TWO COLLATIONS OF THE TEXT OF ACTS IN CODEX 876

A VINDICATION OF MR VALENTINE-RICHARDS

I WRITE this note to vindicate the reputation of a scholar who is no longer here to speak for himself, and to reassure my fellow-students as to the accuracy of his work.

Three years ago it fell to me to prepare for the Press an edition of the text of Acts in Codex 614 and some of its allies (Cambridge University Press 1934) which the late Mr A. V. Valentine-Richards had left unfinished at the time of his death (see *J.T.S.* vol. xxxvi pp. 191 f). My own part in the published work was confined to providing a brief introduction. The Greek text and the apparatus had already been completed and were actually in print. In this work Mr Valentine-Richards had included a collation of the text of Acts in Codex 876 (formerly 224), now MS no. 16 of the Michigan collection, but previously III 37 in the Burdett-Coutts Library in London. This MS is assigned by Gregory to the thirteenth century, but Professor H. A. Sanders in the study to which I shall presently refer thinks that late twelfth century is the probable date. Though the text of 876 has certain marked affinities with 614, it is less closely connected therewith than are 383, 431, and 1518. No doubt this is the reason why Mr Valentine-Richards had relegated it to an Appendix.

Reviewing this posthumous work of Mr Valentine-Richards in the *Theol. Literatur-Blatt*, May 24, 1935, Dr E. Nestle wrote as follows: 'Ob alles richtig und vollständig ist, könnte nur an den Handschriften selbst nachgeprüft werden; nach einer brieflichen Notiz von H. A. Sanders hat einer seiner Schüler in der Vergleichung von 876 *44* Irrtümer gefunden.' Professor Sanders has now himself published a complete collation of 876—in addition to Acts the MS includes the Catholic Epistles and the Epistles of St Paul—and he has prefixed thereto a full examination of the affinities of 876 both with 614 and its allies (especially 1518), and with other minuscule MSS, notably 103 and its supporters.[1] This study breaks fresh ground and collects valuable data for the later history of the text of the Acts and the Epistles. In his introduction Professor Sanders informs us that he had actually completed his own collation of the entire MS before he learnt for the first time from me of the existence of Mr Valentine-Richards's collation of the text of Acts. He 'gratefully acknowledges' the help he has received from Mr Valentine-Richards's collation, but at the same time he repeats publicly in his own

[1] *Studies in honor of Walter Miller, University of Missouri Studies*, Columbia, Mo. U.S.A. pp. 141–189.

name the charge which he had already communicated by letter to Dr Nestle: 'forty-four errors', he writes, 'were discovered by a comparison against seven in my own collation.'

Now forty-four errors in twenty-eight chapters is not perhaps a larger proportion than might be found in many collations which are in current use, but it is a larger proportion than I should expect to find in a collation by Mr Valentine-Richards. I have therefore myself conducted a minute comparison between the two collations with a view to identifying the forty-four errors with which Professor Sanders has credited Mr Valentine-Richards. This is the result. I have found thirty-eight discrepancies between the two collations. I should add that I have not included among these thirty-eight discrepancies six errors in text numeration, since these clearly ought not to count as errors in collation.[1] Nor have I included xvii 18, where a plus sign has dropped out of the type at the beginning of a line in Mr Valentine-Richards's collation, since the real intention of the note is not doubtful. Nor have I included v 3, where Professor Sanders gives Αναια as the reading of the MS, since Mr Valentine-Richards qualifies his record of Αναιας with a note of doubt—*ut vid.*

I now proceed to analyse these thirty-eight discrepancies.

It has perhaps escaped the notice of Professor Sanders and his pupil that, while Professor Sanders took as his standard of comparison for the Textus Receptus the Oxford edition of 1880, Mr Valentine-Richards collated with Dr Scrivener's *N.T. Graece Editio Major* (Cambridge) of 1891, and that these two editions are not quite identical. In actual fact no less than eight of the readings recorded by Professor Sanders as variants from the Textus Receptus, which are not to be found in Mr Valentine-Richards's collation, are not there recorded for the very good reason that they are also the readings of the text with which Mr Valentine-Richards was collating. It is of some general interest to record that in every case it is Scrivener, not the Oxford text, which reproduces the original reading of the third edition of Stephanus, and further that in six cases out of the eight the later Oxford text departs not only from the original Stephanus, but also from Stephanus as reproduced by Mill. Mr Valentine-Richards has been happier than Professor Sanders in his choice of a text with which to collate,[2] but in so far as accuracy in collation is in question, these eight discrepancies, not only do not prove error on the part of either collator, they actually help to establish the fidelity of them both to the texts on which they severally worked. The

[1] At i 43, xii 15, and xxvii 10 Mr Valentine-Richards is at fault. At iii 3, vii 16, and xx 34 Professor Sanders is at fault.

