

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1948

Variant Readings in the Text of First Corinthians on the Basis of P46

Walter H. Lutz

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_lutzw@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lutz, Walter H., "Variant Readings in the Text of First Corinthians on the Basis of P46" (1948). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 275.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/275>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**VARIANT READINGS IN THE TEXT OF FIRST CORINTHIANS
ON THE BASIS OF P46**

A Thesis Presented to

**The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology**

In Partial Fulfillment

**of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity**

by

Walter H. Lutz

May 1948

Approved by:

W. Arndt.
Martin H. Franzmann

VARIANT READINGS IN THE TEXT OF FIRST CORINTHIANS ON THE BASIS OF P46

Introduction

Our interest in this study is a reexamination of the text of First Corinthians on the basis of P46. P46 is the symbol, agreed upon by scholars, to designate the Pauline Epistles in the Chester Beatty Collection of Biblical Papyri. It comprises manuscript no. II of the collection.¹

The Chester Beatty Papyri are a group of twelve manuscripts containing portions of the Old and New Testaments found in Egypt (the exact location is unknown, but thought to be in the Fayum) and acquired in portions by Mr. A. Chester Beatty and the University of Michigan at intervals beginning with the year 1931.²

We are particularly interested in the significance of these finds for New Testament textual criticism. These papyri constitute the most important recent addition to the materials of Biblical textual criticism. The importance of the collection lies in its early date. Until the time of its acquisition the oldest and most valuable documents for the text of

1. The sigla was assigned to the manuscript by Prof. E. von Dobschutz. The full text of the Pauline Epistles (P46) was published in 1936, in Fasciculus III of the series edited by F. G. Kenyon.

2. For details on the story of these finds and on their external characteristics see Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus I, General Introduction.

the New Testament were Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, which date from the fourth century. For earlier evidence there have only been a few small fragments and the evidence of early Christian fathers and versions. "The Chester Beatty papyri carry back the direct tradition well into the third century, and in some instances into the second."¹ Specifically with regard to the Pauline Epistles (P46) it seems certain that they are not later than the first half of the third century. Kenyon tells us that Prof. Ulrich Wilcken, the first living authority on papyrology, would date P46 at about 200 A.D. He also adds that it makes a strong claim to have been written no later than a century and a half after the death of Paul.²

The editors of the various texts of the Greek New Testament being used today (Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Weiss, and others of less importance) did not possess the valuable testimony of P46.³ Therefore, in the light of generalizations and conclusions that are allowed on the evidence of these papyri, and on the specific testimony of P46, we have thought it a valuable study to make a closer examination of the text of First Corinthians as we find it in Nestle's seventeenth edition of the Greek New Testament, which presents the 'majority text' of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weiss. The aim of this endeavor has been that of the best editors - to arrive at the autographic text of Paul himself, and not merely the earliest text of which we have witness in the extant manuscripts.

We have worked on the following basis. We have taken all those cases

-
1. F. G. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, General Introduction, p. 15.
 2. *Ibid.*, Fasciculus III, Supplement (Text), p. xv.
 3. Bovar, a Spanish scholar, has published a text with critical notes in which use is made of the papyri finds, but it seems the circulation of this edition is limited. Cf. Metzger, "Recent Spanish Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in the Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (December, 1947), pp. 401 ff.

in Nestle's seventeenth edition of the New Testament where the reading of P46 is not taken into the text and have evaluated them to see whether they should have been regarded as authentic.

In our consideration of each variant we have used four main criteria of judgment, principles of textual criticism enunciated by the worthiest critics of the past. In general they can be divided into two classes, one having to do with external and the other with internal evidence. The numbered paragraphs after each variant have reference to specific criteria by which we have examined the evidence. Under the first point the external evidence is examined - the documentary testimony, which comprises the evidence in the uncial and cursive Greek manuscripts, the early versions of the Bible (translations), and finally the early church fathers.¹ The first goal under this point was to find out which reading was most wide-spread. The next three points comprise internal evidence, 2 and 3 transcriptional (from the point of view of the scribe), and number 4 intrinsic (from the point of view of the author). Under the second criterion we attempt to determine which reading cannot be traced to an unintentional alteration on the part of the scribe (such errors that result from itacism, homoioteleuton, diplography, lapsus memoriae, and others).²

We attempt under the third criterion to determine the reading which cannot be traced to an intentional alteration, usually designated as the more difficult reading.³

1. A.T. Robertson classifies all unintentional errors into a) errors of the eye, b) errors of the ear, c) errors of memory, d) errors of the judgment, e) errors of the pen, and f) errors of speech. See A.T. Robertson, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 150 ff.

2. In recording the external testimony of each variant we make use of Nestle's system of signs. See his "Explanations" in his Greek New Testament. Often, where it seems advisable, we have given more complete attestation as recorded in Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Graeca.

3. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 156 ff., lists the possibilities of a) linguistic or rhetorical changes, b) clearing up historical difficulties, c) harmonistic corruptions, d) doctrinal corrections, and e) liturgical corruptions.

The general canon that would cover the above transcriptional criteria is: "that reading must be preferred that explains the origin of the others."

Under the fourth point our aim is to determine the intrinsic probability of each variant. Considerations of style and context are primary factors here. The golden canon of intrinsic evidence is that "no reading can possibly be original which contradicts the context of the passage or the tenor of the writing."¹

By a careful weighing of the above criteria we have come to a decision on the variants under consideration in First Corinthians. In our considerations we have often omitted number 4, especially where it is obvious that factors of style and context play no role. At times we have also combined the two transcriptional criteria, or even all the criteria, and recorded our judgments in one paragraph. Where numbers are used they refer to the respective criteria set forth above.

A few remarks should be made about the relative weight we have given to the criteria used. The evidence of the Chester Beatty papyri has contributed much in this respect, the details of which we will set forth later. The problem that has been the concern of the textual critics through the years has been the extent of authority to be given to internal evidence in relation to external testimony. We have tried to follow the following principles. We have not tried to follow rigorously any one manuscript proven to be generally reliable or a so-called 'good' group of manuscripts, much less a so-called text-type like Westcott and Hort's divisions or the 'local texts' of Streeter. To designate broad groups we use the terminology recommended by the best scholars today, and not that of Westcott and Hort, realizing of course that

1. McClellan, as quoted in Robertson, *Ibid*, p. 165.

even these designations are somewhat nebulous. The tradition out of which grew the Textus Receptus we designate as 'Byzantine.' The term 'Western' is restricted to documents hailing from North Africa (Carthage), Italy, and Gaul. The term 'Alexandrian' is applied to the group of witnesses from Egypt, and finally 'Antiochian' to the Syriac versions originating in that general locale. This division is closely geographical (corresponding to Streeter's), and the witnesses can be so divided because those of each locale display certain definite affinities.¹ Although we attempt to ascertain which reading is more widespread, or has the preponderance of external testimony on the basis of 'reliable' documents, we have tried to avoid the glaring mistakes of former critics who religiously followed the testimony of one document or a so-called text-type (like Westcott and Hort's 'Neutral'). When internal evidence seemed to us to offer rather decisive evidence we disregarded any preponderance in external evidence.

Recent studies in the field of New Testament textual criticism have led to conclusions that support our method of giving the last word to internal evidence. The trend is away from the 'genealogical' methods of Westcott and Hort and Streeter.² The mistake that Westcott and Hort made was that once a document was proven to be comparatively pure, this external evidence of the general worth of the manuscript as a whole was given greater weight than internal evidence of single readings. All the facts seem to confirm the truth that manuscripts and 'texts' were not rigorously homogeneous. Transmission of the text

1. Streeter in The Four Gospels has made a case for a Caesarean text also. Because of the scarcity of witnesses testifying to such a text in Paul's epistles we have not operated with that division.

2. See the article by E.C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method," in the Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (June, 1947).

can in no way be charted accurately because of the phenomenon of mixture, and no manuscript extant has escaped this, because most of the mixture took place in the first three centuries. The same applies to generalizations on all readings of a group of documents. The trouble lies in an exact definition of a group of documents. The groups themselves are unstable and mixed.

Within a text-type as 'Neutral' are large variations.¹ The mistake is made in envisioning the possibility of tracing back from a group of manuscripts to a single parent or 'archetype', and from parents to another single archetype, until the ultimate parent is reached. The fact of the matter is that it was not a single document responsible for the text of later documents, but one document had behind it any number of parents that influenced its text.²

The so-called Western text has been seriously indicted as a whole, and because of this generalized indictment certain editors have rejected most of its distinctive readings. This generalization can be carried too far. Internal evidence must be taken into serious account in many readings called by Hort 'Western interpolations.' We have attempted to follow this rule. Certain editors have also generalized unwarrantedly on the Alexandrian tradition, often permitting its own attestation to carry the weight against the better reading attested by another tradition.

The trend away from primary dependence on 'the best manuscript' or the best family can be seen in many scholars today such as Joseph Bedier, Paul

1. *Ibid*, p. 119.

2. Colwell, *op. cit.*, p. 124, comments as follows on mixture: "Until we know more about 'groups of documents,' we cannot use them as road signs to guide us through the tangled jungle of mixture. When we do know more, it is probable that the new knowledge will illuminate the history of the text to a limited degree, and will thus aid all studies in textual criticism, but will render only general and not direct assistance to the problem of over-coming mixture."

Collomp, Marie-Joseph Lagrange, G.D. Kilpatrick, J. Rendel Harris, F.C. Burkitt, Ernest C. Colwell, Frederick C. Grant, Kirsopp and Silva Lake, and H.C. Hoskier.¹ This trend is also evidenced in these conclusions by F.G. Kenyon in a review of recent developments in the field of Biblical textual criticism.

It is not justifiable, either on the evidence now available with regard to these books (New Testament), or by analogy with what we now know of the textual history of classical literature in general, to pin our faith on any one manuscript, however high an opinion we may have of its merit. An element of subjective criticism must remain; and this inevitably means an element of uncertainty, since it is impossible to escape the personal equation of the critic. It is better, however, to acknowledge difficulties than to ignore them; and the recognition of the existence of this element of uncertainty may serve to sharpen the wits of critics, and to stimulate the search for objective evidence, which alone can be finally decisive.²

Any study involving P46 would be incomplete without characterizing its relationship and affinity to single manuscripts and groups of manuscripts. We shall do this now with special reference to the text of First Corinthians.

It must first be noted that P46 confirms the essential soundness of the existing texts of First Corinthians. "There are no important omissions or additions of passages, and no variations which affect vital facts or doctrines."³

The text of P46, as well as that of the other Chester Beatty Papyri, points decisively to the conclusion that Codex Vaticanus does not represent a text of original purity dominant in Egypt throughout the second and third centuries. P46 gives positive proof that other texts existed. Although Codex B may be

1. We offer Colwell's conclusions on the genealogical method, *Ibid*, p. 132. "In any case, it is clear that in a field where no manuscripts have parents, where centuries and continents separate witnesses, the genealogical method is not of primary importance. Its importance lies in the realm of provincial history. It can chart the history of transmission in an area narrowly limited in time and space. Within that area it sheds a bright light. But in the larger realm where the larger questions are settled, it still has to demonstrate its value for the reconstruction of the original text of the Greek New Testament."

2. F.G. Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, pp. 85-86.

3. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, General Introduction, p. 15.

the best single representative of the original text, the Chester Beatty Papyri have shaken its claim for exclusive predominance and primitive purity.¹ Furthermore, the evidence of the Chester Beatty Papyri has completed the disintegration of the so-called 'Western' text as a single family in the old sense of Westcott and Hort, which included the Old Syriac versions and other Eastern authorities. These papyri have many readings in common with Codex Bezae and other 'Western' authorities, but it is significant that they attest to none of their more striking variations. In general they confirm the view that throughout the second and third centuries there was existent a considerable variety of readings which had not yet crystallized into families.

In showing the affinity of P46 to the Alexandrian (S² A B C) and Western (D F G) traditions we give Kenyon's tabulation.³ He takes the cases in Paul's epistles in which the Alexandrian authorities and the Western definitely take different sides and shows the agreements of P46 with each.

	P46 with Alexandrian	With Western
Romans	89	51
1 Corinthians	143	29
2 Corinthians	60	11
Ephesians	47	5
Galatians	40	5
Philippians	23	6
Colossians	20	3

The above table demonstrates conclusively that P46 is closer to the Alexandrian than to the Western group. Kenyon gives his significant conclusions to the above facts in the following words:

The papyrus ranges itself quite definitely with the Alexandrian rather than with the Western group, though the preponderance is

1. Ibid, p. 16. On p. 17 he concludes, "The most that can be said is that all readings which can be shown to be of early date must be considered on their merits, without being absolutely overborne by the weight of the Vatican MS."

2. We use this symbol to designate Codex Sinaiticus.

3. Ibid, Fasciculus III, Supplement (Text), p. xvii.

much less strongly marked in Romans than in the other Epistles. There remains, however, a respectable minority of agreements with the Western group, and it is to be remembered that there are not a few other cases where one of the Alexandrian witnesses is found supporting a Western reading, so that we have, for example, BDFG against S/SAC, or CDFG against S/SAB. The result is to confirm the belief, to which other evidence seems to point, that while the Alexandrian group is on the whole the most trustworthy authority for the text of the New Testament, readings supported by the Western group are at times to be preferred, and should receive consideration on their merits.¹

It can be noted that the character of P46 is generally uniform throughout. In Kenyon's tables showing the comparison of P46 with the principal uncial manuscripts and the Textus Receptus the fact is apparent that in every case there is a preponderance of agreement with B. This is less strongly marked in Romans and First Corinthians, but in all cases the agreement is greater than with any other manuscript. The next in order of agreement are S/S, A, and C. We give the table for First Corinthians.²

	<u>With</u>	<u>Against</u>		<u>With</u>	<u>Against</u>
S/S	365	132	F	203	272
A	333	157	G	203	272
B	374	124	Tex. Rec.	222	276
C	213	103	Singular	92	
D	237	263	Errors	35	

Nestle, in the critical apparatus of his seventeenth edition of the Greek New Testament, cites P46 162 times in First Corinthians. Of these, 37 readings are in his judgment taken into the text and 125 are not. The fact that P46 gives us so many distinctive early readings demands a reconsideration and reexamination of the text on the part of critics. We have made a partial attempt at this and herewith present our examination.

