

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]

THE CHESTER BEATTY PAPYRUS AND THE WESTERN AND BYZANTINE TEXTS

SIR FREDERIC KENYON has said that the evidence of the Chester Beatty papyrus goes 'far towards completing the disintegration of the so-called "Western" text', and this is certainly true of the Western text in the very wide sense in which that term has often been used. The question of the attitude of the papyrus to the 'Western' text in its narrower sense is somewhat obscured by the fact that Sir Frederic Kenyon's *apparatus criticus* does not take account of the 'more marked and peculiar readings of D and its allies'. In my study of 'the Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean text' (*J.T.S.* xl, pp. 46-55) I followed the same course. It seems clear, however, that the effect of ignoring the peculiar readings of D is to falsify the textual perspective. I included in my tables a number of cases in which one or more of the 'Caesarean' group agrees with D against the papyrus and the other members of the group. A collation of \mathfrak{P}^{45} with D in Mark further shows the papyrus in 47 cases supporting the majority of manuscripts, or a very large proportion of them, against D alone or almost alone. In all but 16 of these readings D has Latin support, and several of the exceptions are variants in which support by a version is practically impossible. In Mark \mathfrak{P}^{45} nowhere agrees with D except in the company of other manuscripts.

The situation is somewhat different in Luke. Here there are 28 cases in which the papyrus agrees with D alone or with small support from other manuscripts, including the remarkable reading in ix. 62: οὐδεὶς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπων καὶ ἐπιβάλλων τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἄροτρον. There are in this Gospel 104 cases in which \mathfrak{P}^{45} agrees with the majority of manuscripts against D, where D stands alone or has very little support.

In John there are 33 readings of the majority of manuscripts supported by the papyrus against D, while 16 of its readings agree with D alone or with D and a few other manuscripts. In the cases in Luke and John also the D readings have usually Latin support, except where the variant is of a nature that could not be represented in a version.

All these facts constitute additional evidence for the eccentricity of the D text. Even this evidence, however, contributes to the general confirmation of the 'substantial integrity of the textual tradition'. For the singular and sub-singular readings of D and its Latin supporters from which \mathfrak{P}^{45} dissents are not 'bold and extensive interpolations', or even, in most instances, harmonistic paraphrases. They include, indeed, the well-known harmonistic additions to Luke xi. 2

and xi. 30, but in general they are variations in word-order, grammatical form or vocabulary, or small omissions or additions, such as are common in all texts. The testimony of \mathfrak{P}^{45} , in fact, suggests that the 'Western' text is a text which has departed in an unusually large number of cases from the main line of manuscript tradition, but that it by no means differs from that tradition *toto suo habitu universoque colore*, as Griesbach declared.

There are, however, a few among the D readings supported by the papyrus which seem to have some bearing on another observation of Griesbach, in which he declares that the Western text *servare solet lectiones genuinas duriores, a Graecae linguae ratione abhorrentes, Hebraizantes, soloecas, cacophonas; . . . Alexandrina vero recensio, quaecumque Graecis auribus molesta esse possent, evitare ac immutare studet*. In Luke xi. 34 \mathfrak{P}^{45} reads with D $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ τὸ σῶμα instead of ὄλον τὸ σῶμα. Here $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is as good Greek as ὄλον, and can hardly be called *Hebraizans*, except in so far as it is more common than ὄλον in the Septuagint. If it was the original reading, the alteration seems more likely to have been due to the parallel passage in Matthew, and perhaps to the growing preference for ὄλος which has culminated in the disappearance of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in Modern Greek, than to Alexandrian purism. Another reading in Luke which may very well be genuine is $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$ τὸν καιρὸν for τὸν δὲ καιρὸν in xii. 56. The word is constantly used by Luke in the same sense, but again it is perfectly good Greek.

In John xi. 33 \mathfrak{P}^{45} reads τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας τοὺς συνεληλυθότας αὐτῆι. This is substantially the reading of D, which however has μετ' αὐτῆς instead of αὐτῆι. The \mathfrak{P}^{45} reading is certainly as much in the Johannine style as the common reading and is unobjectionable as Greek. It is no doubt the harder reading, and the variant in D may well be a simplification, while the other reading might conceivably be an emendation inspired by the same motive. It could hardly have been inspired by the motive suggested by Griesbach, unless we imagine Greek ears which found the perfect participle cacophonous. The same alternative of perfect and aorist participles appears in John xi. 45, where \mathfrak{P}^{45} and D read ἑωρακότες against θεασάμενοι. It is remarkable, however, that in Luke ix. 36 \mathfrak{P}^{45} reads ἐόρακαν and D ἐθεάσαντο. All these variants seem to have some relation to the confusion between perfect and aorist, which was beginning when our earliest manuscripts were written and which ended in the disappearance of the perfect in Modern Greek. The writer of the Fourth Gospel appears to have used the two tenses with discrimination, and the papyrus reading in all the cases quoted has every chance of being genuine. The alternative reading, however, is clearly not due to purism.

