

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

OMISSIONS, ADDITIONS, AND CONFLATIONS IN THE CHESTER BEATTY PAPYRUS

CANON STREETER, in reviewing Prof. Clark's 'Primitive Text of the Acts' in the *J.T.S.* of July 1933, remarks: 'For more than a century the maxim *brevior lectio potior* has been treated as an axiom, so much so that textual critics have been schooled in the belief that their first duty is to suspect interpolation.' Hort was so convinced that corruptions by interpolation were more numerous than corruptions by omission that he held that the nearer a document 'stands to the autograph, the more numerous must be the omissions laid to its charge' by those who judge it by a 'late and degenerate text'. Prof. Clark, as is well known, arrived at precisely the opposite conclusion: that the commonest error of copyists is not interpolation, but omission, and that 'nowhere is the falsity of the maxim *brevior lectio potior* more evident than in the New Testament.'

The Chester Beatty papyrus stands a century nearer to the autographs than the earliest vellum uncial, and it will be interesting to see whether it contains more numerous omissions from the Received Text than **N** or **B**, or whether it furnishes any considerable new crop of early 'interpolations'.

It has been asserted that **P**⁵⁵ does not support any of the 'greater Western interpolations'. This is undoubtedly true as regards Acts. In the Gospels, however, only two of the passages affected are extant, namely, Matt. xx 28 and Luke ix 55, 56. In both cases the papyrus omits the 'interpolation', in the first case in company with the great majority of Greek manuscripts, in the second in a much smaller company. Here, too, it omits the 'subsidiary gloss' in v. 54, and thus ranges itself with **NBLΞ 71. 157 syr^s g¹¹** and the Anglo-Saxon version. If this is an interpolation, it is clearly from an 'extraneous source', but the additional authority of the papyrus hardly makes it less incredible that Luke could have related the incident of the Samaritan village without the saying of Jesus which is the real point of the story.

The papyrus does not invariably follow this group in its omissions. It probably omitted *καὶ κλιῶν* in Mark vii 4 with **NBLΔ**, and it certainly omitted *βαπτισμοὺς ξηστῶν* etc. in Mark vii 8 and *μετὰ δακρῶν* in Mark ix 24 in the same company, and *ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ* in Luke xi 54 with **NBL**. On the other hand it seems, from the space available, to have read *ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία* in Mark ix 29 against **N*** and **B**. In Luke xi 11 it has a transposition and omission of its own, which help to explain the omission in **B**. The question opens: *τίνα γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν [πῶ αἰ]τήσῃ υἱ [ἰ]χθύν καὶ ἀντι ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ ἢ κ[αἰ] ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ἄρτον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον;*

The other 'neutral' omissions which the papyrus supports are not very important, unless we except *καὶ στραφεὶς εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπεν* in Luke x 22 and *εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς* in Luke x 38. It appears, on the other hand, to have omitted *πρὸ ἐμοῦ* in John x 8 with **N*EFGMSUTA** 28. 106. 131. 237. 435 al¹⁰⁰, supported by most Latin texts, against **ABDW@** and others. It also omits the famous 'neutral' addition to Luke x 41, and reads *ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία* with the great majority of manuscripts. Another place in which it supports a 'Byzantine' omission is Luke xiv 3, where it reads *ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι* with **AW** and the majority of manuscripts against **NBDL@** *famm.* 1, 13, which add *ἡ οὐ*. The omission agrees with the parallel passage in Matthew.

There are a number of omissions supported by other manuscripts, but not by **NB**. In Mark v 21 **P¹⁵** appears to have omitted not only *ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ* with **D@** *fam.* 1. 565. 700 and others, but also *εἰς τὸ πέραν* without other support. In Mark viii 35 the papyrus omits *ἐμοῦ καὶ* before *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* with **D** 28. 700, some Latin manuscripts and *syr^s*. In Luke x 14 it omits *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως* with **D** 63. 253, and in Luke xi 33 *οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον* with **LTΞ** *fam.* 1. In Luke vi 48 the space left in its mutilated page shows that it must have omitted the words following *οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλευθῆναι αὐτήν* in company with 700 and *syr^s*. It does not, however, appear to have joined 700 in omitting *καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα* in v. 49 of the same chapter.

