

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<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]

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,

however abundant they may be' (or 'though he be in abundance'). This interpretation also involves a great strain on the language, but I believe that it is something like the meaning that I should have puzzled out for myself, though I should never have felt sure that I was right.

As for the other interpretation, it is, as I have said, difficult to believe that all these translators arrived at it independently. It may, no doubt, be safely assumed that the Scandinavian translators were influenced by Luther, and we know that Tyndale consulted Luther's Bible. The history of the Rumanian version makes Luther's influence improbable, but does not utterly exclude it. One Spanish and the Catalan version purport to be made from the Vulgate, which only makes the coincidence more remarkable. It is, however, conceivable that Luther and the other translators knew the passage in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. vi. 34 (578)), in which he quotes our text *κατὰ λέξιν* in this form: *ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἔστιν ἢ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ*. Blass boldly prints this as the true reading in his Roman Text of Luke. The Sinaitic Syriac version gives hints of the same reading, though there are gaps in its text, which appears in Mrs. Lewis's translation as follows: '. . . not . . . in the abundance of goods . . .'.

There is, however, another strange feature in this matter. Wycliffe's version (I quote it in Purvey's revised form) runs: 'for the lijf of a man is not in the abundaunce of the thingis whiche he weldith'. Tyndale may have known this, even Luther may have known it, but where did Wycliffe get it from? Did he know the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, and could he have read them if he did? In any case the Anglo-Saxon version is 'For þam ðe nys nanes mannes lif on gytsunge of þam ðe he ah'. 'Gytsunge' is, of course, a mistake, a dittography induced by the same word in the first part of the verse, but the whole rendering seems to point to a reading of the Vulgate or of some earlier Latin version which is quite unknown to us. There is, however, one Latin reading which throws some light on the problem, not of our translations, but of the original text. This is the reading of *c*, the Codex Colbertinus, which runs: 'non in obaudiencia substantiae alicui est vita sua ex his quae possidet'. Mr. Barnard, in his study of 'Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text' (*Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1899), says: 'If the last four words are a later addition to the original translation represented in *c*, this version gives us an exact translation of the text found in Clement . . .'. He does not seem to have noticed that the same is equally true of the Authorized Version, of Wycliffe, and of the Anglo-Saxon text. The reading of *c* seems clearly to point to a Greek text with the word *ὑπάρχοντα* in some form both before and after *ἢ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ*. I had already suspected a transposition of this word, but the Latin version suggests a solution which removes all my

scruples against accepting Clement's as the true reading of the passage. I apply the method explained by Prof. A. C. Clark in his *Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford, 1914). Among the ancestors of most of our manuscripts was almost certainly a manuscript with lines of 10-12 letters and another with lines of 14-16 letters. Let us assume then that the text was written thus :

ΟΤΙΟΥΚΕΝΤΩ
ΠΕΡΙΣΣΕΥΕΙΝΤΙΝΙ
ΤΑΥΙΛΑΡΧΟΝΤΑΥΤΟΥ
ΕΣΤΙΝΗΖΩΗΑΥΤΟΥ

By the effect of homoeoteleuton, a scribe repeated τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ after ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. If Clement was right in omitting αὐτοῦ after τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, as D does after ζωὴ, a similar mistake may be assumed in copying a manuscript of 10-12 letters. A later copyist altered τὰ ὑπάρχοντα to ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, in order to make sense, and this produced the reading which underlies the Latin of *c*. Later the first τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ was omitted, and gave the actual text found in all our manuscripts. Meanwhile the original text had given birth to the old Syriac translation and to a Latin version which survives in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels and in Wycliffe.

It would certainly be a pleasant thing to be able to believe that the 'Morning Star of the Reformation' influenced the great German translator of the Bible, and through him passed on the true text of Luke to all the Lutheran countries and even beyond. It seems clear at least that Latin texts were known to the Anglo-Saxon translator and to Wycliffe which have not come down to us, and a further question suggests itself: are there Greek manuscripts of the Gospels in Rumania which have not yet been collated? C. C. TARELLI

ST. JOHN x. 29

Ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μείζων ἐστίν, κτλ. If this reading is right it seems hardly possible to account for the variants ὃ and μείζον, while, on the other hand, ὁ . . . μείζόν (printed by W.-H.) makes no good sense. We seem forced to choose either ὃς . . . μείζον or ὃ . . . μείζων as the reading which gave rise to the variants (unless indeed we regard both ὃς and ὃ as attempts to replace a relative ὃ which originally preceded πατήρ and was mistaken for the article). I take ὃ . . . μείζων to be the likelier alternative; likelier, that is, to point the way towards the true reading, for neither μείζων nor μείζον has any intrinsic probability. The chief obstacle to the restoration of the passage lies in πάντων. The uncertainty as to its right position (before or after μείζων) indicates that it is an intruder,

due no doubt to the need for a genitive after the comparative. And once πάντων is gone we can see that μείζων itself is corrupt. We can get a hint for emendation from ver. 28, καὶ γὰρ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, it being in John's manner to repeat a thought (with slight variations) in consecutive verses. I suggest, then, that the original may have been ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δέδωκέν μοι <ἐν ἐμοὶ> ζῶν ἐστίν. Cf. i. 4; xv. 1 ff. Or, more simply, μοι ζῶν, or even μοι <ἀεὶ> ζῶν.

R. G. BURY

THE LIFE AND PERSONALITY OF LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM

It is proposed, in the first place, to investigate the life and personality of Leontius of Byzantium in the light of the internal evidence of *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, his earliest treatise.¹ In the second place, the external evidence of the manuscripts of his works, and of Byzantine tradition generally, will be taken into consideration. On this basis an attempt will be made to answer the question: Which of various sixth-century references to a Leontius are to be regarded as true sources for further knowledge about Leontius of Byzantium? The question will involve the discussion of certain hypotheses which have been advanced in an endeavour to fix the identity of Leontius of Byzantium. As a result of these inquiries it is hoped that a clearer picture of our author will have been gained.

The Internal Evidence of Contra N. et E.

All that we know of the early life of Leontius is derived from the third book of *Contra N. et E.* This book is a savage polemic against Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and their followers. Leontius turns upon them in this fashion:

'For I was myself a member of the crew, against whom I have now made it my purpose to erect a column to the glory of God, and to solemnize a triumph over them. They have ceased to keep their impiety hidden in the secret closet, and to allure the multitude in obscurity and darkness. They now come out into the open, visible from afar, and so have become abominations that all must shun. Yes, when I was young, they wasted my time and robbed me of my reason. Every possible instrument of evil did they bring to bear upon me. For I made it my aim to search out the exact truth of authoritative Christian teaching. And when I had tasted of this, as the saying is, with the tips of my fingers, I waxed

¹ Reprinted in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 86, 1268 B-1396 A; the Prologue shows that it is his first attempt at authorship.