Another reading in Luke, in which P^{45} and the majority of manuscripts are opposed to D, rather suggests the reverse process to that described by Griesbach. This is in ix. 29, where D reads $\eta\ \iota\delta\epsilon\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\omega\theta\eta$, while the common reading is $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \dots\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$. Against this may be set two readings in Mark opposed by the papyrus in common with most other manuscripts. One is in vi. 41, where D reads $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ in place of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, and the other is D's $\xi\zeta\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$ in viii. 11. Both these are expressions favoured by the Septuagint, and both would offend an Atticist. The first might in its context be held to savour of Hebraism; the second is merely a *κοινή* form. In view of the alleged preservation of readings *a Graecae linguae ratione abhorrentes* it is further interesting to note that D, alone among Greek manuscripts, consistently follows the more correct spelling $\pi\omicron\delta\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma$ instead of $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma$.

An analysis of the readings of the papyrus in Mark which agree with the Byzantine text yields interesting results. Apart from readings opposed only by D, the attestation of these by the older uncials is as follows:

ⲚABDW	6	ADW	14
ⲚABD	2	AB	1
ⲚABW	18	AD	1
ⲚADW	3	AW	16
ⲚAB	7	A	3
ⲚAW	2	BDW	1
ⲚBW	4	DW	2
ⲚDW	1	N &c.	2
ABDW	3		—
ABD	1		
		Total	87

It will be seen that the largest group is that of ⲚABW, which is followed by AW and ADW. The constant element in most of these combinations is A, which supports 77 out of 87 readings (62 in company with W). An even more constant element is N, which supports 66 out of the 71 readings for which it is extant. Moreover 3 of the remaining 5 are not true Byzantine readings, though found in the Textus Receptus, but are opposed by the majority of the later uncials and minuscules, while in one other these witnesses are divided. These facts form a curious comment on Cronin's judgment on N as a manuscript illustrating the manner in which the 'vigour and incisiveness of the original writing' were superseded by a later and 'smoother' text.

It is interesting to compare the attestation of the readings common

to \mathfrak{P}^{45} and the Byzantine text with that of the readings of the Byzantine text to which it is opposed. This is as follows:

\aleph ABDW	30	ABW	1
\aleph ABD	25	AB	3
\aleph ABW	8	ADW	6
\aleph ADW	2	AD	5
\aleph AB	14	AW	5
\aleph AD	1	A	18
\aleph AW	1	W	2
\aleph A	2	Other uncials	5
\aleph BDW	1		
ABDW	1	Total	131
ABD	1		

The principal difference here is the larger number of readings supported by \aleph ABDW and \aleph ABD, which is to a great extent accounted for by the singular and sub-singular readings of \mathfrak{P}^{45} . Fifteen of the \aleph ABDW readings are in fact opposed by singular and 5 by sub-singular readings of the papyrus. A further difference is the smaller support from W, which is natural in view of the close affinity between W and \mathfrak{P}^{45} . Otherwise the attestation is very similar, and it is noteworthy that the proportion of readings supported by no early uncial other than A or AW is decidedly smaller than in the first table. The number of readings supported by none of the early uncials, or by none earlier than N, is so small in both cases that it hardly seems worth while to compare the proportions. Two of the 5 readings in the second table, however, are not genuine Byzantine readings, and if these are deducted, the proportion is the same in both cases. N is again a constant element, agreeing with the Textus Receptus 101 times out of the 110 for which it is extant. One of its disagreements with the Textus Receptus is in agreement with the Byzantine text, while one variant is merely the spelling $\epsilon\theta\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ against $\epsilon\theta\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. Four of its non-Byzantine readings are in agreement with \mathfrak{P}^{45} .

Readings common to the 'Western' and Byzantine texts are usually treated as Western readings adopted by the Antiochian recension. It seems unlikely, however, that any readings adopted by such a recension would be purely Western. They must always have had a wider circulation. This supposition seems to be confirmed by the fact that the proportion of ζ ADW and ζ AD readings supported by \mathfrak{P}^{45} is greater than the proportion of such readings opposed by it. On the other hand, there is no great difference in the Latin support of the papyrus readings of these classes and that of the readings opposed by the papyrus. Out of the 14 ADW readings of \mathfrak{P}^{45} , 10 are attested by all

or most of the Latin witnesses and 3 others by some of them, while the remaining reading is a case of *εὐθέως* against *εὐθύς*. The one AD reading is also a purely Greek variant. Of the 6 ADW readings opposed by \mathfrak{P}^{45} , all have some Latin support, while 4 have the support of the majority of the Latin texts. Three out of the 5 AD readings agree with all the Latin witnesses and a fourth with about half of them. The fifth is a purely Greek variant. In almost all the cases in question on both sides the readings are supported by other versions besides the Latin.

