

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1957

The Unadopted Witness of P46 in the Nestle Text of Galatians, Colossians, and I Thessalonians and its Treatment in the RSV

Walter A. Ritter

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

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ritter, Walter A., "The Unadopted Witness of P46 in the Nestle Text of Galatians, Colossians, and I Thessalonians and its Treatment in the RSV" (1957). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 535.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/535>

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

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS OF P₄₆ IN THE NESTLE TEXT OF
GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND I THESSALONIANS
AND ITS TREATMENT IN THE R.S.V.

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

Walter A. Ritter

June 1957

Approved by: Frederick W. Danker
Advisor

Alfred von Rohr Jauer
Reader

UNADOPTED P46 IN NESTLE AND THE R.S.V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. A DESCRIPTION OF THE CHESTER-BEATY PAPYRI	4
III. THE CANONS OF CRITICISM	16
IV. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH, B, D	23
V. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH AND B	25
VI. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY B AND D	32
VII. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH AND D	40
VIII. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY B	46
IX. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH	69
X. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY D	74
XI. THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY NEITHER ALEPH, B, OR D	87
XII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Ever since textual critics could examine the latest discovery of New Testament manuscripts reported in 1930, the Chester-Beatty papyri intrigued them like a child with a new toy. The high quality of the text of the Pauline codex, called P⁴⁶, was immediately apparent, and critics began to wonder how much of the "established" Greek text would need revision in the light of this wonderful discovery. This thesis is an evaluation of a limited number of the variant readings in that important manuscript.

The present evaluation has a threefold aim: (a) to evaluate those unadopted readings of P⁴⁶ cited in the critical apparatus of the "Nestle" text in order to evaluate that text in the light of the papyrus witness; (b) to draw significant conclusions (as far as possible with this limited selection) on the basis of textual associations with the papyrus witness; (c) to compare the treatment of the P⁴⁶ witness in the Revised Standard Version translation.¹

In carrying out the first purpose, the twenty-first edition of the popular Greek text edited by Eberhard Nestle has been used.² Although many variants in the papyrus are not cited in Nestle's apparatus, sufficient variants of a more significant nature are included to make an

¹The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952). Hereafter this is referred to as RSV.

²Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (Editio vicesima prima; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952).

evaluation possible. Only in the last chapter has the textual reproduction of Sanders³ been consistently consulted whenever possible. In other chapters this has been done only occasionally.

One hundred and thirty one variants have been evaluated. These represent the total number of those unadopted readings for which the testimony of the papyrus is cited in the Nestle apparatus for Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and I Thessalonians. The latter epistle was found to be fragmentary in the papyrus and only once did Nestle's critical apparatus for this letter cite the witness of the papyrus (chap. 5:27). Since this variant is read by the Nestle text, no further readings from this letter are evaluated.

Because the scope of this project does not include an evaluation of all the variant readings supported by P46, no definitive conclusions on the quality of the papyrus can be drawn. Nor would it be wise to base such conclusions on a critical apparatus. That purpose would demand a study of the papyrus itself or a reproduction thereof. But the one hundred and thirty-one variants represent 74.4 per cent of the total number of citations (176) in the critical apparatus. The remaining forty-five readings which appear in the Nestle text, though not evaluated, have been used statistically, and some possible conclusions or evident tendencies have been noted on this basis at the end of each chapter.

In order to determine any possible conclusions concerning the manuscript affiliations of the papyrus text, the three major uncials (B, Aleph, D) have been grouped in the seven different combinations

³Henry A. Sanders, A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935).

possible. Hence variants have been grouped according to the common manuscript support of these three uncials--plus the papyrus testimony. A final chapter treats those readings of P46 to which none of these three add their support. The eight different groupings of variants to which the papyrus adds its testimony are treated in the following order: (1) B -, ζ - D; (2) ζ - B; (3) B - D; (4) ζ - D; (5) B; (6) χ ; (7) D; (8) P46 alone. Since this procedure allows a progressive verse by verse treatment from the beginning of Galatians to the end of Colossians only within the limits of each chapter, every variant is referred to by its designated number.

The evaluation of each individual reading is concluded by a reference to its treatment in the RSV. It is not always possible to associate an English translation with certainty to either variant. To do justice to the purpose stated above, only those translations which admit of quite certain association have been considered valid subjects for conclusions. Further doubtful associations have been parenthetically noted.

All evaluations have been checked with the translation and remarks of the modern capable exegeses in the Neues Testament Deutsch commentary.⁴ Any differences of opinion or significant translations have been noted. In addition to this many individual variants have been frequently discussed in the light of specific evidence gathered from textual-critical writings.

⁴H. W. Beyer and Others, Das Neue Testament Deutsch: Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Goettingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), Vol. VIII. Hereafter this is referred to as NTD.

CHAPTER II

A DESCRIPTION OF THE CHESTER-BEATTY PAPYRI

"The fortunes of this MS. are an illustration of the chances of discovery" writes Frederic G. Kenyon,¹ who announced the find of Papyrus 46 in the London "Times" of November 19, 1931, with a short article.²

The intriguing story begins in the Spring of 1930.³ Dr. Carl Schmidt, a German manuscript critic, found scattered among the dealers of Cairo portions of what was to be hailed as the greatest find "since that of the Sinaiticus"⁴ (1859) or "since the first publication of the Codex Vaticanus"⁵ (1867). Schmidt ascertained that they had come from the Fayum, east of the Nile,⁶ when he found that more of the same leaves were offered there and that a lot had been purchased later that year by Mr. A. Chester-Beatty, the American manuscript collector, resident in London. But the exact source of the find is unknown, and might well remain so, since the Egyptian dealers made a typical refusal to divulge

¹F. G. Kenyon, The Bible and Modern Scholarship (London: John Murray, 1949), p. 126.

²Carl Schmidt, "Die Neuesten Bibelfunde aus Aegypten," Zeitschrift für die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXX (1931), 285-93. Hereafter this periodical will be referred to as ZNTW.

³Ibid., p. 286.

⁴F. G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1948), p. 73.

⁵Kirsopp and Silva Lake, "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (January, 1936), 90.

⁶Oscar Paret, Die Bibel; Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950), p. 52.

any such knowledge.⁷ Schmidt suggests the source as "probably Alame . . . near the ancient Aphroditopolis . . . probably worn out and discarded fragments, which were not destroyed because they were sacred."⁸ This region lies about 100 km. south of Cairo, thirty miles north of Memphis. Sanders states, "as currently gossiped in Egypt, the papyri were found in a Coptic graveyard . . . of some . . . monastery . . . buried with a dignitary of the monastery,"⁹ after being placed into jars in the Oriental fashion.¹⁰ But Dobschütz challenges any reference to a monastery at this time and suggests they were used as a church lectionary or came from a scholar's library.¹¹ Others suggest they were found beneath the ruins of a Christian church¹² and that they represent the library of the church or the monastery or of the community.¹³ In any case, the sands of Egypt alone offer the conditions necessary for the survival of papyri, and it was in the Fayum district that previous finds had also been made.¹⁴

A part of the eleven codices was purchased by Mr. Beatty in 1930 and 1931, and in the Winter of the following year another portion was obtained

⁷Schmidt, op. cit., p. 292.

⁸Quoted by Lake, op. cit., p. 89

⁹Henry A. Sanders, A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935), p. 13.

¹⁰Cf. the description by Oscar Paret, op. cit., p. 52.

¹¹R. von Dobschütz, "Zur Liste der Neu-testamentlichen Handschriften," ZNTW, XXIII (1933), 186.

¹²Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 39.

¹³Frederic Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940), p. 226.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 204.

from Egyptian dealers.¹⁵ Most of the codices belong to him, while the University of Michigan, Mr. John Scheide, and the Michigan Library at Vienna own the rest.¹⁶ They were mounted under glass for study by Dr. Ibscher of Berlin,¹⁷ and the work of editing them was done by Kenyon in 1934,¹⁸ H. A. Sanders in 1935,¹⁹ and the final "complete" edition by Kenyon in 1936.²⁰ "They rest in our hands today as a new instrument the like of which no generation of critics has known. . . . epic making though they may be, they still lie unassimilated."²¹

This "epic making" nature of the Chester-Beatty papyri is essentially an implication drawn from their almost unbelievably early dating. Clark summarizes: "The Beatty papyri have been dated by Sanders after 250; by Kenyon, before 250; by Wilken, ca. 200; by Gerstinger, before 200."²² But this is almost too general a statement since the different codices have been variously dated. Of the codex containing the Pauline corpus, designated P46 by von Dobschütz, Kenyon remarks, "Ulrich Wilken, the most experienced living papyrologist, would on palaeographical

¹⁵Sanders, op. cit., p. 1.

¹⁶Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology, p. 222.

¹⁷Frederic Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible (London: Emery Walker Ltd., 1933), Fasciculus I, 5.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Sanders, op. cit.

²⁰Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III Supplement, VII.

²¹Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren, editors, New Testament Manuscript Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 19.

²²Ibid., p. 175, note 1.

grounds put this MS. quite at the beginning of the century, or perhaps even in the second, about A.D. 200."²³ Lietzmann concurs in this,²⁴ Grant says "not later than 250 A.D.,"²⁵ and Zuntz says it "may even reach back into the second century."²⁶ Sanders remarked, "I would agree [with Kenyon] that the manuscript (hand) belongs to the third century, but I would hesitate to put emphasis on the first half of the century."²⁷ Kenyon, after further consideration, claimed a "due reserve" in offering again his estimates of the several codices: "The three N.T. MSS. may all be assigned with confidence to the third century: the Pauline MS. to the very beginning of it, the Gospels and Acts to the first half of it, the Apocalypse perhaps to the second half."²⁸ And of the Old Testament MSS. he says, "The earliest MS. is of the first half of the second century and the latest not later than the fourth. But most are third century."²⁹ This means that the Pauline codex is the "oldest and most valuable"³⁰ of

²³F. G. Kenyon, "Review of Sanders' 'A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul,'" American Journal of Philology, LVII (January, 1936), 92.

²⁴Hans Lietzmann, Zur Würdigung des Chester Beatty Papyrus der Paulusbrieve (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1934), p. 9.

²⁵Frederick C. Grant, "Textual Criticism," An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, edited by Luther A. Weigle (Issued by ICB, 1946), p. 37.

²⁶G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 11. This study is based largely on I Corinthians and Hebrews.

²⁷Sanders, op. cit., p. 13.

²⁸Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 188.

²⁹Ibid., p. 39.

³⁰Sanders, op. cit., p. vii.



all Pauline codices. Only the John Rylands fragment of John 18 antedates P46 which now reduces by half "the 250 years separating the Vaticanus and its archetype,"³¹ and presents a text fully a century older than the great uncials by a contemporary of Clemens Alexandrinus!

Kenyon evaluates the significance of this date when he says;

The interval then between the dates of the original composition and the earliest extant evidence becomes so small as to be in fact negligible, and the last foundation for any doubt that the Scriptures have come down to us substantially as they were written has now been removed. Both the authenticity and the general integrity of the books of the New Testament may be regarded as finally established.³²

So much for the general significance of the C.B. papyri and of P46 in particular. But a brief description of the nature and content of these codices will reveal further poles of attraction for the manuscript critic.

As stated before, the papyri are in the codex book form, i.e. papyrus sheets were laid together and folded in half to form a book.³³ This is much like the form of a modern book and stands in sharp contrast to the roll, the predecessor of this form, whose contents were much more limited. For the textual critic this means that the whole Pauline corpus, as also the Gospels, were found together in one volume! Hence the whole avenue to early variants is opened wide since the early readers and scribes could compare the various records, confuse parallel readings, and offer textual accommodations! "They confirm the belief that the

³¹Zuntz, op. cit., p. 17.

³²Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology, p. 288.

³³For a full description of the early book forms cf. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus I, pp. 9f.

Christian community was addicted to the codex rather than to the roll³⁴ and was possibly even responsible for the invention of the codex form!³⁵

The Chester-Beatty collection³⁶ consists of eleven codices. Seven of these (160 leaves) contain portions of nine Old Testament books. The codex containing portions of Numbers and Deuteronomy is from the first half of the second century and ranks as the oldest Greek MS. of any significant size! One codex is non-canonical and contains the Book of Enoch and a homily on the Passion by the second century bishop, Melito of Sardis. The other three contain (1) The Gospels and Acts (one-seventh of the text on 30 leaves), designated P45; (2) Revelation (chaps. 9-17), designated P47; and (3) The Pauline corpus on eighty-six leaves (out of an original 104) in the following order and with the designated portions lacking: Romans (chaps. 1-5:17; 6:14-8:15), Hebrews, I and II Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians (chaps. 2:3-5:5), and II Thessalonians (?). Four leaves within were missing, hence Kenyon established a loss of seven leaves, both at the beginning and end of the codex. These facts are evidently of real concern to the question of the Pauline canon.

Professor Sanders, inclined to doubt the authenticity of the Pastorals, worked on the incomplete Michigan portion of the leaves and postulated the original presence of (1) Philemon between Galatians and Philippians, and (2) I and II Timothy alone (without Titus) in an

³⁴Ibid., p. 12.

³⁵Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology, p. 213.

³⁶Cf. the Fascicles of Kenyon for the best description of the codices.

abbreviated form at the end of the codex--since the scribe is apparently compressing script in the latter leaves with the intent to include something further on the few remaining leaves.³⁷ Kenyon discredits the first possibility with the later recovery of that portion and the second as pure conjecture, and suggests that the Pastorals were never included on the less-than-half-sufficient leaves, which were probably blank because the scribe found it "difficult to calculate in advance how many quires are needed."³⁸

The order of the books is remarkable. It has been cited not only as attesting an arrangement by decreasing length³⁹ but also as an earlier standard order in the Pauline corpus as was claimed by Zahn.⁴⁰ The Western arrangement, in which Hebrews follows the Pastorals, is described by Kenyon as the latest of five consecutive orders in development,⁴¹ "Its present position is proof of the high importance assigned to it, and of the unquestioning acceptance of its Pauline authorship"⁴² as was universally held in the Eastern church. But only minuscule 1919 supports the papyrus in placing Hebrews after Romans.

One further arrangement is of very special significance. The doxology of Romans, found at the end of chap. 16 (vs. 25-27) in B, Aleph,

³⁷Sanders, op. cit., pp. 10f.

³⁸Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III Supplement, VII, v and xi.

³⁹Charles H. Buck, "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 351ff.

⁴⁰Carl Schmidt, op. cit., p. 290.

⁴¹These are listed by Lake, op. cit., p. 97.

⁴²Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III Supplement, VII, xi.

and D and at the end of chap. 14 in the mass of later MSS., is here found after chap. 15:33. Sanders calls this the "original order" and describes chap. 16 as "the covering letter introducing "our sister" Phoebe to the Ephesians."⁴³ But Kenyon, though conceding that the position in *Ph6* seems to confirm such views, warns against adopting this conjecture, and suggests that its position might derive from an early treatment of the last chapter as a hymn doxology.⁴⁴ But as a general conclusion he often states: "It offers no sensational variants."⁴⁴

In the several introductions to their fascicle editions, Kenyon and Sanders have described the physical characteristics of the Pauline codex in some detail. It is a single-quire codex of eleven by six and one-half inch leaves⁴⁵ (original size). On it is inscribed in elegant carefully formed letters of dark brown ink (slightly faded) a single column of script (nine by six inches) which tends progressively to increase from twenty-five to thirty-two unruled lines. The page surface of this codex, which was probably bound at one time, has seen little rubbing, and, although the pages were once numbered, their order has now been determined by considering fibres and matched stains. No leaf is entirely perfect, lacking at page-bottom anywhere from a fraction of a line to seven lines and progressively increasing until the last two leaves are merely fragments. Compared to the diversity of hands in the total collection the Pauline codex has the best scribal hand in quality

⁴³Sanders, op. cit., p. 35.

⁴⁴Kenyon, The Bible and Modern Scholarship, p. 127.

⁴⁵The figures given here are average or approximate.

of workmanship. The scribe has inserted a few reading marks and accents but very little punctuation. He has left many slight spaces in the text, especially after abbreviations. The nomina sacra are regularly abbreviated in the earlier three-letter mode. Its stichometry substantiates the Codex Claromontanus in the normal reckoning of thirty-six letters per stichos.

Although some of the relations of the Beatty papyri to textual criticism and the nature of their Pauline text will be discussed at greater length in the next chapters, a general comparison of the papyrus text-type is in place here.

The papyri have certainly made it clear that variants were plentiful and diffused at the end of the second century. But the most valuable conclusion is that "they confirm the essential soundness of the existing texts . . . [having] no variations which effect vital facts or doctrines."⁴⁶ Zuntz, more particularly, describes the text as one of supreme quality, corrected by an expert hand, but containing many surface errors from the pen of a careless and dull scribe who made a poor representation of an excellent tradition.⁴⁷ This tradition has been analytically presented by Kenyon in a table of comparisons (based on Tischendorf) in which the readings of the papyrus, "with" and "against" the readings of Aleph, A, B, D, and sigma, are numerically plotted.⁴⁸ It is immediately apparent that the papyrus has not only a pronounced agreement with the Alexandrians (Aleph, A, B), but also has

⁴⁶Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus I, p. 15.

