger, ‘The Extent of the Old Testament Canon’, Bible Translator 40 (1989), pp. 301–308.
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