For the purpose of saving space we have not always made our remarks self-explanatory as to the particular criteria being considered under the respective numbers. For this reason we include this brief formulation to aid the reader.

1. Ibid, p. xvii.

2. Ibid, pp. xvi-xvii.

We consider each numbered paragraph as follows:

1. Which reading has the preponderance of external evidence?
2. Which reading cannot be traced to an unintentional scribal alteration?
3. Which reading cannot be traced to an intentional alteration?

(This is usually the more difficult reading.)

4. Which reading is more probably original from the point of view of the author? (Under this point style, context, the author's theology, etc., come into consideration.)

Chapter One1:2

Nestle: τῆ οὐρανῆ ἐν κοε., ἡγιαρ. ἐν χε. Ἰεροῦ : N, A, D², L, P,
(Byzantine).

P46: ἡγιαρ. ἐν χε. Ἰεροῦ, τῆ οὐρανῆ ἐν κοε. : B, D*, F, G

1. The Nestle text is found early in Alexandria and might have been dominant there, being opposed only by Alexandrian B. The P46 reading was found early in the West, being clearly the dominant reading there. It also finds support early in Alexandria. Hence, the P46 reading was more widespread before the fifth century.

2. There seems to be little reason for an unintentional alteration here; and even if possible, no one reading would hold the better brief for originality.

3. This consideration is clearly in favor of P46. It is hardly conceivable that the Nestle reading would have been altered intentionally, because it is the easier reading. However, the P46 reading would be plainly open to suspicion on the part of a scribe. It is not as smooth as the former in construction. Furthermore, a redactor might be grammatically offended by the plural form in ἡγιαρῶν, considering it to be dependent on τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Hence, the harshness of the position of ἡγιαρ. ἐν χε. Ἰεροῦ is in favor of its being the original one.

4. Paul's style would clearly seem to favor the Nestle reading. It can be paralleled to 1 Thess. 2:14 and Rom. 1:7, both supporting this construction. However, the P46 reading is not grammatically untenable.

We confidently adopt the P46 reading here as authentic, especially on the basis of transcriptional evidence, possessing also weighty external support in a group which scholars have proven reliable in Paul's Epistles. Paul's style may not favor it, but this very fact might induce alteration in transcription. The consideration of style is weak here anyway. We have

few parallels, and all of Paul's greetings vary extensively in construction, showing that Paul did not hold himself to a stereotyped form.

1:8 (A)

Nestle: *ἕως τέλους* : N, A, B, C ; Origen

P46: *τέλειους*.

Codex D: *ἄχρι τέλους* : F, G

1. We find here a clear division between Alexandrian and Western testimony as far as two readings are concerned. P46 is the sole witness to its reading. The Nestle text is Alexandrian, and that of D, Western. On this score alone the text would be favored.

2. Unintentional alteration is not likely to have taken place here, unless it was a momentary forgetting of the copy upon shifting the eye to the writing material, in which case no one reading would explain the other as definitely in error.

3. From this point of view it seems possible that the P46 reading could be an alteration to conform to the immediately following form by omitting the preposition and changing the noun to an adjective. This completely changes the meaning of the phrase. However, in this case it would be natural to have a conjunction between the two words.

4. The reading of Nestle is found in exact parallel in 2 Cor. 1:13, where it is fully attested. Other examples of a like use of *ἕως* are found in 1 Cor. 4:13, 8:7, 15:6, and Rom. 11:8. Paul uses both forms, *ἄχρι* more than *ἕως*. Style offers little light, but in view of the exact parallels to the text, perhaps favors that reading.

We choose the reading of Nestle as authentic, having the weight of external evidence. Transcriptional and intrinsic evidence may not favor it over other

readings, but, none the less, do not offer evidence against it. For the lack of decisive internal evidence we adopt the text on the basis of external testimony.

1:8 (B)

Nestle: $\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$: *well.*

P46: - $\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$: B.

1. It is immediately evident that the Nestle text was more widespread, being dominant both in Alexandria and the West. P46, however, has important testimony in B.

2. It seems that both the possibility of addition and that of omission are present here - addition because of familiarity with the more frequent appellation, and omission because of homoioteleuton or a careless oversight.

3. The copyist would be more likely to insert $\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ for reasons of style, following the preceding and following forms, than to omit it. One can think of little reason to drop it intentionally if it were original.

4. The style of Paul is in no way decisive here. It is true that Paul uses the form of the text more often throughout his epistles, but the fact that he has many instances of $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ standing alone discounts this consideration.

External evidence favors the Nestle reading; whereas, internal considerations seem to favor slightly the P46 reading. We adopt the longer form because we feel that the internal considerations are highly conjectural on this particular problem, and the external weight is quite decidedly on the side of the Nestle form.

1:10

Nestle: *οχις κατα* : *nell.*

P46: *οχιςκα* : 33, 17.

1. The external testimony is highly in favor of the Nestle text.
2. Both are conceivable as unintentional alterations, but the longer form is naturally favored from this point of view.
3. It may be that the P46 reading is an attempt to conform in number to the verb. On the other hand, it may be conjectured that the plural form is an attempt to harmonize with the context.
4. The context seems to call strongly for the plural form. There were several factions in Corinth, favoring the use of *οχιςκατα*.

We consider the reading of Nestle as original. External and intrinsic considerations outweigh the slight possibility of opposing transcriptional evidence.

1:11

Nestle: *δδελφοις μου* : N, A, B, C², D, F, G, Byzantine

P46: *δδελφοις* : C*, d.

1. The reading of the Nestle text was more widespread, with dominant support from Alexandria and the West.
2. There is here more likelihood of dropping the *μου* unintentionally than of adding it.
3. This consideration balances out, several conjectures being possible.
4. A factor supporting the *μου* reading is that Paul is speaking in deep earnestness and wants to be as persuasive as possible with his readers. He is greatly concerned about rectifying the situation. Hence, he would more naturally include the personal *μου*.

Externally and internally the evidence favors the inclusion of *ἡ*. There is little doubt that it was authentic.

1:13 (A)

Nestle: *κεκείρται ὁ χειρτός*: *well.*

P46: *ἡ κεκείρται ὁ χειρτός*: 326, *pc*; *sy^P*

1. The Nestle reading has much more widespread support. Besides its own witness the P46 reading has slight and scattered support.
2. It is natural that the text is more fallible to unintentional omission than to addition. This, then, favors P46.
3. There are several considerations that weigh heavily for the Nestle reading here. *ἡ* is used in the next question indicating the possibility of insertion here to conform to the following. Also, since a negative answer is expected the scribe may have inserted *ἡ*. But there is certainly no need for Paul to use *ἡ* here. The answer is so self-evident that the inclusion of *ἡ* would take away some of the emotional force which the context points to.
4. The intrinsic argument has already been mentioned above. There is no doubt that the Nestle reading is authentic, having the better external, transcriptional, and intrinsic evidence.

1:13 (B)

Nestle: *ὅτι ἐστὶν ὁ κωδων*: *well.*

P46: *πρὸς ὁ κωδων*: B, *D**

1. Both readings are found in Alexandria and the West, but the Nestle is predominant in Alexandria and possibly also in the West.
2. Several possibilities offer themselves, rendering this consideration

undecisive. We find a very confused use of these two prepositions in the New Testament.

The enfeebling of the distinction between *περί* and *ὑπέρ* c. gen. is a matter of some importance in the New Testament, where these prepositions are used in well-known passages to describe the relation of the Redeemer to man or man's sins. It is an evident fact that *ὑπέρ* is often a colourless "about," as in 2 Cor. 8:23; it is used, for example, scores of times in accounts, with the sense of our commercial "to." This seems to show that its original fullness of content must not be presumed upon in theological definitions, although it may not have been wholly forgotten.¹

3. It is almost impossible to decide what happened here. Both prepositions, in sense, fit well. In many instances in the New Testament we have transcriptional confusion with these two prepositions.² Before we can conjecture with any reasonable grounds as to what took place here we must look into intrinsic considerations.

4. Both prepositions have support in Pauline usage. Paul's emphasis here is not on the nature of the crucifixion, but on the word *παυλος*. If he really wanted to express the substitutionary aspect of the cross he would probably have used *ὑπέρ*. In this case it strikes us that the stronger *ὑπέρ* is an alteration of the more neutral *περί* for the sake of clarity. If *ὑπέρ* were original there seems less reason for alteration to *περί*, although it would be foolish to insist on this conjecture.

On the basis of the above conjecture we prefer *περί*, with very early attestation in P46 and good support in B and D*.

1:25

Nestle: *χειρόν θεοῦ ὑπάκειν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν*: *nell.*

P46: *χειρότος θεοῦ ὑπακίς ἐστι (- ἐστ. Clem. of Alex.) καὶ θεοῦ σοφία*: *Clem. of Alexandria.*

1. The Nestle has the great weight of support.

1. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 105

2. cf. Blass, p. 133

2. Unintentional alteration is hardly involved because in each document either the nominative or the accusative is used throughout.

3. It appears that the scribe of P46 or a parent tried to make a distinct sentence of verse 24 by adding εἶπε and changing the three accusatives to nominatives. Clement's reading is grammatically wrong, and the scribe of P46 may have attempted a correction in a like reading in the manuscript from which he was copying.

4. Both readings make sense. I would say the context is in favor of the Nestle reading. The emphasis in the previous verses is on *κωμίας τοῦ κλεῦματος* (v. 21) and again on *κλεῦροσθεν* (v. 23). To make a distinct sentence of verse 24 and add εἶπε is a shifting of style here and a weakening to my mind making it unlikely for Paul to have done this. External and internal evidence, therefore, points to the Nestle reading as authentic.

Chapter Two

2:1

Nestle: *κλετῶσθεν*; B, D, W, E, F, G, L, P; *deffg*; *Byzantine*

P46: *κωρτῆσθεν*; N*, A, C, Ψ, 1912, *al*; *r*; *syP*, *bo*

1. The Nestle reading is distinctly Western with important Alexandrian support in B. The P46 reading has predominant Alexandrian testimony and may have been prominent in Antioch.

2. The Word of the Gospel is often referred to as *κωρτῆσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. If an unintentional change is involved here it is possible that the more familiar expression is substituted for the less familiar.

3. This consideration favors the Nestle reading. The P46 reading has the look of a harmonistic correction, due to verse 7 (cf. 4:1, Col. 2:2, Rev. 10:7).¹

1. Findlay, The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. II, p. 774

4. It is quite clear here that *μετύτερον* suits better *καταγγέλλων*. Since internal considerations highly favor the Nestle reading, having also good external support, we adopt it as original. Westcott and Hort would probably call the P46 reading an 'Alexandrian' harmonistic emendation.

2:4

Nestle: *πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγος* : B, 18, D, (F, G), (+ἀνθρωπίνης A, C, Byzantine)

P46: *πειθοῖς σοφίας* : G, F

1. We have no less than seven distinct variant readings at this point.

The Nestle reading is more widespread than any. P46 is weakly supported by G and F.

2. This question favors the Nestle reading. Conceivably P46 shows an unintentional omission, feeling perhaps that ἐν *πειθοῖς σοφ.* gave full sense after having written it.

3. In most of the variants we find obvious editorial changes. We feel that this consideration favors the Nestle reading. The addition of *ἀνθρωπίνης* in A and C is probably an editorial addition from verses 5 and 13. The confusion evidenced in other readings is probably due to the failure to understand the word *πειθοῖς*, which has not yet been found elsewhere. However, it could very well be derived from *πείθω*, as *φείδος* is from *φείδομαι*. The reading in Nestle is without doubt Alexandrian. Scholarship has tried to show conclusively that the Alexandrian (Neutral) text is marked by the editorial attempt to give the original text, without concern to stylistic difficulties.¹ If the Nestle reading is authentic it would attest to the above conclusion, since Alexandria kept the difficult *πειθοῖς*.

Style offers no decisive evidence. On the basis of our conjectures under

1. Cf. Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, p. 81f.)

transcriptional considerations and the best documentary evidence we are satisfied to adopt the Nestle reading as authentic.

2:9

Nestle: $\delta\tau\alpha$ $\eta\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu$: A, B, C ; *Clem. of Rome, Cyril, Jerome*

P46: δ $\eta\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu$: κ , D, G, *Byzantine*

1. External testimony is evenly divided on this point. It is interesting that Jerome and Clement of Rome attest to the reading of Nestle, which has no Western support. They swing the balance somewhat.

2. and 3. Transcriptional evidence leans heavy for the Nestle reading.

$\delta\tau\alpha$ is easily corrupted to δ , not vice versa. Further support to this is the parallel δ at the beginning of the quotation.

4. Stylistic considerations can have little weight either way. With hesitancy we give the decision to $\delta\tau\alpha$ vs. P46. Its use is confirmed for example in 2 Corinthians 1:20.

2:12

Nestle: $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$: *all.*

P46: $\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$: D, C, G, F, L ; *Origen*

1. The Nestle reading is more widespread. P46 may be Western, but the Old Latin versions (d, e, f, g, r) had sciamus, and also the Vulgate. External evidence certainly gives the weight to $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$.

