

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1957

The Significance of the P46 in the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians According to the Nestle Text

Edward Frederick Peters

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_peterse@csel.edu

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peters, Edward Frederick, "The Significance of the P46 in the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians According to the Nestle Text" (1957). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 534.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/534>

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@csel.edu.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF P46 IN THE SECOND EPISTLE
OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS
ACCORDING TO THE NESTLE TEXT

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Edward Frederick Peters

June 1957

Approved by:

Friedrich W. Danker

Advisor

Adolf von Rohr-Sauer

Reader

Short Title

P46 IN SECOND CORINTHIANS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE MANUSCRIPT P46	3
The History of P46	3
The Characteristics of P46	6
The Significance of P46	11
III. THE PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM	18
External Evidence	21
Internal Evidence	22
IV. P46 IN THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS .	31
V. CONCLUSIONS	83
APPENDIX	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the past sixteen years, since the discovery of the Chester Beatty Papyri, New Testament scholars and students have been studying these important manuscripts in order to discover what value they have for the history of textual criticism. Many questions have been raised, and some of them have been answered. But textual critics are far from arriving at any final conclusions about either the Chester Beatty Papyri themselves or about their place in textual criticism. Many careful studies will still have to be made before the information which this discovery has to offer is exhausted.

The purpose of this paper is to try to determine, to a certain extent, the significance of one of these Chester Beatty Papyri, namely P46, in St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It tries to answer some of the questions that are being asked and which must be answered before critics are able to give P46 a final slot in the complicated maze of the history of the New Testament text.

The study is of course limited, first of all, by the author's deficiencies in knowledge of the New Testament, and secondly, by the amount of material available. With one exception, the sources used in this paper are available in Pritzlaff Memorial Library at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. The exception is H. A. Sanders', A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of

the Epistles of Paul, which was obtained from the library of the University of Michigan. The readings cited in this paper are restricted to those mentioned in the apparatus of the twenty-first edition of Eberhard Nestle's Novum Testamentum Graece.

Chapter II presents in brief a discussion of the whole manuscript P46: the history, characteristics, and significance of the manuscript. Chapter III sets down the basic principles for the science of textual criticism which are employed in this paper. Chapter IV, the main body of the thesis, is a discussion of each instance in which P46 is noted in the Nestle apparatus in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The significance of these variant readings is summarized in the final chapter.

Not long after this purchase, it was discovered that the Egyptian collector had sold thirty pages of the same manuscript of the Pauline Epistles to the University of Michigan.²

As these papyrus leaves were slowly being collected, scholars set to work publishing them. In 1936, Kenyon in England published the original ten leaves. In 1939, H. J. Gwynn published these ten leaves with the thirty that he

Ernst Schulz, "Die neuere Bibelfunde aus Ägypten," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1911).

James Park, *Die Bibel: Ihre Entdeckung in Brak* (2nd edition; Stuttgart: Privatdruck des Verlagsbuchhandels, 1930), pp. 52-53.

CHAPTER II

THE MANUSCRIPT P46

The History of P46

In the year 1930, Mr. Chester Beatty, a private collector of manuscripts, bought a group of ten papyri of the Epistles of St. Paul, which had recently been found somewhere in Egypt. This was the beginning of one of the greatest manuscript discoveries since Tischendorf's purchase of the great Codex Sinaiticus in 1844. Within a short time, Sir Frederic Kenyon and Dr. H. I. Bell in England, and Dr. Ibscher, curator of papyri at the Berlin Museum, began to piece the fragments together and give them a thorough examination.¹

Not long after this purchase, it was discovered that the Egyptian dealers had sold thirty pages of the same manuscript of the Pauline Epistles to the University of Michigan.²

As these papyrus leaves were slowly being collected, scholars set to work publishing them. In 1934, Kenyon in England published the original ten leaves. In 1935, H. A. Sanders published these ten leaves with the thirty that he

¹Carl Schmidt, "Die neuesten Bibelfunde aus Aegypten," Zeitschrift fuer die neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXX (1931), 285-6.

²Oscar Paret, Die Bibel: Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift (Second edition; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950), pp. 52-53.

had at his disposal, and it was thought that this was a complete printed facsimile of a very important manuscript. But no sooner was Sanders' publication of these forty leaves in print than Mr. Beatty purchased no less than forty-six more leaves of the same codex--a total of eighty-six leaves.³ Finally all eighty-six leaves of the manuscript were published in 1936 by Sir Frederic Kenyon.⁴

New Testament scholars throughout the world were eager to learn where the manuscript had been found, in hopes that manuscripts of equal importance might be searched for and discovered. But the Egyptian dealers refused to disclose the location of the find.⁵ Finally, Dr. Carl Schmidt, of Berlin, after careful study, decided that the manuscript had come from Alame on the east bank of the Nile near the site of the ancient city of Aphroditopolis, about one hundred kilometers south of Cairo. Very likely they had been stored in a jar and buried near an old cloister instead of being destroyed, because of the sacred character of the text.⁶

It is difficult to determine the exact date of this

³Frederic Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible (London: Emery Walker, Ltd., 1933-41), VII, vii. Hereafter this will be cited as The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri.

⁴E. C. Colwell, What is the Best New Testament? (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. 49.

⁵Paret, op. cit., p. 53.

⁶Schmidt, op. cit., p. 4.

manuscript, numbered P46 by Professor von Dobschuetz,⁷ although most of the scholars who have studied the manuscript agree on the third century. H. C. Hoskier dated the manuscript earlier than anyone else when he placed its writing in about the year 190 A. D.⁸ Professor Ulrich Wilcken, universally recognized as the chief living papyrologist, dates the manuscript at 200 A. D.,⁹ along with the editor of the Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft.¹⁰ Sir Frederic Kenyon would place P46 in the first half of the third century,¹¹ along with Oscar Paret.¹² However, Sanders states: "I agree that the manuscript belongs to the third century, but I would hesitate to put emphasis on the first half of the century."¹³ At any rate, there is enough agreement among recognized New Testament scholars to place P46 in the third century, at least a full century before the great codices Aleph and B, which were, until the discovery of P46, by far the most important witnesses to the Epistles of St. Paul.

⁷H. A. Sanders, A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935), p. 1.

⁸Elmer Moeller; "P46 and Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (1946), 343.

⁹Hans Lietzmann, Zur Wuerdigung des Chester-Beatty-Papyrus der Paulusbriefe (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934), p. 3.

¹⁰"Notizen," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIII (1934), 221.

¹¹Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, pp. xiv-xv.

¹²Paret, op. cit., opposite Plate 4.

¹³Sanders, op. cit., p. 13.

The Characteristics of P46

As the scholars probed further and further into P46, comparisons with other manuscripts displayed various characteristics peculiar to P46. Because the present chapter is only preliminary to a more detailed view of a particular section of the manuscript P46, only a few of these characteristics which may prove helpful to the study as a whole will be cited.

At the present time there are eighty-six extant leaves in P46. Originally there were 104 leaves in a single quire. Seven leaves are missing at the beginning and seven at the end, as well as two leaves coming immediately after the first that has been preserved, together with the corresponding leaves at the end.¹⁴ The codex was formed by laying fifty-two sheets of papyrus on one another and folding the whole mass over in the middle.¹⁵ The verso side of the leaf precedes the recto in the first half, and the recto precedes the verso in the second half.¹⁶

The text begins on the inside of the first leaf, and the pages are numbered throughout in the center of the upper margin.¹⁷ Owing to a scribal error, two pages escaped numeration between pages 100 and 101, hence the page numbers from that point are

¹⁴Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. viii.

¹⁵Ibid., p. ix.

¹⁶Sanders, op. cit., p. 2.

¹⁷Ibid.

lower by two than they should have been.¹⁸

None of the pages in the manuscript are entirely perfect, but usually the loss is only a few lines. At the beginning of the codex the loss is only one or two lines at the bottom: however, at the end it rises to a loss of seven.¹⁹ The leaves measure from eight and one-half inches long and from five and three-eighths to six inches wide. The single column of writing on each page is from seven to eight inches long and from four to five inches wide. The number of lines vary from twenty-five to thirty-two.²⁰

The hand in which P46 is written is large and free-flowing with some pretensions to style and elegance. Each page is upright and square in formation with no letters exaggerated. Both letters and lines are neat and well-spaced.²¹ The ink is dark brown and has faded little.²²

What the last seven leaves of the manuscript contained cannot be determined. It is far too short for the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles, unless pages were tacked on to the end of the codex. Probably the last five sheets after the First Epistle to the Thessalonians were left

¹⁸Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. ix.

¹⁹Ibid., p. viii.

²⁰Sanders, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

²¹Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. xiii.

²²Sanders, op. cit., p. 12.

blank, since it was difficult for a scribe to judge just how many leaves he would require for such a large work before he started.²³

The manuscript P46 contains the Pauline Epistles in the following order: The Epistles to the Romans, Hebrews, Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. Missing are the following verses: Romans 1:1-5:17; 6:14-8:15; I Thessalonians 2:3-5:5; and whatever followed this on the last seven pages.²⁴ The placing of the Epistle to the Hebrews immediately after the Epistle to the Romans is almost unique. None of the Church Fathers mention this order, and it has been found in but one other manuscript, Minuscule 1919.²⁵

G. Zuntz, who did extensive work on P46 in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Hebrews, notes some other characteristics of the manuscript. He remarks that in spite of its neat appearance (it was written by a professional scribe and corrected--but very imperfectly--by an expert), P46 is by no means a good manuscript. The scribe committed very many blunders. Probably he was subject to fits of exhaustion.²⁶

²³Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, pp. x-xi.

²⁴Ibid., p. x.

²⁵Sanders, op. cit., p. 12.

²⁶G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: British Academy by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 18.

However, he does not mean to imply that the text of P46 is not good. The text may well be ranked along with Aleph, B, and D as one of the most important of all New Testament manuscripts. The scribe did poor work in copying a very excellent text, however, and the manuscript was corrected very sketchily by three correctors. The first corrector was probably the scribe himself, who corrected as he wrote. The second corrector wrote in a broad pen and very black ink and added the page numbers and stichoi. The third corrector wrote in a cursive hand, probably in the late third century.²⁷

In his evaluation, Zuntz offers a two-fold caveat: First of all, there are a great number of scribal slips in P46. Secondly, it preserves some very ancient conjectural alterations of the original wording. Therefore, a reading of P46 alone should never be accepted unless its intrinsic quality can stand the severest test; also scribal slips must be discarded in assessing the basic quality of this most ancient witness.²⁸ Kenyon supports this assertion by saying that readings peculiar to P46 are not as a rule very noteworthy--some merely scribal errors. Others are possible variants though in the absence of support they are not likely to be preferred.²⁹

The above references display some of the peculiarities of

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 253-54.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 23.

²⁹ Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. xvii.

the manuscript itself that have been noted by various scholars as they studied P46. But how does P46 fit into the textual tradition of the New Testament?