⁴⁷Zuntz, op. cit., pp. 18, 56, 157.

⁴⁸Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III Supplement, VII, xvii.

a significant portion of Western (D) and Byzantine (sigma) readings. That the Byzantines find a somewhat better support in the papyrus than does the Claromontanus is probably due to the fact that, unlike the Western tradition, the Byzantine tradition here consists of more than one manuscript.

This table might be compared with another of Kenyon's in which the readings of the papyrus are plotted against the total Alexandrians and Westerns (DFG):⁴⁹

	<u>Pl⁶ = Alex.</u>	<u>Pl⁶ = DFG</u>
Romans	89	51
Hebrews	79	20
I Cor.	143	29
II Cor.	60	11
Ephesians	47	5
Galatians	40	5
Philippians	23	6
Colossians	20	3
I Thess. (too small)		

This tabulation shows the Alexandrian agreement certainly less pronounced in Romans. In general it may be concluded that the papyrus is not identical with any of the main families!⁵⁰ Hoskier, on the basis of the usage of the article in Pl⁶, postulates an archetype in a Graeco-Latin bi-columnar,⁵¹ while Sanders finds a great agreement with the *Oxyrynchus papyri*.⁵² A so-called "Caesarean text" has not been isolated

⁴⁹Ibid., p. xvii.

⁵⁰Kenyon, The Bible and Modern Scholarship, pp. 19f.

⁵¹H. C. Hoskier, "Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles Known as Pl⁶" (with "Addenda"), The Journal of Theological Studies (Special print, 1937), 18.

⁵²Sanders, op. cit., pp. 32f.

in the Pauline corpus, but it seems that P45 has substantiated it in the Gospels.⁵³

Although the Pauline papyri generally confirm the antiquity of the Alexandrian Vaticanus and demonstrates the early currency of some of its particular readings heretofore not known elsewhere, they also show many departures from the earliest recensions.

What is significant is that they prove that in Egypt, in the early part of the third century, readings were in circulation which were derived from, or which eventually became attached to, all the principle families, together with a not inconsiderable number of which no other witness has survived.⁵⁴

The Vatican text therefore represents neither an original purity, an unaltered tradition, nor an exclusively dominant text-type of Egypt in its own era, i.e., fully a century after P46.⁵⁵ It can still contain the best textual scholarship and representation of the original, but the one-sided trust placed in its text in the past is now basically disturbed, as Lietzmann aptly points out.⁵⁶

Not only has P46 been a trustworthy guide in assessing the value of the vaunted Vaticanus, but it has led to a gradual abandoning of Westcott-Hort's theory of the "neutral text" and an awakening interest in the importance of the "western text."⁵⁷ It testifies to some of the "late" western minority-readings!⁵⁸ Hoskier finds an "intimate relation"

⁵³Zuntz, op. cit., p. 151.

⁵⁴Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 250.

⁵⁵Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus I, p. 16.

⁵⁶Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵⁷F. C. Grant, op. cit., pp. 39f.

⁵⁸Elmer Hoeller, "P46 and Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (May, 1946), 340-50.

between the Urtext of P₄₆ and the Latins.⁵⁹ Sanders considers the agreement of P₄₆ with DFG as "strong evidence for the original" in spite of complete Alexandrian opposition.⁶⁰ Kenyon thinks that Western group-support of the papyrus makes for readings "at times to be preferred"⁶¹ while Zuntz concludes that the support of only one Western witness can establish the "original" reading!⁶² Paul Glaue has gone all out in vindication of the Western text in the Gospels!⁶³ And even some "very late" Byzantine readings have gained respect with the emerging support of the papyrus!⁶⁴

A careful review of P₄₆ will reveal a situation of much interest, for it exhibits, ne judice, a closer textual relationship, even if rougher, between Rome, Sardinia, Carthage, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, and Byzance, than obtained one hundred to two hundred years later.⁶⁵

This means that genealogical families in the textual history of the second and third centuries are indistinct, a problem of great concern in establishing the canons of textual criticism.

⁵⁹Hoskier, op. cit., Addenda, p. 1.

⁶⁰Sanders, op. cit., p. 30.

⁶¹Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III. Supplement, VII, xvii.

⁶²Zuntz, op. cit., p. 158.

⁶³D. Paul Glaue, "Der Aelteste Text der Geschichtlichen Buecher des Neuen Testaments," ZNTW, XLV (1954), 90-108.

⁶⁴Zuntz, op. cit., p. 50.

⁶⁵Hoskier, op. cit., Addenda, p. 3.

CHAPTER III

THE CANONS OF CRITICISM

"The business of the textual critic is not to correct grammar, to remove obscurities, or to clarify the logic, but simply to restore what the author actually wrote."¹ This is an easily stated objective most difficult to attain. The development of canons or rules of choice to attain such an objective is essentially the history of textual criticism. For an interesting summary of this history the reader is referred to the work of Kenyon,² and for a comparison of three sets of canons (those of Wettstein, Hammond, and Wikgren) to the presentation of Ernest G. Colwell.³

The canons employed herein are essentially those compounded in a brief essay by the late Dr. William F. Arndt.⁴ They represent a sober scholarly simplification of the developments of textual criticism up to the present time, and they reflect a balanced consideration of external and internal factors. The first two canons concern the external, while the last three concern the latter.

¹A. T. Robertson, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New York: Doran and Co., ca. 1925), p. 165.

²F. G. Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940), pp. 289ff.

³Ernest G. Colwell, What is the Best New Testament? (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 111-15.

⁴William F. Arndt, "The Chief Principles of New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, V (August, 1934), 577-84.

- I. "That reading is likely to be correct which is found in the best manuscripts."

"The majority opinion does affirm . . . that Codex Vaticanus . . . is to be accorded the first place among all sources,"⁵ and "discoveries since Hort indicate that the "Neutral" manuscripts (B,¹) are relatively the best."⁶ These two MSS. are the oldest of the great uncials, the former originating "around 330" and the latter about fifty years later.

But, as Kenyon indicates, "textual controversy from 1881 to the present has turned on the comparative claims of the Neutral and Western types of text,"⁷ and especially since the emergence of the Beatty papyri has the Western text merited special consideration. The Codex Claromontanus i.e. D (not to be confused with Codex Beza in the Gospels) "is the leading 'Western' authority for the text of the epistles."⁸ It is a sixth century MSS. which may contain a second century text!

For the sake of simplicity, only these three leading representatives of the East and West shall be considered. Furthermore, a purely numerical majority-support of all the later uncials, minuscules, and versions might constitute a "correction of the sun by the clocks."

Since the Alexandrians ("Neutral") lay the best claim to original purity, it is proper that two of the three witnesses should be chosen from Alexandria. Whichever reading therefore, has the majority support

⁵Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren, editors, New Testament Manuscript Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 10.

⁶Colwell, op. cit., p. 45.

⁷F. G. Kenyon, The Bible and Archaeology, pp. 289ff.

⁸Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1954), p. 26.

of these primary witnesses shall be considered the best, within the limits of this canon.

II. "That reading which was most widespread is entitled to our approval."

Dr. Arndt credits Streeter, author of the famous "The Four Gospels," with a more scientific approach to MS. grouping than Hort who had four somewhat indistinct text-types isolated. Accordingly one thinks of five centers or territories from which the Pauline manuscripts have come. The more localized designation is simply a nomenclature for the wider district, and although the territorial ascriptions are somewhat controversial (there is no direct evidence to show where B and λ^f were written!) they are generally accepted as classified by Nestle.⁹ The more important ascriptions to each of the five territories are as follows:

1. ALEXANDRIA. This text-type parallels Hort's "Neutral" class and is often identified by Continental scholars, perhaps incorrectly, with the work of the LXX editor, Hesychius (Hes.). B, λ^f , C, A, H, I, M, P; minuscules 33, 1739, 81, 104, 424, 1175, 1518, 1611 pm (many others); and especially the patristic evidence of Clement, Origen, al (and others) and the Sahidic (sa) and Bohairic (bo) versions.
2. ANTIOCH. Formerly the tendency was to group these MSS. with the Westerns. It includes especially the older Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac (sy^{S,C}) and the later Peshitta (sy^P). Like the next group it is represented mostly by minuscules.
3. BYZANTIUM or Constantinople, often called the "Koine" text. This text-type is certainly of secondary character, suffering much from progressive revision. Most of the relatively modern translations were based on this poor text, and not till the last decades of the nineteenth century did textual criticism dethrone it.

⁹Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (Editio vicesima prima; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952), pp. 59*-84*. The abbreviations here used are also fully explained in this introduction.

K, L, Oll₂ and the majority (pm) of minuscules. In fact the mass of our extant MSS. represent this text.

4. **ROME**, including Italy and Gaul, called "Western." D-E, F-G, Vulgate (vg), with some Latin MSS. (lat.), especially the minuscules a, b, d, g, and many of the Latin Fathers.
5. **CARTHAGE**--closely allied to the latter, comprises the Old Latin MSS. (vetus Latina) and is designated Itala (it). It is included under the designation for the complete Latin tradition (latt) and represented especially by minuscules f and m.

Although Ph₆ might be classified in a unit by itself, since it does to a degree disassociate itself from the Alexandrian tradition as heretofore known, in the following chapters it is generally classified as representing that locale. Often, then, this canon becomes a best-of-five choice in general. But frequently some locales support both variants cited. Such divided testimony cannot, of course, be cited in favor of either reading exclusively. The most significant "spread," as the development of textual traditions is traced, would seem to be the united testimony of Rome and Alexandria.

The last three canons concern transcriptional or internal evidence and represent an attempt to evaluate the readings from the scribe's own viewpoint.

III. "That reading is likely to be correct which cannot easily be traced back to the unintentional alteration of the copyist."

Among such alterations the following are to be considered: (a) the marginal gloss or explanation incorporated into the text; (b) homoioteton--in which the same or similar sentence- or word-ending has caused confusion resulting in either repetition or in omission; (c) homioarkton--in which the same or similar sentence- or word-beginning has caused confusion; (d) haplography--in which a duplicated letter or word has erroneously been written only once; (e) dittography--in which a singular

letter or word has erroneously been repeated; (f) itacism--in which the iota has been omitted or inserted wrongly in view of the similarity in pronunciation of η and ϵ ("ee"). In a general way these scribal slips constitute lapsus pennae or memoriae, but more often an error oculi. This would seem to indicate that the scribe of P46 copied by sight rather than by dictation.

- IV. "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."

Scribes often thought to improve a text for grammatical or doctrinal reasons when it seemed difficult or apparently contradictory. The knowledge of parallel expressions elsewhere often compelled them to accommodate one reading to the other ("cross-breeding"). This could often result from the parallel phrase which was written as a marginal gloss or from the recall of such phrases by memory. Hence some such errors could be explained as unintentional. This preference for the most difficult reading as the genuine one is expressed in Bengel's classic "Proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua."

- V. "That reading is likely to be the correct one which best agrees with the style and diction and other characteristics of the author in question."

This rule of choice assumes a natural consistency on the part of the writer, ceteris paribus. But as such it can often make for a difficult choice in contradiction to the latter canon. For the more difficult reading is sometimes that reading less typical of the author's style! In other cases this canon demonstrates itself in preference for the shorter reading, the one without scribal polish or interpretive additions.

All of the five principles here enunciated are not always applicable. Nor is each one always of equal value in determining a sheer best-of-five numerical support. Much depends on the circumstances of the individual case. Once canon three can be so compelling or probable that a reading seems genuine in spite of weak MSS. support or a narrow distribution, or both. Sometimes the last canon hardly demands application.

The preferences which derive from considering the three canons concerning intrinsic probabilities have been summarized as "the readings which explain other variants, but are not contrariwise themselves to be explained by the others."¹⁰ That such internally more probable readings have increasingly merited the preference of modern critics is a direct result of the papyrus testimony. It will be recalled that it has not only lowered the esteem for the Vaticanus, but has also dispelled the idea that the Egyptian text of the early centuries is predominantly, rather wholly, of one delineated type or genealogical stemma. The significance of such conclusions is simply that the external evidence has been given increasingly less regard while internal considerations have been increasingly accented. E. C. Colwell places highest confidence in internal evidence when he says, "The majority of the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reasons."¹¹ Frederick Grant claims that

¹⁰ Frederick C. Grant, "Textual Criticism," An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, edited by Luther A. Weigle (Issued by ICRB, 1946), p. 41.

¹¹ Colwell, op. cit., p. 53.

the style of the author is the best basis for preference and concludes,

In place of some rule of preference for one type of text over another, or for their common agreements over their divergencies, we shall have to trust a great deal more than heretofore to what is called internal criticism. . . . The reviser of today is forced to adopt the eclectic principle.¹²

In the present evaluation the internal evidence, especially the fifth canon, has not been invoked without due moderation. It would often seem that intrinsic considerations involve so many intangible factors and constitute such a subtle process that even the most scholarly critic can become overly indebted to his own subjective judgment. This can sometimes constitute risky, unsound, even unfair treatment of the text. The five canons adopted here as presented by Dr. William Arndt are considered a wholesome balance against such dangerous subjectivity. They tend to stifle any premature, a priori, overambitious emphasis on the relatively new witness. Hence the first two canons concerning the externa are here given a due respect. When the total internal considerations prove quite inconsequential either way, the summary evidence of the first two canons is usually taken as conclusive. This is not to believe that "the true reading wins out in the end" or must be found in the majority of uncials, nor is this to place undue confidence in any one manuscript. The first two canons constitute a check against each other, and all five canons, taken together, form a legitimate and valid set of criteria.

In the following chapters these criteria will be applied to the variants grouped in the eight possible textual associations between the papyrus and the three primary uncials.

¹²Grant, op. cit., pp. 40ff.

CHAPTER IV

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH, B, AND D

- 1) Gal. 2:12 TEXT: $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$
P46: $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ B s^f D* G al it Br.

The complete testimony of the primary uncials strongly favors the unadopted reading of P46.

Rome, Carthage, and Alexandria represent a geographical distribution which favors the reading of the papyrus.

Since P46 alone is consistent in using also the singular indefinite pronoun $\tau\lambda\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ it is quite possible that the reading in the primary MSS. cited is homoiarkton from such a reading in the preceding verse. Both phrases occur in the middle of the line in the papyrus!

The reading of P46 makes good sense, assuming simply that only one person "came from James." But this contention is supported only in the verb and not in the pronoun by the mass of MSS. evidence and P46 itself concludes by saying Peter feared "those ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) of the circumcision." Although the external evidence is totally in favor of the papyrus reading, the intrinsic considerations are even more compelling and would here demand the reconstructed text (cf. 87 and 88).

The MSV accepts the Nestle text reading without any footnote reference to the overwhelming MSS. evidence!

- 2) Col. 1:17 TEXT: $\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ C Kaine al lat sy
P46: $\tilde{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$ Hes. D* G pm.

All three primary witnesses favor the reading of P46.

Alexandria, Byzantium, Rome, and Antioch are represented by the

reading of the text; Alexandria and Rome (first hand) by the reading of P46. This distribution favors the reading of the text.

Paul had just referred to Epaphras as our fellow servant and now refers to him also as one ministering on our behalf or "as well as us." The preceding ὑπέρ probably accounts for the pronoun in the second person as a close homoiarkton. The reading of P46 seems slightly more difficult and other hands in D probably represent an attempt to correct this.

The witness of P46 is rather decisive for a change in the Nestle text.

The RSV adopts the reading of the papyrus and a footnote recognizes the witnesses for the Nestle reading.

Conclusions: There are a total of five readings cited in the Nestle text in which three primary uncials are supported by the papyrus. The three adopted readings occur in Gal. 5:17; Phil. 1:27; and Col. 2:18.

That there are only five such readings demonstrates an early tradition strongly divided. But their united testimony is an almost certain witness for the correct text. One of the two unadopted readings has been accepted and the RSV has done the same. The other reading might demonstrate that the total mass of the best MSS. can possibly perpetuate a mistake! But it seems strange that this reading has not been acknowledged with a footnote in the RSV.

CHAPTER V

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH AND B

- 3) Eph. 1:1 TEXT: [ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] A Kaine D G pl. lat sy
 P46: (omitted) B* 31* 424 1739 Mion (Tert.) Or.

Two of the three primary witnesses in the first hand support P46.

The reading which omits the phrase is notably only Alexandrian.

Even this location furnishes divided testimony, for the "lesser" Alexandrian (A) includes the phrase together with the complete Roman tradition and that of Byzantium and Antioch. Hence the omission of the phrase is not widely attested.

