

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]

the asterisk of ⚡ would seem to be an error, since the clause is in all LXX manuscripts as well as the M.T. ⚡ could, in fact, probably be corrected from *x* in some places; thus in iii. 21, 30 *x* omits half a dozen words which are missing in the M.T.; deliberate omission by *x* is probable and the passages should almost certainly have been marked with the obelus in ⚡.

We may conclude by remarking how often the secondary versions Armenian, Sahidic, Ethiopic, OL. support the KZ group in witnessing to the pre-Hexaplaric text. In xviii. 2 and xx. 10, indeed, we seem to have two exceptional Hexaplaric insertions in OL. Sah Eth made with the majority of Greek manuscripts, though BMN omit the first and MN the second. Even here, however, the omission of the first in B makes it doubtful whether it is really a Hexaplaric insertion. On the other hand we have already quoted one passage, xix. 23, where Z and its cursives seem to have conflated the true LXX with the Hexaplaric reading, and the OL. stands alone as the representative of the simple true LXX text; and another, v. 28, where the OL. again has the best claim to give us the true LXX; but the working out of the relation between the OL. and the various Greek texts and its frequent superiority to them and even at times to the Hebrew must be left for another article.

A. V. BILLEN

SOME FURTHER LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF THE CHESTER BEATTY PAPYRUS OF THE GOSPELS

PREVIOUS studies of the Chester Beatty papyrus P⁴⁵ have suggested that it is at least unsafe to assume a late date for a reading which might be explained as an 'improvement'. There are a number of other readings which are interesting from the same point of view.

	P ⁴⁵	<i>Contra</i>
Mark		
vi. 41	παρθῶσιν \aleph^c ADM ² N &c.	παρτιθῶσιν \aleph^* BLM [*] W &c.
vi. 45	ἀπολύση ANW &c.	ἀπολύει \aleph BDLΔ1, ἀπολύσει E*KΓfam. 13 al.
vii. 35	διηνοίχθησαν ANX &c.	ἡνοίγησαν \aleph BDΔ1, διηνοίγησαν WΘ, ἡνοίχθησαν L
Luke		
x. 34	ἐπιχέας singular	ἐπιχέων <i>cett.</i>
xi. 38	ἐβαπτίσατο 700	ἐβαπτίσθη <i>cett.</i>
xii. 3	ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτία εἰπῆτε singular	ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτία εἶπατε <i>cett.</i>

xiii. 9	ἐκκοψον 69. 157	ἐκκόψεις <i>cett.</i>
xiii. 13	ἐδόξασεν D	ἐδόξαζεν <i>cett.</i>
xiv. 8	κατακλείνου singular	κατακλιθῆς <i>cett.</i>
xiv. 20	ἡγάμηκα (or ἐγάμηκα) singular	ἔγημα <i>cett.</i>

John

x. 16	ἄπερ singular	ἄ <i>cett.</i>
x. 40	πρότερον κΔΘ f. 13	πρώτον <i>cett.</i>
xi. 22	αἰτήσης W	αἰτήση <i>cett.</i>

These are, of course, not all clear 'improvements', but none of them, if not genuine, seems likely to have arisen from mere accident. They imply a preference for one grammatical form over another. Are they Alexandrian 'corrections', or are they refinements which in other texts have been worn away in the careless and unskilful transcription of the first two centuries?

It is clear that the evidence of \mathfrak{P}^{45} changes the aspect of this problem. So long as we had no earlier manuscript than B, the notion of Alexandrian and Antiochian 'improvements' had great plausibility. Thus, in John xi. 19, when *πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν* or *πρὸς Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν* was attested by $\kappa\text{BC}^*\text{DLWX}$ 33, and A and the vast majority of later manuscripts read *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν*, it was arguable that the simpler reading was the original and the other an 'improvement'. The support of the longer reading by a manuscript a hundred years older than B reinforces the inherent improbability of such an emendation and confirms the likelihood that the passage was mutilated by copyists who did not understand the idiom, or feared that their readers would not understand it. It is interesting to note that this is one of the cases in which Tischendorf went against κ , as also in John xi. 29, where A and the later manuscripts read *ἐγείρεται* and *ἔρχεται* against *ἡγέρθη*, attested by $\kappa\text{BC}^*\text{DLWX}$ 33, and *ἦρχετο*, attested by $\kappa\text{BC}^*\text{LWX}$ 33. He does not give any reason for his choice, but it may be presumed that he thought the aorist and imperfect more likely to have been an emendation than the historic present. As I have pointed out in an earlier article, \mathfrak{P}^{45} justifies his decision.