In general, it is agreed that P46 agrees more with the Alexandrian tradition than with any other family, although the manuscript also reveals a significant number of Western readings. Kenyon remarks:

With regard to the text of the Pauline Epistles, all that can be said at present is that the manuscript is certainly not of the Byzantine type and is definitely nearer to the Aleph and AB group, and especially to B, than to the Western group DFG. It shows, however, several agreements with FG in small groups, though fewer than with B. The order of agreement after B is A Aleph CDFG, with the textus recentus a long way behind. There are a considerable number of singular readings, but none of much importance.³⁰

Lake,³¹ William Hatch,³² H. A. Sanders,³³ and Zuntz³⁴ agree generally with this observation.

With regard to specific Western readings, P46 has made more apparent than ever before the importance of the Western text. Sanders notes, for example, that the agreement of P46, D, F, and G must be considered strong evidence for the original

³⁰Frederic Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 61.

³¹Kirsopp Lake, "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (January, 1936), 97.

³²William H. P. Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1939), opposite Plate II.

³³Sanders, op. cit., p. 23.

³⁴Zuntz, op. cit., p. 135.

text.³⁵ And Zuntz affirms this when he says, "P46 proves that Western readings in non-Western witnesses are, generally, ancient survivals."³⁶ In fact, he maintains that P46 alone with one Western witness can be right against the whole of the other tradition.³⁷ Furthermore, he points out another contribution of the Western text to textual criticism when he says: "In correcting P46 the correctors almost always rejected Western readings and followed the Alexandrian tradition. This shows that as early as 200 A. D. there was in existence a Christian critical philology."³⁸

As far as the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is concerned, Kenyon has found that P46 agrees with the Western text eleven times against sixty agreements with the Alexandrian text in variant readings.³⁹

The Significance of P46

On the basis of some of the characteristics of the manuscript, one must look at another aspect of this important addition to the textual history of the Pauline Epistles. What is the significance of the discovery of P46?

³⁵Sanders, op. cit., p. 30.

³⁶Zuntz, op. cit.,

³⁷Ibid., p. 159.

³⁸Ibid., p. 262.

³⁹Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. xvii.

Probably the most significant thing that P46 has confirmed is the fact that textual scholars are now more certain than ever that the New Testament that we possess is substantially sound. The manuscript has no surprises--nothing basically new, but it confirms the validity both of the present text of the New Testament and the validity of the methods of textual criticism now in use.⁴⁰ It supports the readings of the early uncial against the Byzantine text or the textus receptus, but it does not give exclusive support to any single text or group of manuscripts.⁴¹

P46 is especially helpful in assessing the value of Codex Vaticanus and the Alexandrian tradition. It was the position of Westcott and Hort that Codex B was almost a perfect copy of the original text of the New Testament. However, since the discovery of P46, scholars are much more wary about accepting the readings of B automatically. In fact, Lietzmann goes so far as to say that P46 destroys any over-confidence in the Egyptian text.⁴² P46 points decisively to the conclusion that Codex B does not represent a text of original purity dominant in Egypt throughout the second and third centuries. It gives positive proof that other texts existed.⁴³ Even when P46 and

⁴⁰ Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

⁴¹ Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. xcii.

⁴² Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴³ Walter H. Lutz, "Variant Readings in the Text of First Corinthians on the Basis of P46" (Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1948), p. 7.

the Alexandrian text agree, this is not conclusive evidence that it gives the original text. It merely establishes that in those particular readings P46 gives the earlier Egyptian text on which the Alexandrian revision was based.⁴⁴ As far as the Alexandrian text is concerned, then, P46 has taught scholars to be wary of accepting its readings without careful weighing and counter-weighing of all the evidence.

In addition, P46 has been significant in the critics' judgment of the Western text. Before the discovery of P46, scholars were often all too ready to accept the readings of the Alexandrians without conclusive evidence. On the other hand, they were often all too prone to reject a reading that was discovered to be Western. With the advent of P46 into the world of textual criticism, the picture has changed. Critics are beginning to realize that the Western text (particularly Codex D) contains reading which may well be original. One author remarks:

It took the finding of P46 to demonstrate that the peculiar Western readings of manuscripts F and G are just as old as the preferred readings of Codices Aleph and B, and in some instances may indeed be God's own Word, hidden through many centuries.⁴⁵

Furthermore, P46, along with the other 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,

⁴⁴Sanders, op. cit., p. 30.

⁴⁵Moeller, op. cit., p. 348.

which included the Old Syriac versions and other Eastern authorities.⁴⁶ Lietzmann ventures to say:

Today we are at the old problem, whether and to what extent the Western text is an improvement over the well-established Egyptian text. P46, it is hoped, will answer this question.⁴⁷

In other words, as concerns the Egyptian and the Western texts, P46 strongly indicates that future textual critics will be compelled completely to restudy their comparative evaluations of the two major textual families and their relationship to one another. This does not imply that there are going to be any major changes in the worth of either Codex B and its allies and the Western text, but a new evaluation of the situation with the inclusion of P46 would undoubtedly yield rich rewards to some enterprising scholar.

P46 is an almost complete copy of the Epistles of St. Paul, at least a century older than the oldest of the authorities on which the text had hitherto rested, the great codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.⁴⁸ It antedates both the Lucian and the Hesychian recensions and gives us an example of the type of text that the Hesychian recension (Aleph, B, etc.) was based on.⁴⁹ Not only does it precede the Hesychian recension

⁴⁶Lutz, op. cit., p. 8.

⁴⁷Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 5.

⁴⁸Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. vii.

⁴⁹E. von Dobschuets, "Zur Liste der neutestamentlichen Handschriften," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXII (1933), 180.

but it is also older than both the Old Latin and the Sahidic translations (to both of which it shows much affinity)--translations which are highly respected because of the age of their texts.⁵⁰

In spite of the age of P46's text and its general excellence, however, it dare not replace, in modern critical thought, the position that Codex B held in Westcott and Hort's system. P46 is still an imperfect text. It is nothing more than an excellent example of the codices that were current in about the year 200 A. D.⁵¹ For even P46, by itself, brings us only to the threshold of the decisive period. The recovery of the original text, if it is to be attempted scientifically, depends upon the illumination of its history in the second century.⁵² P46 reveals, in spite of its excellence, that between the middle of the first century, when the Pauline Epistles were written, and 200 A. D. there were a large number of variant readings that crept into the text, which must be discovered and recognized by painstaking methods of criticism.⁵³

Kenyon sums up this aspect of P46's significance as follows:

It therefore seems clear that, while our modern texts are an advance on those which preceded them, we have not

⁵⁰Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 9.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 10.

⁵²Zuntz, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵³Frederic Kenyon, The Bible and Modern Scholarship (London: John Murray, 1949), p. 20.

reached finality. The papyrus affects the balance of evidence in many cases; and while it can by no means claim a predominant authority (since, so far as we know, it is only a text circulating in provincial Egypt), it shows that the margin of doubt in details is greater than was supposed, and that the exercise of critical judgement and the search for further evidence are still required.⁵⁴

Parvis and Wikgren in their momentous work which summarizes the present state of textual criticism, make the following observation, which at first glance may seem somewhat radical, but which upon some reflection may point to a new understanding of this particular aspect of textual criticism:

To study P46 we require a new mental attitude, wherein we may set aside our knowledge and estimate of the early recensions and approach these earliest materials de novo. It would appear to be faulty procedure to judge a third-century text by later ones, especially when the former may antedate the hypothetical Syrian revision.⁵⁵

There is one other significant fact that the discovery of P46 has established. Before 1930, it was generally thought that at the beginning of the third century the Epistles of St. Paul were still restricted to the papyrus roll, a fact which would necessitate separation of the Epistles of St. Paul into individual volumes. However, P46 in its codex form proves that the Pauline writings were known in a collected form as early as the third century, which was impossible as long as the papyrus roll was the only vehicle of publication.⁵⁶ The

⁵⁴Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, p. xxii.

⁵⁵Merrill Parvis and Allen Wikgren, New Testament Manuscript Studies (Chicago: Chicago University Press, c.1950), p. 20.

⁵⁶Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, p. 60.

Chester Beatty Papyri, in general, show that the codex was used even earlier than had hitherto been confirmed.⁵⁷

P46, then, is certainly the most important New Testament discovery of the century. On the one hand, it has proved that we of the twentieth century have a substantially good text of the Epistles of St. Paul. On the other hand, it opened up the threshold of textual history to the vicissitudes of the second century, probably the most important century for the history of textual criticism, and it has caused New Testament scholars to sit back and to evaluate carefully the principles of textual criticism which they had hitherto been using.

⁵⁷Frederic Kenyon, Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 100.

In very brief outline, Westcott and Hort laid down the following principles:

Westcott and Hort isolated four definite families of texts: the Alexandrian, the Alexandrian, the Syrian, and the Western. They did not come to any definite decision as to

¹Benjamin S. Verfield, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), p. 100.

CHAPTER III

THE PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

A thorough discussion of the methods of textual criticism would far exceed the limits of this paper. However, in order intelligently to discuss the variant readings in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians in relation to P46, a few principles should be noted.

The science of textual criticism probably reached its zenith with the introduction to The New Testament in the Original Greek of Westcott and Hort. Benjamin Warfield summarizes the situation at the turn of the century as follows:

The comparative values of the three great modern texts-- the eighth edition of Tischendorf (1864-72), the one great edition of Tregelles (1857-79) and the edition of Westcott and Hort (1881, and reissued in 1885) need hardly be discussed. These three editions indicate the high-water mark of modern criticism, and to point out that they agree in their settlement of the greater part of the text. Where they differ we may decide now with one, most frequently with the latest: and in these comparatively few passages future criticism may find her especial task.¹

In very brief outline, Westcott and Hort laid down the following principles:

Westcott and Hort isolated four definite families of texts: the Neutral, the Alexandrian, the Syrian, and the Western. They did not come to any definite decision as to

¹Benjamin B. Warfield, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899), p. 225.

where the Neutral text arose. The Alexandrian text, of course, had its foundations in Egypt. The Syrian text was what critics today would call the Byzantine text, on which the textus receptus was based. The Western text arose in Italy and North Africa. The best of all the families was the Neutral text, and of the manuscripts in the Neutral text, the best representative was B (the Codex Vaticanus), followed by Aleph (the Codex Sinaiticus). Westcott and Hort considered B virtually a copy of the original text of the New Testament and were often very reluctant to admit that it contained errors.² The Alexandrian text was best represented by A (Codex Alexandrinus) and C (Codex Ephraemi); the Western text by D (Codex Bezae in the Gospels and the Book of the Acts, and Codex Claromontanus in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews); the Syrian text by K and L. But the Alexandrian text, when it was alone, was almost as unimportant as the Syrian, so actually there were only the Neutral and the Western texts. Between the Neutral and the Western texts, Westcott and Hort much preferred the Neutral except for some Western non-interpolations.³

As far as textual criticism itself is concerned, Westcott and Hort divided the methods into two main categories: external and internal evidence. The two methods had to agree in

²B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (New York: Harper Brothers, 1882), II, 210.