But the omission cannot be viewed as an unintentional alteration and the "proto" Alexandrians point clearly to an intentional one in the text. Aleph has the phrase from another later hand and the Vaticanus as a marginal gloss. Both testify to an original lacuna or blank space (to be filled in with various names?). Marcion, by testimony of Tertullian, omits the phrase and inscribes the letter with the title "Ad Laodicensis" and Origen also testifies to the omission of the phrase in the MS. at hand. Here Bengel's canon, proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua, favors the omission, and an insertion at this lacuna might well represent an attempt to make Paul's style consistent. For the typical Pauline style of introduction here violated compare: Rom. 1:7 Πᾶσις . . . πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, Col. 1:1-2 Πᾶσις . . . τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἑταίροις καὶ πλετοῖς ἀδελφοῖς and other introductions. Nowhere else does Pauline style parallel this introduction with ἐν Ἐφέσῳ omitted.

Stoekhardt¹ offers a detailed discussion of the problem (without the benefit of the P46 witness) and favors retaining the phrase after examining the following considerations:

- a. The whole ecclesiastical tradition as "veritas ecclesiae" held it to be sent to the Ephesians.

But in textual criticism the testimony of a heretic is not per se wrong, and if Marcion himself did not eliminate the phrase, as might well be the case, then his testimony in textual matters need not always be considered extra veritatem ecclesiae.

- b. It is an argument from silence to say that Tertullian's appeal to tradition rather than to the phrase $\epsilon\upsilon$ 'Εφεσω in his writing "Against Marcion" proves that Tertullian's text also omitted the phrase.

But the words of Tertullian ("We have it on true tradition of the church that this Epistle was sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans. Marcion, however, was very desirous of giving it a new title, as if he were extremely accurate in investigating such a point.") are indecisive either way in revealing the reading in the MS. before him.

- c. Tertullian held Marcion's offence against the Veritas ecclesiae "as of no inconsiderable moment."
- d. Tertullian mentions Ephesus as "one of the ecclesiarum apostolicarum where the authenticas litteras of the Apostles were read."

But an encyclical letter could still have included Ephesus!

- e. It is an argument from silence to say that Origen's metaphysical explanation of the formula $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ οὐραν as referring to those called from the "not being" into "the being" also testifies to the lack of $\epsilon\upsilon$ 'Εφεσω in his copy.

¹George Stoekhardt, Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, translated by Martin S. Sommer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952), pp. 14-30.

But it seems peculiarly difficult to understand such an explanation on Origen's part if the phrase were not omitted, Alexandrian allegorizing notwithstanding!

f. Jerome condemns Origen's explanation.

But it is to be noted that Jerome's condemnation seems to rest rather on a traditional view than on textual evidence: "Others, however, with greater simplicity think [sic] that the Letter is directed not to those who "are" but to those who are saints and believers at Ephesus." It is pure conjecture to say that these words refer not to two readings but to two explanations of the same reading.

- g. Only in the copies known to him does the fourth century Basilus (in adv. Eunom.) testify to the omission of the phrase: "'To those that are and the believers in Christ Jesus.' For thus also our forbears transmitted it and we ourselves have found it in old copies."

But "old copies" (plural!) in the fourth century are strong evidence!

- h. The Muratorian Canon, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Ignatius knew it as a letter to the Ephesians.
- i. If the phrase were once missing there would be no explanation for the unanimity of tradition and later MSS. in singling out Ephesus as the destination (Zahn, Meyer).
- j. The omission of the phrase is non-Pauline style.
- k. The omission of the phrase renders the sentence meaningless or untranslatable.

Many modern scholars disagree with this last contention. The RSV scholars render $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \ \omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon\lambda\ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ as "to the saints who are also faithful." This need not, as Stoeckhardt claims, imply that there can be saints who are not faithful! Goodspeed renders the phrase, "to God's people who are steadfast," and from a detailed

comparison of Ephesian parallels found in other Pauline sources concludes that the letter is an encyclical introduction for the Pauline epistles compiled by Onesimus and that the papyrus is "decisive evidence" that the phrase was "written long after."² Dr. Wm. Arndt discredits this theory of non-Pauline authorship but concurs in calling the letter an encyclical.³

1. Ewald's reconstruction of the text (τοῖς ἑταῖροῖς οὖτε καὶ πλοτοῖς) from an assumed damaged MS. corner which read τοῖς ἑταῖροῖς οὖτε) and led to the erroneous homoioteleuton τοῖς ἑταῖροῖς τοῖς is too speculative.

It does indeed seem to be such.

- m. The complete lack of personal greetings in this letter does not demonstrate its encyclical nature since Tychicus is instructed to add oral and personal addenda in chap. 6:21.

But such instructions speak as well for its nature as an encyclical as against, and we would then assume that the specifically pertinent addenda were given orally at each place to which the letter was carried. It would rather seem that the lack of written greetings is significant! H. Rendtorff cites Col. 4:7f. in reference to its possible encyclical nature as delivered together with the epistle to the Colossians, and Col. 4:16 as possibly pointing to Laodicea as its destination.⁴

- n. "The epistle from Laodicea" should not be identified with this letter since such identification lacks historical precedent, other than Marcion.

²Edgar Goodspeed, The Key to Ephesians (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), pp. viiiff.

³William Arndt, "Review of Goodspeed's 'The Key to Ephesians'," Concordia Theological Monthly, (December, 1956), p. 978.

⁴HTD, VIII, 56.

A few of these arguments, as presented by Stoeckhardt, are still noteworthy objections (cf. c, h, i) but the consideration of an intentional alteration supported by the oldest and best MSS. shows that the phrase is best rejected.

However, it certainly does not seem fair to the text to translate the cumbersome phrase in the papyrus as if it made good sense in itself, without a parenthetical lacuna (although there is none in the papyrus!) or designated destination. Zuntz aptly remarks,

τοῖς οὖτε without an indication of place . . . following makes no sense [vs. Goodspeed] Anyone wanting to expel the mention of an addressee . . . would surely have had the sense to delete also *τοῖς οὖτε* and thus produce an understandable phrase, comparable to Col. 1:2 and Jude 1. [The two words were] intended to be followed by an indication of place; the latter being left vacant in the original, to be filled in variously in various copies.⁵

The RSV omits the phrase in its text but recognizes its wide attestation in a footnote.

4) Eph. 1:15 TEXT: τῆν ἐχάπηνον Kaine (D & S al) pl lat
 Ph46: (omitted) B 15* A pc; H sy; hr

Two of the three primary MSS. support the omission.

The omission is peculiar to Alexandria while its inclusion represents Rome and Antioch. This distribution favors the reading of the text to a slight degree.

The Ph46 reading can be regarded as more genuine in so far as its omission can hardly be viewed as unintentional. Neither reading is actually a lectio ardua if καθ' ὑμῶν be rendered "among you" rather than by the possessive pronoun. An intentional alteration

⁵G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 228.

seems more likely in the text as an interpolation from the acute parallel in Col. 1:14 where the $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\lambda\varsigma - \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ duet is found, as also in Philemon 5.

Hence the majority of considerations speak strongly for the adoption of Φ_{46} as correct.

The RSV adopts the Nestle text and recognizes the testimony of Φ_{46} in a footnote.

5) Eph. 4:24 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$
 Φ_{46} : $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $B^* K 69$ al lat sy Cl ^{pt}

Two of the three primary MSS., one in the first hand, favor the acrist middle imperative of Φ_{46} .

The imperative is the most widespread reading, represented in Alexandria, Byzantium (K), Rome and Antioch, while the infinitive only in Carthage (?) and Rome.

The infinitive form in the text seems likely to be homoioteleuton, an unintentional confusion from the preceding infinitive $\acute{\alpha}\nu\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. The imperative form seems less likely an intentional effort to make the verb form agree with Pauline usage of the imperative in Rom. 13:14 (cf. also Gal. 3:27). But the internal evidence is quite inconclusive (cf. 105).

The total evidence is definitely in favor of adopting the reading of Φ_{46} as the more genuine one.

The RSV seems to adopt the reading of Φ_{46} without further notation, but the choice is not necessarily apparent in translation.

Conclusions: Of the thirteen readings with such support, Nestle has adopted ten, and thereby demonstrated, quite correctly, an unusual

confidence in this combination of support. In Galatians he has adopted all four (3:7; 4:7; 4:15; 5:21), in Ephesians two (2:15; 5:19) of the five, in Philippians all three (2:11; 3:10; 3:16), and the one (4:12) in Colossians.

All three readings have been adopted. The RSV has adopted one, probably two.

That there are only thirteen such readings demonstrates that the Alexandrian tradition is not a narrow entity. That all three are worthy of acceptance demonstrates a lack of special agreement in error (Leitfehler) between P46 and the major Alexandrians.⁶ When these three witnesses combine they would seem to outweigh all other manuscript support, provided it is not wholly united.

⁶Ibid., p. 65.

CHAPTER VI

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY B AND D

- 6) Gal. 1:3 TEXT: ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Hec. 1912 al
 P46: καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν P51 B Koine D6 al; Th'

Two of the three primary MSS. support the reading of P46.

The reading of the text finds uncial support only in Alexandria (S) and even here the witness is divided. The reading of P46, found in Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome is better attested.

The papyrus hardly presents an unintentional alteration. It seems quite probable, however, that the reading of the text is a lapsus memoriae in which the scribe confused the dictation or reading here with the standard formulas of Paul, or even made an intentional alteration in agreement with them: e.g., Rom. 1:7 ἄπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ι. Χ. I Cor. 1:3 ἄπὸ θ. π. ἡμῶν καὶ κ. Ι. Χ. cf. also 2 Cor. 1:2; Eph. 1:2; Phil. 1:2; (Col. 1:2). In introductions the formula καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν is found only in the letters to Timothy which were probably never included in the papyrus.

The Nestle text should therefore be altered in favor of the less stereotyped reading of P46.

The RSV accepts the reading of P46 without notation.

- 7) Gal. 1:16 TEXT: τρία ἔτη
 P46: ἔτη τρία B Koine D6 pm; W

Two of the three primary uncials support the reading of P46.

The reading of P46 seems more widely attested, being found in Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome, but some of these regions present a

Two of the three primary MSS. favor the reading of P46, possibly also the third, Aleph, in another hand.

The Alexandrian witnesses are divided. While Carthage may support the omission, Rome, Byzantium, and Antioch do not. This would favor the reading of P46 as more widely attested.

The addition of $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ can hardly be termed an unintentional alteration, but it does seem like an intentional attempt to interpret and to improve the text in accommodation to the previous infinitive with its indirect object $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\epsilon\tau\iota\upsilon$. The unbalanced style of the omission seems to have led to a desire for correction in another hand of Aleph, and this might bespeak the genuine nature of the shorter reading.

A decision is here difficult but the external evidence seems more compelling than the internal and would lead to an adoption of the reading in P46.

The ESV adopts the reading of P46 without notation.

10) Eph. 6:12 TEXT: $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$
 P46: $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ B D* G al it sy^P; h

Two of the three primary MSS., one in the first hand only, support the second person pronoun of P46.

The reading of P46 is most widely distributed, being found in Alexandria, Rome, and Carthage (it, h) and in the late Antiochean Syriac Peshitta, though some of these locales furnish divided testimony.

The reading of P46 is hardly an unintentional alteration but would rather seem to fit the whole context (vv. 10-20) better in which Paul speaks in the second person throughout. It might be urged that this is therefore an attempted improvement to make the person consistent. But

the second hand of Aleph militates against this conclusion since that scribe would hardly make an intentional alteration in the consistent use of the original second person.

The reading of P46 is probably quite correct.

The RSV follows the Nestle text without notation.

- 11) Eph. 6:16 TEXT: τὰ πτερυγμένα
 P46: πτετ. B D * 6 ; [H]

Two of the three primary MSS., one in the first hand only, support the omission of the article.

Rome and Alexandria support the omission, but both locales furnish divided testimony. The reading with the article is considerably more widespread.

Although the addition of an article is a more obvious fault than its omission, this omission can possibly be seen as unintentional from the lack of usage in the context. The correction in D points rather to the presence of the article as an attempted improvement in view of the antecedent τὰ βέλη.

A decision is here difficult but the least subjective evidence seems to reject the papyrus reading.

The RSV translation cannot be associated with either reading.

- 12) Phil. 1:24 TEXT: ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί
 P46: ἐπ. ἐν τ. σ. B Koine D G al; W

The reading of P46 is favored by two of the three primary MSS.

Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome support the reading which includes the article, but the testimony of these locales is generally divided. Neither reading can be said to be more widespread.

The occurrence of ἐν is probably best explained as similar to a dittography in which the essence of the infinitive ending was repeated

as a preposition rather to be expected (from $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda$ -) than not. The shorter reading suggests itself as more genuine.

The papyrus reading is therefore rejected in favor of the text.

No association can be clearly deduced from the RSV translation, but the translation "in" (vs. "with") usually represents the preposition with the dative.¹

13) Col. 2:10 TEXT: $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$
 P46: $\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ B D G

Two of the three primary MSS. support the papyrus reading.

Alexandria and Rome alone testify to the reading of P46, and in both places a divided loyalty exists. This fact favors the reading of the text.

Neither the masculine relative $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ nor the neuter relative $\acute{\omicron}$ here submits well to a judgment of intentional or unintentional alteration and both constructions are grammatically possible, though the latter seems more unusual. Robertson remarks, "A special idiom is the relative $\acute{\omicron}$ as an explanation ($\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$) . . . used without much regard to the gender (not to say number) of antecedent or predicate;"²

cf. Col. 3:11 $\tau\eta\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$
 and Eph. 6:17 $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.

Disregard of gender is evidently the case here too, since the neuter relative $\acute{\omicron}$ has a masculine antecedent. Goodspeed, however, seems to

¹F. C. Grant, "Textual Criticism," An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, edited by Luther A. Weigle (Issued by ICRB, 1946), pp. 49f.

²A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 411.

translate it as a personal pronoun, "He is the head" (δ'). (The uncials have no diacritical marks!) Cf. 32.

The distribution of evidence favors the rejection of the papyrus reading, but a decision is difficult.

Neither reading can be clearly associated with the RSV translation.

14) Col. 2:12 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\bar{\omega}\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota$
 P46: $\epsilon.\tau.\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\omega\ BD^*6\ \mu\epsilon;\ W$

The papyrus reading is supported by two of the three primary uncials, but only in the first hand of the Claromontanus.

Alexandria and Rome alone, both with divided testimony, attest the reading of P46. The other reading is therefore most widely known.

The papyrus reading is probably homoioteleuton--a confusion resulting from the difficulty in following with eye or ear the structure of the words $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\bar{\omega}\ \beta\dots(\omega)\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \bar{\omega}$. However, it may be argued that this dative of $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is the more difficult reading since this would be a Pauline hapax legomenon, the only other usages occurring in Mk. 7:4; Heb. 6:2; and 9:10. The word $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$, on the other hand, is Pauline (Rom. 6:4; Eph. 4:5), and the second hand of D might be an attempt to make this usage agree.

A decision as to the correct reading is here difficult, but the evidence seems to favor the rejection of the papyrus reading.

Neither reading can be clearly associated with the RSV translation.

15) Col. 3:22 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 P46: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \text{---}\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\ B A D G\ a\iota;\ h$

Two of the three primary uncials support the papyrus reading.

Alexandria and Rome alone support the papyrus, and in both locales the testimony is divided. The reading of the text is therefore more

widely attested.

Only in Eph. 6:6 is another N. T. usage of this word found, and there in the singular -*ἐν*. Here the text renders the plural "of more than one kind of services."³ This form can hardly be viewed as an unintentional alteration, while the singular might possibly be a false parallel to that in Ephesians.

The papyrus reading is therefore better rejected as an easier alteration.

The RSV translated "eyeservice" which might be collective for the plural, but a definite association with either reading is not apparent.

Conclusions: These ten readings represent about 53 per cent of the total number (19) cited in the apparatus. Nestle adopts one (4:28) of the five in Galatians, two (1:1; 3:8) of the five in Ephesians, one (1:6) of the two in Philippians, four (1:22; 3:6,13,16) of the seven in Colossians, and one (5:27) in I Thessalonians. The latter is the only citation of *Π46* in the entire apparatus for that letter.

That there are more agreements with B - D than with Aleph - B (13) is perhaps the best evidence of the peculiar substantiation which *Π46* gives to certain Western readings.

But it seems that Nestle has gone almost far enough in the number that he has adopted. Only two of the four readings accepted by us seem genuine to a satisfactory degree. The RSV adopts two (6, 9) of these four, definitely rejecting one which should be accepted (10) while

³W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by W. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 604.

clearly accepting another (9) which is somewhat doubtful (also 12?).

Adding these four to the nine already adopted represents an acceptance of 60 per cent of this class.