It would occupy too much time and space to examine the texts of Luke and John in similar detail, but it will not be uninteresting to consider their characteristics briefly. In Luke there are about 130 readings in agreement with the Textus Receptus, excluding those which are opposed to singular or sub-singular readings of D, and here too the largest combinations are ADW and AW, while the next largest (11 readings) is \aleph ABDW. Eight of these readings are opposed by fam. 1, in 5 of which this family stands alone, while it is supported once by 700, once by 28 and 254, and once by fam. 13. Against these cases may set that of x. 36, where \mathfrak{P}^{45} supports a reading of the Textus Receptus, a mere difference in word order it is true, which is only attested by *minusc non ita mu*, which include fam. 1 and 700, but which agrees with all the Latin texts and is followed by Origen. In Luke xi. 13, on the other hand, the papyrus reads *ἀγαθὰ δόματα* with the Textus Receptus *cum minusc vix mu it vg*, Clement and Origen, while famm. 1 and 13 and 700 read *δόματα ἀγαθὰ* with the majority of manuscripts.

In John all the figures are too small to make comparison of much value, but the largest group here is that of all the early uncials \aleph ABDW, while in each case the opposing reading has a very narrow attestation. The most interesting cases are xi. 5, where the opposing reading is supported by Θ famm. 1. 13, and xi. 8, where it is supported by U famm. 1. 13. They are interesting chiefly because in xi. 9 the papyrus supports a reading of the Textus Receptus, *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* against *Ἰησοῦς*, attested by U Θ famm. 1. 13 *al mu*.

Certain combinations of little importance in Mark become more important in Luke and John. These are such groups as ABDW, ABW, \aleph ADW, and \aleph AW, in which B is present without \aleph or \aleph without B. Similar combinations are also found in the non-Byzantine readings of \mathfrak{P}^{45} , and here too they are least common in Mark. This confirms what is sufficiently clear from other evidence, that the agreement between \aleph and B is closer in Mark than in Luke or John. The *apparatus criticus* to Tischendorf's edition of the Codex Sinaiticus gives a hint of this. The paragraph containing the variants in B is

very much smaller in Mark than that showing the variants in the Textus Receptus, while in Luke and John it assumes very different dimensions. In fact the disagreements between \aleph and B in John are much more numerous than those between A and B and still more numerous than those between WH and the Textus Receptus. Hort would explain this by a Western element in \aleph , and this view is certainly favoured by the considerable Latin support for many otherwise singular readings of \aleph .

It is clear, however, that the accession of \mathfrak{P}^{45} has increased the difficulty of segregating pure 'Western' or pure 'Syrian' readings. The agreement of this Egyptian manuscript with such a reading as Luke ix. 62, peculiar to D and a b c e q, but supported also by Clement, is hardly favourable to the Western origin of even the most eccentric 'Western' readings. The readings of the Byzantine text which the papyrus supports, moreover, include at least as many with a purely 'Syrian' attestation as those which it opposes, which cannot but weaken the presumption against readings so attested. In particular the new evidence should restore something of the prestige of A, which it has become customary to rank with the later manuscripts which agree with it rather than with the earlier manuscripts to which it properly belongs. As regards the internal character of the readings, it would surely be extravagant to pretend to discern more of the supposed 'Syrian' characteristics of smoothness and feebleness in those opposed by the papyrus than in those which it supports. The most remarkable of \mathfrak{P}^{45} 's 'Syrian' readings is the very idiomatic passage in John xi. 19 *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν*, while in John x. 38 it reads *πιστεύσατε* against the *πιστεύετε* of \aleph BDLW and others. These are not indeed 'feeble' readings, but they are certainly among those which would at one time have been most confidently explained as Antiochian 'improvements'. Abbott in fact affirms that in John our Lord never uses the aorist imperative of *πιστεύω*, and the only other example, *πίστευσσον* in iv. 21, has a similar attestation to the reading now confirmed by \mathfrak{P}^{45} . It may be that these are Alexandrian, and not Antiochian 'improvements', but the occurrence of such readings, together with the 'Western' readings already examined, in this early manuscript suggests that it is at least unsafe to assume a late date for a reading which might be explained as an 'improvement'.