2. Alteration because of itacism can work both ways.

3. The more difficult reading is that of P46, but we do not believe intentional alteration is involved here.

4. The context would strongly point to $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ as authentic (cp. 2:8 and especially 2:11). Paul is speaking here of 'knowing' the truth. External and intrinsic evidence gives us the certainty that the Nestle reading is original.

2:15

Nestle: *κέν πάντα* : B, *xi*¹, L, P

P46: *τά πάντα* : A, C, D* ; (G, lat, sy^p, Clem. of all. only *πάντα*)

(The chief copies that omit *κέν*, substitute for it *τά* before *πάντα*. We will group them together. *98* omits the whole verse because of homoioteleuton.)

1. The readings that drop *κέν* are most widespread as is evident.
2. A scribe would be more liable to drop the *κέν* than to add it unintentionally.
3. Here two considerations almost balance each other. *κέν* may have been intentionally added because of the following *δέ*, to bring out a clearer contrast, or intentionally dropped for stylistic reasons (because of the preceding *δέ*). We feel that the P46 reading is the more difficult, a view favoring later insertion of the *κέν*.
4. Although Meyer feels that a scribe omitting *κέν* may have done so because of the preceding *δέ*, it seems more probable that he would insert it because of the following *δέ*.¹

We give the decision to P46 because of the stronger external evidence and considerations of intentional alteration. However, we feel that *τά* is an editorial addition in P46 and its supporters. We agree with Alford that it was probably a gloss to show that *πάντα* was not masculine singular.²

Chapter Three3:2

Nestle: *ἐτί* *νυν* : *rell.*

P46: *νυν* : B

1. The Nestle reading has by far the greater extent.
2. Unintentionally the scribe could only have dropped the *ἐτί*. *ἐτί* is

1. Commentary on 1 Corinthians, p. 42
 2. Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. 2, p. 489

similar in sound to the preceding $\sigma\sigma\epsilon'$, also favoring unintentional omission.

3. From this point of view the Nestle reading is also highly favored. The scribe would hardly intentionally add $\epsilon\epsilon'$ because of the $\nu\epsilon$ already present; whereas, on the other hand, he could easily have dropped it for that reason.

4. " $\epsilon\epsilon'$ fehlt im Vatikanus; aber es ist inhaltlich wichtig und doch sprachlich zu fremdartig, um als Einschlebsel gelten zu können."¹

We agree with Bachmann, and are certain that $\epsilon\epsilon'$ was in the original text, the omission in P46 and B being due to either intentional or unintentional omission.

3:3 (A)

Nestle: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$: \aleph, A, B, C, P ; $\nu\gamma, \epsilon\phi, \text{arm.}, \text{aeth.}$; *Clm. gl. l., Or., Enc.*

P46: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\chi\omicron\rho\tau\alpha\ \rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$: *D, G, Byzantine*; *it, \nu\gamma, Arminius*

1. The testimony presents a clean division between the Alexandrian and Western traditions. P46 is the only Egyptian document attesting the Western reading. Its reading is the most widespread, being found early in Italy-Gaul and Antioch.

2. The question of unintentional alteration favors P46, since a scribe is more likely to omit than add unintentionally.

3. The case is different from this point of view. There is no apparent reason why a scribe would omit $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\chi$ if it was in his manuscript. The word is used by Paul in Rom. 16:17 and Gal. 5:20, in the latter instance occurring in a listing with $\rho\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$. This makes it possible that we have here a conformative addition.

We feel that Nestle is right here, the addition being taken over from Gal. 5:20 by scribes. In P46 we may have an instance where a Western reading found

1. Bachmann, Commentary on 1 Corinthians, p. 143.

early residence in Egypt. Origen and Clement of Alexandria give strong early support to our contention.

3:3 (B)

Nestle: *ραρκικοί* : *κ, A, B, C, D³, L, P*

P46: *ραρκίνοι* : *D*, G, F*

1. This matter concerns only the Greek documents. Here again we have a clear division between the Alexandrian and Western traditions. The preponderance of better mss. is for the Nestle reading.

2. The possibility of unintentional error in transcribing favors neither reading.

3. It is more likely that a scribe would intentionally change from *ραρκικοί* to *ραρκίνοι*, and not vice versa, in order to harmonize with *ραρκίους* in verse 1.

4. *ραρκικός* means 'belonging to *ράρς*', 'of the nature of *ράρς*' (as opposed to *πνευματικός*). *ράρκινος* rather means 'consisting of flesh' (like *λίθινος* and *βιτράκινος*). Supposing that Paul did not use both words indiscriminately, the sense in the above passage would then favor *ραρκικοί* in antithesis with *πνευματικός*. The above terms were confounded in the manuscripts, but it is evident that Paul made greater use of *ραρκικός* (Rom. 15:27, 1 Cor. 9:11, 2 Cor. 1:12, 10:4, 1 Pet. 2:11), and always in the above sense.

Our decision goes to *ραρκικοί* on mss. support and the above considerations. Notice that an observant corrector of D makes the change, too.

3:5

Nestle: *his τίς* : *κ^s, A, B; lat*

P46: *his τίς* : *C, D, G, Byzantine, pl; sy*

1. Manuscript testimony is well divided.
2. Unintentionally the change could have been made either way.
3. This consideration points strongly to the Nestle reading as original.

It is much less conceivable that $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ was changed to $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ than vice versa.

Meyer correctly says, "The personal names very naturally suggested the masculine to transcribers."¹ The more difficult reading would then be $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}$.

We adopt Nestle against P46. Point 3 carries the greater weight for the decision here, backed up by good documents. Some would call the alteration a case of Western emendation, but not taken into the Old Latin.

3:12 (A)

Nestle: $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\omicron\nu$: \aleph , B, (C defective in $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\rho.$), 73; *Chm. of Al.,*
Arigen
 P46: $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\nu$: A, D, *Byzantine*

1. The diminutive form, with the witness of the early Fathers, has the greater weight of evidence.
2. The forms could be altered either way unintentionally. Perhaps the sound of the previous $\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ would incline the scribe, while looking away from the copy to write, to copy the diminutive form. This consideration would then favor P46.
3. From our present knowledge it seems doubtful that a scribe would intentionally alter the form either way.
4. If Paul used these forms indiscriminately we would incline towards the diminutive form as original. If Paul made a distinction, the context would favor P46, because Paul is speaking of gold as a building material, gold in the bulk, rather than of gold coins, money, or ornamentation. In 1 Tim. 2:9 Paul uses $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ to refer to ornamentation. The New Testament, more than not,

1. Comm. on 1 Cor., p.63

seems to use the terms distinctively. On the basis of this consideration and No. 3 we give the bow to P46.

3:12 (B)

Nestle: $\chi\epsilon. \lambda\epsilon. : \text{ell.}$

P46: $\chi\epsilon. \kappa\acute{\iota} \chi\epsilon. : B$

1. The shorter reading is more widespread.
2. and 3. The strongest transcriptional consideration is that the words 'gold' and 'silver' are often found together, and usually with $\kappa\acute{\iota}$ between. This might induce the scribe to insert the $\kappa\acute{\iota}$ if it was absent.
4. To preserve the rhetorical effect it seems Paul would not use the conjunction here, if not between the following nouns. External and internal evidence convinces us that the Nestle text is right.

3:13

Nestle: $\tau\acute{o} \pi\upsilon\epsilon \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o} : A, B, C, P; 17, 37, 73; \text{sy}$

P46: $-\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o} : \text{N, D, Byzantine; lat, aeg, arm, aeth; cl. of Alex.}$

1. The former reading is found in Alexandria and Antioch. The latter is found early in Egypt and Italy-Gaul. External evidence is pretty well balanced.
2. The longer text is strongly favored here, there being little reason for the insertion of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$ unintentionally.
3. Scribes might have considered the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$ unessential and so have disregarded it. Notice that most of the versions show a predilection towards omitting it as unnecessary. The Nestle reading can be called the more difficult reading. Our decision is against P46, especially on the basis of transcriptional evidence.

Chapter Four4:2

Nestle: $\sigma\mu\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$: B, *Byzantine* ; *Lat, sy* ; *Origen*

P46: $\sigma\mu\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon$: *N, A, C, D, F, G, P*

1. The P46 reading is more widespread, appearing as dominant in Alexandria and Italy-Gaul. The Nestle reading appears dominant only in Antioch.

2. Unintentional alteration is conceivable both ways.

3. Several conjectures can also be made to this question.

4. The Nestle reading is 3rd person singular present passive indicative.

The P46 reading is either 2nd person plural present active indicative, or imperative in form. The imperative would hardly fit into the argument. The $\omega\tilde{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ gathers what goes before, 'this being the situation,' and points, indeed, to this one essential requirement. Then, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\iota$, takes up the application of the general truth stated to Paul's own relations with the Corinthians. This is almost required by the argument throughout. This consideration moves us to adopt the Nestle form against P46, although P46 is the more widespread.

4:11

Nestle: $\gamma\upsilon\kappa\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$: A, *N, C, E, F, G*, ($\gamma\upsilon\kappa\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$ - B*, D*)

P46: $\gamma\upsilon\kappa\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$: *Byzantine* ; *Clem. of Alex.*

The above presents an insignificant variation in spelling. Transcriptional evidence offers nothing decisive. Much might depend on Koine usage, but we could find no parallels. Classical usage is always like the P46 spelling. This may account for the variant in P46. Notice that B and D of the first hand do not really support the Nestle reading. Since we have found no Koin^e examples to substantiate the spelling of B*, D*, or of A and $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}$, we retain the early attestation of P46 and Clement of Alexandria to the spelling in accordance with classical usage, the other variations being due to itacism. It is the spelling

Nestle himself favors, according to the apparatus.

4:14

Nestle: $\nu\upsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$: N, A, C, P, many minuscules

P46: $\nu\upsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$: B, D, G, Byzantine; lat

1. The Nestle reading is Alexandrian. P46 is Western with good eastern support on B and itself.
2. and 3. The only consideration carrying weight here is the possibility of altering the indicative to conform to the preceding participle.
4. An attempt at a smoother construction with the participle may be involved. We adopt P46 as genuine because of good manuscript support and transcriptional indications.

4:17

Nestle: $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$: N*, A, P

P46: - $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$: B, C, D, G, Byzantine; vg, sy^P

1. The P46 reading is more widespread.
 2. The possibility of omission through homoioteleuton favors the longer reading as original.
 3. An intentional omission is not as likely as an intentional addition. A scribe might have added it for greater precision.
- A decision is difficult, but since transcriptional considerations balance pretty well, external evidence induces us to choose P46.

Chapter Five

5:2

Nestle: $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$: N, A, C; (Ald Latin: "gessit")

P46: $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$: B, D, G, Byzantine; (Vulgate: "fecit")

1. This being a problem of Greek synonyms, we have no absolute versional

evidence, although the Old Latin probably translates gessit from $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ and the Vulgate fecit from $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. We can be quite certain that the Nestle reading is dominant in Alexandria and the latter in Italy-Gaul.

2. and 3. Considerations from this point of view are closely connected with the problem of intrinsic evidence. We shall discuss the matter under that head.

4. Trench has a discussion of these two synonyms. He clarifies the distinction in classical Greek. $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ brings out the object and end of an act, and $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ the means by which the object is attained. He says that the idea of continuity and repetition of action is inherent in $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, but not necessarily in $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, "which may very well be the doing once and for all; the producing and bringing forth something which being produced has an independent existence of its own."¹ As to New Testament usage he says, "... it is not to be denied that very often where the words assume an ethical tinge, the inclination makes itself felt to use $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in a good and $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ in an evil sense."² We see that the first distinction is still inherent, the practising of evil having no abiding fruit as, on the contrary, the doing of good. In an examination of Pauline usage, Trench's contention is supported with regard to the use of $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, and only to a degree with regard to $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. Since this distinction can be noted, although not as clearly as in Attic Greek, $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ has the preference here because of the evil nature of this 'τὸ ἔργον.' We hold then that a scribe, not sensitive to this subtle distinction, being more familiar perhaps with the phrase $\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ἔργον ($\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ being used much more frequently in the New Testament), would consciously or unconsciously, change the word to $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ rather than vice versa. Apart from considerations of meaning we can safely hold that $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ is the more difficult reading here. Since the external evidence is divided we choose $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ as genuine on the basis of

1. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, p. 338

2. Ibid, p. 339

transcriptional and intrinsic considerations.

5:10

Nestle: *καὶ ἔπαυσεν* : *well.*

P46: *καὶ ἔπαυεν* : *Byzantine ; vg, sy*

1. The Nestle text has the great preponderance of support here. Only late mss. and some versions support P46.
2. *καὶ* could have been mechanically taken up into the text rather than *καὶ* because of the repetition of *καὶ* in the context.
3. The Nestle reading again is supported by this question, since *καὶ* might easily have been substituted to conform to the context.

The decision must obviously go to the Nestle reading as genuine.

5:4 (A)

Nestle: *καὶ* : *as, A, pe*

P46: *καὶ* : *B, D, G, Byzantine ; lat, syP*

1. The P46 reading is more widespread, being found in Italy-Gaul and probably in Antioch.
2. The longer text of P46 is favored here.
3. We cannot conceive of an intentional alteration here, except on the basis of some predilection of the scribe, of which naturally we cannot presume to know very much without certain tangible proof. Later in the same verse *καὶ* occurs, pointing to a possibility of harmonization.
4. Paul uses both expressions, and so this point yields little.

We accept P46 here on the basis of transcriptional evidence, amply supported by early manuscript and versional evidence.