[Faint, illegible text]

CHAPTER VII

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH AND D

16) Gal. 1:4 TEXT: ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν P51 BH 33 1611 *pm.*
 P46: περὶ τ. ἁ. s^t *A Kine D 6 al; Th

Two of the three primary uncials support the papyrus, the Sinaiticus only in the first hand.

The papyrus reading is found in majuscules of Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome, while the other reading finds significant support only in Alexandrian codices (B, H) and the more important minuscule 33, and P51. The reading *περὶ* is therefore more widespread.

Robertson remarks, ". . . in the N. T. the distinction between *περὶ* and *ὑπὲρ* is not very marked in some usages, partly due to the affinity in sound and sense"¹ and a brief glance at the concordance entries under *ὑπὲρ* reveals the common v(ariae) l(ectiones) in which *περὶ* is used widely and synonymously for *ὑπὲρ* (Cf. Rom. 8:3 and Gal. 2:20). All internal evidence seems partial to neither reading.

On the basis of the external evidence the reading of P46 should be adopted.

The RSV translation "for our sins" can express either cause or purpose and allows no clear association. Both words are frequently translated with "for" (compare Heb. 5:26 and Rom. 8:3 with 1 Tim. 2:6 and Tit. 2:14).

¹A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 629.

17) Gal. 2:16

TEXT: $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ BA 33P46: $\text{I}\cdot\chi$ I^s C Koine D 6 pl; S

Two of the three primary MSS. support the papyrus.

Although all three MSS. supporting the text are significant ones, they represent only Alexandria, while the papyrus is supported also in Byzantium and Rome.

Confusion in the order of these two names can no doubt be traced to unintentional errors resulting from the frequent occurrence in either order. But which of the above readings represents the alteration seems impossible to determine. In these epistles Nestle reads $\chi\cdot\text{I}$. four other times (where P46 is concerned): Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:6; 2:21; Gal. 2:16b and in the latter two cases only against the witness of P46. In Gal. 3:14 he reads $\text{I}\cdot\chi$. in opposition to P46. His choice is apparently strongly based on the testimony of B. From an analysis of the usage from earlier to later Pauline writings in the certain readings, Sanday and Headlam conclude that $\text{I}\cdot\chi$. is earlier than $\chi\cdot\text{I}$. in the vocabulary of Paul. "In $\chi\cdot\text{I}$. the first word would seem to be rather more distinctly a proper name than in $\text{I}\cdot\chi$. [where] χ . would seem to have a little of its sense as a title still clinging to it."² But this interesting conclusion can hardly be used here in favor of the papyrus since either sense might apply.

On the basis of the external evidence alone the papyrus reading can be adopted.

²W. Sanday and A. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), pp. 3f.

The RSV adopts the reading of the papyrus without any notation!

- 18) Gal. 3:19 TEXT: ἕως ἄρτι B pc Cl.
 P46: ἕ οὗ ε. Hes. Kaine DG pl Jr; Th

The papyrus has the support of two of the three primary witnesses and has an overwhelmingly favorable geographical support.

The problem does not concern the use of the rare form ἕως (for ἕως) but the use of the adverbial ἄρτι for the relative οὗ . The former is found only here in the N. T. (but Rev. 2:25 ἕως οὗ ἄρτι);³ Both forms express the English "until," the reading of the text being a crasis for ἕως χρόνου ἡ, "until the time when!" But the papyrus is best rendered "as long as" or "while" and this seems less meaningful to the context. The text may be favored by the fact that it is a more difficult reading, perhaps even grammatically questionable. The "law was added as long as the seed should come" i.e., while it was yet in promise.

The papyrus reading should be rejected for the more difficult text.

The RSV seems to adopt the reading of the papyrus without notation.

- 19) Eph. 5:31 TEXT: πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα
 P46: τὴν γυναῖκα (s) ADG pc; Th

The papyrus is supported by two of the three primary witnesses, Aleph varying somewhat in a non-essential matter.

Although their representatives are strong, Alexandria and Rome alone support the papyrus, leaving the majority to support the text. And even these locales furnish a divided testimony.

³Robertson, op. cit., p. 1412.

The shorter reading of the papyrus seems much like an unintentional alteration caused by a lapsus memoriae in the repetition of *πρός* prefix in the preceding verb. This seems more likely than a possible unintentional duplication of the prefix.

The papyrus reading can therefore be rejected.

The RSV translation reveals no specific choice of reading.

20) Phil. 2:4 TEXT: τὸ ἐαυτῶν ἕκαστοι σκωπ. B A 6 pc.
 P46: τ. ἐ. ἕκαστος σ. d^sC Koine D pl; h

Although the papyrus has the majority support of the major uncials, the divided testimony of Alexandria and Rome represents a minority support.

The papyrus reading is probably an unintentional alteration in which the initial sigma of the verb following became a part of the ending of *ἕκαστοι*. Nor does the plural article, unanimously attested, allow for the singular ending, and a singular verb is found only in the Koine.

The papyrus reading is therefore to be certainly rejected.

The RSV translation admits of no association.

21) Phil. 2:21 TEXT: χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ B Koine pl.
 P46: I. χ. Hec. D 6 lat sy^p C^l; h

Two of the three primary MSS. support the papyrus reading.

Only Byzantium and Alexandria, the latter only in part, do not substantiate the papyrus.

(For intrinsic considerations cf. 17).

The reading of the papyrus should be adopted.

The RSV adopts the papyrus without notation.

- 22) Phil. 4:23 TEXT: (omitted) B G pc.
 P46: $\xi\mu\eta\nu$ s¹ A Koine D pl. lat sy

The papyrus is supported by two of the three primary uncials, and only Alexandria and Rome, each with divided testimony, have any significant witness against the papyrus.

The problem of this concluding word occurs at the end of nearly every epistle and seems to represent, in most cases, an intentional addition to the authentic text--a popular and fitting conclusion which was originally found in only a few of the epistles (Gal. and Rom.). Of possible significance also is the commonly preceding $\xi\mu\omega\nu$ whose uncials, especially the initial letter, could by their resemblance cause the confusion in repetition. The text then represents a more "difficult" reading.

On the basis of the internal evidence the papyrus testimony should be rejected.

The RSV rejects the papyrus reading without any notation.

- 23) Col. 3:4 TEXT: $\eta\mu\omega\nu$ B Koine al sy
 P46: $\xi\mu\omega\nu$ Hes. D G pm lat; Th

Two of the three primary uncials support the papyrus.

The Alexandrian tradition is divided in its testimony. While Byzantium and Antioch support the text, the Roman tradition supports the papyrus. Hence the papyrus reading is not quite so widely attested.

It may be possible that the reading of the text is an unintentional alteration resulting from a dittography of the final η in the immediately preceding $\xi\omega\eta$, but it seems much more probable that the papyrus represents an unintentional alteration in which the eye of the scribe

read again the similar phrase $\eta \varsigma \omega \eta \psi \mu \omega \nu$ in the preceding verse, or that the papyrus reading is even an intentional attempt at conformity of the two phrases.

The papyrus reading can quite certainly be rejected.

The RSV adopts the reading of the text without notation.

Conclusions: These eight readings represent 67 per cent of the total number (12). The one-third which Nestle adopts constitutes: one (4:3) of the four in Galatians, three (4:8,9; 5:32) of the four in Ephesians (!), none of the three (2:4,21; 4:23) in Philippians, nor the one in Colossians (3:4).

That there are only twelve such readings renders this the most suspicious of those groups in which two of the primary uncials support the papyrus, and it seems to reveal a somewhat doubtful value for Aleph in this combination. It was also the combination Aleph - B which found less frequent support of the papyrus while B - D ranked highest. Hence the papyrus seems to ferret out Aleph as that one to which it gives the least support, even less than to D! The 100 per cent adoption of the Aleph - B combination is therefore due to the presence of B, and this percentage would probably not have been so high had more cases been evaluated.

Three (16, 17, 21) of these eight readings seem genuine and two are adopted by the RSV (16?). In addition to these the RSV might adopt one that is probably not genuine (18).

Adding these three to the four already adopted represents an acceptance of 59 per cent of this class.

CHAPTER VIII

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY B

24) Gal. 2:13 TEXT: [K^ll̄] Hes. Koine D⁶ pl it sy
P46: (omitted) B 1739 f vg. Or; W

Only one of the three primary uncials supports the papyrus.

Both Alexandria and Rome furnish divided testimony, yet here alone does the papyrus find support. The text, on the other hand, has further testimony in the Byzantines and in Carthage and Antioch.

The interpolation, then, of a complementary *μεν* or *καὶ* . . . is typical of the Byzantine text and anything but foreign to the older witnesses; indeed the "Alexandrians" are as liable to it as are the "Westerners" and the distinction of the families is, in this detail, often not maintained. . . . The Alexandrian filter . . . was comparatively often foiled by the strong tendency against *asyndeta* and thus allowed a number of interpolations to flow down to Byzantium. . . . It was not the foolish scribe of P46 that managed, time and time again, to pick on the uninterpolated wording.¹

Hoskier remarks,

It would be a rash person who would accuse P46 of omitting all these copulas [*καὶ*, *δε*, *καὶ*, *οὐκ*, *μεν*] from sheer carelessness, even when alone. It has become clear that far more polishing took place after the original was launched than has been supposed hitherto, and P46 is absolved from many lâches attributed to it.²

The reading of the text seems to be such an interpolation in view of the preceding *καὶ*, and the papyrus reading should therefore be adopted.

¹G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 199f.

²H. C. Hoskier, A Commentary of the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus (London: Bernard Quartich Ltd., 1938), p. 63.

The RSV seems to omit the bracketed *Kαὶ* of the Nestle text.

- 25) Gal. 2:16 TEXT: *Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*
 P46: *I. X. BH 33 1611 pc. sy; Wh*

Only one of the primary MSS. supports the papyrus reading.

Only Alexandria and Antioch, the former divided in testimony, support the reading of the papyrus. The text has certainly a wider testimony.

The reading of the papyrus probably represents an unintentional congruity with the same order of the names in the first part of the verse, and perhaps this accommodation might even be viewed as intentional (cf. 17).

The papyrus reading should therefore be rejected.

The RSV adopts the Nestle text without notation.

- 26) Gal. 3:21 TEXT: [*τοῦ θεοῦ*] *H. es. Koine D (6) pl lat sy; T*
 P46: (omitted) ! *B d Ambst; W*

Of the primary MSS. only the Vaticanus supports the papyrus.

Only Alexandria and Rome, both with divided testimony, favor the papyrus reading.

The brackets in the text show Nestle's doubt (with other editors) and the exclamation mark in the apparatus shows his unsettled preference. It seems typical of the papyrus to omit *τοῦ θεοῦ* cf. Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:14; 3:3. Zuntz remarks of the singular testimony of P46 for a similar omission elsewhere: "The gradual agglomeration of additions . . . is explicable in accordance with the normal features of manuscript tradition. . . . Its consistently shorter text bears the mark of genuineness."³

³Zuntz, op. cit., p. 32.

The reading of the text is possibly such a later interpolation, but Sanders has the opinion that "the insertion started very early, if it was not rather the original text, and the omission due to a careless error."⁴

The external evidence seems too strong to reject the reading of the text.

The RSV adopts the Nestle text without notation.

27) Gal. 3:24 TEXT: *ἡγεγορευ*
 P46: *ἡγεγέτο B C^{1st}*

Only one of the primary MSS. supports the reading of the papyrus.

Only Alexandria and only the minority of its witnesses (even Clement furnishes divided testimony) support the papyrus witness.

The text presents the perfect tense while the papyrus uses the aorist middle *ἡγεγορευ*. Neither reading clarifies the exegetical debate over the subject of this verb--whether it be Christ or the law. Does the law itself lead us to Christ or is it the schoolmaster until Christ came? An unintentional alteration hardly seems possible, and the perfect of the text seems more expressive of Paul's argument that the present result of Christ's past appearance ushered in our new position relative to the law.

The papyrus reading is best rejected.

The RSV makes no specific association apparent, but since it often translates the Greek aorist with the English perfect (vs. past) tense,

⁴Henry A. Sanders, A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935), p. 37.

it is more probable that the text is here translated with "came."⁵

28) Gal. 4:23 TEXT: $\mu\epsilon\nu$ *Her. Kaine D 6 pl; T*
 PH6: (omitted) *B f vg; W*

The majority of the primary witnesses do not support the papyrus. Alexandria and Rome, both with divided testimony, represent a minority distribution of the omission.

In view of the following $\acute{o} \delta\epsilon$ this particle might represent an intentional insertion, the schoolmaster's "polish" applied to improve and balance the text. It is typical of preference for the shorter reading in the papyrus. But this consideration seems too subjective here to be made decisive against the external support (cf. 24, 38).

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation permits no specific association.

29) Gal. 6:4 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$
 PH6: (omitted) *B sa; [H]*

The papyrus has the minority support of the primary uncials.

Only a part of the Alexandrian tradition (The Sahidic is from Upper Egypt) attests the papyrus reading. The text then is much more widespread.

It is difficult to see an alteration of either nature in any of the two readings, and the use of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in association with $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is frequent and well attested. Only the external evidence can here be used.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text without notation.

⁵Frederick C. Grant, "Textual Criticism," An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, edited by Luther A. Weigle (Issued by ICRB, 1946), pp. 49f.

30) Gal. 6:11 TEXT: *πηλίκους γράμμασιν*
 P46: *ήλίκους γ.* B* 33; h

Only one primary uncial supports the papyrus, and that in the first hand only.

Only a divided Alexandrian tradition attests the papyrus reading.

The word *πηλίκος* is the correlative pronoun "how large," here used as exclamation, and is found elsewhere only in Heb. 7:4 (with certain attestation). The shorter classical form in the papyrus is found with strong attestation in Col. 2:1 and with less certainty in James 3:5, and can mean also "how small." Minuscule 642 reads *ποικίλους*—"how varied." Although the testimony of minuscule 33 is often quite reliable and the correction in the Vaticanus points favorably to the papyrus reading, no internal evidence points to any probable alteration in either reading.

The external evidence speaks for the rejection of the papyrus reading.

The RSV translation suggests no specific association.

31) Gal. 6:13 TEXT: *περιτεμνόμενοι*
 P46: *περιτεμνήμενοι* B Kaine (6) al; Wh

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus.

Alexandria and Rome, each with divided testimony, and the Byzantines support the papyrus. This means that each reading has equally wide distribution.

The present passive participle of the text stresses the action which is being committed ("those who receive circumcision"), while the perfect passive participle stresses the state of those to whom the act of circumcision has been applied ("those who are/have been circumcised").

This discussion in Galatians features the present form more prominently (cf. chap. 5:2,3 and the immediate context of the reading). The present tense might rather point to the people concerned as Gentile converts, while the perfect to Jews circumcised in childhood. Althaus rejects this postulate and says, "Mit der Gegenwartsform kennzeichnet Paulus die Judaisten ihrer Haltung nach: sie bejahen die Beschneidung und ueben sie."⁶ In any case the reading of the text seems more consonant with Paul's discussion of Christian liberty (cf. 1 Cor. 7:18), and an alteration in verb form applies to neither reading with peculiar probability. The text is therefore probably correct.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

32) Eph. 1:14, TEXT: $\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\sigma\iota$ Keine D al
 P46: \acute{o} Hes. 6 pm; H

Of the primary MSS., only the Vaticanus supports the papyrus.

Alexandria and Rome, both with divided testimony, represent a minority geographical distribution.

The text adopts the masculine relative pronoun while the papyrus suggests the neuter (or the masculine article). Robertson points to Col. 3:14 as a good example of the relative not agreeing with antecedent and as often gathering "the general notion of 'thing.'"⁷ (cf. 13). Hence both readings could be rendered with the same English translation,

⁶H. W. Beyer and Others, Das Neue Testament Deutsch: Die Kleinere Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Goettingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), VIII, 54. Hereafter this commentary will be referred to as NTD.

⁷A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 713.

although the antecedent $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is a neuter. The internal evidence slightly favors the more natural neuter, but any postulated alteration favors neither reading.

The reading of the papyrus can be rejected.

The RSV translation admits no specific association.

33) Eph. 1:18 TEXT: [$\upsilon\mu\omega\nu$] *Hes. Kaine D6 pl; T*
 P46: (omitted) *B 33 arm Meion; W*

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus.

Alexandria alone (Armenian has a late, mixed test-type) supports the papyrus, and its testimony is divided.

The bracketed reading of the text implies Nestle's personal doubt as to its originality, probably caused by the early testimony of Marcion and the significant minuscule 33 together with B. Although the omission is probably a somewhat less typical reading, its presence as an unintentional alteration is quite improbable. The internal evidence is inconclusive, and on the basis of the external evidence the papyrus reading can be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

34) Eph. 2:5 TEXT: $\tau\omega\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$
 P46: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau.\ \chi.$ *B pc; Wn*

The Vaticanus is the only primary uncial supporting the papyrus, and it is read only at Alexandria where the testimony is divided.

The phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau.\ \chi.$ constantly recurs in the immediate context (cf. 1:12, 20; 2:7,9) and it is directly related to the many verbs compounded with $\tau\upsilon\upsilon$ - in verses 5-6. If the preposition is genuine it is an emphatic use (accompaniment) for describing the new life "with"

Christ. But its presence is probably from an unintentional lapsus memoriae or error oculi in which the previous phrases were duplicated (cf. 39).

The papyrus reading can quite certainly be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text by "with", for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ with dative is usually translated "in."⁸

35) Eph. 3:3 TEXT: $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$

Ph6: (omitted) B G d Ambrot; [H]

Only one of the primary MSS. supports the papyrus.

Rome and Alexandria, each with divided testimony, offer the only support for the papyrus. Zuntz remarks,

I submit that the asyndeton (viz. Ph6) is original and was obliterated as in so many others instances. The substitution in FG, of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ for the $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ of the majority suggests this very process. The asyndeton was the natural way of commencing the apostle's recapitulation of his credentials and preferable to the production of an unwieldy string of dependent clauses precariously attached to the preceding phrase by $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$."⁹

and dependent on the phrase "if indeed (i.e., "as surely") ye have heard."

This scholarly analysis is a good conjecture, but the $\gamma\alpha\rho$ (preceding $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta$) has a precariously poor attestation and should be expected also in Ph6, B, etc. if such is the case here.

The reading of the papyrus can be rejected, though a decision is here difficult.

The RSV adopts the reading of the Nestle text.

36) Eph. 3:19 TEXT: $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\varsigma$

Ph6: $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta$ B 33; h

⁸F. G. Grant, op. cit., pp. 49f.

⁹Zuntz, op. cit., p. 196.

this phrase, but the great majority of them include the article $\tau\lambda\iota\varsigma$. The adjective in question here is either a type of dittography from this article, or, in the case of the papyrus, haplographic confusion. The internal evidence bears out neither reading as more original, though the text seems somewhat more polished.

On the basis of the external evidence the papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates "his" and this probably represents the adjective in the text, since the RSV often refuses to render that adjective with "own."¹⁰

38) Eph. 4:32 TEXT: $\delta\epsilon'$
 Ph6: (omitted) P49 B 1739 al Cl; [H]

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus, but since the Claromontanus, in the first hand only, reads $\acute{o}\upsilon\tau$, the text too is supported by only one proto-Alexandrian (Aleph).

A strong, but divided, Alexandrian testimony is the only locale that omits the particle. The representatives of Rome and Carthage read $\acute{o}\upsilon\tau$. Hence Antioch and Byzantium together with a few of the important Alexandrines furnish the testimony for the particle.

Compare 24 and 28. While the omission of the particle might be viewed as a type of haplography (from the ending of the preceding $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\theta\epsilon$) or as a lapsus memoriae in which the similar vocalization of syllables was heard only once in dictation to the scribe, the inclusion can just as readily be seen as a type of dittography. The latter seems more

¹⁰F. C. Grant, op. cit., pp. 49ff.

probable in view of (1) the preceding succession of $\kappa\alpha\iota$'s, for which this particle became a supplement in the conclusion of Paul's list of imperatives; and (2) the apparent "polish" in the $\text{O}\dot{\text{U}}\text{V}$ inserted by the textual traditions of Rome and Carthage. The whole verse is best read without particular connection to the preceding verse. The internal evidence is more favorable to the papyrus reading.

The papyrus reading should be accepted.

The RSV apparently reads the Nestle text.

39) Eph. 5:19 TEXT: $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$
 P46: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \psi.$ BP^{pc}; W^h

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus.

The minority witnesses of Alexandria alone include the preposition.

The ninth century Porphyrianus is a poor witness.

The problem of alteration is here also concerned with the variants immediately following, in which the same preposition is problematical, and with the use of the dative with and without the preposition in the verse preceding. The insertion at this point probably represents an unintentional alteration, a thoughtless duplication of its previous use which is strongly favored by the lesser witnesses. The real parallel in Col. 3:16 omits the preposition (cf. 34).

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation suggests no particular association, but seems to translate the papyrus--"in psalms" vs. a dative of means.¹¹

¹¹ibid., pp. 49ff.

40) Eph. 5:19 TEXT: ὡδὺς πνευματικῆς
 Fl6: ὡδὺς B d

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus.

A small minority of the Alexandrines and the Roman tradition support the papyrus. The codex Alexandrinus has the reading πν. ἐν ἁγίῳ.

The real parallel in Col. 3:16 includes the adjective, and its integrity there cannot be doubted. Its presence here might well not be original, but a later correction based on the parallel, or possibly homoioteleuton from the previous πνεύματι. This intrinsic evidence hardly overcomes the external, but a decision is quite difficult.

The papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RV translates the Nestle text.

41) Eph. 5:28 TEXT: [καὶ] οἱ ἄνδρες
 Fl6: ἄνδρες B 33; W

The Vaticanus is the only primary uncial that supports the papyrus.

The papyrus reading is found only in the Alexandrian tradition, and here the testimony is divided.

The internal evidence is involved with other readings at this point: καὶ ἄνδρες A, D, G, pc. latt Cl.; οἱ ἄνδρες Aleph, Koine, pl sy^p, T. The standard formula in this verse (οὕτως... καὶ οἱ-text) is found throughout the immediate context: v. 23 ὡς καὶ ὁ χριστός; v. 24 οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία; v. 25 καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστός; v. 29 καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστός. The bracketed καὶ expresses a legitimate doubt by Nestle as a later gloss in the Western tradition of Rome, and the article itself seems to be another such intentional addition in harmony with the standard formula found in the context. The

shorter text does not represent unintentional alteration, and the omission of the article ("men"---collectively) is both proper and compatible with the discussion (cf. 24). The papyrus reading should therefore be adopted.

The RSV probably translates the papyrus (cf. v. 24b), though a definite association is hardly possible.

42) Eph. 6:10 TEXT: ἐνδυναμοῦσθε
 PH6: δυναμοῦσθε B 33 Or; h

The papyrus has a minority support of the primary uncials and its only locale support is in Alexandria where the testimony is divided.

Does the reading of the text represent an unintentional duplication from the preposition ἐν which immediately follows? The compounding of the verb and the repetition of the preposition is very common in N. T. usage, less common in the papyri.¹² The shorter verb form is less common in N. T. usage, and it seems more likely here to represent a type of haplography. Omission is here easier than commission.

All evidence is against the papyrus and it should be rejected.

The RSV translation allows no clear association.

43) Eph. 6:20 TEXT: ἐν αὐτῷ
 PH6: αὐτοῦ B; W

The papyrus has a minority uncial support and is read only in the Alexandrian locale whose testimony is sharply divided.

Paul's wish in the papyrus is "that I might speak it (Acc. Neuter) boldly" and in the text "damit ich in ihm die Freudigkeit gewinne zu

¹²Robertson, op. cit., p. 559.

reden"¹³ where "ihm" refers to τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (v. 19). However, Bauer says, "With ἐν the reason for the παραρρησία is given, and at the same time the object of the free speech"¹⁴ (italics mine). Since this is exhibited in Pauline usage elsewhere, it would seem that the papyrus reading reflects an intentional adaptation from the real parallel in Col. 4:3, 4 where the accusative neuter is firmly attested.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation allows no specific association but seems to translate the papyrus!

14) Phil. 1:19

TEXT: γὰρ

Ph6: δὲ B 69 pc; Wh

The minority of primary witnesses and a singular locale with divided testimony constitute a weak external support for the papyrus.

This variation is not altogether uncommon (cf. Gal. 1:11). The use of γὰρ more readily expresses the idea that a causal now follows the previously expressed thought. Paul rejoices because he knows that etc., and this seems to be his precise thought here. The papyrus reading might be duplicating the ending of the preceding οὐδὲ, but it is probably due to frequent variants on this interchange. Nor is the adversative (or continuative) δὲ altogether fitting here (but cf. 57).

¹³Rendtorff in NTD, VIII, 83.

¹⁴W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by W. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 259.

(Cf. also 11). The problem of the article can be explained both as intentional insertion or omission, either from a host of parallels or from confusion with the ending of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The omission is probably more easily explicable, but its presence and absence are both common usage for Paul in this letter. It would also seem that the personal name (usually without the article) is contextually more to be desired than the appellation (usually with the article). But here the external evidence alone deserves any decisive value.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The MSV probably translates the Nestle text.

47) Phil. 3:13 TEXT: $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\pi\omega$ P16, 1^e A D* al Cl.
 Ph6: $\omicron\upsilon$ B Kaine 6 pm lat sy; WH

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus, but probably also the Claromontanus in the second hand.

Most of the Alexandrines and a minority representation from Rome favor the text. But the papyrus reading is supported by more textual locales, being found in Alexandria, Byzantium, Rome and Antioch.

This problem is somewhat difficult both textually and theologically. The adverbial of the text might be a confusion from the preceding $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$ though this is not likely. It could represent an intentional alteration since "not yet" is expressive of Paul's discussion of his striving and pursuit after the goal, i.e., the $\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (v. 11). On the other hand it is difficult to see the negative particle as an unintentional omission of part of the word $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\pi\omega$.

Does Paul say, "I do not think I have captured it yet"--implying that the goal is attainable, or does he say, "I, for my own self, do not

think I have captured it"--implying that he, of himself, cannot be successful (since the power is from Christ)? The position and presence of the emphatic $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ speaks in favor of the latter interpretation. But the larger context seems to deny this. Paul here claims, "Vollkommen sein heisst dem Ziel nachjagen"¹⁶ and this is probably in answer to the problem of the Philippians expressed in the question, "Why strive if salvation is already declared as possessed?" The recurring $\eta\delta\eta$ (v. 12) and $\delta\iota\omega\kappa\omega$ (verses 12, 14) seem to express just that.¹⁶

A decision here is very difficult, but the total evidence seems to favor the text to a slight degree.

The RSV probably translates the papyrus without notation!

48) Col. 1:12 TEXT: (omitted)
 P46: $\epsilon\mu\delta$ B

The papyrus has minority support from the uncials and in geographical distribution.

Special agreements of this nature would seem to establish a close relationship between the papyrus and Codex Vaticanus.

This particle of coincidence is here grammatically fitting¹⁷ but it seems much like an unintentional insertion, common with such particles as textual "polish." Here it is probably a confusion from the following $\epsilon\mu\delta$ (cf. 122).

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

¹⁶Heinzelmann in NTD, VIII, 101f.

¹⁷Robertson, op. cit., pp. 1124, 1139.

49) Col. 1:18

TEXT: $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ P46: η α . B 1739 pc; [H]

A minority of the primary uncials and only a single locale with divided testimony support the papyrus.

The article here renders the noun neither more absolute or concrete in spite of the personification which would expect it. This is evident from the lack of the use of the article in the noun following. The article here probably represents a scribal "improvement" but the internal evidence is quite inconclusive (cf. 11).

The papyrus reading should be rejected on the basis of external support.

The RSV translation allows no specific association.

50) Col. 1:22

TEXT: $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\lambda\lambda\alpha\acute{\xi}\epsilon\nu$ P46: — $\eta\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\tau\epsilon$ (P46) B (33) Ephr; Wh

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus--and two of the locales, Alexandria and Antioch, with divided testimony.

The papyrus and the more significant minuscule 33 have minor variations from their reported reading. Both readings are aorist, the papyrus form being "found only in Christian writers."¹⁸ But it is to be noted that the representative MSS. of Rome and Carthage (D, G, it) read the second aorist participle $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. In v. 20 the papyrus and B read the first aorist (text) and the same form is found in the only other usage in Eph. 2:16. It might be said that the first aorist form here is an intentional alteration for the sake of

¹⁸Bauer, op. cit., p. 92.

conformity with that in vs. 20. But it is rather more difficult to see how the grammatical whims of the Western scribes would use first one, then the other aorist form. The participle is certainly wrong and the correction in D is probably an attempt to re-establish the earlier first aorist. Hence the total internal evidence is inconclusive.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation suggests no specific association.

51) Col. 1:27 TEXT: $\acute{\omicron}\acute{\sigma}$
 P46: $\acute{\omicron}$ BAG al latt; H

Only one of the primary uncials and the divided testimony of Alexandria and Rome support the papyrus.

(Cf. 13). The text is not to be rejected on grounds of gender, although its antecedent $\mu\upsilon\tau\eta\acute{\rho}\lambda\omicron\nu$ is neuter. In fact this might be regarded in favor of the text as a somewhat more difficult reading. A decision is difficult on the grounds of internal evidence and the meaning of both readings could be the same.

The papyrus should be rejected.

The RSV translation suggests no specific association.

52) Col. 2:13 TEXT: $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$
 P46: $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ B 169 al; h

Only one primary uncial and only a divided Alexandrian testimony support the papyrus.

(Cf. 10 and 23). Verses 13 and 14 offer a context favorable to both the second person and third person--there are three of each, the first three of which are in the second person. The problem of variation in this particular instance is probably due to the very fact that it

stands as the last (or first) in the series. Hence unintentional alterations are possibilities for each reading, but the more immediate context, the preceding, almost demands the reading of the text here. Neither pronoun is found in D, G, P, al lat, and this omission could possibly be correct!

The papyrus reading is to be rejected.

The RSV does not translate the papyrus, possibly even follows the reading of D.

53) Col. 2:15 TEXT: ἔδελφμάτωεν
 P46: κλι ε. B; W

Only one of the primary uncials and a divided Alexandrian testimony support the papyrus.

(Cf. 24). The longer reading is an apparent interpolation of the conjunction either from the preceding κλι which suggests a series, or more probably from that parallel series in Eph. 1:21. It furthermore seems evident that the author did not want to connect a participle coordinately with a transitive verb as is the case in the papyrus. The "public exposure" consisted in the ἀπεκδυσάμενος.¹⁹ Here the papyrus exhibits poor scribal work, succumbing to the tendency to obliterate original asyndeta.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV adopts the papyrus reading with notation!

54) Col. 2:23 TEXT: κλι ἔφελδία.
 P46: ἔφελδία B 1739 in Ambros; [H]

¹⁹Rendtorff in NTD, VIII, 119.

The shorter reading is attested only by one of the uncials and the divided witness of Alexandria (1739 may be the text of Origen) and Carthage (m).

(Cf. 24 and 53). The presence or omission of the particle is not directly related to the exegetical problem here which arises from punctuation (cf. conjectures in the apparatus). Both readings are possible. If omitted, then the castigation consists "in the abuse of the body." A decision is here difficult, but the intentional production of asyndeton in the proto-Alexandrians seems quite unique and could be questionable.²⁰

On external grounds the papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

55) Col. 3:15 TEXT: *ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι*
 P46: *ἐν σ.* B 1739

Only one primary uncial and a divided Alexandrian witness support the papyrus.

The papyrus reading is quite certainly an example of haplography, either from the preceding preposition or from the noun ending. The same "one body" of Rom. 12:5 is the underlying thought here. But a dittography in the text, though less likely, is also a possibility.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

56) Col. 3:23 TEXT: *καὶ οὐκ ἐνδρωπῶσις*
 P46: *οὐκ ἐν.* B 1739

²⁰Zuntz, op. cit., pp. 207f.

Only one of the primary uncials and a divided Alexandrian witness support the papyrus.

The asyndeton . . . "grace, not food," lays all stress on the first member, with which the second is contrasted as inadmissible. Where the conjunction is added, as in "demons and not God" . . . the second member indicates the true alternative and is correspondingly stressed. If this observation is correct--and it seems to be in keeping with the spirit of the language-- . . . the addition of *K* would pervert the apostolic injunction into ". . . working as though it were for the Lord and not, as it ought to be, for men."²¹

(Cf. 2:8 and 1 Cor. 7:12). This observation seems perfectly correct here and the conjunction of the text seems like pure scribal polish.

The papyrus reading should be adopted, in spite of external evidence.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

Conclusions: The frequency with which the papyrus corresponds to particular readings found in B alone constitutes a general certification of the antiquity of the Vaticanus text. Except for the last classification i.e., P46 alone, this is the largest, comprising no less than forty-seven readings. Fourteen (29 per cent) of these are adopted by Nestle as follows:

6 of the 14 in Galatians
2 of the 14 in Ephesians
2 of the 6 in Philippians
4 of the 13 in Colossians

Of the remaining 33, only four seem to be genuine (24, 38, 41, 56). Only two of these (24, 41) have probably been adopted by the RSV while the other two are definitely rejected. In addition to these, however, the RSV has adopted two (43, 47) and possibly four (39?, 53?)

²¹Ibid., p. 208.

other readings. In one case (52) it follows neither papyrus nor text (?).

Adding the four genuine readings to the fourteen in the text represents an acceptance of 38 per cent of this combination.