³A. T. Robertson, An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New York: Doran Company, c.1925), p. 37.

result if one was to have confidence in one's conclusion.⁴

First of all, internal evidence had to be applied (a) to the whole of a single document, (b) to groups of documents, and (c) to families of documents to determine the value of the individual manuscripts and families. When this had been done, one was ready to approach the external evidence in a scientific manner.⁵ External evidence (i.e., the evidence of the manuscript or group of manuscripts as a whole) had to be applied first to classes of manuscripts, then to groups, and finally to individual manuscripts.⁶ Internal evidence (the evidence of the particular reading) was divided into transcriptional probability (looking at the reading from the standpoint of the scribe who copied the manuscript) and intrinsic probability (looking at the reading from the standpoint of the author.)⁷ When studying the internal evidence of a reading, it was better to begin with the transcriptional evidence, because it was more objective, than to deal first with intrinsic evidence, which was more subjective.⁸ In general, all textual criticism consisted merely in using these

⁴Ibid., pp. 148-49.

⁵Ibid., p. 174.

⁶Ibid., p. 198.

⁷Westcott and Hort, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

⁸Robertson, An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament, p. 163.

two kinds of evidence in various ways.⁹

External Evidence

Before a particular manuscript could be used as external evidence, its value had to be decided by the principles of internal evidence, and the age of the text had to be determined. To date a particular text the following procedure was generally used: The earlier versions and citations were carefully ransacked, and a list of readings was drawn from those dated sources which could be confidently declared to be ancient. Each manuscript was then tested by this list. If a manuscript contained a considerable portion of these readings, or of readings which on grounds of transcriptional probability were older than even these, it was demonstrated to contain an old text. If, on the other hand, a manuscript failed to contain these readings, and presented instead variants which according to transcriptional probability appeared to have grown out of them, or which could be proved from dated citations to have been current at a later time, its text was assumed to be late.¹⁰ Only then was a particular manuscript ready to be used as external evidence. As well as applying internal evidence to one manuscript as a whole to determine its value, one had also to apply it to groups of documents to determine the value of the group as

⁹Warfield, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 112-13.

a whole.¹¹

When a manuscript had been graded according to its worth as a witness to the original text of the New Testament and had been placed into a family or category, it was ready to be used as external evidence for whatever particular reading was under discussion. First of all, the textual critic compared the reading which he was studying with the best manuscripts. If the reading agreed with the reading in the majority of the best manuscripts, it had passed the first test of textual criticism. He then compared his reading with the families of manuscripts (i.e., the Neutral, Alexandrian, Syrian, and Western) to determine how widely his reading was known geographically. If the reading was to be found in the majority of geographical areas it had passed the second test of textual criticism. These two steps were, in brief, the external methods of criticism. This is, of course, a very much over-simplified explanation of the method of external evidence, but it is basically what the critic first had to do to determine the value of each variant reading in the New Testament.

Internal Evidence

The methods of internal evidence were divided into two categories: transcriptional probability and intrinsic probability. In the former instance, the textual critic asked

¹¹Robertson, An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 179-80.

whether a change in the text has been made intentionally or unintentionally by the scribe. When determining which reading was the original and which was the change, the critic took into consideration the possibilities of errors of the eye, of the memory, of judgment, of the pen, or of speech.¹² An intentional error may have been made when the scribe corrected what he thought was a linguistic or rhetorical error by a previous scribe.¹³ Probably the most common error was that of accidental omission.¹⁴ The possibility of various types of error could be greatly expanded on, but, in general, these are the possible errors that the textual critic had to take into consideration in determining the value of a reading by transcriptional probability. To summarize, the two chief sources of error were the miscopying of a word or phrase and a conjecture intended to correct what seemed to be an error.¹⁵

Finally, the textual critic had to study the reading from the point of view of the author. What would the author have written? This was known as the method of intrinsic probability.¹⁶ The preparation for using the intrinsic method of criticism

¹²Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 24.

¹³Warfield, op. cit., p. 95.

¹⁴B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (New York: Macmillan Company, 1925), p. 36.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁶Robertson, An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament, p. 163.

consisted in a serious and sympathetic study of the author in hand; without this all appeal to intrinsic evidence was but opening the floodgates to the most abounding error.¹⁷ The danger that attended the use of the intrinsic method grew out of the tendency to read one's own standpoint into the author, instead of reading oneself back into his.¹⁸ Therefore, this last method had to be used with a great deal of caution.

These were basically the principles of textual criticism which Westcott and Hort developed at the turn of the century. For the most part, they are still the rules which the critic follows today. However, advances have been made in the study of the manuscript and, although Westcott and Hort are followed to a great degree, some of the corrections in their method advanced by modern textual criticism ought to be mentioned.

Westcott and Hort considered B and Aleph almost perfect manuscripts which represented what they called the Neutral text. Today their evaluation of these two codices, especially B, has been seriously challenged, as well as their designation "Neutral" text. We still follow with reservations their principle that B is the best manuscript.¹⁹ Westcott and Hort's Neutral text is recognized today not as a separate type of text of Alexandria preserved in a purer state than some of the

¹⁷Warfield, op. cit., p. 85.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 84-85.

¹⁹Streeter, op. cit., p. 146.

other Alexandrian texts,²⁰ but as a part of the Alexandrian tradition, probably a careful revision of an earlier text now lost to us.²¹ B and Aleph appear to represent, more nearly than any others, the text used by Origen before 230 A. D., and Origen would have used the oldest text he could procure. Therefore, any reading of B which is supported by Aleph or any Alexandrian text, we may assume certainly belongs to the Alexandrian text in its earliest form.²² At any rate, today B has been challenged as an absolute authority, and Aleph even more so.²³

Scholars today have also changed their concept of Westcott and Hort's Western text. It had been thought that D and others represented the "Western" text, which was unimportant. However, today it is recognized that the Western text is probably two distinct traditions, an Eastern and a Western,²⁴ called by Streeter the Caesarean text (Theta) and the text of the Church of Syria (sy^s and sy^c), as well as the text of Gaul

²⁰William F. Arndt, "A Definite Need in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVI (March, 1945), 181.

²¹A. T. Robertson, Studies in the Text of the New Testament (New York: Doran Company, c.1926), p. 83.

²²Streeter, op. cit., p. 127.

²³Frederic Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 65.

²⁴Streeter, op. cit., p. 32.

and Italy (abD) and North Africa (ke).²⁵ It used to be said that a reading was usually condemned if it were found to be a Western reading. But this is no longer true. However, it is still very unclear as to how a Western reading is to be valued.²⁶ In fact, critics today give a special prominence to Codex Bezae (D) for the Gospels and the Book of the Acts saying that it represents the readings of the so-called Western text, which, it is held, is the text that obtained quite universally in the second century.²⁷

Probably the next most prominent textual critic after Westcott and Hort, was H. F. von Soden, who divided all manuscripts into three groups: H--Egypt; I--Palestine and the West; K--Byzantine tradition. Thus he corrected Westcott and Hort's theory of the Neutral text, apart from the Alexandrian.²⁸ However, von Soden's three groups, although they helped to correct one misunderstanding of Westcott and Hort, were not satisfactory for long. In 1926, one of the greatest textual critics of the century propounded a new theory with regard to the origin of the textual families. It was the opinion of B. H.

²⁵Frederic Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1949), p. 243.

²⁶Robertson, Studies in the Text of the New Testament, p. 92.

²⁷William F. Arndt, "The Chief Principles of New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, V (August, 1934), 580.

²⁸Arndt, "A Definite Need in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism," p. 182.

Streeter that in ancient times (ca. 200 A. D.) local texts had arisen in various centers of Christendom, which are still reflected in the Old Latin, Syrian, and Egyptian versions. Later these texts were composited in the East under the influence of Constantinople and in the West in the Vulgate, which was as influential as the earlier Old Latin. From the East came the Caesarean (Theta) and the Antiochian (sy^s and sy^c) texts; from the West came the Italian-Gallic (bff²) and the African (ke). The Lucian recension (ca. 310 A.D.), the mother of the textus receptus, is a composite of the Alexandrian, Antiochian, and Western texts.²⁹ So Streeter proposed five geographically located families: the Alexandrian (B, Aleph, L); the Italian-Gallic (Dabff²); the African (ke^{Mk}); the Antiochian (Old Syriac); and the Caesarean (Theta).³⁰ The new family which he proposed (the Caesarean) has been shown since 1926, to possess very strong claims to consideration.³¹ Streeter's findings have not, to be sure, met with universal acceptance. Some scholars feel, for example, that there is an apparent connection between the Old Latin and the Old Syrian traditions; that there are more similarities than would have originated in the Greek predecessors; and that Streeter did not take this apparent

²⁹Heinrich J. Vogels, Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1955), p. 206.

³⁰Streeter, op. cit., p. 145.

³¹Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, p. 65.

similarity into consideration.³² In general, however, Streeter's work has made valuable contributions to the science of textual criticism.

Today the history and methods of textual criticism seem more complicated than ever before. The trend at the present time is away from the genealogical methods of Westcott and Hort and Streeter.³³ Instead of a state of orderly descent, though with an ever-widening genealogical pedigree, from the original autographs to the extant copies of the fourth century, one seems to see a period of increasing disorder, from which a state of comparative order was ultimately produced when the Church reached more settled conditions.³⁴ The discovery of P46 complicates the situation even more. It seems that textual critics today may have to use it as constituting a separate unit by itself beside the five local text groups that Streeter has isolated.³⁵

Modern criticism, with the discovery of P46, stands before the barrier of the second century, the age, so it seems, of unbounded liberties with the text.³⁶ Critics realize today

³²Vogels, op. cit., p. 206.

³³Walter H. Lutz, "Variant Readings in the Text of First Corinthians on the Basis of P46" (Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1948), p. 5.

³⁴Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 244.

³⁵Arndt, "A Definite Need in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism," p. 185.

³⁶G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: British Academy by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 11.

more than ever that one cannot categorize all the rules of textual criticism into neat pigeon-holes and judge each reading coldly and mechanically according to an inviolable set of rules. Each reading has to be evaluated on its own merit and be judged on its own worth. This does not mean, however, that textual criticism today is subjective, i.e., arbitrary and incapable of objective verification for the mere reason that it is not mechanical.³⁷ The present-day critic must be thoroughly acquainted with the labor that has been done before his time and bring all possible available knowledge into play as he brings the text of the New Testament canon ever closer to the text of the autographs.

On the basis of the preceding information, the following canons of textual criticism will be employed in evaluating the text of P46 in the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians according to the Nestle text:

1. That reading is most likely to be correct which is found in the best manuscripts.
2. That reading which was most widespread is entitled to our approval.
3. That reading is likely to be correct which cannot easily be traced back to the unintentional alteration of a copyist.
4. That reading is likely to be the correct one of which it seems clear that it has not arisen through the intentional alteration of a copyist.
5. That reading is likely to be the correct one which best agrees with the style and diction and other

³⁷Ibid., p. 12.

characteristics of the author in question.³⁸

The last canon is not easy to apply. But as Robertson observes, scribes often have a wooden tendency to weed out an author's peculiarities.³⁹

³⁸Arndt, "The Chief Principles of New Testament Textual Criticism," pp. 578-81.

³⁹Robertson, An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 161-62.