5:4 (B)

Nestle: - $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$: B, A, D*

P46: $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$: N, G, Byzantine; lat, sy^p

1. External attestation is closely divided. The Nestle reading is dominant in Alexandria. P46 has good testimony in both Alexandria and Italy-Gaul besides Antiochian support.

2. Two possibilities can be offered here. A scribe could have inadvertently completed a familiar expression. On the other hand, the factor of homoioteleuton could account for an omission. We feel that the latter possibility has the greater weight.

3. Meyer makes the assertion that the solemnity of the passage would induce the scribe to insert $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$.¹ An objection to this is that Paul himself may have entertained the same considerations, and for that reason have included $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The uncertainty involved in Meyer's claim persuades us that for the present the inclusion of $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is more satisfactory, ascribing to the Nestle reading an unintentional omission in transcription.

5:12

Nestle: $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}$ τοὺς ἔργω ὑμεῖς κείρατε : *nell.*

P46: τοὺς ἔργων ὑμεῖς κείρατε :

1. The Nestle reading has the weight of testimony on this point.
2. Unintentional alteration is hardly involved here.
3. The P46 reading is a command, $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$ being imperative, and could have been changed to read so in conformity with the command in verse 13 to put away the wrongdoer. In that case $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}$ would have to be dropped, as P46 does.
4. Intrinsic considerations favor the text. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ἔργω in contrast to

1. op. cit., p. 107

preceding and following is much preferred to τοὺς ἔρωθεν as the expression Paul was likely to have used. Without doubt the Nestle text is the authentic reading, supported on all counts.

5:13

Nestle: ἐφάρατε: N, A, B, C, D*, F, G; *lat*

P46: ἐφάριεστε.

It is immediately evident that the text has conclusive evidence in its favor. Similarity in pronunciation could easily account for the alteration in P46. The context most forcefully calls for the aorist imperative rather than the present, and we can only conceive of Paul, in his present earnestness, and because of the specific case involved, using the aorist imperative: "get this one out now and once and for all!"

Chapter Six:

6:7

Nestle: κεν οδρ: A, B, N³, C, E; *syr, aeth*

P46: κεν: N*, D*, 33; *latt*

1. The Nestle text is slightly favored, being found in Alexandria and Antioch. The P46 reading is clearly Western.
2. Omission is more likely, favoring the longer text.
3. We have strong evidence here for P46. The statement in this clause can be taken as inferential, upon what goes before and even upon the following οδρ clause. οδρ would bring this out clearly and might be inserted if missing. Notice that κεν οδρ is used in verse 4, lending support here.
4. Paul's use of κεν οδρ is limited. The context might favor it, but in no way can we say that it necessitates Paul's use of it here. His prime purpose is to make them deeply conscious of an obvious fact, and not to show it as resultant upon something else.

Primarily on the basis of point 3 we adopt P46 as authentic here.

6:14

Nestle: ἐφεξέσει; N, C, E, K, L; *ay*

P46: ἐφεξείσει; P^u, A, D, 69

The P46 here is quite obviously the result of an unintentional scribal slip of the pen or a misreading due to itacism. It seems that Meyer's remark is quite conclusive: "The connection makes the future necessary as the correlative of *καταλείπει* in ver. 13, and the evidence in its favour is preponderant, in view of the divided state of the codd. for the other readings."¹

B; 1739; and r, and Origen support ἐφείσει; which looks much like a result of repetition of the previous form in the same verse - *είσει*.

6:16

Nestle: ἢ οὐκ: N, A, B, C, F, G; *lath*

P46: οὐκ: D, Byzantine; *Mercion*

1. The weight of external testimony favors the Nestle reading. It is Alexandrian and more than likely Western.
2. The question of unintentional alteration speaks for the longer reading
3. If an intentional change is involved the probability of insertion for contextual reasons is strongest.
4. The argument of the context and Pauline usage favor the inclusion. On external and internal grounds we can be certain that the Nestle reading is authentic.

1. *op. cit.*, p. 126

Chapter Seven7:5 (A)Nestle: $\delta\upsilon$; *nell.*P46: $-\delta\upsilon$: B, *claus. of Alex., Origen*

External testimony favors the Nestle reading. However, transcriptional and intrinsic evidence speak for P46. There is a good likelihood that $\delta\upsilon$ was inserted for the sake of clarity. Otherwise Paul never uses $\delta\upsilon$ with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\acute{\iota}$. And this bids fair to be the case here. We incline here to think of $\delta\upsilon$ as a grammatical gloss, and accept the P46 reading.

7:5 (B)Nestle: $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$; \aleph , A, B, C, DP46: $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\epsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon$: (*Byzantine; lat, sy: $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\epsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon$*)

1. The Nestle form is Alexandrian and attested by D of the West. The P46 form with a slight variation is Antiochian and may be dominant in Italy-Gaul.

2. The variation seems too great to involve unintentional alteration.

3. The P46 reading is more than likely and ecclesiastical gloss to obtain fuller clarity in the expression. On the basis of these considerations we are no doubt choosing the genuine text with $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$.

7:7Nestle: $\beta\iota\alpha\ \delta'$: \aleph , A, B, C, DP46: $\beta\iota\alpha\ \delta\delta$: *Byzantine*

Since it is highly probable that unintentional alteration is involved here we accept the δ' as authentic on the weight of external attestation.

7:9Nestle: $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$: \aleph , A, C*P46: $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$: B, D, G, *Byzantine*

1. Manuscript testimony is divided on this point, the Western reading having an important witness in Alexandrian B.

2. and 3. Unintentional alteration is unlikely. It must have been

deliberate, either changing the aorist to the present infinitive to conform to $\piυρϵοδϵϱαι$, or vice versa in an attempt to improve the thought. Neither form has conclusive evidence. We give the benefit of the doubt to P46 with good manuscript support, feeling that the aorist form best explains the alteration to the present.

7:13 (A)

Nestle: $\acute{\alpha}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$: A, B, C, D^s, (L, K), Byzantine

P46: $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$: S^s, D^s, G, P; *lat*

1. Nestle is dominant in Alexandria and P46 in the West.
2. By reason of the similarity of form and sound there is present the possibility of error both ways.
3. A strong transcriptional conjecture is that $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ was a change to conform to $\acute{\alpha}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in verse 12.
4. $\acute{\alpha}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ is the better construction here on grammatical grounds, and Paul uses the construction very often. Paul's style of course would confirm the $\acute{\alpha}'\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, but not demand it. We feel that it is authentic against P46, having the better external and internal probability. Notice that both S^s and D were altered to the Nestle form by correctors.

7:13 (B)

Nestle: $\sigmaυρϵυδϵκε\acute{\iota}$: *well*.

P46: $\epsilon\delta\delta\epsilonκε\acute{\iota}$: B

1. It is evident that the Nestle reading is the more widespread.
2. The more probable unintentional alteration is in omission of the prefix. However, the possibility exists of conforming to the previous verse.
3. On the face of it this point would favor P46, viewing the other as an

attempt to conform to the preceding form in verse 12.

4. Paul used the prefixed form three times: here, the verse previous, and in Rom. 1:32. He uses the shorter form more often. However, there is no reason that Paul should have used $\epsilon\delta\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ here since he used the prefixed form in exactly the same sense and connection in the previous verse. Furthermore, that form seems a bit more adequate here, since it was a matter of 'agreeing together,' 'agreeing with.' If the longer form is authentic the shorter is an unintentional alteration, perhaps by reason of familiarity with the more common form. Transcriptional considerations are not decisive on this point. Therefore, primarily on the basis of external evidence, we adopt the Nestle reading as authentic.

7:15

Nestle: $\delta\kappa\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$: S6*, A, C, K

P46: $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$: B, D, G, Byzantine; *lett, sy*

1. The P46 reading is more widespread, being found in Antioch and Italy-Gaul.
2. It is impossible to determine which reading is favored on this point.
3. It might be conjectured that $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$ was changed to $\delta\kappa\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$ to conform to $\delta\kappa\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\nu}$ in verse 14, or even because of the nature of this epistle - earnest exhortation concerning particular conditions, where the personal 'you' is expected - but the conjecture is weak at best.
4. It must be said that in this epistle Paul uses the forms of $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$ much more often than $\delta\kappa\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$ in passages where both are possible according to sense; but this results largely from the nature of the epistle and doesn't carry much weight.

An objective decision is difficult here. Subjectively we feel that P46 is genuine, having better external testimony and nothing standing against it

on internal grounds.

7:36

Nestle: $\tilde{\eta}$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\varsigma$: $\mathcal{N}, B, F, G, K, L$; *it*, *clm. of Al.*

P46: $\tilde{\epsilon}$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$: $A, D, 33$; *vgcl*, *syP*

External evidence favors the Nestle reading. Transcriptional possibilities balance, with the possibility of insertion for fuller expression or omission unintentionally. We adopt the Nestle reading on external grounds and the probability of transcriptional omission.

7:37

Nestle: $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$: *Alex. tradition, D*; *vg*

P46: $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$: G , *it*

1. Alexandria attests the longer reading with the West divided. The Nestle reading has the preponderant support.

2. This consideration strongly favors the longer reading.

3. Meyer is right in saying with regard to $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ that "it was very likely to be left out as being unessential, so far as the sense was concerned, after $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$."¹

4. Paul uses $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ in Col. 1:23. It seems that both readings give good sense, with the first being probably a little stronger. On all counts the longer reading has the slight edge in our opinion, and so we have little reason to consider it spurious.

7:38 (A)

Nestle: $\tau\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$: $\mathcal{N}, A, D, G, 69$; ($\pi\alpha\rho\theta.$ $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$: B, D); (*Byzantine omits*).

P46: $\tau\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$: *clm. of Alex.*

1. op. cit., p. 148

1. It is evident that Nestle has the preponderant support.
2. The P46 reading would be favored here because of the good possibility of conforming inadvertently to the previous form.
3. This may have occurred intentionally, again speaking for P46.
4. Style offers little, except that one might expect Paul to use the same expression he just used. This would throw weight to the Nestle reading. We feel that transcriptional evidence cannot be decisive here because of the slight difference involved. We, therefore, give the decision to the Nestle reading on the basis of external witness.

7:38 (B)

Nestle: $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\epsilon$: *nell.*

P46: $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota$: B, 69

On the basis of external support and the greater probability of alteration to conform to the previous word in verse 37, whether intentionally or otherwise, we adopt the reading of the text.

7:40

Nestle: $\mu\alpha\kappa\rho\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\alpha$: *nell.*

P46: $\mu\alpha\kappa\rho\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$: *lbm. of lbx.*

1. The Nestle reading is more widespread and has for it the great weight of witnesses.
2. Unintentional dropping of ϵ has a certain possibility. It may, however, be an unintentional inclusion, having in mind the positive form, which would end with a ϵ , and forgetting momentarily, in the process of transcribing, the comparative form.
3. We can find no ground for an intentional alteration either way.

4. This is the only comparative form of *ἡρώδης* in the New Testament; hence, style cannot help us. Considering the formation of the comparative in general, however, it would be unique, indeed, to have P46 as an authentic form here.

The Nestle form is undoubtedly authentic, the error in P46 arising for the reason already suggested.

Chapter Eight

8:3

Nestle: τὸν θεόν: *nell.* / ὅτι αὐτοῦ: *nell.*

P46: - τὸν θεόν: *Clem. of Alex.* / - ὅτι αὐτοῦ: *N*, 33; Clem. of Alex.*

1. The text, of course, is more widespread, with P46 supported in both instances by Clement of Alexandria, plus *N** and the cursive *33* in the latter, considered by Hort the best of the cursives.

2. The weight of probability favors the longer text here - but it seems almost impossible that an unintentional omission of such significant words occurred.

3. Verses 2 and 3 are difficult passages to interpret. Paul is showing the necessity of love to the Church in Corinth - love towards one another. The distinction in verse 2 is not between secular and divine knowledge, but between knowledge of divine things without love as distinguished from such knowledge with love. Now Paul is talking of its necessity in social relationships, which makes verse 3 seem not to the point ("εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν"), unless the reader understands the source of the love to which Paul is exhorting. It seems that P46 and its supporters did not penetrate the profundity of Paul's statement and tried to harmonize the passage with the context by the omission of the references to God in τὸν θεόν and ὅτι αὐτοῦ. Our conjecture is

strengthened by the fact that omission renders the verse practically unintelligible.

4. Style throws little light on the problem, but it is interesting to note that in Gal. 4:9 we find an exact parallel expression. For a similar theological expression see John 10:14. We are convinced of the authenticity of the text here on both external and internal grounds.

8:6

Nestle: ἀλλ': *rell.*

P46: - ἀλλ': B; *Arab., Armen., Eus.; sah, basm*

1. External testimony weighs heavy for the longer text. P46 is only supported by the important Alexandrian B among the Greek uncials.

2. and 3. Unintentional omission does not seem likely. On the other hand ἀλλ' is not necessary here, and if it was not present in the original, it could have been inserted for the sake of emphasizing the contrast. We think it has to be admitted that the P46 reading is the more difficult and best explains the Nestle reading. For this reason and for early attestation on good documents we adopt the P46 reading as authentic, feeling that intentional alteration is involved here.

8:7

Nestle: ἀρθευῖς ὄδρα: *rell.*

P46: ἀρθευοδρα: *Clem. of Alex.*

It is quite certain that the only possibility of error here is unintentional. Considering New Testament usage ἀρθευοδρα would be the more familiar expression. The Nestle text is probably authentic, being the more rare expression and having much better external support.