The cases in Mark are more doubtful. There are other instances of conflict between aorist and present subjunctive, in which the attestation is not dissimilar from that in vi. 41. In general Mark's usage in phrases with *ἵνα* shows no preference for the present over the aorist, but rather the contrary. In vi. 45 assimilation to Matthew might have produced *ἀπολύση*, and the 'correction' of that reading to *ἀπολύει* does not seem very probable. On the other hand, there

is no example of $\xi\omega\varsigma$ with indicative in Mark, and only one example of $\xi\omega\varsigma$ without $\alpha\tilde{\nu}$, where it is also followed by the aorist subjunctive in most manuscripts, with an alternative reading in the future indicative. These tense forms are frequently confused, and, in later manuscripts at least, the confusion may be a case of itacism. There are no variants in Φ^{45} which suggest such confusion, but in Luke xi. 21 the papyrus reads $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ (a present indicative) after $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$, and in xi. 22 $\nu\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\eta$ after $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$. This inconsistency can hardly be a mere itacism, since η and $\epsilon\iota$ are not interchangeable in Φ^{45} , and are rarely confused in any of the earlier manuscripts. The identification in pronunciation of η and ι began later and developed more slowly than most of the other itacistic changes, and is not complete even yet, for there are still dialects in which η retains its older sound of a lengthened ϵ . That it had this sound for the writer of Φ^{45} is suggested by a peculiar itacism in that manuscript, $B\alpha\iota\theta\alpha\nu[\iota\alpha\nu]$ for $B\eta\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. The confusion of the tense forms probably originated at a time when $\epsilon\iota$ was still a true diphthong, with a sound more like the earlier than the later sound of η . In Mark vi. 45 a few uncials and a number of cursives read $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$, which, with the omission of σ before ϵ , a common error in uncials, would account for $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$. $\delta\iota\eta\nu\omicron\iota\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ in vii. 35 might be due to the preceding $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\chi\theta\eta\tau\iota$, but it is equally arguable that $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\chi\theta\eta\tau\iota$ makes $\delta\iota\eta\nu\omicron\iota\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ the more probable reading. Indeed, the sudden change from the compound to the simple verb, and from one form of aorist to another, seems an artificiality alien from Mark's manner.

The case is naturally a little different with the singular and sub-singular readings in Φ^{45} in Luke and John. These may be mere individualities of the manuscript, and support by a single late cursive like 700, or by two such as 69 and 157, may well be accidental. Before such readings are dismissed, however, it seems desirable to inquire whether they are consonant with the usage of the author, and whether the alternative reading is one which might easily have arisen in transcription. $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ is certainly more correct than $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$, and the latter, being a word of much more frequent use in Christian documents, might easily have found its way into the text, even apart from the tendency of the passive forms to supplant the middle. There is no other example of $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ in Luke, but he shows a clear sense of the distinction between passive and middle in other verbs. D even makes him use the middle $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron$ in xxii. 50; and it is just as appropriate here as in xvi. 3, where all manuscripts read $\acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$. $\epsilon\pi\iota\chi\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ is again a highly accurate expression, which is inherently as likely to be due to Luke as to his copyist, while the alternative reading is easily explicable. $\delta\sigma\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is rare in Luke, though fairly frequent in

Matthew. *ἔκκοψον* may be due to the influence of *ἔκκοψον* in v. 7. As regards *ἐδόξασεν*, the evidence generally suggests that Luke preferred the imperfect to the aorist with this verb, but there is one other passage with a conflict of readings, xxiii. 47, where *ΝΒDLR* read *ἐδόξαζεν* and *ACQWXΓΔΛΠ* unc³ *ἐδόξασεν*. Lucan usage, on the other hand, is distinctly favourable to *κατακλίνου*. Luke employs the imperative with *μή* nearly three times as often as the subjunctive, while four out of the eleven cases printed as subjunctive are in the second person plural aorist passive, where the spelling of the subjunctive and the imperative is the same, except for the accentuation. The alternative reading *κατακλιθῆς*, moreover, might have arisen from the influence of the preceding *κληθῆς*. The reading in xiv. 20 does not seem particularly Lucan, and the aorist is used in the other clauses of the phrase, and attested by *ϕ*⁴⁵ in the one place for which it is extant. As regards this reading, it would be interesting to see the substitution of the augment for reduplication in the perfect attested by the papyrus, but the context makes it rather probable that the reading is a mistake for *ἐγάμησα*.

The *ϕ*⁴⁵ readings in the Fourth Gospel are quite Johannine, *πρότερον* in particular being used by no other Evangelist, while John employs it three times. In one of these cases, vii. 50, D has the alternative reading *πρώτον*.