This combination also exhibits the "shorter text" in the lack of conjunctions and articles (24, 26, 28, 41, 46, 54, 56) and so demonstrates a special affinity with B.

That so many readings with such attestation do not seem genuine is a clear warning against the quality of a variant singularly attested by the Vaticanus codex and supported by the papyrus!

As I have said, in the tradition of the classical writers, very often accepted as genuine. The opposite error likewise occurs, but it is far less frequent. . . . Lightfoot observed this passage . . . and concluded that it . . . remaining the subject which he was interpreting by his defense of himself, he was after the apostle's manner, while it would seem the obvious connecting particle to translate. His judgment has now been confirmed by the again rejecting B. Lightfoot did not fail to notice the parallel in 1 Cor. iv 1; 2 Cor. vii 14. These might indeed be supposed to have produced the same reading in the present passage. These, however, are far more genuine parallels. The exceptional character of the reading is thus so striking that it could hardly have been introduced if it had been in the text from the first. It was its existence, here again, to a mistaken effort at clarifying the apostle's thought.

This argument is truly convincing (cf. 24).

The papyrus reading should be adopted.

The RV translates the Greek text.

24. Gal. 3:22. RV: "is loose by Law's Law".
RV: "is free by Law's Law".

Only one of the primary articles (in the first hand) and the

10. Hunt, The Text of the Epistles: A Comparison from the Vatican Codex (London) 1878. *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 1891, p. 232.

CHAPTER IX

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY ALEPH

- 57) Gal. 1:11 TEXT: $\gamma\upsilon\omega\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omega$ $\gamma\alpha\rho$ B D* 6 pc lat
 Ph6: $\gamma\upsilon$. $\delta\epsilon$ $\sigma\iota^s$ *A Kaine pl. ay; Th

Only the first hand of one primary uncial supports the papyrus.

Strong Roman tradition supports the text while Antioch and Byzantium witness for the papyrus. The tradition of Alexandria is divided.

Hence the papyrus reading is somewhat more widespread.

An original $\delta\epsilon$ is, in the tradition of the classical writers, very often corrupted to $\gamma\alpha\rho$. The opposite change likewise occurs, but it is far less frequent. . . . Bishop Lightfoot discussed this passage . . . [and concluded that $\delta\epsilon$], resuming the subject which has been interrupted by his defence of himself, is more after the Apostle's manner, while $\gamma\alpha\rho$ would seem the obvious connecting particle to transcribers. His judgement has now been confirmed by Ph6 again opposing B. Lightfoot did not fail to notice the parallels in 1 Cor. xv 1; 2 Cor. viii 1: $\delta\epsilon$ there might indeed be supposed to have occasioned the same reading in the present passage. These, however, are for once, genuine parallels. The superficial appropriateness of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ is here so striking that it could hardly have been dislodged if it had been in the text from the first. It owes its existence, here again, to a mistaken effort at clarifying the apostle's thought.¹

This argument is truly convincing (cf. 44).

The papyrus reading should be adopted.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

- 58) Gal. 3:28 TEXT: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ $\text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{\omega}\upsilon$
 Ph6: $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ 'I . $\sigma\iota^s$ *A

Only one of the primary uncials (in the first hand) and the

¹G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), pp. 203f.

used here). Although it might be argued that a specific promise is here being referred to with the use of the article, the other internal considerations seem more weighty.

The papyrus reading should be adopted.

The RSV translates "through promise" and this might be the papyrus reading without notation!

60) Gal. 4:25 TEXT: δὲ Ἄραp BAD al^{hmg} (Koine pm^{hmg}; S)
 P46: δὲ Ambrot. sa (s^oLC 6 lat Or; Th)

The witnesses in parentheses above also read/omit Ἄραp but read ραp for δὲ (cf. 57). (Since the problem pertains primarily to the omission rather than to the reading of ραp for δὲ, this reading has not been treated in the last chapter.)

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus and its reading is witnessed by the divided testimony of two locales, Alexandria and Rome. Besides these two locales the text is also read in the traditions of Antioch and Byzantium. Hence it is more widely read than the papyrus and has the majority support of the primary uncials.

Two considerations favor the papyrus reading: (1) it is the simplest grammatically and expresses best the point that Mt. Sinai is not in the promised land;³ (2) it omits what could be dittography on two counts: (a) a duplication of the previous Ἄραp or, better (b) a corruption of the conjunction ραp. But two intrinsic considerations favor the text: (1) It is difficult to see how ραp or Ἄραp crept into all except three of the witnesses cited above if it was not in the original,

³H. W. Beyer and Others, Das Neue Testament Deutsch: Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Göttingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), VIII, 38.

since the papyrus is the only early witness omitting it. If the text seems to represent dittography, then it seems even more likely that the papyrus represents haplography; (2) The somewhat more difficult reading of the text ("the word Hagar is Mt. Sinai") probably commends it as a reading which lacks the simplification of scribal polish. The internal evidence favors neither reading, and the external evidence is decisively in favor of rejecting the papyrus reading.

The RSV translates the Nestle text and recognizes the papyrus with a footnote.

61) Phil. 3:7 TEXT: $\xi\lambda\lambda\alpha$
 P46: (omitted) $s^1 s^*$ AB pc. d; T

Only one of the primary uncials (in the first hand only) and the divided witness of Alexandria and Rome support the papyrus.

The internal evidence here is most problematical. The reading of the text seems so much like homoiarikon--from the following verse. Yet it would seem that Paul has here approached the antithesis of his previous discussion (vss. 4-6) and $\xi\lambda\lambda\alpha$ is then most certainly to be expected. This expectation probably accounts for the polished correction in the Sinaiticus. But this evidence is perhaps not strong enough to discredit the external factors.

The papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

62) Col. 1:18 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$
 P46: T. V. $s^1 s^*$ L.

The first hand of one of the primary uncials and the divided tradition of Alexandria and Rome (the latter in the European text of

Irenaeus) alone support the papyrus.

Neither reading is without much Pauline usage and it is easier to see an unintentional omission in the papyrus than an intentional insertion in the text. The thought here is partitive, and the preposition might be more expressive of it. The second hand of Aleph is probably a legitimate correction of the original blunder. "In the N.T. the partitive relation is usually more sharply defined by prepositions."⁴

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV (probably) translates the Nestle text.

Conclusions: That the papyrus is not favorably disposed to the Codex Sinaiticus in special agreements is here further evident. Only nine such readings are cited by Nestle. But of these nine he adopts four: one (2:6) of the five in Galatians, all three (4:7; 5:31; 6:1) cases in Ephesians (1), and none of the singular instances in Phil. 3:7 and Col. 1:18.

Only two of the remaining five seem genuine. The RSV probably adopts one of these (59) but rejects the other (57).

Adding these two to the four in the Nestle text represents an acceptance of 67 per cent of this combination. This high percentage, however, is probably a somewhat distorted evaluation since it is based on only a few cases.

It may be noteworthy that in this text-group (1) almost all of the papyrus readings are shorter; (2) most of them seem quite genuine (cf. the conclusions in chapter six); (3) especially the first hand of Aleph has the papyrus support.

⁴A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 502.

CHAPTER X

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY D

63) Gal. 1:16 TEXT: *Εὐαγγελίζωμαι*
 P46: *— ἰσῶμαι* D*

Only one of the primary uncials (in the first hand only), representing the divided testimony of one locale (Rome), supports the papyrus.

The present subjunctive of the text emphasizes continued "preaching" while the aorist subjunctive of the papyrus is less iterative. The preceding aorist infinitive might have led the scribe to write the aorist here, but it is more probable that it is the direct result of indistinct dictation. Both words are, however, contextually good and probably read by Claromontanus. It is unique that this reading should be peculiar to D and the papyrus, without any other support.

The papyrus reading should be rejected, especially in view of the external testimony.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

64) Gal. 3:14a TEXT: *Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* B⁵¹
 P46: *Χ. Ἰ.* AC Kaine D⁶ pl; T h

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus but its reading is widely attested--Alexandria (divided), Byzantium, and Rome.

(Cf. 17 and 21). The order of these words in the papyrus is popular both ways, but somewhat more common in the order as found in the text here. The text here is probably a confused order from the parallel in Eph. 1:3--a verse which the scribes undoubtedly knew well.

A decision is difficult here, but the papyrus reading should

probably be adopted.

The RSV translates the papyrus without notation.

65) Gal. 3:14b TEXT: ἑπαγγελία
 P46: εὐλογία D*6 pc it M^cion Ambrot. Ephr.

Only one of the primary uncials (first hand only) and the divided testimony of Alexandria, Rome, and Carthage support the papyrus.

The εὐλογία ("blessing") is not spoken of elsewhere as being "of the Spirit", but the "promise" (text) is so used expegetically.¹ It is difficult to see how the longer word could be unintentional alteration of the shorter, and the latter could well be homoiocarkton (cf. v. 14a). The "promised Spirit" will be received according to Pauline theology, and the second hand of the Claromontanus is probably a restoration of the original.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

66) Gal. 5:7 TEXT: ἀληθεία
 P46: τῆ ἀ. C^hoine D6 pl; S

Only one of the primary uncials and the divided testimony of Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome support the papyrus.

The article is in all probability a later "polished" insertion in a small lacuna here which resulted from a different punctuation at this point due to the additional ending *αὐτὸν πείθεσθαι* G it vg^s.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation allows no specific association.

¹W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by W. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 280.

67) Gal. 5:12 TEXT: ἄποκόψουτε
 P46: — ψυτετε D6

Only one of the primary MSS. and the divided testimony of Alexandria (P46) and Rome support the papyrus.

The wish is expressed in the text with the future middle indicative, in the papyrus with the aorist middle subjunctive. On the usage of mood after ὀφείλον Robertson says, "This unfulfilled wish occurs only three times in the N. T.: once with the aorist . . . (1 Cor. 4:8), and twice with the imperfect. . . . ὀφείλον occurs once also with the future. . . . However, we do find the fut. ind. for a future wish. So Gal. 5:12."² Hence the text is unique in being the only future indicative used to express the "impossible wish." This uniqueness speaks for its genuine character and the papyrus reading is probably a scribal blunder.

The papyrus should be rejected.

The RSV probably translates the Nestle text.

68) Gal. 5:24 TEXT: χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
 P46: χ. Koine D6 lat sy^p Main C

The papyrus reading is supported by one of the primary uncials and represents Alexandria (divided testimony), Byzantium, Rome, and Antioch. Hence its geographical distribution is slightly better than that of the text.

It is not difficult to see in each reading a type of alteration of the original, whether that was one word or two. The most likely

²A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press), p. 923.

possibility is that the papyrus is an intentional omission based on Paul's description in Rom. 8:9b. The omission is perhaps also an easier error than a supposed interpolation.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

69) Eph. 1:1 TEXT: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$
 P46: $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ D

One primary uncial and the divided witness of Rome and Alexandria support the omission.

(Cf. 11). Although the longer reading might be explained as an intentional attempt at conformity with other standard introductions (cf. especially Phil. 1:1), it seems much more likely that the triple consecutive-- $\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in the preceding words resulted in a type of haplography in which the article, already once used, was omitted. The article here is especially Pauline, almost bearing the force of the relative pronoun.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV (probably) translates the Nestle text.

70) Eph. 2:4 TEXT: $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$
 P46: $\acute{\alpha}\rho$ D* & *pe. it*

The first hand of one of the primary uncials and the divided testimony of Alexandria and Rome with that of Carthage support the shorter reading. These considerations give the text a slight preference.

The papyrus does not readily represent an alteration, either intentional or unintentional, yet the latter is more likely than is an intentional insertion for the reading of the text.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV (probably) translates the papyrus!

71) Eph. 3:20 TEXT: ὑπὲρ πάντων
 Pl6: πάντων D G lat

The papyrus is supported by one primary uncial and is read only at Rome and Alexandria (Pl6).

In view of the ὑπὲρ which follows the reading compounded in the verb ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, the papyrus scribe can be charged with haplography while the scribe of the text can be similarly liable for a type of dittography. The unintentional insertion of the preposition seems less likely than its omission and the typically shorter text of the papyrus probably represents the blunder. But a decision is here difficult.

Largely on the basis of external evidence the papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

72) Eph. 4:9 TEXT: τὸ κλιώτερον μέριον
 Pl6: T. K. D* G it syr cl dr

Only the first hand of one of the great uncials supports the papyrus.

Antioch (late) and Carthage together with the divided traditions of Alexandria and Rome have the shorter reading. This distribution slightly favors the papyrus testimony.

As in the papyrus, the adjective is used substantively in the LXX (Ps. 139:15), but this is a hapax legomenon in Pauline usage, with or without the noun. The sequence -τερον μέριον τῆς might lend itself well to the omission of μέριον as a type of haplography. But it is

significant that the "descent" here referred to is nowhere else described as being to certain "μέρη." Although the longer reading certainly appears to be scribal polish, its unique nature speaks for its originality and the total conflicting internal evidences make a decision here difficult.

The papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RSV (probably) translates the Nestle text.

73) Eph. 5:2 TEXT: ἡγάπησεν ὑμῶν
 PH6: ἡ. ὑμῶν Koine D6 pm lat sy Cl^{pt}

Only one of the primary MSS. supports the papyrus.

Rome, Byzantium, Antioch, and the divided witness of Alexandria represent a favorable distribution of the papyrus reading.

(Cf. 10 and 23). The phrase immediately following is correctly read ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν . Paul has been speaking in the second person (text) and the question is whether he changes person already here or in the phrase following which is coordinately joined to this ἡγάπησεν. The papyrus is certainly smoother in the context and therefore more likely an intentional alteration. Perhaps it is even an unintentional homoioteleuton from the preceding word of the following phrase.³

The total evidence renders a decision difficult but the papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RSV translates the papyrus without notation!

74) Eph. 5:20 TEXT: τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ

³H. W. Beyer and Others, Das Neue Testament Deutsch: Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Göttingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), VIII, 79.

Ph6: τῷ πατρὶ καὶ θεῷ D*G 69 1175

Only the first hand of one of the primary uncials and the divided testimony of Rome and Alexandria support the papyrus.

An exact parallel to the text is Col. 3:17 where the order is certain. It seems quite probable that an elision occurred, either vocal or by sight, between τῷ and θεῷ and the scribe of the papyrus then appended καὶ θεῷ. The second hand of D is probably an attempt to restore the original Pauline formula, since its reading is not found elsewhere (cf. 4:6; 5:20; 6:23). But this very uniqueness might possibly favor the reading in the papyrus. The internal evidence is inconclusive.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The NSV translates the Nestle text.

75) Eph. 6:5 TEXT: κατὰ τὰ κτλ κυρίως
Ph6: κυρίως κ. σ. Kaine D G al; S

One of the primary uncials, the Byzantine tradition, and the divided testimony of Rome and Alexandria support the papyrus. These facts slightly favor the text.

While it is difficult to explain the reading of the text as being either kind of alteration, it is quite possible that the papyrus reading represents an attraction of κυρίως to the preceding article τῶν by virtue of their similar endings.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The NSV translation indicates no specific association.

76) Phil. 1:23 TEXT: εἰς τὸ ἐλευθερωθῆναι
Ph6: τ. ἐ. D G

Only one of the primary uncials and the divided testimony of Alexandria and Rome support the papyrus reading.

The articular infinitive, with or without a preposition, is common to Pauline usage.⁴ The omission is a more likely error than the insertion, especially in view of the fact that the context, preceding and following, is literally crowded with examples of the articular infinitive, and all are without a preposition! The omission then is probably the work of a carelessly consistent scribe and the special meaning here should demand the preposition.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The NSV translation indicates no specific association.

77) Phil. 2:3 TEXT: ἡγούμενοι
 P46: προηγούμενοι DI al

Only the primary uncial from Rome and the divided witness of Alexandria (I) support the papyrus.

The compounded verb would be an accentuation of the following ὑπερ-
 ἔχουσις, and if it connotes "consider better" rather than
 "consider" (ἡγεσθαι) then it represents the expected form.⁵
 The papyrus hardly represents an unintentional alteration, although it
 can possibly be charged with a polished text. But the internal evidence
 as a whole seems to favor the longer reading.

On the basis of external evidence the papyrus reading can be re-
 jected.

⁴Robertson, op. cit., pp. 990f. and 1065f.

⁵Bauer, op. cit., p. 713.

The RSV translation indicates no specific association.

78) Phil. 2:5

TEXT: ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΡΟΒΕΙΤΕ

Pl⁶: T. γαρ φ. Kaine DG pl. lat. sy

Only one of the primary uncials supports the papyrus but its reading has the wider support, being found in Byzantium, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria (divided).

(Cf. 24). The papyrus is unusual here in that it represents the longer reading, including the copula instead of following its usual custom of omitting it. The use here would be inferential, "so, then." Neither reading is easily understood as unintentional alteration and γαρ, so appropriate here, might again represent scribal polish. The internal evidence sheds its weight on neither reading.