8:10

Nestle: $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}$: \mathcal{N}, A, D ; d, e

P46: $-\sigma\acute{\epsilon}$: B, C, lat

The documents present divided support with no clear-cut division into localities. We feel that internal evidence points strongly to P46 as authentic. The shorter reading can best explain the longer. It is difficult to conceive of so many documents omitting the word in question unintentionally. It strikes us, however, that a scribe would readily insert it to personalize the exhortation. We see this personal note in the very verse preceding and throughout the epistle. And the personal pronoun here would be the easier reading. On the basis of these rather subjective considerations, but possessing adequate documentary testimony, we adopt the P46 reading as original.

8:12

Nestle: $\delta\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu$: *rell.*

P46: $-\delta\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu$: *Chm. of Alex.*

The text has the preponderant external support. Omission is possible on several grounds. The word is not necessitated by the sense. Homoioteleuton can conceivably account for omission. On the other hand, one would expect Paul to use the word. He is stressing 'weakness.' On all counts we must adopt the Nestle reading. The shorter reading is probably an unintentional alteration, brought about by the preceding similar looking word.

Chapter Nine9:2

Nestle: $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$: \mathcal{N}, B, P ; *Origen*

P46: $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$: $D, C, Byzantine$

1. There is a consistent division between Alexandrian and Western testimony.

The nature of the variant restricts the evidence to Greek documents.

2. Unintentional alteration is not probable.

3. If the case is an alteration to *σου*, it seems that it would be found after the noun as in verse 1: τὸ ἔργον σου. Meyer has a good point when he says, "the 'Recepta' is a more precise definition of the meaning inserted in view of verse 3."¹

4. With respect to *ἑκός*, New Testament usage follows classical usage here, and of all the examples found in Paul's letters, the forms of *ἑκός* always occur between the article and the noun. (Cf. Rom 10:1, Philem. 12, 1 Cor. 16:21, Gal. 6:11, Col. 4:18, 1 Cor. 11:24) This seems to clarify our problem here. If the text were altered to P46, it would necessitate changing the position of the article to conform to usage. This necessity of changing its position is not present if the alteration were vice versa, and then more than likely we would find τῆς σου ἀποστολῆς, following the order of P46.

If our reasoning is correct, the probable original reading is given by Nestle, the alteration occurring for the reason suggested under point 3.

9:7

Nestle: τὸν καρπὸν: *86**, A, B, C*, D*, E; *Origen*

P46: ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ: *Byzantine*

1. Versional attestation is divided and hence it is not listed. Some of the later Fathers support P46. However, it is the only witness to its reading earlier than the 5th century. The Nestle reading obviously has the weight of evidence.

2. Unintentional modification is more likely to result from the longer reading in P46, favoring it as original.

1. op. cit., p. 194

3. The question of intentional alteration favors the Nestle reading. The P46 reading is a conceivable modification with the intention of conforming to the expression immediately following: ἐκ τοῦ γαλιλάτος, and failing to notice the difference in meaning. On the basis of this strong possibility and external evidence we adopt the Nestle reading.

9:8

Nestle: ταῦτα λαλῶ: N, A, B, C

P46: λέγω: (ταῦτα λέγω: D, G; lat)

1. As far as λαλῶ and λέγω are concerned it is clear that we have a consistent division between Alexandria and Italy-Gaul.

2. If there is a possibility of unintentional alteration, it would work both ways.

3. On the face of it there seems greater possibility of alteration to λέγω to conform to the following λέγω. However, one might conceive of an opposite alteration with a view to precision and differentiation between the 'speaking' of the Law and Paul's 'speaking.'

4. Trench makes the following distinction between λαλῶ and λέγω: The former has reference to the articulation of words as contrasted with silence or with mere sounds or animal cries. The latter is regarded as the orderly linking and knitting together in connected discourse of the inward thoughts and feelings of the mind. By numerous examples Trench seems to prove his contention, and maintains that the New Testament consistently makes this distinction.¹ If Trench is right concerning the precise referent of these words, the context would seem to demand λέγω both times. The emphasis is not on the articulation of words as contrasted with silence or another type of sounding, but on the

1. op. cit., p. 267

content - the reference - of the words themselves.

We adopt the P46 text primarily on the grounds that the context strongly favors it. Paul made a distinction between the words otherwise and we feel we are right in holding it valid here. As to the $\tau\alpha\theta\tau\eta$ the overwhelming external evidence induces us to accept it.

2:9

Nestle: $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$: B*, D*, G, 1739

P46: $\phi\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$: N, A, B³, C; Origen

1. Witnesses are well divided. The Nestle text is Western and attested by Alexandrian B and cursive 1739.¹ P46 has Alexandrian support.

2. This is a difference where unintentional alteration seems difficult, unless made because of the memory of the LXX passage.

3. The consideration from this point of view is highly in favor of the Nestle form, because the LXX reading in Dt. 25:4 is $\phi\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and an alteration to conform to it is very possible.

4. Style offers little light. In 1 Tim. 5:18 the evidence supports the reading of $\phi\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. But we know that Paul was often free in his quotations from the LXX, being primarily interested in content and meaning. Since transcriptional evidence throws its weight for the Western form we adopt it as authentic.

2:13

Nestle: $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau. \acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\omicron\delta$: B, N, D*, G; lat, aeg; Augustine

P46: - $\tau\acute{\alpha}$: A, C, D², Byzantine; d, sy

1. The Spanish scholar Bovar believes that P46 shows closest affinity with Minuscule 1739, "whose archetype seems to have been written at Caesarea." See Bruce M. Metzger, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

It seems unlikely that there would be an intentional alteration here. On the other hand τῆ could have easily slipped out without appreciably changing the sense. For this reason the text is probably authentic, with good external support, B S⁶ D G being the best group found thus far in the Pauline Epistles.

2:16

Nestle: εὐαγγελίσωμαι: B, C, D, G

P46: -ίσωμαι: A, S, K, (-ίσομαι: L, P, Kc)

1. The Nestle text was found in Italy-Gaul while Alexandrian witnesses are divided.
2. Unintentional alteration is conceivable both ways, lending greater probability to no one reading.
3. This point seems to be decisive here. A scribe not too concerned with finer points of meaning might easily alter the form to coincide with the present form preceding it in the same verse. The L P variant is probably an unintentional digression from the P46 text.
4. The reading of the Nestle text gives the fuller meaning. The first condition is from the point of view of the present while the latter, with the aorist form, is from the point of view of the future judgment. Everything points to the Western text as authentic here.

2:18

Nestle: μου: S*, A, C, K; aeg

P46: μοι: B, (S D, G; it), Byzantine

The dative of the personal pronoun to denote possession does not occur as often as the genitive. The P46 text, therefore, can be called the more difficult. This is at best a weak argument here but we adopt it as authentic on these

grounds because external testimony is so evenly divided.

2:21

Nestle: κερδάνω : *Alexandrian tradition, G, 69*

P46: κερδάνω : *Byzantine, (5 D), 55³*

1. Manuscript support weighs heavier for the Nestle text.
2. and 3. Alteration could occur both ways depending with which form the scribe is more familiar. κερδάνω is used several times in close proximity to this form, and in the same way, supporting the possibility of conforming to it.
4. The factor of Paul's style favors the use of κερδάνω, κερδάνω being the only formation of the aorist of its kind in the New Testament. κερδάνω is, of course, the regular formation from κερδάνω the present; and this fact might offer a possibility of alteration to its form, but then it would be hard to explain why no variation occurred with the other forms while many manuscripts support this one. It has been conjectured that κερδάνω is here the future κερδάνω, which is possible with εἶναι in Koine Greek. But it is unlikely that Paul would use the aorist subjunctive four times with εἶναι in the same context and have a future interspersed with them. We must therefore choose here between the more difficult form and the context and style. We choose the more difficult form for reasons already mentioned, having also good external evidence on its side.

2:27

Nestle: ὑποκρίσω : *N, A, B, C, D* ; Origen*

P46: ὑποκρίσω : *D, G, Byzantine ; vg, syP*

1. The Nestle text is better attested.
2. ὑποκρίσω is probably the more familiar word, giving weight to the Nestle

text as original, being the more readily altered.

3. *διωπιάσω* is only used here and Luke 18:5. It is quite familiar in classical Greek. *διποπιάσω* is really a different word. Liddell and Scott make the statement that it was a late form of *διποπείσω*, meaning to press lightly. On this score there also seems a greater possibility of reducing the text form to *διποπιάσω* rather than vice versa, since it was probably more familiar, and scribes may have taken offense at the harsher *διωπιάσω*.

We adopt *διωπιάσω* as genuine because of better external support, and on the probability of reducing the rarer *διωπιάσω* to the more familiar *διποπιάσω*. Clement of Alexandria and cursive 69 have been bold enough to give *διποπείσω*.

Chapter Ten

10:3

Nestle: τὸ αὐτό: *rell.*

P46: τὸ: A (N^s* om. τὸ αὐτό)

It is quite obvious here that the P46 text is the result of homoioteleuton, leaving out αὐτό, which has the same ending as τὸ. Since internal considerations here cannot be conclusive, we rely on the overwhelming external evidence. This must hold for the reading in S^s* also. It was corrected later. P46 makes the same error in the very next verse, and is only supported by A and cursive 181.

10:4

Nestle: ἡ πέτρα δε: N, B, D*, (C)

P46: ἡ δε πέτρα: A, C, Byzantine

1. The text has the better Alexandrian and Western attestation.
2. This point favors the Nestle text because the P46 construction is the more familiar.

3. This question again favors the Nestle text, it being the rarer construction.

4. "To the obvious rule, that a subordinating conjunction stands at the beginning of the subordinate clause dependent upon it, there are some exceptions, as in classical Greek, especially in St. Paul, since emphasized portions of the subordinate sentence are placed before the conjunction."¹ The above clause about which we are concerned is coordinate, but the same applies to it. Paul probably used the form that the Nestle text has, it being the more unfamiliar construction, yet bringing into proper emphasis *ἡ πέτρα*, and being well attested externally. The P46 form can more easily be an unintentional alteration in mechanical transcription.

10:9 (A)

Nestle: *κύριον*: *Alexandrian tradition; syhmng*

P46: *κεῖρόν*: *D, G, Byzantine; latt, sy, aeg, Italic, Or, Cl. Gal, Ar.*

1. The Nestle text has the strong Alexandrian support. The P46 reading, however, has more widespread testimony in Italy-Gaul and Antioch, together with important witnesses in Alexandria.

2. An unintentional alteration is quite improbable.

3. The verb *ἐκπειράω* is always used in reference to tempting God. It was probably well-known from the Old Testament (Dt. 6:16), and is quoted in Matthew and Luke (Matt. 4:7, Lk. 4:12), and may have been widely quoted. If this is true there is greater possibility of alteration to conform to this well-known passage than to change the familiar designations to *κεῖρός*. From this point of view, then, *κεῖρόν* can best explain the other variations, rather than vice versa. Meyer does not agree but says that the P46 and A readings are interpretations and that "Epiphanius avers *κεῖρόν* to be a change made

1. Blass, Grammar of the New Testament Greek, p. 290

by Marcion."¹

Here is a case where the Alexandrian reading stands alone opposing the Western and Byzantine traditions, the oldest versions, and some of the best early Fathers, besides P46. Formerly scholars would hardly have questioned the preeminence of the Alexandrian tradition, but not any more. The decision here probably rests on internal considerations. As a result of our transcriptional examination we hesitatingly adopt the P46 text as best able to explain all other variations; hence, as original.

10:9 (B)

Nestle: ἐπεὶ ἔρασαν; B, A, *Byzantine*

P46: εἴτε πεὶ ἔρασαν; N, C, D, G

Manuscript evidence is pretty well balanced on this point with the Western witnesses alone being clearly for the longer form. A case could be made for each reading, but we adopt the Nestle text because the P46 reading can easily be explained as a repetition of ἐκπερῆσαν in the same verse, although the omission of -σι- is a conceivable alteration.

10:18

Nestle: οὐχ; N, A, C, D*, G; *Chrysostom*

P46: οὐχι; B, *Byzantine*; *late fathers*

1. οὐχ is quite clearly Western, but Alexandrian support is divided with B and P46 supporting οὐχι. The testimony slightly favors the Nestle text.
2. It seems dangerous to favor either reading; but all things being equal the longer reading best explains unintentional alteration.
3. The possibility of intentional alteration is quite remote here. Although οὐχι is used to introduce questions expecting a positive answer (more so in Paul and Luke), yet the other form is also used, οὐχ being the more emphatic

and stronger form. This may be reason enough for a scribe to add the ϵ , although there remains a possibility of dropping it for easier pronunciation.

4. The context might favor the use of the stronger form; but, then, we cannot dictate to Paul from 1948. What does the complete picture give? -no decisive testimony externally or internally for either reading. Tentatively we accept P46, which better explains error in mechanical transcription.

10:19

Nestle: η' $\delta\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\tau\epsilon\nu$: *rell.*

P46: - *whole question* : η^* , A, C*

Although P46 has some good support it is immediately evident that the second question is authentic. It is difficult to explain its interpolation if it was not there. On the other hand there are good reasons to explain its omission. Both questions end with the same words, pointing to a probable mechanical omission; and both questions sound very much alike. The Nestle text is obviously authentic here. Notice that correctors of $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^*$ and C* noticed this glaring error and made the correction.

10:20

Nestle: $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\theta\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$: B, D, G; *it*; *Manson*

P46: $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\theta\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\alpha$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\sigma\mu$: *Alex. and Byzantine trad.*; *lab, sy*

1. The shorter text was predominant in the West with a few of the Old Latin witnesses and the Vulgate against it. The longer text supported by P46 is more widespread, being clearly Alexandrian and Antiochian.