[2] A fourth edition of Scrivener's *Novum Testamentum textus Stephanici A.D. 1550 cum variis lectionibus editionum Bezae, etc.*, with further corrections by Eb. Nestle, was published at Cambridge (Deighton, Bell & Co.) in 1906.

number of discrepancies which require explanation is thus reduced from thirty-eight to thirty.

This total of thirty is subject to further reduction. For in the first place it would not be more reasonable to account it an 'error' that Mr Valentine-Richards has failed to record the abbreviation *ἰλήμ* for *Ἰερουσαλήμ* at xv 4 than it would be to account it an 'error' that Professor Sanders has not recorded the abbreviation *Δᾶδ* for *Δαβίδ* at i 16. Again, three discrepancies are explained by the fact that Mr Valentine-Richards has recognized the hand of one and not, with Professor Sanders, of two correctors. Now Professor Sanders ascribes three corrections in Acts and three only to 'man. 2', and since in one of these three cases (xxvii 31) Professor Sanders is himself in doubt whether the correction may not be truly ascribed to the original hand, and since the total of the corrections in the other two passages amounts, it seems, to three letters (*+τῇ* and *αὐτόν* for *αὐτῶν*), it is likely that here too there is room for doubt as to the corrector's identity. In three other notes Professor Sanders differs from Mr Valentine-Richards, not in ascribing to the original hand a different reading, but only in considering the original reading to be doubtful. It may be conceded that in three cases Professor Sanders gives a slightly more complete account of the MS as it stands, inasmuch as he records three corrections by a later hand (of the fifteenth century) which Mr Valentine-Richards has not included. But Mr Valentine-Richards's omission of these later corrections seems less serious than Professor Sanders's inclusion in his Introduction (p. 152) of the impossible *ζημίαν* (xxvii 10) as the reading of 876 itself, when in the collation he only claims for it the authority of 'man. 3.'

At xii 15 Professor Sanders has no note to correspond with Mr Valentine-Richards's note '*δε* ante *ελεγον*.' Now here it seems very probable that Mr Valentine-Richards records an actual variant of the MS (*δε* for *δ'*) and that Professor Sanders—or his pupil—has overlooked it. And the probability is increased by the fact that this note of Mr Valentine-Richards coincides with one of his three errors in verse numeration, which may easily have misled Professor Sanders when he checked his own collation by that of Mr Valentine-Richards. It is in any case a very slight matter.

Mr Valentine-Richards has once failed to record the addition and once the omission of *νῦ ἐφελκυστικόν* in 876. It seems needlessly exacting to reckon these two omissions as errors.

And, lastly, a further four variants are only included in Professor Sanders's collation because of eccentric accentuation or wrong breathing. Since Mr Valentine-Richards follows the very usual practice of printing his apparatus without breathings and accents, of course these 'variants' do not appear.

Thirteen discrepancies remain, and I believe thirteen only, which, assuming that Professor Sanders's collation is exact throughout, may fairly be regarded as 'errors' on the part of Mr Valentine-Richards. In at least two cases, I strongly suspect that in truth Mr Valentine-Richards, not Professor Sanders, is in the right. But whether the true total of Mr Valentine-Richards's errors is thirteen, or eleven, or ten, the number is comparable with the seven which Professor Sanders acknowledges himself to have discovered in his own collation by the help of Mr Valentine-Richards.

The thirteen are these :—.

i 12 +τοῦ (ὄρους) H. A. S. Not in V-R.
15 εἴκουσι (ν erased) H. A. S. Not in V-R.