There is a curious variant in Luke ix. 48, supported by *lmn*^{scr}, *ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῶν* for *ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν*. The *ὑμῶν* is of course justifiable as a partitive genitive, but the construction is not characteristic of Luke or of any New Testament writer. The coincidence in such a reading of *ϕ*⁴⁵ and three fourteenth-century manuscripts, whose text is described by Scrivener as approaching more closely to the received editions than any he was acquainted with, may be accidental, but is certainly remarkable.

Another grammatical variant, which would have been characterized as an enfeeblement if found in a later manuscript, is *δεῦρο ἔλθε ἕξω* for *δεῦρο ἕξω* in John xi. 43. The same may be said of two variations in vocabulary in Luke, *ποιούμαι* for *ἐπιτελῶ* or *ἀποτελῶ* in xiii. 32, and *ποίησον* for *ἀνάγκασον* in xiv. 23, and perhaps of *καλήν* for *ἀγαθήν* in x. 42. *ἀγαθήν* is certainly more Lucan. The reverse is the case with xii. 4, where the papyrus agrees with 700 in reading *πτοηθῆτε* for *φοβηθῆτε*. In Luke xi. 36 *ϕ*⁴⁵ reads *μέλος*, where all other manuscripts have *μέρος*. Sir Frederic Kenyon notes this as being *per errorem*, but is this so certain? *μέλος* makes perfectly good sense, and although Luke never uses the word, he never uses *μέρος* for a part of the body.

There are two interesting variants in agreement with D. One is *εἰσπορευομένους* for *εἰσερχομένους* in Luke xi. 52. What is curious

about this is that in John v. 29 D reads *ἐξελεύσονται* against *ἐκπορεύονται* in all other manuscripts, and in Mark vii. 19 *εἰσέρχεται* for *εἰσπορεύεται*, and *ἐξέρχεται* for *ἐκπορεύεται*. The other example is in Luke xi. 53, where the papyrus reads *ἔχειν* with DS al⁶ against *ἐνέχειν*. This is the more curious since P⁴⁵ in the whole passage agrees in the main with *κ*BL.

There are two variants in John which deserve special attention. The first is in x. 41, where the papyrus reads *οὐδὲ ἔν* with W^Θ famm. 1, 13, while all other manuscripts read *οὐδέν*. It will be remembered that in John i. 3 all manuscripts except *κ*D fam. 1 and a few others read *οὐδὲ ἔν*. The reading *οὐδὲ ἔν* in John i. 3 is so well attested that there can be no doubt of its genuineness, and it is quite in keeping with the Johannine style. It seems curious, however, that John should use the expression nowhere else. In fact it does appear in six other places in some manuscripts. The attestation is as follows: iii. 27 B c^{scr}; v. 19 fam. 1. 565; v. 30 G al pauc; x. 41 the present case; xv. 5 B; xxi. 3 C*W. In all these cases the locution is as appropriate and as likely to have been used by John as in i. 3. x. 41 is the only one of these places for which P⁴⁵ is extant, and it confirms the W^Θ reading.

The other instance is the singular reading *ζήσει* for *ζήσεται* in xi. 25. This is the only case in which the future of *ζάω* occurs in John without a conflict of readings. There are five other cases with *ζήσει*, *ζήσουσι*, or *ζήσετε* on one side and *ζήσεται*, *ζήσονται*, or *ζήσεσθε* on the other, with *κ* and B each favouring the active forms four times and the passive once, D and W being each twice on one side and twice on the other and once attesting a third variant, while L is always on the active side and the Byzantine manuscripts generally favour the passive forms. A is only extant in two cases, in both of which it favours the passive forms. Now, it will be seen, P⁴⁵, which is not extant for any of the other passages, attests the active form in the one case in which hitherto all manuscripts have been on the other side.

The general conclusion from all these instances seems to be that the text probably did, from a very early date, suffer both from 'improvements' and from the careless obliteration of fine shades of expression, and that it is not by any means a safe rule to reject, as a matter of course, the most correct or elegant of two or more readings.