2. and 3. We cannot find good reason to omit $\tau\alpha$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\sigma\mu$ if it were original, except perhaps the fact that it is not necessary for the point of the argument, which is still unlikely grounds for omission. On the other hand, there are likelier grounds for interpolation. It may have been done for perspicuity - an attempt perhaps at liturgical clarification. However, the restriction to

Gentile sacrifice is not at all made previous to this. (In Fact Paul makes a reference to Israelitish idolatry in 10:7.) The reference to Gentile sacrificing here seems just a bit incongruous to the general reference $\sigma\tilde{\epsilon}\ \tilde{\epsilon}\rho\text{-}\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in verse 18, although this argument might offer grounds to omit the original $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tilde{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\mu$. Yet, the case clearly seems to be that of interpolation, because in late manuscripts of the Textus Receptus type the plural form of the verb was changed to the singular $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ to agree with the singular $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tilde{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\mu$. For these reasons especially we accept the shorter reading of the Nestle text.

Chapter Eleven

11:15

Nestle: $\delta\epsilon\ \delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\delta\tau\tilde{\eta}$; *Alexandrian tradition (s C, H, P, 69, al; lat)*
alg, amm, aeth

P46: $-\alpha\delta\tau\tilde{\eta}$; *D, G, Byzantine; few Old Latin*

1. The case presents a clear division between the Alexandrian and Western traditions, with the Vulgate and some Old Latin mss. supporting the Alexandrian and Byzantine tradition and P46 witnessing to the Western. We notice that cursive 69 of the Ferrar group supports the Nestle text.

2. From this point of view the longer text is favored, with slight chance of unintentional interpolation.

3. This consideration would seem to point to the P46 reading as original, since $\alpha\delta\tau\tilde{\eta}$ might have been brought in to harmonize with similar constructions in the previous sentence, or perhaps for the sake of precision. It could hardly have been omitted intentionally.

4. Intrinsic factors can hardly play a role here, although it might be conjectured that there is little reason why Paul should not have used the pronoun here, when he had used it twice in the immediate proximity. We feel that our transcriptional conjectures together with external testimony are strong

enough to adopt the P46 text as authentic.

11:19

Nestle: γένωται ἐν ὕκῳ: *vell.*

P46: -ἐν ὕκῳ: C

There are too many ways open to transcriptional omission to accept the P46 reading. The Nestle text also has overwhelming external attestation.

11:22

Nestle: ἐπαινέσω: *vell.*

P46: ἐπαινῶ: B, G; *lab*

It is immediately evident that there is a likely transcriptional error here which produced the present form to coincide with the preceding and following present forms. The change from the present to the future would be hard to explain, and considering external attestation we are compelled to choose the Nestle text as original. B G is usually a bad group standing alone in Paul's epistles.

11:24 (A)

Nestle: *κού* ἔστιν: *vell.*

P46: ἔστιν *κού*.

The P46 order stands against all external evidence here. The reading probably arose through an attempt at a smoother construction, but the apostle, no doubt, had a purpose in emphasizing *κού*.

11:24 (B)

Nestle: το ὑπέρ: *vell.*

P46: -ὄπερ.

The omission here by P46 must certainly be in error. There is no transcriptional evidence for P46 that will make a showing against the external attestation of the Nestle text.

(It is interesting to note that P46 in this same verse throws its weight against the probable liturgical additions.)

11:25

Nestle: ἐκὼ αἰκατι : *vell.*

P46: αἰκατι σου : A, C ; *minuscules*

1. The Nestle text has by far the better Alexandrian and Western attestation, opposed only by P46 and Alexandrian A and C.
2. There is no evident occasion for an unintentional alteration here, except because of memory, since the Synoptic Gospels use the P46 construction (cf. Matt. 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20). This is a possible conjecture and would add weight to the reading of the Nestle text.
3. There is little probability of conscious change to the possessive pronoun because it is not so common in Paul (John uses it extensively), the other construction being the more familiar in Paul. The change to the genitive of the personal pronoun, however, is more probable, it being more common besides being the form used in the Gospels.
4. Paul does not use the possessive pronoun very often, but this fact can carry little weight here. When he uses it there is little doubt that he does so for the sake of emphasis. External and internal evidence points to the possessive form as genuine.

11:26

Nestle: τὸ ποτήριον : *nell.*

P46: τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο : *Byzantine; sy*

It is clear that τοῦτο is an interpolation. If it was authentic how can we explain the fact that it is missing in so many good manuscripts, where little reason exists for omission? τοῦτο was inserted because of the preceding τοῦτον with ἄρατον. On external and internal considerations P46 is in error.

Chapter Twelve12:3

Nestle: ἀνάθεκα Ἰησοῦς : *Alex. tradition; sy*

P46: ἀνάθεκα Ἰησοῦν : *D, G, Byzantine; it; (ἀν. -οῦ: F, 1611; sy)*

1. The above variants show distinctive Alexandrian and Western readings.

The Nestle text has the stronger support with Alexandria and Antioch.

2. This consideration favors neither variant more than the other.

3. From this point of view an alteration is possible from the nominative to the accusative as the object of λέγει, or vice versa thinking of it as a direct quote. The former possibility seems to be the stronger of the two.

4. It seems quite clear from an unprejudiced reading of the text that Paul meant this to be a direct quote, and the construction itself points to this. This is a strong statement, and one would not imagine that Paul would weaken it by indirect speech. We agree with Bachmann on this point: "Die schwach vertretene LA Ἰησοῦν an erster Stelle widerspricht dem Gebrauch und der Bedeutung von ἀνάθεκα in der biblischen Ausdrucksweise; Ἰησοῦν, wie D, G, K, L, P, d, g lesen, würde die offenbar gewollte Lebendigkeit der Wiedergabe der direkten Rede zerstören, ebenso die Variante κύριον Ἰησοῦν in der zweiten Hälfte des Verses."¹ At present therefore we are satisfied to adopt the Nestle text as authentic.

1. op. cit., p. 377-8.

12:6

Nestle: $\delta \delta\epsilon$: *vell.* (D, G : $\delta \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\epsilon$); *many fathers.*

P46: $\kappa\alpha\iota \delta$: B, C, 69; *curatives and some fathers.*

1. We are not concerned with the word order here. The text in Nestle is then the most widespread, being supported in the West, Alexandria, and Antioch, and attested by many early and late Fathers.

2. We cannot determine whether unintentional change is involved here.

3. Both constructions are used just previous to this, so the suggestion of conformity carries little weight. The more immediate construction is $\kappa\alpha\iota \delta$. If the scribe is more prone to follow this the Nestle text would be favored as original.

4. As is already indicated by the immediately preceding examples (verse 4: $\tau\omicron \delta\epsilon$; verse 5: $\kappa\alpha\iota \delta$) style could hardly play an important role here. It is evident that Paul made use of both constructions.

We cautiously adopt the Nestle text on the basis of its widespread character. Internal considerations have no decisive word here.

12:9 (A)

Nestle: $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$: \aleph^* , B, D, G; *lat*

P46: $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega \delta\epsilon$: A, C, \aleph^3 , *Byzantine*

1. We have solid Western attestation for the Nestle text plus Alexandrian \aleph^* and B. The P46 text became dominant later in the Byzantine tradition, with early testimony in P46 and Alexandrian A. The omission is favored.

2. This consideration evidences both possibilities.

3. The question at this point looks decisive. There is little reason to omit $\delta\epsilon$ if originally present. Unintentional omission hardly explains the widespread character of the omission. This is verified by the fully attested parallels in this same section. On the other hand, it would be easy to insert

to insert it to conform to examples before and after.

We believe that the shorter reading is authentic because it best explains the unique divergence in this instance; whereas, the use of $\delta\epsilon'$ before and after in the context is well attested. If $\delta\epsilon'$ had been in the original text it would have been attested like the others. The shorter text also carries the weightier external support.

12:9b (B)

Nestle: $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \epsilon\nu\iota\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\ : A, B; \text{lat}$

P46: $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\ .$

$\frac{1}{3}$ S: $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\delta\tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\ : D, G, \text{Byzantine}; \text{Clam. of Al., Or, Cyril}$

The weight of external testimony quite decisively condemns the shorter P46 reading. It was, no doubt, an oversight by a copyist, perhaps because it is much alike in appearance to the preceding $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega$. Between the other two we accept the Nestle reading since it seems quite likely that $\alpha\delta\tau\omega$ has crept in after the preceding, $\epsilon\nu\iota$ being the more difficult reading.

12:10 (A)

Nestle: $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\mu}\alpha\tau\alpha\ \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\omega\nu\ : \text{nell.}$

P46: $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho. \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\omega\nu. (\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\omega\nu\ : D, G; \text{it (wg)})$

Manuscript evidence slightly favors the Nestle text - the plural form $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\omega\nu$. In this case the Nestle reading can best explain the variations. The P46 form is supported by the Western group of witnesses. However, the origin of the Western readings can be explained. The form $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is more than likely erroneous. In the New Testament it is only used of superhuman power.

1. Thayer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek, p. 215.

It may have come in here inadvertently because the context contains the word two times, or by a careless oversight. The sense is strongly against it. The singular *δυνατῶν* was then made to conform in number to it. The Nestle form fits the thought perfectly, being almost demanded. *ἐνεργήματα* is plural with the expegetical plural genitive *δυνατῶν*. This is a result taking place in man, and this fits the context. The P46 form is probably a scribal error of the eye.

12:10 (B)

Nestle: *δε'* after 2nd and 3rd ἀλλω : *κ, A, C, K, L, P; syr; Anigen*

P46: -bis *δε'* : *B, D, G; lat; Mercion, Clem. of al.*

The variation here is really of a very minor nature. The contrast remains with or without the *δε'*. The Nestle text is perhaps dominant in Alexandria and certainly in Antioch. The P46 text is clearly Western with important and early Alexandrian support. So the evidence is well divided. We feel that transcriptional probability is on the side of the West and therefore adopt it as original. In this whole section we have a series of contrasts being made. We feel that the *δε'* which are well attested are authentic, but that those having conflicting, uncertain testimony are interpolations for the sake of conformity, or to confirm the contrast.

12:11

Nestle: *ἰδιῶ ἐκάστῳ* : *rell.*

P46: - *ἰδιῶ* : *D, G; lat syr*

1. The Alexandrian tradition is arrayed against the Western here.
2. One must concede the possibility of unintentional omission, but it is highly improbable that any such alteration is involved here.
3. What is probable is that the *ἰδιῶ* was dropped as unnecessary, the scribe feeling that it adds nothing to the meaning. It might be conjectured

that the longer text shows a conflate reading, but we have no testimony to the single $\dot{\rho}\delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ reading to substantiate this. On the other hand the inclusion seems to have a very precise reference. In the words of Findlay it "adds the thought that the Spirit deals with each recipient by himself, individually and appropriately."¹

Since style offers no objection we accept the Nestle text on the basis of strong transcriptional evidence, supported reasonably well externally.

12:18

Nestle: $\nu\dot{\rho}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$: B, A, D*, G

P46: $\nu\nu\nu\dot{\nu}\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$: \mathcal{N} , C, D², *Byzantine*

$\nu\nu\nu\dot{\nu}$ is not found in the New Testament except in the writings of Paul and a few places in Acts and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Attic Greek makes a definite distinction in usage, but in Paul's writings no distinction is made. We adopt the longer P46 reading as authentic because it seems to explain best the other variant. It is the longer reading and, hence, easier altered unintentionally. It is the less common form in the New Testament, which also speaks for originality here. There are a few parallels where it is also used after a conditional statement with $\epsilon\acute{\tau}$: Rom. 7:17, and 1 Cor. 15:20. We feel that contrary external evidence does not sufficiently oppose our transcriptional conclusions.

12:20

Nestle: $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu$: \mathcal{N} , A, C, D², *Byzantine* ; *lat*

P46: $-\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu$; B, D* ; d, e

We retain $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ because it seems hardly likely that it would have been inserted if originally absent. The statement already has two qualifying particles

1. op. cit., 889

(considering $\nu\delta\nu$ logically); hence, why should a scribe add a third intentionally? Omission is more likely on those grounds. Manuscript support is well divided, so not decisive.

12:24

Nestle: $\delta\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\psi$: $\alpha\epsilon$, A, B, C

P46: $\delta\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$: D, G, Byzantine; Origen

1. Here again Alexandrian attestation opposes Western and P46. It is interesting that Origen supports the Western text.
2. The Alexandrian form is uncommon and so favored.
3. One sees little chance for intentional alteration because of the similarity of meaning.
4. Considerations of style can offer nothing decisive (cp. 8:8 for the middle form). We give the choice rather confidently to the middle form by reason of transcriptional probability with good Alexandrian support.

⁷
12:31

Nestle: $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$: *rell.*

P46: $\epsilon\acute{\iota}^{\prime}\tau\epsilon$: D*

Transcriptional evidence is not in any way decisive here, the alteration resulting from itacism being possible both ways. If the latter part of verse 31 is conditional with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}^{\prime}\tau\epsilon$, the verb would certainly be expressed and not understood as the case would have to be here. The condition here would also be very awkward with what follows, hardly the introduction Paul would use. We agree with Bachmann:

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ ist aber auch durch die frühesten Übersetzungen gesichert und der Indikativ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ drückt nicht den Wunsch, etwas Unvergleichliches zu erstreben, sondern die Tatsache, dass solches

erstrebt wird, aus; ist diese Voraussetzung aber schon gegeben, dann ist das Anerbieten des Nachsatzes überflüssig.¹

The evidence, external, transcriptional, and intrinsic demand the Nestle text as authentic.

Chapter Thirteen

13:2

Nestle: καὶ εἰς ; (N), B, D, F, K, L

P46: καὶ ; A, C ; μc

1. The documentary evidence is highly in favor of the longer text.
2. This question favors the longer reading, crasis being possible without too much thought.
3. It is difficult to understand why a scribe would intentionally alter the reading here, except to harmonize with the preceding or following use in this chapter; however, all of these readings are contested, making it difficult to determine the direction of possible change. The composite form in P46 might be favored from the viewpoint that it is the more difficult, but how much weight can one give to this?