CHAPTER IV

P46 IN THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

In the present chapter each of the variant readings in P46 included in the Nestle text (twenty-first edition) will be studied on the basis of the five canons of criticism quoted at the end of Chapter III. Rather than repeat each of the canons with each reading, the number of each paragraph in the following discussions will refer to the corresponding number of the canon quoted in the last chapter. Each reading which Nestle includes will be considered chapter by chapter and verse by verse. The final conclusions follow at the end of the complete list of readings.

1:6-7 καὶ σωτηρίας εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν, καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. P46 H r vg sy^p text.

τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν, καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας. Brc. καὶ σωτηρίας τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν, καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας. R D Gal it.

1. The four chief uncials (Aleph, B, D, and P46) are divided evenly for and against the reading of P46.
2. In the area of geographical distribution the manuscripts are again about evenly divided for and against P46.
3. In all probability an intentional change has not been made since there is no particularly difficult reading which would indicate a change to try to simplify it.
4. The variant readings are apparently due to homoioteleuton, since the phrase *ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως* occurs twice. Evidently the scribe of B skipped a line in the manuscript from which he was copying or was copying from a manuscript which already had this error, and he or someone else inserted the missing phrase elsewhere.

Lietzmann observes that the original text is undoubtedly the text which Nestle incorporates. This reading alone fits the context. The error was obviously made by a scribe's skipping a line between the first and the second *παρακλήσεως*.¹ Both Nicoll² and Meyer³ agree with this conclusion in their commentaries.

5. Little can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is evenly divided; hence little can be concluded on these grounds. The internal

¹Hans Lietzmann, An die Korinther: I und II, Vol. IX in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Guenther Bornkamm (Tuebingen: Paul Siebeck, 1949), p. 100.

²W. Robertson Nicoll, editor, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in The Expositor's Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 38.

³Heinrich A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, translated from the fifth edition of the German by D. Douglas Bannerman, translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884), VI, 415.

evidence points to an error due to homoioteleuton.

Correct reading: text with P46.

1:9 ἐγείροντι - text. ἐγείραντι - P46 326 a1.

1. The majority of the uncials favor the reading of the text against P46.
2. The geographical distribution overwhelmingly favors the reading of the text.
3. Perhaps the copyist of P46 changed the present participle to the aorist to refer to the past raisings from the dead, i.e., Christ's and others (νεκρούς), whereas Paul wrote the present tense referring to Christ's resurrection and ours.
4. Perhaps the copyist of P46 read or heard α for ο.
5. St. Paul uses the present and aorist participles of ἐγείρω about equally.

Conclusion: Since P46 stands alone, except for one minuscule, the reading of P46 can probably best be explained by the scribe's reading α for ο. Correct reading: text against P46.

With this conclusion Lietzmann agrees.⁴

1:10 τηλικούτου θανάτου - text. τηλικούτων θανάτων - P46

1739. 2005. (1a7) sy Or. Ambst.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with Nestle's text.
2. The reading of the Nestle text has a wider geographic distribution.
3. Perhaps the copyist felt that the plural fit better with the previous τοὺς νεκρούς.
4. The variant could hardly be explained as a slip of the pen.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

⁴Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 101.

Conclusion: Perhaps the variant can best be explained in that P46's scribe changed the singular to the plural to agree with τούς νεκρούς .

Correct reading: text against P46.

1:10 καὶ ῥύεταί - text. P46 5al vg^{codd}. καὶ ῥύεταί. B Gpm. vg^{cl}

Omit - AD^{syf}.

1. The majority of the uncials uphold the reading of the text.
2. Geography favors the reading of the text.
3. Perhaps those manuscripts that omitted the phrase did so because they felt it was an insertion of a marginal note. Perhaps the reading ῥύεταί was made thus because someone felt that a previous scribe had made a mistake by copying the ῥύεταί in the next line.
4. Perhaps the reading ῥύεταί is an inadvertent omission of the σ.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Regardless of the reasons for the reading ῥύεταί and the omission, the reading of the text has by far the best attestation since the Byzantine family, G and vg^{cl}, are late readings and the omission is limited to one good Western manuscript (D) and two late, poor manuscripts (A and syP). All three readings make sense. If one chooses ῥύεταί one has to explain why it has such poor attestation. If one chooses ῥύεταί, however, one can explain both of the other variants-- ῥύεταί because the scribe felt that ῥύεταί was a homoioteleuton and the omission for the same reason.

Correct reading: text and P46. Both Lietzmann⁵ and Nicoll⁶ agree with this conclusion.

1:10 [ὅτι] ΗΚ (56) pl. lat. Omit - P46 B D* 1739 Or.

1. The majority of uncials agree with P46.
2. The two readings are about evenly divided geographically.
3. It sees that the ὅτι was deliberately inserted to make it clear that the phrase following was still part of the preceding line of thought and the object of ἠλπίζαμεν.
4. The reading was probably not omitted unintentionally since this would make the reading more difficult. It may have been inserted unintentionally since the word is what one would expect at this place.
5. St. Paul uses ὅτι with an indirect statement three times, and twice he uses subject accusative and infinitive.

Conclusion: Since the attestation for either reading is about equally strong, we have to turn to internal evidence. Since omitting the ὅτι makes the reading more difficult, it is probably the correct reading.

Correct reading: P46 against the text.

1:11 ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων - text. ἐν πολλῷ προσώπῳ - P466M
1739. ἐν προσώπῳ πολλῶν - 256 p. r.

1. The majority of the uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text is more widely distributed geographically.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Nicoll, op. cit., p. 41.

3. It would seem that the difficult reading of P46 is made much easier in the other manuscripts. The reading of minuscule 256 is probably a conflation.
4. Perhaps the reading found in P46 is due to the mistake of a sleepy scribe.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both Lietzmann⁷ and Nicoll⁸ agree that the reading of the text is the original.

Correct reading: text against P46.

1:11 ἡμῶν - text. ὑμῶν - P46* B R a l.

1. The uncials are evenly divided between the readings of P46 and the text.
2. The two readings are about evenly divided geographically.
3. Perhaps the text was changed from ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν to agree with εἰς ἡμᾶς. But it was hardly changed from ἡμῶν to ὑμῶν, which would make it more difficult.
4. Either change is possible since the two words are so similar and both make sense.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since the external evidence is so closely balanced, the internal evidence must be the criterion. ὑμῶν is the more difficult reading by a slight margin; hence it is perhaps correct.

Correct reading: P46 against the text.

1:12 ἀγιότητι - text. P46 5 6 9 pc. r. C l O t θ ἀπλότητι - R D G pl. latsy.

⁷Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 101.

⁸Nicoll, op. cit., p. 42.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the text.
2. The reading which disagrees with the text is more widely distributed geographically.
3. There is no obvious reason for an intentional change since both make sense.
4. Since the change consists of only two letters, the change is probably unintentional.
5. St. Paul uses the word ἀπλότης oftener than ἀγιότης.

Conclusion: Lietzmann observes that ἀγιότητι could come from a scribal error ΑΠΛΟΤΗΤΙ, misread as ΑΠΟΤΗΤΙ and copied again as ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ. On the other hand, ἀπλότηςτι could have come from ἀγιότητι in the same way. However, the corresponding σοφία σαρκική agrees with the reading ἀπλότηςτι.⁹

Correct reading: probably DG against text and P46.

1:12 Omits καὶ - text. Has καὶ - P46 B 69 a1. v9.

1. The uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text is more widely distributed geographically.
3. Since both readings make sense equally well, the change is probably unintentional.
4. It is just as plausible to say that the καὶ was inadvertently omitted or inserted.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: One must turn to external evidence. The reading of the text has a very slightly better reading.

Correct reading: perhaps the text against P46.

⁹Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 101.

1:13 ἀλλ' ἢ ἀ-text / ἀλλ' ἢ - D* 1739 pc | ἀλλ' ἀ - P46 33 / ἢ ἀ - G (ex lat?)

1. The chief uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text is confined to a smaller geographical area than those readings against it.
3. Perhaps the ἢ was omitted from P46 when the following correlative ἢ was omitted. On the other hand, perhaps an ἢ was inserted when the marginal note ἐπιγνώσκετε was inserted.
4. An unintentional omission is more plausible than an unintentional insertion.
5. No conclusion can be reached on the basis of style.

Conclusion: ἀλλ' ἢ and ἢ ἀ can be omitted because of poor attestation. But since both these readings include the ἢ and only P46 omits it, the ἢ probably is original. Since only one very poor manuscript (G) omits the ἀλλ', it too belongs. The ἀ is omitted only by D* and 1739 and if omitted would make a nigh impossible reading.

Correct reading: text against P46.

1:13 ἢ καὶ ἐπιγνώσκετε - text. Omit - P46 BPC.

1. The uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has a wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps it was omitted because it looked like a marginal note taken into the text.
4. Perhaps the reading was omitted due to homoioteleuton. On the other hand, perhaps it was inserted as a marginal note.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is slightly in favor

of the reading of the text. The internal evidence favors the reading in the Nestle text. In addition, since the previous ^h had such good attestation, it would seem that its correlative would have equal attestation. Only P46 omits both ^h and ^h.

Correct reading: text against P46.

1:14 ἡμῶν - text. Omits - P46 A C R D pm.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no necessity either for adding or omitting the reading deliberately.
4. Since both readings are correct and common, the word could have been either omitted or added unintentionally.
5. Nothing can be concluded from St. Paul's style.

Conclusion: Internal evidence is about equal on both sides and the external evidence, although spread more widely geographically in agreement with P46, is weak. But the reading of P46 is probably correct.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

1:17 τὸ αἶναι καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ - text. τὸ αἶναι καὶ τὸ οὐ - P46 424^a vg.

1. The majority of the major uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text is more widely distributed geographically.
3. Perhaps the scribe of P46 or of an earlier manuscript changed the reading to agree with v. 19. The Vulgate may be influenced by the same tradition.

4. It doesn't seem that an unintentional omission of addition is plausible.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: All the evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46. With this conclusion Lietzmann agrees.¹⁰

1:18 δ (before $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$ $\delta\upsilon\alpha\acute{s}$)-text. Omit-P46D*

1. The uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text is more widely distributed geographically.
3. Perhaps the reading of the text is an intentional insertion because it is better Greek, but it is hardly an intentional omission.
4. It could have been unintentionally omitted because it is only one letter, or it could have been unintentionally inserted because it is better Greek.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is about equal on both sides. External evidence is very slightly in favor of the text.

Correct reading: perhaps text against P46.

1:19 $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}s$ $\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ -text. δ^* AC. $\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ -P46BRDGpl.

1. The major uncials favor the reading of P46.
2. The reading of P46 has a wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for making an intentional change.
4. The error is probably due to a slip of the pen.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 103.

5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The evidence is slightly in favor of the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

1:22 δ (before $\kappa\alpha\iota$)-text. P46 BFD (^sGit) pm. Omit - $\delta\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\alpha\iota$.

1. The major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the article was omitted because $\delta\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\alpha\iota$ has no article.
4. Perhaps the article was inadvertantly omitted because it consists of only one letter.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external and internal evidence point to the Nestle reading.