There is another class of variants which does not perhaps fall within quite the same category, that is to say, variations in the order of words. Hort pointed out that 'a large proportion of the readings in which the primary Greek manuscripts stand alone differ from the rival readings in order only', and he insists elsewhere on the 'peculiar habitual purity of the text of B in respect of the order of words';

a purity which is specially exhibited in numerous ternary or more composite variations, in which B is the sole or almost the sole authority for the one collocation which will account for the other variants'. There are not many of these ternary or more composite variations in those parts of the text for which the papyrus is extant, and none in which it supports B. In Luke xi. 19, which exhibited five variations in word order, one of which *αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται* is attested by B and D, P⁴⁵ adds a sixth *αὐτοὶ ἔσονται ὑμῶν κριταί*. It also adds a fifth to the four variants in Luke xii. 28, where it reads *ἐν ἀγρῶ σήμερον τὸν χόρτον ὄντα*, while WH read *ἐν ἀγρῶ τὸν χόρτον ὄντα σήμερον* with \aleph BL 157, and a fourth to the three in Luke xii. 52, in which WH read *πέντε ἐν ἐνὶ οἴκῳ* with \aleph BL and the papyrus reads *ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνὶ πέντε*. In Luke xiv. 26 it reads *μου εἶναι μαθητῆς* with \aleph KL fam. 13 al¹⁰ against *εἶναι μου μαθητῆς* of \aleph B and WH and *μου μαθητῆς εἶναι* of AD and the Textus Receptus. In John x. 32 the papyrus agrees with \aleph AK Θ ALP fam. 1 in reading *ἔργα καλὰ ἔδειξα ὑμῖν*, which WH give in the margin, while the reading of their text, *ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν καλά*, is found in B only, and the Textus Receptus has a third reading *καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν*, attested by DLXΓΔ unc⁷ fam. 13. It is difficult in any of these cases to see in the B reading 'the one collocation which will account for the other variants', and in two of them WH have an alternative marginal reading. For the rest P⁴⁵ agrees with the Textus Receptus against WH and B 9 times, and with WH and B against the Textus Receptus 7 times, in variants in word order in Mark; in similar variants in Luke it is 14 times with the Textus Receptus against WH and B, and 6 times with WH and B against the Textus Receptus; while in John the agreements with the Textus Receptus against WH and B are 3 and the agreements with WH and B against the Textus Receptus 5. All the agreements with B have other support, and most of them considerable other support. There are also in Luke one agreement with WH and the Textus Receptus against B, where B is supported only by 254 in a reading which WH give in the margin, one agreement with AK Π al plus¹⁰, one with DK Π , one with K Π , one with \aleph ADL 33, one with \aleph LTX, one with DLMX Ξ 33, two with D 157, and two with D alone, against WH, B, and the Textus Receptus. P⁴⁵ has moreover 18 singular variants in word order in Luke, 4 in Mark, and 5 in John.

All this, of course, does not disprove the 'peculiar habitual purity' of B in word order, but it certainly does not confirm it. A glance at the various readings in Plato or any other Greek prose writer will show that variation in the order of words is in fact one of the commonest transcriptional aberrations, and the attestation of such variants is hardly favourable to the 'peculiar habitual purity' in word order

of any particular group or family of manuscripts. In Thucydides, for example, the Vatican manuscript presents, from chapter 92 of Book vi to the end, a text differing considerably from that of the other leading manuscripts. In this part of the history the apparatus criticus of the Oxford edition shows 56 variants in word order in which this codex is opposed to all the other manuscripts cited. In 24 of these cases the Oxford text follows the Vatican manuscript, while in 32 it accepts the opposing reading, and there are certainly few cases in which there is not considerable room for hesitation between the two readings. It is difficult to feel any greater certainty about the habitual superiority of B in the Gospels. C. C. TARELLI

THE BYZANTINE TEXT IN NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

I

AN edition of the Greek New Testament aiming at the complete representation of the material relevant for textual criticism cannot now be produced on traditional lines. More than 4,500 manuscripts are known to exist. Of these it is impossible to reproduce, in an apparatus criticus, the readings even of the fraction that has as yet been collated; wherever the bulk of later manuscripts is at variance with a modern critical text the reader must be beset by endless rows of meaningless figures. Von Soden endeavoured to produce a surveyable apparatus by comprising the masses of manuscripts in groups. But, quite apart from the disastrous shortcomings of his still memorable effort, the great bulk of Byzantine manuscripts defies all attempts to group them. Von Soden's groups and sub-groups, even supposing that they were all based on well-ascertained facts, by sheer weight of numbers defeat the attempt to obtain a clear idea of the evidence for any widely attested variant. If, on the other hand, von Soden's sigla are resolved into their components (as has been done in Legg's recent edition), the majority of the corresponding manuscripts, including many important ones, immediately and unavoidably disappear through the dark emergency exit inscribed 'al. pler.'

Von Soden and K. Lake have shown that this unwieldy bulk of later manuscripts, in spite of a certain amount of variation, exhibits one form of the text, namely the Byzantine. This momentous observation opens up a way to overcome the deadlock and, at the same time, to secure progress in several other fields of textual criticism.

The dispute about the absolute value of the Byzantine text is a thing of the past. But it is still an indispensable tool of the critical