4. καὶ εἰς for καὶ εἰς 'and if' is only found sporadically. 1 Cor. 7:28, 12:15f., Mk. 3:24f., Lk. 17:3f. all parallel the Nestle reading. Both forms are certainly possible in this connection, but style and context (cf. εἰς in verse 1) seem to favor the full form καὶ εἰς. Since internal evidence is not decisive either way, but perhaps pointing to the longer reading as original, we adopt the Nestle text on its widespread external support.

13:3 (A)

P46: καὶ : vs. all witnesses.

There is too much external evidence against P46 here to accept it, and where transcriptional considerations are highly conjectural.

1. op. cit., p. 388

13:3 (B)

Nestle: $\kappa\upsilon\theta\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$: D, G, L; lat, sy; Cl. g al., Tert.; (- $\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$: C, Byzantine)

P46: $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$: 16, A, B, 69, pc; aeg; Anigen

1. Documentary witnesses are divided. The Nestle text is clearly Western with Antiochian support. The P46 text has Alexandrian support, but the Nestle reading is more widespread. Here we have a case where the best manuscripts differ from almost all other documents.
2. At once it is evident that we can dismiss this point since several possibilities present themselves, but none with decisive weight.
3. This consideration is important. Various views have been expressed in this connection. Meyer makes the statement that $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$ had been written on the margin of manuscripts to call attention to the loveless motive involved and then came to supplant the similar and more difficult $\epsilon\iota\mu\ \kappa\upsilon\theta\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the text. He also indicates the conviction that this subjunctive is a corruption by an ignorant copyist of the future indicative.¹ Tischendorf also adopted this reading. Westcott and Hort make a case for the P46 reading. They feel that it gives excellent sense, and offer three causes that probably led to its early corruption. The familiarity with Christian martyrs, which led even writers who retained the true text to interpret in this manner the 'yielding up' of the body, would soon suggest martyrdom by fire. The words might easily be affected by what is said in Daniel 3:28 of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Finally, the unfamiliar absolute use of $\pi\alpha\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\omega\kappa\iota$ might cause difficulty.² Findlay, following Westcott-Hort's line of thought says that $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\theta\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$ is a grammatical monstrum, a reading that cannot well be explained except as a corruption of $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\rho\omega\kappa\alpha\iota$. He cites a further possible cause for the corruption in the fact that Josephus (B.F., vii. 8. 7) tells of a Buddhist fakir

1. op. cit., p.300

2. Westcott-Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol.II, Appendix, p. 117.

who about this time immolated himself by fire at Athens.¹ According to the above theories we have two conceivable courses the text took in being corrupted. We feel that Meyer's point of view is the most likely. Westcott and Hort and Findlay resort to some rather fantastic reasons for corruption, and are doing this, it seems, in their effort to retain a simpler and clearer text.

4. As far as the context is concerned, we feel that *καυχόμενος* is really unnecessary, looking very much like a scribal interpretation. The main point is lack of love. And with the Nestle reading we have an effective, climactic finale to the first section of the chapter. This we feel is more in harmony with the whole context and purpose of Paul's eulogy of love. We therefore adopt the Nestle text as authentic on the basis of opinions already given. This need not imply that all contrary witnesses result from the same course of corruption as suggested. The P46 form may well be an innocent alteration, made without conscious considerations. This is a case, then, where we might conjecture that the scholarship of Alexandria produced something new where the simplicity of the rest of the world retained the old.

1314

Nestle: *ἢ ἀγάπην* : 56, A, C, D, F, G ; *ib*, *vgr* ; *Ar.*, *Cyril*

P46: - *ἢ ἀγάπην* : B, 33 ; *f* ; *vq* ; *Clem. of Al.*, *Text.*, *Ephraem*

1. The longer text is clearly Western and Alexandrian. P46 has scattered support, with some important Fathers.

2. and 3. In this case we are inclined to give more weight to possibilities of unintentional alteration. We feel there is little reason to insert *ἢ ἀγάπην* if it were not there. If it were absent the scribe would naturally connect the second *ἀγάπην* with *οὐ φιλοῖ*; it would naturally seem sufficient for the following list of negative qualities. (As we know, the early manuscripts had

1. Findlay, *op. cit.*, p. 899

no punctuation marks.) On the other hand, it could quite easily have been dropped, either unintentionally, or as unnecessary - a cumbrance to the flow of the passage. For this reason we consider the longer reading genuine, having also good, if not preponderant, testimony.

13:13

Nestle: κένει π. ἐλ. ἀγ., τὰ τρία ταῦτα: *vell.*

P46: κέναι τὰ τρία ταῦτα π. ἐλ. ἀγ.: *Clem. of Alex.*

In the first place, the preponderance of manuscript evidence opposes the P46 arrangement. In the second place it is obvious that this is an attempt at a smoother and more natural sequence. We retain the Nestle text as genuine.

Chapter Fourteen

14:11

Nestle: ἐν ἐμοί: *N, A, B, K, P*

P46: - ἐν: *D, G, 1739, pc; (lat: michi); Clem. of Alex.*

1. The Nestle text is Alexandrian and that of P46 Western, supported, however, by Alexandrian 1739 and Clement of Alexandria.
2. This consideration would naturally favor the longer reading.
3. and 4. Internal evidence is decisive. To all indications we have here ἐν as a dative. τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος in the same verse would also point to this. This use of ἐν is rare, but instances of it occur, especially in the LXX.¹ It is therefore the more difficult reading, and would hardly be inserted by so many good manuscripts if it was not present originally. However, it could easily have been dropped. In view of the above facts it is almost incontestable that ἐν ἐμοί is the authentic reading.

1. Cf. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 588

no punctuation marks.) On the other hand, it could quite easily have been dropped, either unintentionally, or as unnecessary - a cumbrance to the flow of the passage. For this reason we consider the longer reading genuine, having also good, if not preponderant, testimony.

13:13

Nestle: κένει π. ἐλ. ἀγ., τὰ τρία ταῦτα: *vell.*

P46: κέναι τὰ τρία ταῦτα π. ἐλ. ἀγ.: *Clem. of Alex.*

In the first place, the preponderance of manuscript evidence opposes the P46 arrangement. In the second place it is obvious that this is an attempt at a smoother and more natural sequence. We retain the Nestle text as genuine.

Chapter Fourteen

14:11

Nestle: ἐν ἐμοί: *N, A, B, K, P*

P46: - ἐν: *D, G, 1739, pc; (lat: mihi); Clem. of Alex.*

1. The Nestle text is Alexandrian and that of P46 Western, supported, however, by Alexandrian 1739 and Clement of Alexandria.

2. This consideration would naturally favor the longer reading.

3. and 4. Internal evidence is decisive. To all indications we have here ἐν as a dative. τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος in the same verse would also point to this. This use of ἐν is rare, but instances of it occur, especially in the LXX. It is therefore the more difficult reading, and would hardly be inserted by so many good manuscripts if it was not present originally. However, it could easily have been dropped. In view of the above facts it is almost incontestable that ἐν ἐμοί is the authentic reading.

1. Cf. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 588

found early in Italy-Gaul and Antioch.

2. The longer Nestle text better explains unintentional alteration.

3. This is the sole use of ἐν in the immediate passages, and could easily have fallen out in conformity to the other instrumental datives. We choose the Nestle text on transcriptional grounds against the somewhat favored documentary evidence of the P46 text.

14:18

Nestle: λαλῶ : *well.*

P46: λαλεῖν.

P46 reads thus alone against a great weight of evidence. This passage was tampered with quite freely through varied interpretations and efforts to improve the grammar. The P46 reading has this appearance. Meyer says on this passage: "Other transcribers, who rightly saw in πάντων ὁκῶν κ.τ.λ. the ground of the εὐχαριστῶ, sought to help the construction, some of them by ὅτι, some by changing λαλῶ into λαλῶν. The latter was welcome also to those who saw in πάντων----λαλῶν, not the ground, but the mode of the εὐχαριστῶ."¹

There is no doubt that the Nestle text is authentic.

14:19

Nestle: τῷ νοῷ σου: *κ, A, B, D, F, G; lat*

P46: ἐν τῷ νοῷ σου

Byzantine: δεῖ τοῦ νοῦ σου: *ε, ε; many fathers; (Thevenin: δεῖ τὸν νόσον)*

1. P46 stands alone. The Nestle text is the most widespread, being dominant in Alexandria and the West.

2. and 3. It is difficult to explain the latter two readings as resultants

1. op. cit., p. 312

from the first. The Nestle text would seem to offer no difficulty to a transcriber. It was already used in verse 15. P46 is a conceivable alteration, but the more difficult Byzantine rendering would hardly seem to stem from the Nestle text. From our point of view the course of corruption is most easily explained from the Byzantine form to the Nestle form. First, from *δεῖ* with the genitive to *ἐν* with the instrumental dative. From this reading, then, the construction in verse 15 could easily be brought in. It would seem that this is disregarding early testimony. However, notice that the early error of Marcion is without doubt a result of a misreading of *δεῖ τοῦ νοῦς, σου*. The *δεῖ* reading was also found in early Old Latin manuscripts.

14:21

Nestle: *ἑτέρων* : *κ, Α, Β*

P46: *ἑτέροισ* : *Δ, Ε, Byzantine; latt, sy; Marcion, Origen*

The P46 text is more widespread. The former is thoroughly Alexandrian. Unintentional corruption could most easily occur by mechanically writing the dative after *ἑτερογλώσσους* and *κρέσσιν*, hardly vice versa. Hence, transcriptional evidence favors the Nestle text, which we are satisfied to consider original, with good witnesses to testify.

14:23

Nestle: *συνέληθη* : *κ, Α, Δ, μ*

P46: *ἔληθη* : *Β, Γ**

It is quickly evident that *ἔληθη* involves an unintentional omission of *συν-*, which is very much like the preceding *οὖν*. The few manuscripts that have the shorter form attest to it as a result, then, of omission because of homioteleuton. No considerations oppose this decision.

14:25

Nestle: *καρδίας* : *well.*

P46: *σκαροίας*.

The P46 reading could make a good case on transcriptional grounds, being the more difficult reading. We are at a loss to explain how a change could have come about here since both give good sense. We adopt *καρδίας* on overwhelming external testimony.

14:33

Nestle: *ὁ θεός* : *well.*

P46: *θεός* : *G (Am. by Marcion, Tert., Ambros.)*

θεός is freely used with and without the article. However, by far the most frequent use in the Epistles is without the article. This would lend credence to the conclusion that the longer reading is original, on the supposition that a scribe would easily drop the article because of the familiarity of that use. On external and internal grounds we must decide against P46 as giving the authentic text here.

14:38

Nestle: *ἀγροεῖται* : *ss*, A, G; lat; Origen*

P46: *ἀγροεῖτω* : *B, Byzantine; sy; (ἀγροεῖτε : D*)*

1. Predominant Alexandrian attestation and strong Western supports the Nestle text. It has been conjectured that the form is a Western corruption. The P46 text was dominant in Antioch and has important support in Alexandria.
2. Meyer makes a good case for the imperative form attested by P46.

In the scriptio continua an *ω* might easily be left out from *ἀγροεῖτω ὅτε*, and then it would be all the more natural to supplement wrongly the defective *ἀγροεῖτ* by making it *ἀγροεῖται*, as it is well known that Paul is fond of a striking interchange between the active and passive of the same verb (8:2,3; 13:12). One can hardly conceive any ground for *ἀγροεῖται* being changed into the imperative, especially as the imperative gives a sense

which seems not to be in keeping with apostolic strictness and authority. Offense taken at this might be the very occasion of ἀποδέτω being purposely altered into ἀποδέτασ .1

3. Meyer already gives a hypothesis that favors the imperative form - the fact that it gives a sense which seems not to be in keeping with apostolic strictness and authority. However, it must be admitted that the indicative reading is hard to expound. To decide which is really the more difficult reading would involve a definite interpretation of the scribal mind. We adopt the reading attested by P46 especially on the basis of the internal arguments presented by Meyer. External evidence is divided on the point.

14:39

Nestle: - ἐν : ss, A ; lat ; sy

P46: ἐν γλώσσαις : B, D*, G ; it

1. The shorter text is more widespread, being dominant in Antioch and probably in Alexandria, and with Old Latin attestation in the West. The text in P46 is attested by the Western tradition.

2. There is greater probability of unintentional omission, heightened by the fact that ἐν would be unnecessary.

3. Intentional alteration seems unlikely because no serious variation in meaning is involved. It could have been dropped perhaps because of the more common expression: λαλεῖν γλώσσαις. The documentary evidence may favor the omission slightly, but not enough, we feel, to persuade us to choose it as original against transcriptional evidence.

Chapter Fifteen

15:7

Nestle: εἶτα τοῖς ἀποσ. : B, N², L

P46: εἵπειτα : N*, A, C, Mⁿ ; Origen

The variation shown here is quite unimportant. Both εἶτα and εἵπειτα were

seemingly used just preceding this. In this case where transcriptional conjectures are abundant, and many possibilities offer themselves, we rely on the preponderant external evidence and take the longer form attested by P46 as genuine.