Correct reading: text with P46.

2:1 $\delta\epsilon$ -text. $\gamma\alpha\rho$ - P46 B69Pc.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Since both readings make about equal sense, a scribe could have felt that either $\delta\epsilon$ or $\gamma\alpha\rho$ was better and changed it.
4. A scribe could have inadvertantly changed one for the other since both make about equal sense.
5. Nothing definite can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points very slightly to the Nestle reading.

Correct reading: perhaps the text against P46.

2:16 *Has 2 ἐκ's - P46⁵ 69pc. Cl. Or. Omits both - R D G pl. In.^{1st}.*

1. The major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the widest geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the scribe thought the sentence made better sense with or without the ἐκ.
4. A scribe would hardly insert or omit both ἐκ's unintentionally.
5. St. Paul uses ὁσμή and the genitive once with ἐκ and once without it.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is unclear. External evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text with P46. Both Lietzmann¹¹ and Nicoll¹² agree with this conclusion.

2:17 πολλοὶ - text. λοιποὶ - P46 R D G al sy Mcion.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. Geographical distribution favors the reading of P46.
3. The word καπηλεύω has two meanings (peddle and adulterate). It is possible that one scribe was acquainted only with the meaning "to adulterate" and hence changed λοιποὶ to πολλοὶ. Perhaps λοιποὶ was too all-inclusive.
4. The reading of either is hardly due to an unintentional change.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

¹¹Ibid., p. 109.

¹²Nicoll, op. cit., p. 51.

Conclusion: The evidence all seems to point to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

3:3 Omits καὶ (before ἐγγεγραμμένη)-text. Has καὶ-P46B pc. vg.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. The sentence reads more smoothly without the καὶ; perhaps it was therefore left out. It would hardly have been inserted intentionally. καὶ is, therefore, the more difficult reading.
4. It would hardly have been inserted unintentionally since the reading is smoother without the καὶ, but it may well have been left out unintentionally.
5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is about even. The internal evidence points to the retention of the καὶ.

Correct reading: probably P46 against text.

3:6 ἀποκτείνει-text. Bpc. / ἀποκτενεῖ-P46*ACRDa1 / ἀποκτείνει-P46^c56Ka1.

1. The major uncials do not favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the reading was ἀποκτενεῖ and a scribe changed it to the present tense to make it agree with σωποιεῖ, or to ἀποκτείνει because it was the only one of the two alternate forms he knew, or vice versa.
4. Since each change is a change of only one letter, any of the three could be plausible.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

3:9 ἡ διακονία - text. Β R¹⁸ it. vj.⁴¹ τῇ διακονίᾳ - P46 5 D G al itsy

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of P46.
2. The two readings are about equally divided between the two readings geographically.
3. Perhaps a change was made to the dative to make a chiasm. Perhaps a change was made to the nominative to agree with ἡ διακονία in the next line.
4. Perhaps the τ was inadvertently left out or inserted.
5. Nothing can be concluded from the author's style.

Conclusion: Since the external evidence points to the dative and since St. Paul was a man who could probably appreciate the literary value of a chiasm, the dative is probably the correct reading.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

3:18 κατοπτριζόμενοι - text. κατοπτριζόμεθα οἱ - P46 (33 Or¹).

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps an earlier scribe misread κατοπτριζόμεθα οἱ for κατοπτριζόμενοι and the scribe of P46 changed μεταμορφούμεθα to the participle to agree with the οἱ. Or perhaps an earlier scribe had read μεταμορφούμενοι for μεταμορφούμεθα and the scribe of P46 changed κατοπτριζόμενοι to κατοπτριζόμεθα οἱ.
4. Probably both are not unintentional changes but only one, and some scribe tried to correct it to make a smooth Greek sentence.

5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since P46 is the only major manuscript to have either *κατοπτρισόμεθα* or *μεταμορφούμενοι* the reading of the text is the correct one in both instances.

Correct reading: text against P46.

3:18 *μεταμορφούμεθα* - text. *μεταμορφούμενοι* - P46 A Or^P.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. (Cf. the last reading for a discussion of the rest of this variant.)

4:2 *συνιστάνοντες* - text. P46 B P 16/1a1. *συνιστάντες* - א' C D* Gpc
συνιστάνοντες - R P m.

1. The major uncials are equally divided for and against the reading of P46.
2. The readings which oppose P46 have the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the aorist participle was changed to the present to agree with the other present participles. There hardly would have been an intentional change to the aorist.
4. Perhaps the *-ον-* was inadvertantly omitted from the present participle, which is the easier reading.
5. St. Paul uses the two participles about an equal number of times.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is about equal. The external evidence points very slightly to the reading of Aleph and D*. The same variant readings occur in Chapter six, verse four.¹³

¹³Infra, p. 53.

Correct reading: Aleph and D* against text and P46.

4:5 $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\iota\nu$ $\text{In}\sigma\omicron\nu$ -text. $\text{In}\sigma\omicron\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\iota\nu$ -P46; ACD lat.

1. The major uncials agree in the majority with the reading of the text against P46.
2. The reading of P46 against the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Either reading could be the result of an unintentional change.
5. St. Paul uses both readings interchangeably.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

4:5 $\text{In}\sigma\omicron\nu$ -text. $\text{In}\sigma\omicron\nu$ -P46 X* C p c M cion.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The geographic distribution favors the reading of the text.
3. Perhaps a scribe felt that the phrase $\delta\iota\alpha$ $\text{In}\sigma\omicron\nu$ did not fit Paul's theology.
4. The ν could have been either omitted or added inadvertently. Perhaps the genitive was changed to the accusative by reason of homoioteleuton from the line above.
5. St. Paul uses both forms.

Conclusion: The internal evidence points to P46 very slightly, but the external evidence points to the text.

Correct reading: probably text against P46, but very doubtful. Nicoll accepts the reading of the text.¹⁴

¹⁴Nicoll, op. cit., p. 61.

4:6 λάμψει - text. P46^x* B A D* C I sy λάμψαι - C R G pl. lat. Mcion.

1. The major uncials all have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Either reading could have been changed to the other depending upon whether the scribe thought direct or indirect statements were better.
4. An ε could easily be mistaken for an α or vice versa.
5. St. Paul uses both constructions in his epistles.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text and of P46.

Correct reading: P46 with text. With this conclusion Nicoll agrees.¹⁵

4:6 τοῦ θεοῦ - text. αὐτοῦ - P46* C* D* G it Mcion.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps αὐτοῦ was changed to make it clear to whom it was referred. But τοῦ θεοῦ would hardly have been changed to αὐτοῦ.
4. Perhaps τοῦ θεοῦ was a marginal reading explaining αὐτοῦ, which was incorporated into the text.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is about equal. The internal evidence points to the reading of P46 as the more difficult reading.

¹⁵Ibid.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

4:6 Omits Ἰησοῦ (before Χριστοῦ) - text. BA33 Mcion Or
Has Ἰησοῦ - P46 XCR pl. (SDG 1739 lat.).

1. The major uncials favor the reading of P46.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Either an inadvertant omission or addition is possible.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since the internal evidence is inconclusive and the evidence for the inclusion of Ἰησοῦ is stronger according to external evidence (although D inverts the two), the probable correct reading is P46 against the text.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

4:11 $\alpha\epsilon\iota$ - text. $\epsilon\iota$ - P46 G sy^P Iv. Text. Ambst.

1. The major uncials favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe thought that $\epsilon\iota$ was a mistake because there is no main clause to complete the sentence if the first clause is conditional. It is very unlikely that a scribe would have changed $\alpha\epsilon\iota$ to $\epsilon\iota$ since this would make a much more difficult reading.
4. The α could have been dropped inadvertantly and the $\epsilon\iota$ continued because the latter makes sense, although it is more difficult.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence shows that the reading of P46 is more difficult, but the external evidence points

strongly to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

4:14 Omits κύριον - text. Has κύριον - P46 B 33 p.c.v. vg. Or. Tert.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for either an intentional addition or omission.
4. The word could have been either inserted or omitted unintentionally, since both are common.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since the internal evidence is inconclusive, the external evidence must be the deciding factor. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

4:17 Omits ἡμῶν (after θλίψεως) - text. P46 B sy^p Chr. Has ἡμῶν x^e K D.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the ἡμῶν was added for clarity and to agree with the ἡμῶν.
4. Perhaps the word was left out by a slip of the pen.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence would point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

5:3 εἰ γε - text. εἴπερ - P46 BDG pc

1. The major uncials agree with the reading of P46 except for Aleph.
2. The two readings are about equally divided as far as geographical distribution is concerned.
3. Probably a scribe thought one was grammatically better.
4. Perhaps it is an unintentional error, but it is more likely that it is an intentional change.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

5:10 διὰ - text. ἰδιὰ - P46. 623. lat. Or^p

1. The majority of the major uncials contain the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe felt that ἰδιὰ was more doctrinally correct than διὰ since the reading of the text might infer salvation through works. This, however, is a weak argument.
4. The iota could easily have been dropped unintentionally or it could have been added since ἰδιὰ is such a common idiom.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive, but since P46 is the only major manuscript that has ἰδιὰ, the reading of the text is probably correct.

Correct reading: text against P46. Vogels agrees with

this conclusion.¹⁶

5:10 φαῦλον - text. κρσ. κακὸν - P46 B R D G P1.

1. The uncials agree with the reading of P46 except for Aleph.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. κακὸν is much more common than φαῦλον, so would hardly be changed to φαῦλον.
4. Perhaps φαῦλον is a gloss which was incorporated into the text.
5. κακὸν is much more common in the epistles of St. Paul.

Conclusion: External evidence points to the reading of P46. Internal evidence is inconclusive.

Correct reading: P46 against text. Nicoll remarks that φαῦλον is probably an early change introduced from the Epistle to the Romans, chapter nine, verse eleven.¹⁷

5:12 ἡμῶν - text. ὑμῶν - P46 B X P C.

1. The reading of P46 is supported by two other major uncials.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. ὑμῶν might have been changed to ἡμῶν since it fits much better into the context. But hardly would ἡμῶν have been changed to ὑμῶν.
4. The ὑμῶν might have been written by mistake for or vice versa.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

¹⁶Heinrich J. Vogels, Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1955), p. 163.

¹⁷Nicoll, op. cit., p. 67.

Conclusion: Both the external evidence and the internal evidence are very inconclusive. However, both Lietzmann¹⁸ and Nicoll¹⁹ favor the reading of the text very strongly.

Correct reading: probably text against P46.

5:16 εἰ καὶ-text. P46. B^x* D^x PC | εἰ δὲ-K | εἰδὲ και-C P P m C l | καὶ εἰ-G IatsyP

1. All four major uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for a deliberate change.
4. Probably εἰ δὲ was written by mistake for εἰ καὶ and the Koine tradition made a conflation.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since the reading of the text has the strongest external witness (the readings of K and G being very weak) and the Koine tradition seems to have a conflation, and the internal evidence is inconclusive, the reading of the text is probably correct.