(Is εἴκουσι a slip for εἴκοσι in the collation? Professor Sanders seems not to include this variant in his own analysis of the readings of 876, though he includes other variants which are mere scribal eccentricities, e.g. χηρ ix 41. J. M. C.)

iv 32 πιστευόντων for πιστευσάντων H. A. S. Not in V-R.
vii 44 μωυσεῖ for μωσῇ H. A. S. Μωυση V-R.
ix 41 χήρ for χήρας (sic) H. A. S. Not in V-R.
xvi 1 κατήντηκε for κατήνησε H. A. S. Not in V-R.
xvi 40 V-R. gives εις] προς. Not in H. A. S.
xx 24 ὃν first written; corr. ἣν man 3, H. A. S. Not in V-R.
xxi 13 V-R. gives δε] τε. Not in H. A. S.
xxii 29 ἀπέστησα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ for ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ H. A. S. Not in V-R.
(A very curious mistake on the part of the scribe. J. M. C.)
xxiv 9 om. δέ H. A. S. Not in V-R.
xxv 26 προσήγαγον for προήγαγον H. A. S. Not in V-R.
xxvii 17 ὑποζωνναύντες H. A. S. Not in V-R.

It is no part of my purpose to disparage Professor Sanders's work upon Codex 876. I have already paid my tribute to his useful analysis of the readings of the MS shewing its textual affinities, and had no more been in question than the accuracy of this particular collation I might have refrained from an odious comparison. But in Mr Valentine-Richards's book the collation of 876 is subsidiary to more extensive and more important work on Codex 614 and its nearer allies. If the censure into which Professor Sanders has been betrayed (relying, as I suspect, upon the too sharp eyes of an inexperienced pupil) is not reduced to its proper proportions, it will inevitably weaken the confidence of textual critics in the rest of Mr Valentine-Richards's work. I have little doubt that there are some faults there too, as there are in almost every collation; but I hope to have shewn that the evidence of Professor Sanders's independent work on 876, when it has been properly scrutinized and

controlled, encourages us to expect that they are neither numerous nor important. J. M. CREED.

A NOTE ON MARK iv. 28 f.

THE phrase ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός still awaits a satisfying interpretation. The ingenious conjecture (Blass and Turner), καιρός for καρπός, has not commended itself. It is open to the obvious objection that in real life the beginning of the harvest is fixed not by the calendar but by the state of the crop. It is ὁ καρπός and not ὁ καιρός that gives the signal that the time to reap has come. Therefore if we are to translate παραδοῖ by 'permits' or 'allows', it is better to retain ὁ καρπός as the subject of the verb.

But the matter does not end there. We can go on to ask whether Mark's παραδοῖ is right. The moment that question is put, a new possibility emerges—that παραδοῖ is a mistranslation of an Aramaic original. In this connexion Josh. xi 19 is instructive:

M.T. לֹא הָיְתָה עִיר אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁלִימָה אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

Targum (ed. Praetorius):

לָא הֲוָת קַרְתָּא דְאַשְׁלֵימַת עִם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

The apparatus of the large Cambridge Septuagint presents us with three Greek renderings of השלימה: παρέδωκεν, παρεδόθη, and εἰρήνευσε. We need not stay to discuss the question which of these is the correct rendering: it is sufficient to notice that παραδίδωμι and εἰρηνεύω were among the possible renderings and, further, that they do not exhaust the possibilities. Suppose that Mark's παραδοῖ is the translation of some form of that root of many shades of meaning, שלם. Then we might retranslate ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός by

וְכַד יַשְׁלֵים פֵּירָא

where ישלים is read as an 'Aph'el and could fairly be rendered by the Greek παραδοῖ. I suggest that יַשְׁלֵים is a misreading of יִשְׁלַם (Pe'al) and that another meaning of the root שלם is involved, that of 'completeness', 'maturity', the meaning that appears in the Syriac ܓܰܒܪܳܐ ܫܠܺܝܡܳܐ 'an adult male'. The original sense of the clause will then have been: 'when the fruit is fully mature.'

This conclusion carries with it the corollary that the parable describes not three but four stages in the growth of the crop: the blade, the ear, the full corn in the ear, the mature fully ripe grain. And here we may notice that the Palestinian farmer, on the testimony of Dalman (*Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, ii 304 f), distinguishes some eleven stages of