A decision here is very difficult, but the papyrus should probably be rejected.

The RSV translates the Nestle text.

79) Phil. 2:15

TEXT: ἵνα γένηθε

Pl⁶: ἵνα γένητε AD*6 latt

Only the first hand of one primary uncial and the tradition at Rome and Alexandria (divided) support the papyrus.

The middle ending in the aorist is invariably used with this verb and the active ending suggested in the papyrus is an unusual form. Its uniqueness almost seems impossible, probably the blunder of a forgetful scribe or from a reconstruction after omitting the sigma. The second hand of the Claromontanus is a correction of this difficult form.

The papyrus reading should be rejected.

The RSV translation renders no specific association possible.

80) Phil. 3:12 TEXT: (omitted)
 P46: ἡ ἡδὴ δεδικαίωμαι D*(6) it la^{let} Ambat.

Only the first hand of one of the primary uncials and the locales of Carthage, Alexandria, and Rome (divided) have the longer reading. This distribution slightly favors the text.

While it is difficult, rather impossible, to see in the longer reading an unintentional insertion, it is very possible that ἡ ἡδὴ can be a simple dittography from the immediate context. Nestle suggests the possibility that the papyrus represents an interpolation from 1 Cor. 4:4 but this seems rather strained. The verb δεδικαίωμαι is probably an interpretive interpolation for Paul's τετελείωμαι. The insertion is not necessarily counter to Paul's claim to a forensic justification, though such a thought might have caused scribal correction in the Claromontanus.

The papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The NSV translates the Nestle text.

81) Phil. 4:15 TEXT: οὐδὲτε εἰ καὶ
 P46: οὐδὲτε καὶ D* 69 pc

The papyrus is supported by the first hand only of one primary uncial and the divided tradition of Alexandria and Rome.

(Cf. 38). While the text might be viewed as representing a type of dittography (from the concluding syllable of οὐδὲτε), the papyrus reading might be haplography on the same basis. Neither reading would seem to concern the problem of intentional alteration. If any conclusion is here drawn, the reading of the text is less easily impugned as lacking scribal polish and the correction in D might

indicate this. But the internal evidence is indecisive.

On the basis of external considerations the papyrus reading should be rejected.

A specific choice cannot be discerned in the RSV translation.

82) Phil. 4:16 TEXT: *Εἰς τὴν χρείαν μου*
 P46: *T. X. M. AD* 81 pc.*

Only the firsthand of one primary uncial and the divided testimony of Rome and Alexandria support the papyrus.

Another hand in D reads *μου* and this reveals the scribal problem over whether or not *χρείαν* was to be understood as the direct object ("you sent help to me"--text) or not ("You sent money/gifts for my need."). This problem must be solved by an evaluation of *μου/μου*. The dative seems correct and this would call for the preposition, unless *Εἰς* be taken with *χρείαν* to express purpose. The latter is an equal probability. But best of all is the probability that the dative of possession is here implied, "you sent (gifts) for my need." Although this intrinsic evidence is inconclusive, it seems more probable that the papyrus represents an intentional omission.

The papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The RSV seems to translate the papyrus, with notation.

83) Col. 2:13 TEXT: *τοῖς πλρ.*
 P46: *Εἰς τοῖς πλρ. AC Keine D G pm; S*

Only one of primary uncials supports the papyrus which is read in Byzantium and the divided tradition of Rome and Alexandria. This is still a minority distribution, though only to a small degree.

The exact parallels in Eph. 2:1,5 do not have the preposition. At first glance the text seems to be an intentional attempt at conformity

to these. The action of the scribe in D makes this even more probable. Here he has let the preposition stand, while in the case of the following noun (ἄκροβυστις) he has eliminated it. He was apparently processing his text to remove scribal polish, yet he left the first preposition in the text, and this would seem to indicate that he must have had good reasons for doing this. However, this conjecture is very subjective and concerns itself with a preposition that could often be inserted erroneously.

On the basis of the external testimony the papyrus reading should probably be rejected.

The ESV translation makes no specific association apparent.

Conclusions: Of the last three groups in which the support of the papyrus is found in only one of the major uncials, this grouping or association seems most significant.

Nestle adopts only one (Gal. 6:10) of the twenty-two readings in this class and so demonstrates his suspicious attitude. But it is noteworthy that there are more than twice as many such special agreements with D alone as there are in combination with Aleph alone. At the very least this proves the antiquity of many readings peculiar to D.

But very few of these readings seem genuine. Only one (64) of the twenty-one might be so called. This does not indicate that the papyrus is a forceful caveat against the singular attestation of D,⁶ but rather that the papyrus has many agreements in error with it! Three readings

⁶G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p.42. Here the opposite opinion is expressed.

(72, 73, 78) have not been adopted but call for special recognition.

It is often difficult to assess the choice of the RSV translators. They too adopt no. 61, and probably also one more (82).

Adding one genuine reading to that already in the text represents an acceptance of only 9 per cent of this class.

[Faint, illegible text]

CHAPTER XI

THE UNADOPTED WITNESS SUPPORTED BY NEITHER ALEPH, B, OR D

In the evaluations of readings supported by the papyrus alone, a slight variation in procedure has been adopted. Since none of the primary uncials support the papyrus reading, the external evidence is always completely negative; and unless the geographical distribution is of some possible significance, it too has not been noted. The lack of mention of both of these factors is therefore to be taken as completely negative against the papyrus reading.

Wherever it has been possible the reproduction of the papyrus text by Sanders¹ has been consulted for these readings. Many of the conclusions made are derived from those observations and would not be apparent from the Nestle text.

When the HSV neither adopts the papyrus reading nor makes any mention of it in a footnote, no reference to that translation is made.

Because of the totally negative external support, none of these readings are adopted as genuine. Any that are noteworthy and seem to compel acceptance on the basis of internal evidence alone are noted as such and are referred to in the conclusion to the chapter.

(81) Gal. 1:6 TEXT: *ΕΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ* (D)
PL6: *ΕΥ ΧΡ.* P46^{v10} & *Mcim Tert. Ephr.*

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

It is to be noted that the codex Claromontanus does not simply include *Χριστοῦ* but reads *Ἰησοῦ Χ.*

Nestle considers the claim to originality of the omission as very strong ("I") and marks the omission as a probable reading ("vid") in the papyrus since the writing is here quite illegible. At first the insertion seems quite unusual since *τοῦ καλέσους* might be taken to refer to Christ! Then Paul says, "from him (i.e. Christ) who called you in the grace of Christ." But verse 15 shows us that the "caller" through whose grace one is called is apparently not Christ, since the one who calls is differentiated from "his Son" whom he reveals (but cf. 83). Although *Χρίστος* is most often *τοῦ Θεοῦ* (as probably also in v. 15), the frequent Pauline benedictions are ample substantiation for the use of a *Χρίστος Χριστοῦ*, and verse 15 is not necessarily a serious contradiction, though a worthwhile consideration. The illegible papyrus reading might even be an attempt to correct or erase this apparent contradiction since it does not seem precariously close to the worn edge of the papyrus sheet. Beyer-Althaus² reads the papyrus, but the internal evidence does not seem to demand the omission.

85) Gal. 1:15 TEXT: καὶ καλέσας δὲ τῆς χρίστος αὐτοῦ
 P16: (omitted) Or.

Such a significantly large omission might initiate an association of Origen with the papyrus!

²H. W. Beyer and Others, Das Neue Testament Deutsch: Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Goettingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), VIII, 6. Hereafter this commentary will be referred to as NTD.

The omission is related to verse 6 (cf. 84). Since it is not found in the papyrus it is even more difficult to see why *Χριστοῦ* in that verse should have caused the scribe some trouble. Since the omitted phrase constitutes a whole line in the papyrus, it is beyond all doubt a scribal blunder in which the eye of the scribe skipped a line.

86) Gal. 2:9 TEXT: Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφῶς
 Ph6: Ἰ. καὶ Πέτρος κ

The codex Claromontanus witnesses to further confusion here with the reading Πέτρος κ. Ἰάκωβος.

The Roman and Byzantine traditions read the Greek name Πέτρος throughout this portion (compare verses 7, 8, 11, 14). Only here does the papyrus not read the Aramaic Κηφῶς : The context of the whole letter seems to indicate a predominantly Gentile addressee³ and this would favor the use of the Greek term in the papyrus. Had it already been questioned whether this Cephas was the apostle Peter?⁴ This hardly seems probable. The papyrus seems to represent an unintentional continuation of the Greek name usage in verses 7 and 8.

87) Gal. 2:12 TEXT: ΤΙΝΑΣ ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου
 Ph6: ΤΙΝΑ ἀ. Ἰ. deg^o κ⁺

The singular indefinite pronoun (vs. plural) of the papyrus is in agreement with the singular verb following i.e., ἦλθεν (cf. 1, 88). The singular can be the result of (1) simple scribal omission of final sigma, especially in view of the following ἀπὸ¹ ; (2) a

³Ibid., p. 1.

⁴W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by W. Arndt and G. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 660.

correction in agreement with the verb ἦλθεν which is homoioarkton from verse 11; (3) misunderstanding ΤΙΝΑ as referring to the Cephas who also "came" (ἔρχομαι).

88) Gal. 2:12 TEXT: σὺν ἡσθελεν
 P46: — θλον

(Cf. 1 and 87). The papyrus reading is more accurately reproduced as σὺν ἡσθελον,⁵ and it is not difficult to see the problem of the scribe in seeing the plural form or hearing, from the itacism, the singular form. Although the scribe of the papyrus had apparently misunderstood the account, this can hardly be the cause of this particular error since it makes good sense, in spite of ΤΙΝΑ and ἦλθεν (cf. vs. 13 ΤΟΥ-ΔΟΥΤΩ ΟΙ ΛΟΙΠΟΝ). Perhaps the singular here even represents an unintentional homoioarkton which occurred when the scribe had already seen or heard the following ἦλθεν and wrote that ending on the present word!

89) Gal. 2:14 TEXT: καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ἔῃς
 P46: ἔῃς 917 d Ambat.

The long omission makes good sense, is well nigh impossible to explain as an alteration, and commends itself as original in view of the fact that the long reading has many variations and seems to bear the marks of scribal polish--a clarifying adaptation from the style following in v. 15 καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔθνων. The text might also be a partial duplication of the following εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος. The internal evidence certainly favors the papyrus reading.

⁵Sanders, op. cit., p. 101.

90) Gal. 2:16 TEXT: εἰδότες δέ
 P46: εἰδότες A Kaine al sy

The geographical distribution of the papyrus reading is considerably good, though not better than that of the text.

(Cf. 24 and 38). The question is one of scribal polish in the text or else a simple blunder in the papyrus. The sense of the passage would seem to demand the particle of contrast here but the internal evidence is quite inconclusive.

91) Gal. 3:19 TEXT: νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χίρην προστετέθη
 P46: νόμος τῶν πρῆξεων (6 Br. Ambrot. d. m)

Here the papyrus scribe must have been very sleepy, or else he falsely associated πρῆξεων with the frequent mention of ἐξ ἔργων νόμου in the preceding discussion at 2:16; 3:2,10. But Paul never speaks of the νόμος τῶν πρῆξεων and hence the former accusation seems more probable. The evident similarity in the noun (cf. also D* παραδόσεων), the lack of recognizing the pause after νόμος, the haplographic ἔχρησ οὐ ἔλθῃ which should have been preceded by the similar χίρην προστετέθη and read ἔχρησ ἔν (cf. 18), --these are more than ample testimony of a confused or tired scribe.

92) Gal. 3:21 TEXT: ἐκ νόμου ἔν ἦν
 P46: ἐν νομῷ ἦν ἔν

"Righteousness" is described by Paul both in terms of ἐκ νόμου (cf. Rom. 10:4) and ἐν νομῷ (cf. Gal. 5:4). Much confusion exists in this phrase: B also reads ἐν with a different word order while D and Aleph both read ἐκ. The preposition ἐν might here be a ditto-graphy from the initial V in νομῷ, since the final V is often

indicated in the papyrus with a stroke over the preceding vowel.⁶
 The order of $\lambda\nu \eta\nu$ seems more natural but the total intrinsic evidence is quite inconclusive.

93) Gal. 4:6 TEXT: $\tau\omicron\upsilon \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$
 PH6: $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (Maion?)

(Cf. 26 and 8). The omission might be considered representative of an unpolished text since it opposes any possible accommodation on the model of verse 4. But it seems more like a careless error, a type of haplography. If it is remembered that this phrase together with the preceding $\omicron \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \tau\omicron \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ consist only of two or three-letter abbreviated forms in the papyrus, then the confusion or omission is readily understandable. But the internal evidence is not finally conclusive.

94) Gal. 4:10 TEXT: $\pi\lambda\rho\alpha\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\epsilon$
 PH6: $\pi\lambda\rho\alpha\tau\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$

The papyrus, reading the participle, continues the question raised in verse 9 ($\pi\omega\varsigma$) and would seem to put the question mark, as Tischendorf reads, at the end of verse 10. In fact, however, the papyrus has no lacuna there, while it is found after verse 9. Both readings make good sense and the papyrus is probably even smoother. The internal evidence favors neither reading particularly.

95) Gal. 4:11 TEXT: $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\kappa\lambda$
 PH6: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\sigma\lambda$ 1739

The aorist ending of the papyrus, as also the perfect in the text, would be determined solely by the way in which the scribe began the word.

⁶Ibid., pp. 15f.

may even have been recorded in the papyrus, far into the margin from the end of the line,⁹ and may have eventually been literally worn off, since the following line begins $\tau\epsilon \lambda\lambda\lambda$. But this is probably the ending of the preceding verb--as Sanders has it. It is difficult to see in the text any kind of alteration and it strongly suggests itself as genuine.

98) Gal. 5:12 TEXT: $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$
 P46: $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$

The papyrus is here quite certainly wrong. It represents (1) homoiocarkton from the line preceding in which $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ is in approximately the same line position, and (2) forgetting the word $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ when the following $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\acute{\omicron}\psi\omega\nu$ —was heard or seen. Nor can the text be attributed to any kind of alteration.

Hoskier would think of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ as

an early perpetrated finesse. . . . If Paul (as every one of us so often unconsciously does) had used it again in verse 12, early reviewers may have suppressed it in favor of $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$. Otherwise we have to attribute it to an error oculi of the scribes, which does not seem probable here.¹⁰

But this latter conclusion does not seem justified for the reason already stated.

99) Gal. 6:12 TEXT: $\mu\eta \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ B s^v D al
 P46: $\mu\eta \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ A C E K L $\mu\eta\tau\lambda^2$

Although all three primary uncials support the text, the papyrus

⁹Sanders, op. cit., p. 105.

¹⁰H. C. Hoskier, "Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles Known as P46," (plus "Addenda"), The Journal of Theological Studies, (Special print, 1937), Addenda p. 2.

The papyrus also omits the preceding $\acute{\lambda}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (cf. 70) reading thus: $\acute{\lambda}\gamma\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\nu \eta\lambda\epsilon\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. The omission of $\eta\upsilon$ then, is probably haplography from the ending of $\acute{\lambda}\gamma\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\nu$. But the proximity of the latter noun to the verb in question would make a type of dittography in the verb more likely in the text than in the papyrus. The scribe, having just finished writing $\acute{\lambda}\gamma\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\nu$ is more likely to have erred in writing $\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ than is the scribe of the papyrus, whose source or cause of possible dittography ($\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\iota$) is further removed! This internal evidence is inconclusive since it favors the verb in the papyrus, but not the omission.

102) Eph. 2:5 TEXT: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \pi\lambda\upsilon\lambda\pi\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$
 P46: $\tau. \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$

In the exact parallel in Col. 2:13 the papyrus reads as the text above (cf. Rom. 7:24). Hence the papyrus cannot be an accommodation like the text. In the above text the MSS. have suffered much corruption. The Claromontanus reads $\acute{\lambda}\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ and the Vaticanus adds $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ to the text. The former is undoubtedly homioarkton from the beginning of the chapter and the Vaticanus has repeated its erroneous $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ in verse 1 (cf. v. 3). The reading of the text also seems like homioarkton from the beginning of the chapter. This is indeed a more probable unintentional alteration than might be held against the papyrus. It might possibly be a simple abbreviation of the word. The following context also favors the papyrus as does the intrinsic evidence on the whole.

103) Eph. 3:8 TEXT: $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu \acute{\lambda}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$
 P46: $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$

The parallels in verse 2 and in Col. 1:25,29 do not speak of Paul as *ἄγιος* and it is not very likely that the text represents any kind of alteration by reading this adjective. The shorter reading of the papyrus is probably a simple omission, unintentional, aided by the similar endings of the two words.