Correct reading: text and P46. Meyer agrees with this conclusion.²⁰

5:19 τὸν λόγον-text. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον-P46 εὐαγγέλιον τὸν λόγον (D*) G.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided for and against the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical

¹⁸Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 124.

¹⁹Nicoll, op. cit., p. 69.

²⁰Meyer, op. cit., p. 506.

distribution.

3. Perhaps λόγον was changed to εὐαγγέλιου for clarification.
4. The marginal reading εὐαγγέλιον might have been incorporated into the text by mistake.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The readings of D and G are probably conflation. The reading of the text is probably correct since P46 stands alone and λόγον is the more difficult reading.

Correct reading: text against P46.

6:4 συνιστάνοντες - text B Pa1 συνιστάντες - P46 X* C D* G pc C1
 συνιστῶντες - K pm.

1. The majority of the major uncials have the reading of P46.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps an epistolary aorist was changed to a present participle or vice versa. The present would agree with the previous διδόντες.
4. Perhaps the -ον- was inadvertantly omitted.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since internal evidence is inconclusive and external evidence points to the aorist, it is probably correct.

Correct reading: P46 against text. This same reading occurs in Chapter four, verse two.²¹

6:16 ἡμεῖς εσμεν - text. ὑμεῖς εστε - P46 C R G pm sy

1. The majority of the major uncials favor the reading

²¹Supra, p. 45.

of the text.

2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the ἡμεῖς was changed to ὑμεῖς to agree with the imperative at the beginning of the paragraph. But hardly would the ὑμεῖς be changed to ἡμεῖς.
4. It is difficult to imagine that the two words would both be changed inadvertently.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since ἡμεῖς is the more difficult reading and the external evidence points to ἡμεῖς, it is probably the correct one.

Correct reading: text against P46.

7:1 φόβω - text. ἀγάπη - P46.

1. The majority of the uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the scribe of P46 was not well acquainted with the Biblical use of φόβος θεοῦ and changed it to ἀγάπη. But an intentional change would hardly have been made to φόβω.
4. This is hardly an unintentional change.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

7:5 ἔσχηκεν - text. ἔσχεν - P46 B6K.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.

2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the reading was changed from the aorist to the perfect to denote past action with present implications. Or perhaps it was changed to the aorist to denote that the action is past and complete. The perfect would be the more logical.
4. Perhaps the -ικ- was inadvertently left out.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since the internal evidence is inconclusive, the external evidence must be the criterion. It points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

7:8 βλέπω-text BD* Ambst | βλέπω γάρ-ξC R Gpl. itsy | βλέπων-P46^c vj.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided for and against the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the γάρ was inserted intentionally when a scribe considered the end of the sentence to be *μεταμελόμην* instead of *μεταμέλομαι*.
4. Perhaps the γάρ was inadvertently omitted.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: P46 is weakly attested. BD and Aleph C are about of equal value, but the reading of Aleph C has a wider geographic attestation than BD.

Correct reading: Aleph C against P46. Both Lietzmann²²

²²Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 131.

and Meyer²³ agree with this conclusion.

7:11 ἐπιποθέσθαι - text. ἐπιποθείαν - P46 δ* 1 1611* 2005.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Since both words mean the same thing, either could have been changed to the other. It is possible that the reading of P46 was the original and was changed to the reading of the text to agree with the same word in verse eleven. On the other hand, the scribe might have remembered the word in the Epistle to the Romans, chapter fifteen, verse twenty-three, and changed the reading of the text to that of P46.
4. It is possible that a scribe misread or didn't hear one of the words correctly.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

7:14 ἐπὶ Τίτου - text B δ* pc | ἢ ἐπὶ Τίτου - P46 C R p^m | ἢ πρὸς Τίτου - D G Pal latsy.

1. The major uncials are divided equally for and against the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. The ἢ could have just as easily been inserted as omitted unintentionally, since both are correct.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

²³Meyer, op. cit., p. 558.

Conclusion: The $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ has poor attestation. The internal evidence for the other two readings is about equal. Although the reading of P46 has a wider geographical distribution, the reading of the text is better.

Correct reading: text against P46.

8:2 $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ - text. $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ - P46 D* pc.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Both readings would be grammatically correct, but perhaps a scribe thought one would fit the sense better.
4. Since it is only the difference of one letter that is involved, either could have been changed inadvertently.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

8:7 $\tilde{\eta}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ - text + P46 B69 a. r. sy^p Or | $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ - X C R D G p m. l a t s y^h

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of Aleph C has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. The reading could have been changed either way because of the similarity in sound.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The

external evidence points very slightly toward the reading of Aleph C.

Correct reading: probably Aleph C against P46, B and text, but a very difficult reading.

8:16 δίδούτι - text. δούτι - P46 D G L P m.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the present was changed to the epistolary aorist or vice versa.
4. The first two letters of the participle could have been dropped inadvertently.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence and external evidence both seem to point to the present tense.

Correct reading: text against P46. Meyer agrees with this conclusion.²⁴

8:19 ἐν - text. σὺν - P46 X̄ R̄ D G P m it sy.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of P46.
2. The reading in P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. The reading of P46 would be a difficult reading, since σὺν usually means "along with." It is possible that a scribe changed it to an easier reading. Perhaps he was influenced by the previous συνέκδημος.
4. It is hardly an unintentional change.

²⁴Ibid., p. 577.

5. *σὺν χάριτι* occurs nowhere else in St. Paul.

Conclusion: Since the external evidence points to the reading of P46 and the internal evidence suggests that *σὺν* is the more difficult reading, it is probably correct.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

8:21 *προνοούμεν γὰρ* - text. P46 ἢ DG al. | *προνοούμενοι*
 K al. | *προνοούμενοι γὰρ* - C 69 a | C 1.

1. All four of the major uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the verb was changed to a participle to agree with the previous participle *στέλλόμενοι*.
4. The *-αι* could have been added unintentionally or it could have just as easily been dropped.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is about equal for and against the text. The external evidence is strongly in favor of the text.

Correct reading: text with P46. Meyer comes to the same conclusion.²⁵

9:1 *περισσόν* - text. *περισσότερον* - P46.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.

²⁵Ibid.

3. The comparative does not make much sense and hence a change would not be from the comparative to the adverb.
4. It is conceivable that a sleepy scribe could have written the comparative without thinking.
5. There is nothing that can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point strongly to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

9:2 το (before *ὑμῶν*) - text. P46 B^x pc. | δ-C R D G pl.

1. The major uncials agree with the text except for D.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe wasn't aware of the use of the word *ῥήσος* in both the neuter and the masculine genders.
4. Perhaps the τ could have been added or dropped unintentionally.
5. St. Paul uses the masculine five times and the neuter twice.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of the text. The fact that St. Paul usually uses the masculine would make the neuter the more difficult reading.

Correct reading: text and P46. Nicoll also accepts this reading.²⁶

9:4 λέγωμεν - text. λέγω - P46 C* D G it. Ambst.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.

²⁶Nicoll, op. cit., p. 91.

2. The two readings are about evenly divided as far as geographical distribution is concerned.
3. There is no reason for a change since St. Paul uses both the singular and the plural of the first person in the context.
4. Perhaps the - $\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ could have been unintentionally omitted by a careless scribe.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal and external evidence are both equal, but the external evidence points very slightly to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

9:5 *Has kai (before $\mu\eta$)-text. Omits kai - P46 X* G latt sy^P*

1. The major uncials are divided equally for and against the text.
2. The geographical distribution favors the reading of P46.
3. There is no reason either to omit or add the *kai*.
4. The *kai* could have just as easily been omitted or added since both are good Greek.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is about even and the external evidence is slightly in favor of the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

9:8 *$\delta\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau$ - text P46 5 D* G | $\delta\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ - 33pc | $\delta\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ - R pl.*

1. The major uncials all favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. The readings against the text are probably not intentional.

4. The readings of 33 and the Koine are probably slips of the pen.

5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of the text. The internal evidence is inconclusive.

Correct reading: text and P46.

9:10 σπέρμα - text. σπόρον - P46 B D* G

1. The majority of the major uncials favor the reading of P46.
2. The two readings are about evenly divided geographically.
3. Perhaps a scribe felt that one of the words was better Greek than the other.
4. Perhaps the change is due to homoioteleuton in the next line.
5. If the reading of P46 is correct, this verse would be the only time that he uses the word.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of P46. The internal evidence is divided: σπόρον is the more difficult word but it could be a case of homoioteleuton. In view of the external evidence, the reading of P46 is probably correct.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

9:10 χορηγήσει καὶ πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν καὶ αὐξήσει - text.
 χορηγήσαι καὶ πληθύναι τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν καὶ αὐξήσαι - R (G) pl.
 χορηγήσει καὶ πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν καὶ αὐξήσαι - P46.

1. The majority of the major uncials favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical

distribution.

3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. The readings of the Koine tradition and P46 are probably the results of a series of unintentional changes. Perhaps the Koine reading is a conflation.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

10:4 στρατείας-text P46 B^{al} C¹ D^r | στρατιῶν-^hC^R D^G P^m.

1. The major uncials are divided between the two readings.
2. The two readings are also divided about equally geographically.
3. The reading of the text is the easier reading, since a parallel to the word "army" is not mentioned in the context. Perhaps the reading of Aleph was changed to the reading of the text.
4. Probably the change is unintentional since it is a change of only one letter. It is more plausible that a letter was dropped than that it was added.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is divided. The external evidence points slightly to the reading of the text.

Probable correct reading: P46 and text against Aleph and C.

10:7 ἐφ' -text P46 B^X L^{pc} d^g | ἀφ' -C^R D^G P^l.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the text.
2. The readings are about equally divided geographically.
3. The reading of C is grammatically possible but would make a very difficult reading--"of his own accord."

It is very unlikely that 'αφ' would have been written as an intentional change.

4. The α could have been substituted unintentionally by a sleepy scribe.
5. The word ἀφ' is used by St. Paul but doesn't fit well into this context.

Conclusion: Both the internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46. Meyer also accepts this reading.²⁷

10:8 Has τε (after εἰς) - text. Omits - P46 B G H 33 a1.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Possibly the τε was inserted because the author felt it fit well into the context, but it was hardly omitted intentionally.
4. The word could have been dropped by a sleepy scribe, or it could have been inserted when the scribe's eye jumped to the εἰς of the line above.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46. Meyer also decides on this reading.²⁸

10:8 Omits ἡμῶν (before εἰς) - text P46 S D* P c | Has ἡμῶν - R G (5 Ppc) pl.

²⁷Meyer, op. cit., p. 615.

²⁸Ibid.

1. All four major uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason to add or to omit the word.
4. Perhaps it was intentionally added or omitted by a sleepy scribe. Both would sound natural.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

11:3 [καὶ τῆς ἀγνόητος]-text P46 δ (^sD) Galitsy^h | Omits-HP
R 1739 pm. vg. sy. Cl. Or.