There are a few omissions not hitherto supported by any Greek manuscript. In Luke xii the whole of v. 9 has dropped out, as in the Latin *e* and *syr^s*, which seems an obvious case of homoeoteleuton. In John xi 25 *καὶ ἡ ζωὴ* is omitted after *ἀνάστασις*, an omission which already had the authority of *a* and *l*, *syr^s* and Cyprian. In v. 51 of the same chapter *τοῦ ἐνἑαυτοῦ ἐκείνου* is omitted after *ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν*, as in the Latin *e* and *syr^s*, but in no Greek manuscript so far collated. Here the similarity to v. 49 makes omission or repetition equally easy and natural.

There is a variation from the common text in Mark vi 17, where only the words *αὐτοῦ γυν[αῖκα]* are preserved. This implies some such transposition as *Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ γυναικα*, but the space is hardly compatible with an omission.

Among the omissions peculiar to **P¹⁵** I do not, in general, include omissions of single words, to which I am not inclined to attach the same importance as the late Mr Hoskier did in his study of **P¹⁶**. The omission or addition of the pronoun in such expressions as *τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* is too common a clerical error to have much significance, and the choice between omission and interpolation in the explanation of such variants is usually a matter of taste. Of the omissions which seem

deserving of attention, I doubt if any would have been accepted by Hort as 'non-interpolations', and all are easily explicable as accidental omissions. In Mark vi 40 the words ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα are omitted after *πρασιαὶ πρασιαί*. In v. 48 of the same chapter τῆς νυκτός is omitted after *φυλακὴν*, unless it was placed before it, while the space suggests that ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης was omitted in v. 49. In Luke x 11 the words τὸν κολληθέντα are omitted after *κοινοτρόν*, an obvious error, while in vv. 27, 28 there were evidently two or more omissions, which Sir Frederic Kenyon suggests may have included the command 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'. The text is too obliterated here for certainty, but it is possible to guess at these omissions with some confidence. The first was most probably the word ἀποκριθεὶς. For the rest, it should be noted that the passage includes the series of phrases commencing ἐξ ὅλης (or ἐν ὅλῃ), and nothing would be more natural than the omission of one or more of these. One of them is, in fact, omitted by D, another by U and some minuscules, a third by one of Scrivener's MSS., and a fourth by Origen. The omission of two of these phrases would fully account for the space required and seems much more likely than the omission of καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.

Luke x 21 has an omission which confirms Epiphanius and Tertullian *πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* without καὶ τῆς γῆς. In Luke xi 19 τὰ δαιμόνια is omitted after *ἐκβάλλω*. In Luke xii 2 the words καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται have dropped out after *ἀποκαλυφθήσεται*, and in John x 35 πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡ γραφή are omitted. Finally, there is an omission in Luke xii 47 which introduces a new complication into a series of variants in which NB appear as supporters of a 'conflate' reading. The papyrus reads καὶ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα against καὶ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας in B 33, καὶ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας of A and the Textus Receptus, καὶ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας of LW fam. 13 and καὶ μὴ ποιήσας of D 69. The accidental omission of μὴ ἐτοιμάσας ἢ (or μηδέ) seems the most natural explanation of this variant.

Among the additions to the Received Text there are a few of 'Western' attestation. Mark vi 2 appears from the space to have read ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ with D^o 118. 565. 700. Mark vi 47 has *πάλαι* after *ἦν* with D fam. 1. 22. 28. Mark viii 14 has *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* after *ἐπελάθοντο* with DW fam. 13.

More numerous are the additions attested in company with members of the W^o family. In Mark vi 24 *αἰτῆσαι* followed *εἶπεν* as in W. In Mark vi 37 the space would leave room for *ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ* after *φαγεῖν*, as in W and fam. 13. In Mark viii 17 *διαλογίζεσθε* is followed by *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὀλιγόπιστοι*, as in W and fam. 13. Mark ix 2, which is somewhat mutilated, must have read *ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοῦς* with W and fam. 13. ^o 28. 472 and 565 have the same addition, but with

αὐτόν. In Luke xiv 5 the addition of ἦ before *υἱός* suggests the possibility that the archetype of the papyrus read *δνος ἦ υἱός ἦ βοῦς*. © reads *δνος υἱός*, while the Curetonian Syriac has 'son or ox or ass', and Hort quotes from Wetstein a translation from the Mishna *Si in puteum incidat bos aut asinus . . . filius aut filia, servus aut ancilla*, which, with its echo of Exodus, seems to give the clue to the conflict of readings in this passage.