15:10

Nestle: - $\tilde{\eta}$: B, S*, D*, G; *Origen*

P46: $\theta\epsilon\omicron\theta \tilde{\eta}$: A, *Byzantine*, *pl*

The Nestle text is more widespread and has the better manuscript support. Internal considerations decisively favor the shorter text. In the first place the $\tilde{\eta}$ could have come in mechanically from the preceding $\tilde{\eta} \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\epsilon'$. A second possibility is the inclusion of $\tilde{\eta}$ "in order to have a thoroughly complete contrast to $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\kappa \epsilon\tilde{\gamma}\acute{\omega}$."¹ For these transcriptional reasons we feel confident that the strongly attested Nestle reading is original.

15:17

Nestle: $\epsilon\tilde{\rho}\tau\tau\iota\nu$: B, D*; *lat*, *sy*

P46: - $\epsilon\tilde{\rho}\tau\tau\iota\nu$: *Alex. and Byz. traditions*, G; *pl*

There is no reason to add the $\epsilon\tilde{\rho}\tau\tau\iota\nu$ if it was originally absent. However, if it was original, it might have been inadvertently dropped as unnecessary in view of verse 14 where the copula is not used. For this reason we accept the longer reading as authentic against P46.

15:27

Nestle: $\delta\tilde{\iota}\epsilon$: *well*.

P46: - $\delta\tilde{\iota}\epsilon$: B, 33, d; *vg*; *Lp¹⁴⁷*

1. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 337

The longer reading has the weight of external testimony. Transcriptionally viewed various possibilities present themselves. 1) If the $\delta\tau\epsilon$ were present and the scribe considered it direct speech he might have dropped $\delta\tau\epsilon$ as unnecessary, also being the less prevalent construction for direct speech. 2) If the $\delta\tau\epsilon$ were lacking the scribe might have considered the clause as indirect speech and, therefore, made the indication with $\delta\tau\epsilon$. Style could hardly be decisive since both constructions in direct speech are used by Paul. It is probably safe to say that if Paul wanted to have direct speech here he would not have used $\delta\tau\epsilon$, and if indirect, he would have used $\delta\tau\tau$. But to determine this is almost impossible, because the subject of the verb is the general $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$.

Tentatively we adhere to the reading attested by P46 as being the more difficult reading with rather important documentary support.

15:31

Nestle: ἀδελφοί: *sc, A, B, k; 69, al; r, vg, sy*

P46: - ἀδελφοί: *D, G, Byzantine; it*

1. The longer text is the more widespread.
2. ἀδελφοί is more likely to have been dropped unintentionally: first, because it is the longer reading, but also since ἀδελφοί is a natural addition at the beginning of a new section and might well be overlooked here.
3. A serious intent at alteration could hardly be envisioned here. Although the inclusion is in keeping with the impassioned address, it would hardly be reason enough to insert the word.
4. Paul has used ἀδελφοί in the same way before in 1 Corinthians, although this fact would only confirm its use here and not demand it.

Externally and internally our considerations demand choosing the Nestle text as authentic.

15:37

Nestle: γεννρότερον: *nell.*

P46: γεννρότερον: *ε; ιβ*

External evidence weighs heavily for the spelling of the Nestle text. Transcriptionally we feel the following consideration is pointed. The former may have been changed to the latter for the sake of the contrast to death in verse 36. Taking the verse alone, one is almost inclined to say that the picture here demands the future of *γεννηται*: "the body that is to be." Paul uses this figure of the seed and the full plant to point to the full and new life to come. The figure of a birth of the new body of the plant would not seem to have a figurative sense at all. The emphasis is on the dead organism and the new complete being. We, therefore, choose the Nestle text as authentic, feeling that the other subtly contradicts the context.

15:47

Nestle: *δ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος*: B, C, D*, E, F, G, N*; *latt*

P46: + *πνευματικός.*

Byzantine: + *δ κύριος*: A, *pl*; *sy* (Marcion: *κύριος* for *ἀνθρ.*)

1. Documentary evidence is highly in favor of the Nestle text.
2. This consideration would favor the longer text, but one looks hard to find a reason to omit such significant words.
3. The probability is strong that the longer readings and Marcion's are glosses for reasons of explanation and clarity: the P46 change for the sake of contrast to *καίς* and perhaps influenced by the preceding verses, Marcion's substitution on doctrinal grounds, and the Byzantine reading for clarity.
4. When compared to verse 45 Paul's style would favor the Nestle text. On all counts we must choose it as genuine.

15:51

Nestle: $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ κολικησθήσθε, πάντες δέ; B, Byz., pl; sy, aeg;
 Tertullian, Origen, Cyril, Chrys., Theod.

P46: $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ before πάντες.

S¹B: κολικ., $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ πάντες δέ' (A)' $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ π. : 33): (A), C, (G, 33), and Greek
 mss. mentioned by Jerome, Aug., Pel., and others.

D*: ἀναστῆσθήσθε; $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ π. δέ; lat; Marcion

1. We find considerable confusion among the manuscripts here, especially because the Patristic authorities from the 3rd to the 5th centuries stood in doubt as to the true reading.¹ The main question involved is the position of $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$. Here we have the Western witnesses and most of the Alexandrian supporting the $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ in the second part of the verse against the authority of B, Antioch attestation, the Egyptian versions, and many early Fathers. This reading was really only dominant in Antioch; hence, on this score, the second $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ is more widely attested. P46 straddles the fence and supports both readings, but it stands alone in this.

2. It is unlikely that the significant variations in question here come about through unintentional alteration, so we can dismiss this consideration as favoring neither reading.

3. The Nestle reading can best explain the other variations. It seems the first $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ was early deleted because of the difficulty in interpreting the passage. Paul seems to say that all of those living shall not sleep (die), but as a matter of fact, all those then living did die. But this interpretation is not at all necessary. The words can simply mean that all (including both the apostle and his readers) will not die.² As much as to say: "Our perishable flesh and blood, whether through death or not, must undergo a change."³

4. Turning to the latter part of the verse we find that other statements of Paul demand that the $\sigma\bar{\upsilon}$ be dropped. Such a reading is required by verse 50

1. Cf. Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, vol. II, p. 561f., Findlay, op. cit., p. 940

2. Cf. Meyer, op. cit., p. 393

3. Findlay, op. cit., p. 941

and 52 and 53 (which interprets the *ἀλλήλων* in 51). (Cp. also Phil. 3:21 and 1 Thess. 4:15) Findlay says:

The unusual position of *οὐ* (after *πάντες*), and the fact that *οὐ κοινῶς*, appear to express an anticipation that failed of fulfilment, led to the shifting of the *οὐ*. *ἀναστρέψασθαι* is a bold Western paraphrase. The reading of B and the T.R. alone agrees with Paul's situation (cf. 1 Th. 4:15) and with the tenor of this passage.¹

We concur. Intrinsic considerations are decisive in favor of the Nestle text. The P46 text is impossible with two negative statements and yet a contrast in *δε*.

15:52

Nestle: *ἐπιπῆ*: *rell.*

P46: *ἐοπιῆ*: D, G, 1739; *latt*

According to the meanings both words would fit equally well here, although the figure in *ἐπιπῆ* is a little stronger. There is also no parallel in the New Testament to aid in our judgment. Since we have purely documentary evidence to go on, we would choose the Nestle text as authentic.

15:54

Nestle: *τὸ φθαρ.* --- *ἄφ. και*: A, B, D, Byzantine; *it ay*; Origen

P46: — *τὸ φθαρ.* --- *ἄφ. και*: 56*, C*, pc; vg; Marcion, *lv*

It is quite evident in this case that the omission is unintentional, due to homoioteleuton (*τὸ φθαρτὸν* similar to *τὸ θυμτὸν*). The longer reading is also favored by greater weight of external evidence, being probably Western, Alexandrian, and certainly Antiochian. It is very unlikely that a section of this size would be inserted intentionally in so many documents.

1. op. cit., p.940

Chapter Sixteen16:6 (A)

Nestle: *κατακενω*: B, 1739, pc

P46: *παρακενω*: ss, A, C, D, G, Byzantine, pl

1. The nature of the variant in Greek does not show up in the versions.

The P46 text has the best support here, being predominant in Alexandria and the West.

2. and 3. Transcriptional considerations are highly conjectural. It might be thought that *παρακ.* is an assimilation to *παρκακενω*, or that *κατακενω* was substituted for a more fitting contrast with *εν παροδω* in verse 7. Of the two possibilities the former carries more weight, but far from being decisive.

4. As stated above *κατακ.* would probably fit better into a contrast with *εν παροδω*, but the point cannot be pressed too far. In this case we feel that documentary evidence outweighs any internal consideration that might favor the B reading. We retain the Textus Receptus attested by P46.

16:6 (B)

Nestle: *καί*: -null.

P46: - *καί*: B, 1739, pc; sy P

External witness highly favors the *καί*. A scribe would hardly insert a *καί* unintentionally. The difference between the two readings isn't really significant enough to give serious consideration to intentional alteration. We adopt the Nestle text as authentic on the grounds that the omission is unintentional, being supported also by a greater weight of documents.

16:10

Nestle: *εγω*: ss, A, C, K, L, P, (D, G: *καί εγω*)

P46: *εγω*: B, 1739, pc

The Nestle text is the more widespread. There appears least reason for dropping the *καί* if it was there originally. Paul emphasizes the *καί* (even) in several instances of comparison in 1 Corinthians (cf. 7:8, 10:33); hence, the omission here is unlikely if the *καί* was authentic. On the other hand we feel that *ἐξῷ* best explains the variants here. The emphasis on *καί* is not necessary here, and the insertion of it is either inadvertant (which is unlikely), or purposely inserted through familiarity with Paul's use of it in connection with *ὡς* and *ἐξῷ*. We therefore prefer the P46 text as genuine.

16:15

Nestle: Ἀκατίας : *nell.*

P46: Ἀρίας :

The P46 reading is a manifest corruption from the former. The words are of similar appearance and pronunciation; and, hence, the alteration no doubt was unintentional. Furthermore, Stephanus was not from Asia, making the reading impossible. Beyond all doubt the Nestle reading is authentic.

16:17

Nestle: ὁκέτερον : B, C, D, G

P46: ὁκῶν : *ss, A, Byzantine, pl*

1. *ὁκῶν* was possibly dominant in Alexandria, but nowhere else.
2. This question favors the longer form because unintentional substitution of the more common construction is entirely possible.
3. *ὁκῶν* could have easily been substituted because of its frequent use in comparison to the other form. *ὁκέτερον* is used very seldom in the New Testament (11 times - 5 in Paul). We can find no reason why the *ὁκέτερον* would find a place in so many uncials if it were not there originally.

4. *Ἰκέρειρον* is used by Paul five times, making it a rare but possible construction. We adopt it as authentic because of transcriptional evidence and very good documentary testimony.

16:19

P46: -αἰ εἰκκ. ---- ἀο. *Ἰκῆς*: 69. *pc*

It is immediately evident that this reading results from an error of the eye, skipping from the first *Ἰκῆς* to the second, and continuing at that point. There is no doubt that the Nestle text is authentic here.

CONCLUSION

We have considered 116 P46 variants that were not taken into the Nestle text. Of the 162 citations of P46 by Nestle in his critical apparatus 37 are taken into the text. In our examination of variants not in the text we have found 29 to be authentic. Instead of the original 37 we now find 66, out of the 162 cited, as authentic, which is well over a third. We must realize that in this tabulation many of the P46 variants cannot be accepted because of purely unintentional scribal errors, the elimination of which would show a higher percentage of authentic readings. This is sufficient evidence to show that a place of considerable importance should be given to P46 in reconstructing the original text.

The change in the text as we have examined and altered it is not radical, but it indicates for us that we should have a new edition of the Greek New Testament, not based on former editions, but on a thorough reexamination of the text in the light of recent developments in the field of New Testament textual criticism, especially taking into account the new evidence from P46 and the remaining Chester Beatty papyri.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BACHMANN, D. PHILIPP, Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, 3. Auflage, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1921. ^
- BIASS, F., Grammar of New Testament Greek, translated by Thackeray, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911.
- COLWELL, E.C., "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI, June, 1947.
- FINDLAY, G.G., St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, in The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. II, New York, Hodder and Stoughton Limited.
- HOSKIER, H.C., "'The Shorter Text' of the Pauline Epistles as gathered from the Papyrus 46," Appendix to an article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles known as P46, The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 150, Oxford, University Press, April, 1937.
- _____, _____, P46, Addenda et Corrigenda, Oxford, University Press, 1937.
- KENYON, F.G., Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- _____, _____, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Amen House, E.C., 1933.
- _____, _____, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus I (General Introduction) and Fasciculus III (Supplement, Pauline Epistles, Text), London, Emery Walker Limited, 1933 and 1936.
- MEYER, HEINRICI AUGUST WILHELM, Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians, translated from the German by D. D. Bannerman, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 1884.
- MOULTON, W.F., and GEDEN, A.S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament, second edition, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1913.
- MOULTON, J. H., A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. I, Prolegomena, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1913.
- NESTLE, D. EBERHARD, Novum Testamentum Graece, cum apparatu critico, novis curis elaboravit D. Erwin Nestle, 17. Auflage, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1941.

- RAHLFS, A., Septuaginta, Stuttgart, Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.**
- ROBERTSON, A.T., An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1925.**
- _____, _____, Studies in the Text of the New Testament, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1926.**
- _____, _____, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, Nashville, Tennessee, Broadman Press, 1934.**
- STREETER, B.H., The Four Gospels, London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1930.**
- THAYER, J.H., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1889.**
- TISCHENDORF, CONSTANTINUS, Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior, volumen II, Lipsiae, Giesecke & Devrient, 1872.**
- TRENCH, RICHARD C., Synonyms of the New Testament, London Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. Ltd., 1915.**
- WARFIELD, B.B., An Introductio. to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Sixth Edition, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.**
- WESTCOTT, B.F., AND HORT, F.J., The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction and Appendix, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1882.**