1. All four uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for intentionally omitting it or for inserting it unless as a marginal note.
4. It is possibly an included marginal note, but perhaps some scribe thought it so and omitted it. It is possible that it was omitted because of the similarity to ἀπρόστατος, by reason of homoioteleuton. It almost looks like a conflation of early variants.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence would point to the exclusion of the phrase, but the external evidence is strongly in favor of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46. However, Lietzmann disagrees and says that this is one of the few cases where the Koine tradition has the original over against Aleph and B.²⁹

²⁹Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 145.

11:3 Omits τὸν (before χριστὸν) - text X6 1611.1739pm / Has τὸν - P46 B7D a1 C1.

1. Three of the major uncials disagree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of P46 is favored by geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason either to add or to omit the article.
4. The article could have been either added or omitted unintentionally since both would be good Greek.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

11:4 ἀνέχεσθε - text. B⁰ P46. 33. pc sa sy^p / ἀνειχεσθε - x̄ R G pm. vg.

1. The majority of the uncials have the reading of the text.
2. The two readings are divided about evenly as far as geographical distribution is concerned.
3. Possibly a change was made to the present tense to fit into the sentence structure, but there was hardly a change to the imperfect since this would make it a more difficult reading.
4. Since it is a difference of only one letter, the change is probably unintentional. An inadvertent change would have been possible either way.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence would suggest that the imperfect is the more difficult reading, but the external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46 against Aleph. Lietzmann remarks that if one used the imperfect, one would suddenly be

jumping into the conditional.³⁰

11:18 [τὴν] (ὅσον σάρκα)-B $\bar{\rho}$ pm. | Omits - P46 5 D Gal.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of P46.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason to add or omit the word intentionally.
4. The word could have been added or omitted unintentionally since both readings are natural Greek.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Internal evidence is inconclusive. External evidence points to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text. This is also the reading that Lietzmann adopts.³¹

11:23 φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως - P46 BD* lat. txt. | πληγαῖς περισσοτέρως ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως - s $\bar{\kappa}$ * G.
 πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως - H $\bar{\kappa}$ pl. sy.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Perhaps this is a case of homoioteleuton.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid., p. 149.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text with P46. Nicoll adopts this reading also.³²

11:27 διψει - text. διψη - P46 B* H P c.

1. The major uncials are divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Quite possibly the scribe was not acquainted with the late form διψει and wrote the more archaic form, διψη.
4. Since both forms sound alike to the ear, either one could have been written by a scribe listening to a reader.
5. The word is a hapax legomenon in St. Paul's epistles.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence indicates that the reading of the text is correct.

Correct reading: text against P46.

11:30 Ηαs μου (before ναυηρομαi) - text. Omits μου - P46 B H.

1. The major uncials are divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason to make an intentional change since both make sense. Perhaps a scribe thought that μου clarified it slightly.
4. Perhaps a scribe inadvertently inserted it since the sentence sounds natural with the addition.

³²Nicoll, op. cit., p. 105.

5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:1 δετ - text. P46 Ἡ GLpm. ιατςγ | δε̇ - κ D* | δη̇ - R a l.

1. The uncials are divided equally for and against the reading of the text.
2. The readings for and against the text are about equally divided geographically.
3. Perhaps the δε̇ changed from δετ to agree with the following μέν.
4. Perhaps a scribe unintentionally wrote δε̇ to agree with the following μέν. The reading of the Koine tradition could well be due to a scribe's writing by ear, since both words sound alike.
5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46 against Aleph, D, and the Koine tradition. This is also the reading that Lietzmann accepts.³³

12:1 συμφέρον μὲν - text. P46 Ἡ GFVg | συμφέρει μοι - H R p l
itsy^h | συμφέρει - D sy l

1. The majority of the major uncials follow the reading of the text.
2. The readings for and against the text are about evenly divided.

³³Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 152.

3. There is no reason to make an intentional change. But perhaps a scribe changed it because this structure is strange to St. Paul. He usually uses the finite verb.
4. This is hardly an unintentional change, unless the scribe was very sleepy. Perhaps the omission of the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ in D is an influence from the Latin text.
5. St. Paul uses the participle without the article only here.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46. Lietzmann also accepts this reading.³⁴

12:1 $\delta\epsilon$ - text. P46 $\delta\epsilon$ pc lat / $\gamma\alpha\rho$ - R D pl. sy / $\delta\epsilon$ ka' - B.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided for and against the reading of the text.
2. The readings for and against the text are divided about evenly geographically.
3. Perhaps a scribe felt that $\gamma\alpha\rho$ fit the context better.
4. Perhaps the reading in B is unintentional.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. But the external evidence favors the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46. Nicoll agrees with this conclusion.³⁵

12:3 $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$ - text p46 B D* / $\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ - δ R G pl.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 152-53.

³⁵Nicoll, op. cit., p. 109.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the reading of the text was changed to agree with the previous $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in verse 2.
4. This is probably not an unintentional change.
5. St. Paul uses $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ only twice outside this verse, once in the previous verse, which could have influenced this one. St. Paul was enough of a man of letters to know how to vary his style by using a synonym.

Conclusion: The internal and external evidence both favor the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:3 [$\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \text{o}\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$] - text. P46 ARD Gpl / omit - B C D.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason to omit the phrase intentionally.
4. Perhaps the word was omitted because of homoioteleuton.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external and internal evidence both favor the inclusion of the phrase.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:5 $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}$ - text. $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\upsilon$ - P46.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.

3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. The -δεν could have been omitted or added by a careless scribe.
5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive.

The external evidence points strongly to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:5 Omits μου (last word) - text. BD* 33 pc. syl. Has μου - XFGpl.

1. The majority of the uncials favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps some scribe thought its addition was a clarification. Such insertions for smoothness or completeness are common.
4. The word could have been either added or omitted inadvertently.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Internal evidence is inconclusive. External evidence indicates that the reading of the text is correct.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:6 θελήσω καυχῆσθαι - text. θέλω καυχῆσθαι - P46.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text is favored by the geographical distribution.
3. If this is an intentional change, it would likely not be changed to the reading of P46, which is more difficult.

4. Possibly a sleepy scribe wrote *-σόμεν* by mistake.
5. St. Paul almost invariably uses the infinitive with *θέλω*.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence favor the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:6 Omits τὶ (before ἐς)-text. / Has τὶ - P46 R D* pm. it vg^{cl} sy^A

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading in P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe thought it clarified the sentence to add the word, but he hardly would have omitted it for the same reason.
4. Perhaps it was omitted by mistake, but to add it unintentionally is less plausible. Perhaps it is a marginal note taken into the text.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Internal and external evidence indicate slightly that the reading of P46 is correct.

Correct reading: P46 against text. Nicoll agrees.³⁶

12:7 Has δὶ (before ἰνα)-text / Omits - P46 R D pl. latsy Ir. Or.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading in P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe omitted it, considering the end of the verse to be ἐμοῦ. Perhaps a scribe added it for clarification.

³⁶Ibid., p. 110.

4. Hardly would this have been added or omitted unintentionally unless it was a marginal note that was added.

5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal and external evidence point slightly to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text. Lietzmann remarks that $\delta\iota\delta$ makes an almost impossible reading.³⁷ However, Nicoll says that $\delta\iota\delta$ is the best reading.³⁸

12:7 $\text{ἵνα μὴ ὀνεραῖρωμαι}$ - text. P46 B I K pl. sy Or. Tert. | Omit X* A D G pc. lat. It.

1. The major uncials are divided evenly between the two readings.
2. The two readings are also divided about evenly geographically.
3. Perhaps the phrase was omitted because a scribe thought it was a duplication of the same phrase above.
4. Perhaps it was included by copying the same phrase from above by mistake--homoioteleuton.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the text very slightly. Since the inclusion of the phrase is the more difficult reading, it is probably correct.

Correct reading: text and P46. The omission, according to Lietzmann, appears to be a correction of style.³⁹

³⁷Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 155.

³⁸Nicoll, op. cit., p. 110.

³⁹Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 155.

12:10 καὶ - text P46 B³ #pc / ἐν - ARD6 pl. latsy (before ἀνενοχουρίας)

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text is favored geographically.
3. Perhaps the reading was changed to ἐν in keeping with the context, but it would hardly have been changed to καὶ intentionally.
4. Perhaps the καὶ in the following line was copied by mistake. Or perhaps the context led the scribe to write ἐν unintentionally.
5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive, and, although καὶ is the more difficult reading, the external evidence indicates that the text is correct.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:10 καὶ - text P46 B³ #pc / ἐν ARD6 pl. latsy (before ἀνενοχουρίας)

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading against the text has wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the ἐν was changed to καὶ to end the series of prepositional phrases. Or perhaps it was changed to ἐν in keeping with the context.
4. Perhaps the word was changed to ἐν unintentionally in keeping with the context.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The internal evidence is inconclusive. The external evidence favors the reading of the text and P46.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:11 Omits τὶ (after οὐδὲν γὰρ) - text. / Has τὶ - P46 B.

1. The major uncials are equally divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason to omit the word intentionally. Perhaps it was added to clarify the sentence when a scribe took οὐδέν adverbially.
4. Perhaps it was omitted by a careless scribe but hardly added intentionally.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Internal evidence is inconclusive. External evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:12 σημείους τε - text P46 B X pc. / σημείους - AD pc. it. / καὶ σημείους - G sy P / ἐν σημείους - R pl. vg^{cl}.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the widest geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps a scribe felt that the τε was awkward and omitted it.
4. Perhaps a scribe unintentionally left it out since the phrase σημείους καὶ τέρεσιν often occurs without the τε.
5. St. Paul uses the phrase twice with τε and twice without it.

Conclusion: Since the external evidence points to the reading of the text, it is probably the correct reading.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:13 ἡσώθητε - text. P46 B X* O* pc. / ἡπτήθητε - AR pl. / ἐλαττώθητε - G.

1. The major uncials all agree with the reading of the text.

2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the reading in G is what the scribe thought was a better way to express the idea.
4. A careless scribe could have written an η for an θ by mistake.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence in particular points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46. Nicoll also accepts this reading.⁴⁰

12:14 *Has τοῦτο (before τρίτου)-text. P46 S(5D) 6 pm. lat. sy / Omit - K. al.*

1. The major uncials all agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Probably the word was omitted inadvertently by a careless scribe.
5. There is nothing that can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:14 *τοῖς γυνεῦσιν ὀρθραυρίσειν-text. ὀρθραυρίσειν τοῖς γυνεῦσιν - P46 1739.*

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.

⁴⁰Nicoll, op. cit., p. 113.

2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Perhaps *ὁνομασίσειν* was inadvertently omitted and then put in at the wrong place.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:15 εἰ- text P4656 / εἰ καὶ- Rpl-vg / Omit- Dit Ambst.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the καὶ was added for smoothness. Perhaps a scribe felt the sentence made better sense without the εἰ. The Koine tradition may be a conflation.
4. The reading of D may be the slip of a careless scribe.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text and P46.

12:15 ἀγαπῶ- text & Apc. > γ' αεγ / ἀγαπῶν- P46 BF DG pl. 1a ff.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of P46.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps it was changed to the indicative active to correspond to the indicative passive, but it would hardly have been changed to the participle.