Of the additions peculiar to the papyrus there are none which could be regarded as 'interpolations from extraneous sources'. In Matt. xxv 43 we read *καὶ γυμνὸς ἤμην* for *γυμνός*. In Luke ix 36 the phrase opens with *ἐγένετο*, and in Luke xii 55 there is an addition of a single word, *ὅταν νότον πνέοντα ἴδητε*, which looks rather like a not very happy conjectural emendation. The repetition of the verb only emphasizes its inappropriateness.

In Luke xi 15 there is a curious case of substitution with an addition. Most texts read *τίνες δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον*. The papyrus reads *τίνες δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλάλησαν ὄχρωοὶ λέγοντες*. The parallel passage in Matt. ix 33 reads *ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες*. 'Ἐλάλησεν' has clearly suggested *ἐλάλησαν*, and the scribe, with Matthew's words in his mind, has finished the sentence in Matthew's form. 'Ὀχρωοὶ' looks like a mistake in writing *ὄχλοι* from dictation. There is a repetition in Luke ix 57, which has been corrected, but which shows that the writer was liable to a common form of error. He repeated *εἶπεν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀκολουθήσω σοί* before *εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*.

The other additions are all of the kind which produce the appearance of 'conflation'. P⁴⁵ supports the 'conflation' of fam. 13 in Mark vii 5, where it reads *κοιναῖς χερσὶν καὶ ἀνίπτοις*, which may very well be the true reading, and the 'conflation' of © 565 in Mark viii 19 *οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ μνημονεύετε*, where NΣ read *οὔπω νοεῖτε*, D *οὐδὲ μνημονεύετε*, and most other manuscripts *καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε*, and where the influence of context and parallel passages is to be suspected. In Luke xii 24 it has an even more interesting reading, which is probably really a conflation of two parallel passages. Here D reads *κατανοήσατε τὰ πέτεινα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* with Matthew against the common reading *κατανοήσατε τοὺς κόρακας*. The papyrus reads *κατανοήσατε τὰ πέτεινα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοὺς κόρακας*.

There are finally a number of variants in which the papyrus contributes to a 'conflation' by other manuscripts. In Luke xi 42, for example, it reads *ἄνηθον* against the *πήγανον* of most other manuscripts and *τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ πήγανον* of fam. 13. Here, too, the parallel passage in Matthew has probably produced confusion. In John x 31 the papyrus reads *ἐβάστασαν* with ©, where D and fam. 13 read *ἐβάστασαν οὖν*, NBLW *ἐβάστασαν πάλιν* and A fam. 1 and the Textus Receptus

ἔβαστασαν οὖν πάλιν. Finally, in John xi 30 it reads ἐπὶ τῷ τόπῳ with Θ, against ἐν τῷ τόπῳ in ADL^S, ἔτι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ in NBCW fam. 1, and ἔτι ἐπὶ τῷ τόπῳ in fam. 13. The one singular reading of the papyrus which materially affects the meaning of the text is also of this character. In Luke ix 50 it reads οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καθ' ὑμῶν οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. It is interesting to compare this with the reading of LΞ 33 al¹⁰ cop syr^p c*, which prefixes οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καθ' ὑμῶν to the B reading.

Altogether the behaviour of the papyrus in these matters does not encourage the belief in extensive interpolation, either at an early or a later date. Its text rather favours the conclusion that accidental omission was easy and common, assimilative additions not uncommon, and interpolations from extraneous sources extremely rare. This is really quite in keeping with the evidence of the manuscripts of the Gospels previously known to us. The variants which have been explained, rightly or wrongly, as interpolations from extraneous sources are very few. The notion that they are common is derived from the phenomena of the 'Western' text of Acts, of which Prof. Clark has given an entirely different explanation, and which, indeed, present a somewhat special problem.