Whatever may be the final solution of these problems, some remarks in Sir Frederic Kenyon's General Introduction to the Chester Beatty Papyri seem to me to suggest a new orientation of critical theory which goes some way towards meeting the situation. Sir Frederic Kenyon's language is so modest and unemphatic that its implications appear to have escaped attention. 'We must recognize', he says,

‘that throughout the second and third centuries there was in existence a considerable variety of readings which had not yet crystallized into families.’ Is it not possible, and even not improbable, that the families which we find later were really formed by a process of crystallization, rather than by systematic recensions?

Sir Frederic Kenyon further suggests that ‘the Vatican text represents the result, not of continuous unaltered tradition, but of skilled scholarship, working on the best available authorities’; in other words, that B itself is, as he calls it elsewhere, a recension. This again seems to me to be a fruitful suggestion. The differences between \aleph and B, which, as I have pointed out, are greater in John than elsewhere, are everywhere, as Hort clearly saw, too great to admit of their common text being derived from a recension as recent as the beginning of the fourth century, as Von Soden’s theories require. The Byzantine text might, of course, be derived from a fourth-century recension, but the early manuscripts which most nearly approximate to it deviate from it so frequently that Von Soden could only bring them into his system by theories as ingenious as the cycles and epicycles of the Ptolemaic astronomy. Burkitt again, in a review of H. J. Vogels’s *Vulgatstudien* in *J.T.S.* xxx. 408 ff., commenting on some of Jerome’s readings, says: ‘It is not very probable that Jerome, writing at the end of the fourth century, happened to have come across an eclectic codex which was fundamentally K but happened to have just these H-readings.’ One of the readings is ‘take up his cross daily’ in Luke ix. 23, which is the reading of A and W and of the Gothic version. Such eclectic codices as Burkitt suggests are, in fact, just what Jerome would be most likely to come across, if we may believe the testimony of extant manuscripts. There is, in fact, no evidence of the existence of a ‘pure’ K text in the fourth century, but only of ‘mixed’ texts more or less approximating to K, while such a manuscript as C has many K readings in a different mixture. \mathfrak{P}^{45} now presents us with an earlier example of a ‘mixed’ text, in which readings which are later found only in K documents are present in company with ‘Neutral’ and ‘Western’ readings, as they are in A and W and C.

It is indeed highly probable that B was a recension, in the sense of a copy produced after comparison of a number of manuscripts, and that \aleph , A, C, and W are recensions in the same sense. There may have been many others, and indeed it is probable that some comparison of documents and selection of readings went to the production of most important copies after the earliest period. It seems doubtful, however, whether any useful purpose is served by imagining recensions which may never have been made and reconstructing texts

which may never have existed, when the actual recensions which we possess contain nearly all the elements which are found in later documents, while the earliest manuscript now shows precisely similar elements mixed in a pattern differing from all the others, though not seriously disturbing the 'substantial integrity of the textual tradition'. Burkitt, in an article on P^{45} in the *J.T.S.* xxxiv. 363 ff., says: 'It is easier, from some points of view, to reconstruct the original than some half-way house like the "neutral" or the "Caesarean" text, that contains some corruptions but not all'. After all, the task of criticism is to reconstruct the original, and this will always involve the weighing of internal and transcriptional probabilities. No real or imaginary recension can ever be proved to be superior to another by any other process than this.

C. C. TARELLI

A NOTE ON LUKE XII. 15

LUKE xii. 15 presents a problem of interpretation which is also a textual problem. The manuscripts are all in substantial agreement. The few variations which they exhibit make no difference to the construction or the meaning of the phrase. It reads in most manuscripts $\delta\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\ \tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ in some). In the Codex Bezae it reads $\delta\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\ \tau\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$. This is certainly a very obscure and difficult passage. The Vulgate renders it 'quia non in abundantia cuiusquam uita eius est ex his quae possidet', which is quite literal, like the marginal reading in the Revised Version, and preserves all the obscurity of the original. The modern translations fall into two groups, each following its own interpretation. The first is headed by Luther and includes our own Authorized Version, the Swedish, Danish, Icelandic, Catalan, and Rumanian translations, the two Spanish versions, and the Portuguese version of Pereira de Figueiredo. These all adopt the interpretation expressed in the Authorized Version, an interpretation which connects $\upsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ with $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$: 'for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth'. I have no doubt that this is what Luke meant, but I find it difficult to understand how all these translators could have divined it. I am sure I should never have done so myself without their assistance.

The other group of translations consists of Donati's Italian version, the Dutch, the older Portuguese, the two French (Ostervald and Segond), and three Modern Greek translations: Maximus (1638), Vamvas (1844), and Pallis (1901). All these connect $\upsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ with $\zeta\omega\eta$ and not with $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$, and assume that the meaning of the phrase is 'a man's life consisteth not in the things that he possesseth,