4. Probably the ν was dropped by mistake.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external and internal evidence both point to the reading of P46.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

12:16 οὐ κατεβάρησα ὑμᾶς - text. | οὐκ ἐβάρησα ὑμᾶς - P46 D*
οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν - X6 (69) et.

1. The major uncials do not support the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change.
4. Probably the -ατ- was inadvertently dropped.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Since Aleph's reading is weakly attested and the reading of P46 can be explained from the reading of the text, the reading of the text is probably correct.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:19 πάλαι - text. οὐ πάλαι - P46 | πάλιν - R D Pl. syr^p

1. The major uncials do not favor the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text does not have the wider geographical distribution.
3. It is possible that a scribe thought that πάλιν fit better since the idea had been mentioned once before. But it would hardly be changed to πάλαι since this makes a more difficult reading. The scribe of P46 probably thought πάλαι was a difficult reading and added an οὐ by conjecture.
4. Perhaps this is an unintentional change one way or the other.

5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence point to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:19 ἐν Χριστῷ - text. Omits - P46 d. e.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The reading of the text has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the phrase was inserted to give the sentence a particular emphasis. There is no reason to omit it.
4. Perhaps the phrase was skipped by a careless scribe.
5. Nothing can be determined on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence points to the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text against P46.

12:20 Σῆλος - text. P46BAD*Gpc.syp. / Σῆλοι - X^Rpl. latt.

1. The majority of the uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The two readings are about equally divided geographically.
3. There is no reason for an intentional change, since both make sense.
4. Perhaps the reading was influenced by the singular that precedes it or the plural that follows it.
5. St. Paul usually uses the singular, but it is noteworthy that in many of his uses of Σῆλος the Vulgate has the plural. Perhaps the plural is an influence from the Latin.

Conclusion: The external evidence and internal evidence

both favor the reading of the text.

Correct reading: text with P46.

12:21 ταπεινώσῃ - text. X A K III al. / ταπεινώσει - P46 B R D G pm.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading in P46.
2. The reading of P46 has the wider geographical distribution.
3. Perhaps the word was changed to the subjunctive to agree with the *μή* or the *πενθήσω*. There is no reason for a change to the indicative.
4. Perhaps the *η* was written by a scribe who was copying from dictation, the subjunctive being the natural spelling after *μή*.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence favor the indicative.

Correct reading: P46 against text.

13:4 σὺν - text. ἐν - P46 D* 33 e.

1. The major uncials are evenly divided between the two readings.
2. The reading of the text and of P46 are evenly divided geographically.
3. Perhaps a scribe changed the *σὺν* to *ἐν* to agree with the previous *ἐν αὐτῷ* or to *σὺν* to agree with the previous *σὺν*.
4. Probably this is a case of homoiarkton, written by mistake under the influence of the previous *ἐν αὐτῷ*.
5. Nothing can be concluded on the basis of style.

Conclusion: The external evidence is inconclusive. The internal evidence would point slightly to the *σὺν*.

Correct reading: text against P46.

13:50mits εοτιν (after οπιν)-text: P46BD^{pc} | Has εοτιν-~~AR~~Gpl. 147.

1. The majority of the major uncials agree with the reading of the text.
2. The two readings are about evenly divided geographically.
3. There is no reason to omit it, but it may have been added for clarification.
4. The word may have been omitted when the scribe saw the εοτιν and thought it was the εοτε from the line below. It may have been added because of homoioteleuton.
5. Nothing can be decided on the basis of style.

Conclusion: Both internal and external evidence indicate that the reading of the text is correct.

Correct reading: text and P46.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

There are countless questions that could be asked as to what the significance of P46 is in the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. One cannot, within the limitations of this presentation, enter into all of them. But the study does suggest several useful considerations.

First of all the question might be asked: "How does P46 fit into the two major families of texts in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians?" The readings break down as follows:

P46 agrees with the Alexandrian family in thirty-three out of ninety-six readings; with the Western family, twelve times; and with a mixture of the Western and Alexandrian families, thirty times. It stands alone against Aleph, B, and D in twenty-one readings. This would indicate that the text is in closer agreement with the Alexandrian family as such than with the Western text by itself. However, because of the mixture of families, a more detailed study would have to be made to arrive at a more definite conclusion.

As for the readings themselves, the Nestle text accepts thirty-two out of the ninety-six readings from P46 as genuine and rejects sixty-four. According to the findings in this paper, fifty-five out of the ninety-six readings are probably correct. This suggests that the Nestle text is in need of further revision. Nestle's principle was to take into consideration

the editions of Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf, and Weiss, and incorporate the reading on which at least two out of the three agreed. The method leaves something to be desired.

As far as the four major uncials are concerned, the following conclusions emerge. Of the twenty-one readings in which P46 stands alone against Aleph, B, and D, none are accepted as correct. P46 and Aleph agree in six readings; of these three are correct. In seventeen readings P46 and B agree against Aleph and D. Of these seventeen, seven are correct. Where P46 and D agree, six out of twelve readings are accepted. In those readings in which P46, Aleph, and B coincide, nine out of ten are accepted. The seven readings in which P46, Aleph, and D agree are all correct, as well as the fifteen readings in which P46, B, and D agree. This reveals the fact that in the readings which Nestle cites, when there is a mixture of Alexandrian and Western readings in agreement with P46, they are all correct. The remaining eight readings are those in which all four major uncials agree against the readings of a lesser manuscript. All of these eight readings are accepted.

In only four out of the ninety-six readings do both P46 and the Nestle text favor a suspected reading (1:12; 4:2; 7:8; 8:7).

During the past several decades, many English translations of the New Testament have been published in the English-speaking world. Of these translations the most widely known is probably the Revised Standard Version, which is to be revised and corrected again within the next few years. Such a

study as this paper would suggest that P46 ought to play an important part in this correction. However, the author believes that for greater accuracy, something more complete than the Nestle text ought to be employed in the process of revision.

Other more detailed questions could be asked, such as: How careful or careless was the scribe in copying? Did the scribe write from dictation or by copying another manuscript? How carefully did the correctors do their work? Did they follow any pattern? Unfortunately, such questions cannot be answered on the basis of the Nestle text. The writer learned one fact, in particular, in the course of his research: no major definitive work in the field of textual criticism should be done on the basis of the Nestle text. One can detect general trends and come to fairly reliable conclusions working with the Nestle apparatus, but one cannot come to final conclusions.

In general, the study revealed that P46 in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians follows the general pattern of the same manuscript in the other epistles. It agrees more with the Alexandrian family than with any other group but has a very definite tendency toward the Western family. Furthermore, the study indicates that the witness of P46 is of tremendous importance for the future of the science of textual criticism.

APPENDIX

The following table lists all of those verses in the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians in which a reading from P46 occurs in the Nestle text. The readings are arranged according to the agreements among the major uncials: Aleph, B, D, and P46. A plus (+) behind the verse number indicates that the writer has accepted the reading as genuine; and a minus (-) indicates that the writer does not consider the reading genuine.

<u>P46 only</u>	<u>P46 and Aleph</u>	<u>P46 and B</u>	<u>P46 and D</u>
1:9 -	1:6-7 +	1:11 +	1:14 +
1:10 -	4:5 -	1:12 -	1:18 -
1:11 -	7:11 -	1:13 -	2:17 +
1:13 -	9:5 +	2:1 -	3:6 +
1:17 -	12:1 +	3:3 +	4:6 +
3:18 -	12:10 -	4:2 -	8:2 -
3:18 -		4:14 -	8:16 -
4:11 -		4:17 +	9:4 -
5:10 -		7:5 -	12:6 +
5:19 -		8:7 -	12:7 +
6:16 -		10:4 +	12:16 -
7:1 -		10:8 -	13:4 -
7:8 -		11:27 -	
7:14 -		11:30 +	
9:1 -		12:1 +	
9:10 -		12:7 +	
12:5 -		12:11 -	
12:6 -			
12:14 -			
12:19 -			
12:19 -			

P46, Aleph, and B

1:10 /
 1:12 /
 2:16 /
 5:12 /
 9:2 /
 10:7 /
 12:1 /
 12:10 /
 12:12 /
 12:15 /

P46, Aleph, and D

3:9 /
 4:5 /
 4:6 /
 6:4 /
 8:19 /
 11:18 /
 12:3 /

P46, B, and D

1:10 /
 1:19 /
 1:22 /
 5:3 /
 5:10 /
 9:10 /
 11:3 /
 11:4 /
 11:23 /
 12:3 /
 12:5 /
 12:15 /
 12:20 /
 12:21 /
 13:5 /

P46, Aleph, B, D

4:6 /
 5:16 /
 8:21 /
 9:8 /
 10:8 /
 11:3 /
 12:13 /
 12:14 /

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Kenyon, Frederic. The Chester Beatty Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Vols. V-VII. London: Emery Walker, Ltd., 1933-41.
- Sanders, H. A. A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul. Vol. XXXVIII of the University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935.

B. Secondary Sources

- Arndt, William F. "The Chief Principles of New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, V (August, 1934), 577-84.
- "A Definite Need in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVI (March, 1945), 180-85.
- Arndt, William F., and F. W. Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1957.
- Clark, Kenneth W. A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- Colwell, E. C. What is the Best New Testament? Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Dobschuetz, E. von. "Zur Liste der Neuentestamentlichen Handschriften," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIII (1933), 185-206.
- Hatch, William H. P. The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Kenyon, Frederic. The Bible and Modern Scholarship. London: John Murray, 1949.
- Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

- . Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- . The Text of the Greek Bible. London: Duckworth, 1949.
- Lake, Kirsopp. "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (January, 1936), 89-102.
- Lietzmann, Hans. An die Korinther: I und II. Vol. IX in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Herausgegeben von Guenther Bornkamm. Tuebingen: Paul Siebeck, 1949.
- . Zur Wuerdigung des Chester-Beatty-Papyrus der Paulusbriefe. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934.
- Lutz, Walter H. "Variant Readings in the Text of First Corinthians on the Basis of P46." Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1948.
- Metzger, Bruce M., editor. Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians. Translated from the fifth edition of the German by D. Douglas Bannerman. Translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- Moeller, Elmer. "P46 and Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (1946), 340-50.
- Nestle, D. Eberhard, editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. 21st edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson, editor. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In The Expositor's Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- "Notizen," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIII (1934), 220-21.
- Paret, Oscar. Die Bibel: Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift. Second edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950.
- Parvis, Merrill Mead and Charles Wikgren. New Testament Manuscript Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1950.

- Robertson, A. T. An Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament. New York: Doran Company, c.1925.
- , Studies in the Text of the New Testament. New York: Doran Company, c.1926.
- Schmidt, Carl. "Die neuesten Bibelfunde aus Aegypten," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXX (1931), 285.
- Schmoller, Alfred. Handkondordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. Achte Auflage. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. New York: Macmillan Company, 1925.
- Vogels, Heinrich J. Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1955.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.
- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Vol. II. New York: Harper Brothers, 1882.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum. London: British Academy by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953.