The papyrus, like the great majority of manuscripts, is in general a witness for the shorter text in Acts, or, as Prof. Tasker expresses it in his detailed analysis in *J.T.S.* xxxviii 152, has 'a distinctive "non-Western" text'. It omits all the 'Western interpolations' for which it is extant, and supports all the readings which Prof. Clark attributes to other manuscripts having modified the construction after omitting a passage contained in a stichos or stichoi of D. It has, however, a certain number of omissions and other variants which seem to have some bearing on Prof. Clark's theory, inasmuch as they coincide with stichoi in D. This is the case, for example, with an omission in v 13 ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός, peculiar to P¹⁶, and an omission in vii 18 ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον, shared with D itself EHP and others, and the Textus Receptus, where the words, if they had appeared in D, must either have ended a stichos or formed a new one. In vii 37 it omits αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε in company with NAB against CDE and the Textus Receptus, which represents a stichos in D. In x 11, where D is lacking in the Greek, the papyrus agrees with the Latin d in placing the words καὶ τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον, which correspond to a stichos, before σκευός τι. It has, however, two omissions in the same passage which do not correspond with stichoi. Again, in x 32, it omits the words ὅς παραγενόμενος λαλήσει σοι, which occur in CDEHLP and the Textus Receptus, and which form a stichos in D. In xi 12 it joins D in omitting μηδὲν διακρίναντα (ὅτ' διακρινόμενον), which again corresponds to a stichos. In xiv 18 it omits the words ἀλλὰ πορεύεσθαι ἕκαστον εἰς τὰ

ἴδια added by C and others, which would also represent a stichos in D. Finally, in xv 7, there is an addition after ζῆ[τήσεως γενομένη]ης, commencing with the words τῶι Παύλῳ καὶ τῶι Βαρνάβῳ[ι πρὸς αὐτοὺς], but too much mutilated for complete restoration, which looks, however, as if it must have been a repetition of the passage in v. 2 τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβῳ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παύλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν. Sir Frederic Kenyon reads νεῖα παυλόν, but the ν and the α are marked as not clear. The addition comes between two stichoi of D, and the words added correspond to a longer passage at v. 2 in D, commencing and ending with the same words, and constituting five stichoi.

All these examples are quite remarkably consistent with Prof. Clark's conclusion in regard to Acts that 'a large number of important variants are at once explicable on the hypothesis that the Greek manuscripts in general were drawn from a single ancestor written in stichoi, such as those found in D, and had in a number of cases omitted lines of their original'. The variants in P⁴⁵ certainly seem to fit with extraordinary exactness into this hypothesis, so far at least, as regards the ancestor written in stichoi. It is further remarkable that, allowing for the difference of text, the punctuation of the papyrus corresponds fairly closely with the stichoi. This is also the case in Mark, the Gospel in which the stichometry of D is most regular. It is also only in Mark and Acts that P⁴⁵ has the punctuating stroke above the line which Sir Frederic Kenyon attributes to a later hand.

The papyrus, therefore, testifies to the antiquity of the D stichometry in Mark and Acts. As regards the variants themselves, however, it should be observed that three of them are omissions shared with D and three omissions against D and other manuscripts, while one is an agreement with a 'Western' transposition. It cannot, therefore, be said that the evidence of P⁴⁵ supports the theory of an abridgement of the text which has affected all Greek manuscripts other than the 'Western' ones.

C. C. TARELLI.

THE GOTHIC VERSION AND THE GREEK TEXT

G. W. S. FRIEDRICHSEN's article in *J.T.S.* xxxix 42-44 on *The Gothic Version and the fourth century Byzantine text* raises a number of interesting points, and incidentally reproaches me with making an unjustified use of Gothic readings in my article on *Historical Greek Grammar and Textual Criticism* in *J.T.S.* xxxviii 238-242. I freely admit my error. Obviously I should not have cited two Gothic readings as fourth-century evidence for the equivalent Greek, *as a matter of course*. I leave it to more competent judges to decide whether it would not be equally wrong to assume, *as a matter of course*, that agreements of the