

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]

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 τῶ Παύλῳ καὶ τῶ 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

Gothic with the Old Latin are due to Latinizing corruption of the Wulfilian text, or whether it is in all cases necessary to eliminate the Italic element before approaching the problem of the underlying Greek. In one of the cases which I cited, Luke vii 44, we are told that the 'conflate reading, which Streitberg adopts, does not occur in any Greek manuscript'. But neither does it occur in any Latin manuscript, and the reading of *e* corresponds closely with that of B, and also with that of NLE, if *μου* is a dative genitive. The evidence which I adduced for the currency of the double pronominal construction shews that the hypothetical reading might easily have arisen in Greek, not by conflation, but simply through a scribe instinctively writing what he would naturally say. I cannot see that the evidence for Latin influence on the Gothic text is sufficient to make it 'almost certain' that the Gothic reading here does not go back to such a Greek reading.

As regards John ix 6, it is, of course, 'not a foregone conclusion that the actual Gothic text does really take back the corresponding reading of A to the middle of the fourth century', and there is no reason for doubting that the reading of the T.R., which is also that of W, is equally old. On the other hand, so many Greek texts have *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτῷ* after *ἐπέχρισεν* that there seems no reason for assigning any other origin to the Gothic *imma*. In his book *The Gothic Version of the Gospels* (p. 66), Friedrichsen gives the Gothic, without *hamma blindin*, as a rendering of *ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*, and the addition of the two words would make it correspond to the A reading. Certainly it makes somewhat awkward reading as a translation of this, but the A reading itself is awkward enough.

The Gothic word-order suggests another possible explanation of the whole series of variants, which is perhaps not very probable but may be worth considering. It is simply that the original reading here was that of fam. 1 *ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*, and that not only *τοῦ τυφλοῦ*, but also *τὸν πηλὸν* is a gloss. The parallelism between vv. 6, 11, and 15 is obvious, and v. 11 reads *πηλὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*, while v. 15 reads *πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*. B and C* read *ἐπέθηκέν* in v. 6, and Weiss considered that *ἐπέχρισεν* was due to the influence of v. 11. The word is found, however, in every manuscript except B and C*, and it seems more probable that *ἐπέθηκέν* is due to v. 15, which may also be responsible for the intrusion of *τὸν πηλόν*. The construction of *ἐπιχρίω* with *τὸν πηλόν* and not *τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς* as its direct object is unusual, although it has a precedent in Dioscorides. The verb is found nowhere else in the New Testament, and it seems curious that John should use it twice in narrating the same incident, but with two different constructions. The fam. 1 reading comes very close to that of the earliest Latin texts, which, moreover,

can hardly have influenced the Gothic here. *e* reads *et superunxit oculos caeci* and *a* *et linuit oculos ejus*. There is also a reading *καὶ ἐπέχρισεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ* in 68 and 108, but this may merely result from the accidental omission of *τὸν πηλόν*. Syr^s, according to Mrs Lewis's translation, reads 'painted upon the eyes of that blind man'. Of course, the Gothic rendering, with its *gasmaid* and *ana augona*, points clearly to a Greek text with *τὸν πηλόν* and *ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*. In v. 11 it has *dismait*. It is also possible that the fam. 1 reading, like some of its other readings (Mark vi 33 for example), marks a tendency to cut the Gordian knot of conflicting variants by simple omission. Even so, it may have succeeded in restoring the true text here, although the Gothic version, which suggested the solution, does not altogether support it.

C. C. TARELLI.

MARK i 45 AND THE MEANING OF *λόγος*

THE word *λόγος* occurs in Mark twenty-three times, and it is the purpose of this note to shew that, with one exception, it is used only in certain closely related senses, and that this fact materially affects the interpretation of Mk. i 45.

Λόγος (used thus in the singular only) may mean 'the message' of Jesus or of the Church, as in ii 2, iv 14, 15 *βίς*, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 33, viii 32. This meaning is common in the New Testament, but in Mark it is noticeable that it is never qualified, as it often is elsewhere, by such phrases as *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *τῆς ἀληθείας* or *τοῦ σταυροῦ*. In the explanation of the parable of the sower it is intended for the Christian message, and in ii 2, iv 33, viii 32, it is the message of Jesus.

The second meaning is 'an utterance' or in the plural 'a body of utterances'. In this use in the singular it refers to an utterance or pronouncement in the context as in v 36, vii 29, ix 10, x 22, xi 29, xiv 39. In vii 13, *ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the reference is to a particular pronouncement of God quoted just before. In the plural, viii 38, x 24, xiii 31, it refers to the utterances of Jesus as a whole and in meaning approaches to the first use. In xii 13, *ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ*, 'catch in speech', we have the one example of the word with a sense outside the above group of related meanings.

It will be noticed that Mk. i 45 has not yet been treated. Here *λόγος* is usually translated 'the story'. To this there are two objections: firstly, as W. C. Allen pointed out, this translation involves an abrupt change of subject from Jesus to the healed leper, and secondly, as is shewn above, Mark nowhere else has *λόγος* in this sense. In the parallel, Lk. v 15, it is true that *λόγος* is to be understood in this sense, but it is doubtful if, apart from this parallel, Mk. i 45 would have ever