104) Eph. 4:11 TEXT: *ἔδωκεν*
 P46: *δεδωκεν* *cl pt*

Contrast 95. The parallel in I Cor. 12:28f uses the aorist of *τίθημι*. The word here used is to be an explicit reference to the O. T. passage quoted in verse 8 above, where the aorist is indisputably read. This would seem to favor the reading of the text. But Paul certainly might speak of the present result with the perfect as in the papyrus (but contrast the use of *ἔδωκεν* in verses 8 and 10). The papyrus seems rather to be a type of dittography, though the internal evidence is not conclusive.

The RSV translates "his gifts were" (?).

105) Eph. 4:23 TEXT: *ἔδωκεν*
 P46: *— δε 33 69 al lat sy cl pt*

With the divided testimony of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch the papyrus reading is still somewhat less widely read than is the text.

(Cf. 5). There the imperative form of the papyrus in the verb following seems correct. On this basis it would seem that the infinitive (text) is an alteration in conformity with the preceding *ἔδωκεν* - *δεδωκεν*, (which is undoubtedly a continuation of verse 22 and not a new sentence as translated in the RSV). But the verb in question here seems to begin a new sentence, not as in the RSV. As such it was

in this phrase, but it is to be noted that none of the great uncials vary in their testimony (text).

In the actual MSS. the phrase probably appears as *του κυριου και θεου* and it is easy to understand the many omissions or duplications that wrongly incur from these words. In this case the shorter text of the papyrus seems more liable to a false haplographic omission than does the longer reading seem liable to scribal polish. But the internal evidence is not conclusive.

109) Eph. 5:9 TEXT: *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΦΩΤΟΣ*
 P46: *Κ. Τ. ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ* *Koine pm.*

While it might be argued that the papyrus presents an intentional alteration (*ΠΝΣ*) after the pattern of Gal. 5:22, it is also a good probability that the text presents a false duplication of a word used often previous to this phrase. Against the latter possibility it may be urged that *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΦΩΤΟΣ* is rather more unique in Pauline thought, but in this context the papyrus seems to present a more immediately unusual word, since *ΦΩΣ* is the subject of Paul's discussion. This internal evidence is quite inconclusive, but the use of *ΦΩΤΟΣ* does indeed seem more meaningful in Paul's present argument.

110) Eph. 5:17 TEXT: *ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ*
 P46: *Τ. ΚΥΡΙΟΥ*

Further confusion exists in that other MSS read *θεου*.

'*Κύριον*', said Th. Zahn, 'ought never again be printed in the text.' . . . No evidence prior to the fourth century can be quoted for it. What evidence for it exists, comes from Egypt, whence later on the variant spread . . . ; yet the Egyptian versions, borne out by Clement and now also by P46, demonstrate that originally it was not read in Egypt either; nor was it in Palestine, where Origen and later Fathers based christological arguments on the opposite variant. The latter is attested from

the second century onwards and everywhere from Lyons to Edessa, not excepting Alexandria. Under these circumstances to adopt the reading $\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ is *fides non quaerens intellectum*. The reading $\text{X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ was apt to stir speculation [among Jews] The difficulty is removed by reading 'Lord,' which left open the reference to the God of the Old Testament. If the latter reading [$\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$] had been original, no one would have cared to create difficulty by the uncalled for gloss 'Christ.' $\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ then is a (later) 'Alexandrian' corruption, which had a very limited effect upon the tradition in general.¹³

To this criticism of a reading in 1 Cor. 10:9, Zuntz elsewhere adds his opinion of $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ and $\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ in the same verse that both are early and widespread corruptions.¹⁴

A brief glance at these epistles in the papyrus does indeed show the predominance of $\text{X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. $\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is rare but is by no means absent: e.g., Eph. 1:15,17; 3:11 (twice!); 4:5; Gal. 5:10; Col. 1:3,10; Phil. 4:23.

In the MSS. the forms $\text{X}\rho\upsilon$ and $\text{K}\upsilon$ can easily lead to confusion. In the preceding verse 10 the reading $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu \tau\omega \text{K}\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ is indisputably correct. The intrinsic evidence here favors neither reading, and it is difficult to see how Zuntz can deny any evidence for $\text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ prior to the fourth century. The papyrus disproves this very "fact." Nor is the addressee of this circular letter of any decisive import for the choice of words here since it included both peoples.

111) Eph. 6:12 TEXT: $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma, \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\varsigma$
 P46: $\mu\epsilon\theta\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\varsigma$

¹³O. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 126.

¹⁴ibid., p. 233.

The uncials Aleph, D, G have a different word order than the text.

The real parallel in Col. 4:7 omits this whole phrase (ἐν... ὑμῖν), nor are there variant readings there. A similar phrase in Phil. 1:12 has δὲ ὑμῖν but this seems rather far removed. Hence it can hardly be said that the text here presents an accommodation since there is no such real parallel. The papyrus bears the onus of a blunder or omission.

114) Phil. 1:10 TEXT: εἰς ἡμέραν
 P46: ε. τῆν ἡ.

Contrast 11, 41, and 59. Here the papyrus does not exhibit its usual freedom from adding the article in obvious fault, thereby expressing an interpretation. The expression does indeed point to a particular day, but that day has already been designated previously (v. 6) without the article. The papyrus very likely represents a false scribal addition.

115) Phil. 1:14 TEXT: τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ Hesy. (5D*) from later Cl.
 P46: τ. λ. ! Koine 1739 al r syⁿ Meion

(Cf. 26). Both readings are read at Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch, while in addition to this the papyrus is favored with the support of Byzantium.

Nestle's own preference is unsettled ("!"). The words of the text are popular and well attested in the Pauline corpus, e.g., Rom. 9:6; 1 Cor. 14:36; 2 Cor. 4:2; and 1 Thess. 2:13. Although no exact parallel exists, τοῦ θεοῦ here seems much like scribal polish and an unnecessary addition. The omission can hardly be described as any kind of alteration and the only real factor in its disfavor is the lack

of support from the great uncials. The total evidence renders a decision difficult, but the shorter reading might well be original!

116) Phil. 1:11 TEXT: καὶ ἑταίρον θεοῦ

P46: θεοῦ κ.ε. ἐμοί

(Cf. Eph. 1:6,12,14 where *δοξα* and *ἑταίρος* are always and only ascribed to God). The papyrus is probably not an intentional alteration, but rather the result of writing *θεοῦ* first. The apparently unfinished sentence then suffered a dittography when homoioteleuton added *ἐμοί*, a confusion from the ending of the preceding *πεπληρωμένοι*. In any event the papyrus does not suggest originality, though it is hardly intentional.

117) Phil. 1:23 TEXT: γὰρ μᾶλλον

P46: γὰρ 436 cl.

Technically, the omission is an easier fault than its insertion. The scribe of the papyrus perhaps thought that two comparatives were enough, and the similar ending of the following *κρεῖττον* could also have aided that omission. It seems unlikely that the text is improperly in agreement with the somewhat parallel thought in 2 Cor. 5:8.

118) Phil. 2:7 TEXT: ἐν ὁμολώματι ἀνθρώπων

P46: ε. ὁ. ἀνθρώπου *Maion Text Or^{4t} Cyper Hil Amber.*

The patristic evidence, representing Alexandria and Carthage, is indeed an impressive array. But such secondary support demands great caution.

The text may be an intentional accommodation to the thought in Heb. 2:17. But this seems rather strained since the word there, although

plural, is certainly $\lambda\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\lambda\varsigma$. It seems rather that the papyrus is an accommodation, either intentional or unintentional, to the comparison immediately preceding ($\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$) and/or following ($\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\lambda\upsilon\theta\rho\omicron\tau\tau\omicron\varsigma$). But the internal evidence is quite inconclusive.

Zuntz observes that "readings which dominate [the surviving MSS.] to the practical exclusion of alternative ones may have been minority readings in earlier times. . . . a renewed caveat against any attempt at settling textual problems by statistical or genealogical methods."¹⁷

119) Phil. 3:3 TEXT: $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$
 P46: $\pi\nu$.

The inclusion of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ disrupts Paul's triplet ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu$) in this verse, which, according to the papyrus, does not contain any direct objects ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$). Hence the longer reading is not as smooth. But this very irregularity might also urge its originality. However, the text rather than the papyrus seems to be a polished accommodation to the sense of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ .\ .\ .$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ in Rom. 1:9. But the construction there offers no partial support to either. The internal evidence is inconclusive but seems to favor the papyrus.

120) Phil. 3:14 TEXT: $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ $\text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$
 P46: $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$

Other MSS. add or substitute $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ while D adds this word to the long reading of the text in what seems to be a combination of all variants.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 81.

Although the longer text might seem to portray interpretive scribal polish, there is no real parallel from which a possible pattern might be urged. The papyrus therefore bears the onus of being a simple blunder.

121) Phil. 3:18 TEXT: τοὺς ἔχθροὺς
 P46: βλέπετε τ. ε.

It is difficult to see an unintentional omission in the text from any technical considerations. The papyrus scribe has here continued the imperatives of verse 17, and supplies a synonym of *σκοπέω* which is there also coupled with *περιπατέω*. The abrupt ending of the sentence (τοὺς... *χριστοῦ*) seems to be somewhat parathetical (—"es sind Feinde des Kreuzes Christi"¹⁸), rather than a continuation from *περιπατοῦσιν*. This abrupt style seems to have compelled the interpolation by the scribe of the papyrus.

122) Phil. 4:18 TEXT: δεξιμενος
 P46: δε δ.

The papyrus is almost certainly a dittography from the initial letters of the word following.

123) Col. 1:12 TEXT: ἐν χριστοῦντες
 P46: κλι ε.

(Cf. 24). Here the papyrus probably impugns itself with its unusual liberal use of the copula. But all internal considerations seem inconclusive here. Zuntz calls this copula a faulty addition¹⁹ (cf. 48).

¹⁸NTD, VIII, p. 102.

¹⁹Zuntz, op. cit., p. 40.

124) Col. 1:16 TEXT: $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\acute{\lambda}\nu\tau\alpha$
 P46: $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$

It might be urged that the text duplicates the original $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\acute{\lambda}\nu\tau\alpha$ at the beginning of the verse. The papyrus scribe, using $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$, is continuing the sentence directly from that previous $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\acute{\lambda}\nu\tau\alpha$ without any reiteration. (cf. Eph. 1:10 and 21 where Paul reiterates). But $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ can also be a confusion from the following $\delta\iota'$. The internal evidence is therefore inconclusive.

125) Col. 1:23 TEXT: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\eta$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$
 P46: $\mu.$ $\mu.$ 33

(Cf. 24). The common $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\eta$ is probably a more distinctive Pauline style of separating the negative factors but it might here well represent scribal polish, especially in view of the preceding participle with $\kappa\alpha\iota$. But the internal evidence seems wholly inconclusive.

Although an explicit association on the basis of the copula is hardly ascertainable, the RSV seems to translate the papyrus!

126) Col. 3:5 TEXT: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu$
 P46: $\epsilon.$ 6

It may be urged that $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ can be used in the bad sense of the forbidden things, as in Rom. 7:7 (cf. 1 Thess. 2:17 for the good sense, without the adjective), even without the adjective, and hence the adjective is an unnecessary addition. But such usages are rare compared to those in which an adjective defines this word. It is much more probable that the papyrus is haplography in which the following $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$ was assumed by the scribe to have been his recording of $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu$.

Hoskier finds that the adjective is an important intrinsic necessity and does not reckon with its bare usage in the sense of the forbidden. Paul would not demand the Brahministic "killing of all desire."²⁰

127) Col. 3:16 TEXT: τῷ θεῷ

Fl46: τ. κυρίῳ Koine pl.

(Cf. 110). It is a very simple and common error to find $\theta\bar{\omega}$ and $K\bar{\omega}$ confused. The reading of the text suggests an originality in that it is more unique, especially in view of the exact parallel in Eph. 5:19. The papyrus probably represents an accommodation to that parallel.

128) Col. 3:22 TEXT: τὸν κύριον

Fl46: τ. θεῶν Koine pm d vg^{cl}

Rome, Byzantium, and Alexandria tender their divided testimony, but this does not constitute a more widespread reading than in the case of the text.

(Cf. 127 and 110). Here the papyrus does not have what is often said to be the later and erroneous reading. The parallel in Eph. 6:5 reads τῷ Χριστῷ and ascribes an obedience $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}$ φόβος to the $K\bar{Y}P\bar{L}\bar{O}\bar{S}$. But this is not a real parallel in construction. It may also be urged that the text is less unique in the context of the $K\bar{Y}P\bar{L}\bar{O}\bar{S}$ κατὰ σάρκα and the following ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ. The papyrus reading is less likely to be an intentional alteration, but $\theta\bar{\nu}$ and $K\bar{\nu}$ can easily create confusion. This renders a decision difficult.

129) Col. 3:24 TEXT: ἀπολήμψετε

Fl46: λήμψετε A Koine & pm; S

²⁰Hoskier, op. cit., p. 17.



(Cf. 42). The divided testimony of Alexandria, Byzantium, and Rome is a fair, but not superior, geographical distribution.

The preceding $\lambda\tau\tau\theta$ is the apparent cause of the difficulty in this verb, and haplography here seems easier than an erroneous duplication. The compound verb is somewhat less popular in Paul and the context seems somewhat more favorable to the stronger accent of the compound verb ("to receive much more, in return"-- $\tau\eta\nu\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota$). These considerations favor the text, but the evidence is inconclusive.

130) Col. 4:8 TEXT: $\gamma\upsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\tau\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\eta\mu\omega\nu$
 P46: $\gamma\upsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\tau\pi\acute{\iota}\eta\mu\omega\nu$ C Kaine pm f v g s; 5

The testimony of Antioch, Byzantium, and of (divided) Alexandria and Rome probably presents a superior distribution for the papyrus.

The exact parallel in Eph. 6:22 is without doubt correct in reading with the text here. If the papyrus is correct then it must be postulated that Tychicus returned to Paul again--or, at least, sent him the news. In a personal remark of this nature one would certainly expect to find the very same record in the two letters, and it seems improper to say that the text is an accommodation to the account in Ephesians. It seems more probable then that there is a type of haplography in the papyrus (from the article $\tau\lambda$ -) than to accuse the text of dittography. The person of the pronoun would naturally follow, depending on what form of $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ the scribe had written.

131) Col. 4:12 TEXT: $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$
 P46: $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$ Kaine pm.

The solution is hardly to be considered as a lexical problem since the meanings of both words can be "fully assured" or "brought to

completion" (i.e. of the will of God in you).²¹ As usual, the compounded verb is less frequently used by Paul, and this passage has no real parallel in Ephesians. The confusion is probably from the similarity of the syllables in $-\eta\rho\sigma(\phi)\omicron\rho\eta-$ and one of these was either omitted or duplicated. The infrequency of the compound verb slightly favors the reading of the text, but the internal evidence is inconclusive.

We note this as another example (cf. 127, 130) of special agreement between the papyrus and the Byzantines--agreements which are of a doubtful integrity. But Zuntz is inclined to believe that this association often proves that the Byzantines reproduced an older tradition!²²

Conclusions: No less than forty-eight readings peculiar to the papyrus alone (i.e., without the support of B, Aleph, D) clearly demonstrates that it represents a tradition that is to a high degree, its very own.

None of these readings are adopted in the Nestle text. Although some of them seem intrinsically probable,²³ none have been adopted in view of the overwhelming lack of external support. But the following variants may be noted especially as:

- a. Careless scribal blunders 85, 91, 98, 106, 113, 122, 126.

²¹Bauer, op. cit., pp. 676f.

²²Zuntz, op. cit., p. 49.

²³Heinrich Seeseman, "Der Chester Beatty Papyrus 46 und der Paulus-text des Clemens Alexandrinus," Zeitschrift fuer die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVI (1937), 91. The author accepts the early judgment that none of the Sonderlesarten, when subjected to severe criticism, bespeak a genuine originality.

- b. Possibly genuine 84, 89, 96, 101, 105, 112, 115, 119, 120.
- c. Characteristically omitting whole clauses 85, 111, 112, 120.
- d. Having unusual support of patristic evidence 118.
- e. Showing characteristic preference for un-compounded verbs 129, 131.
- f. Showing characteristic preference for subjunctive (vs. future)
100, cf. 45, 67.

The RSV translators may have adopted three (95, 104, 125) of these readings.

General considerations reveal that the papyrus frequently has the shorter text, not only omitting whole phrases, but also many articles. Hoskier thinks that its apparently deliberate suppression of the article might show that the scribe was a Graeco-Latin or a non-Greek-thinking man.²⁴ Although this shorter text does not seem to have any special association with the Western tradition (as witnessed only by D!), it at least reveals an apparent lack of scribal polish or editorial correction. This is a legitimate deduction from the large number of unsupported readings.²⁵ Yet it must be conceded that the scribe committed a great number of slips or blunders and the many unadopted papyrus readings probably point to a preservation of some old conjectural alterations.²⁶

Although P46 can be used in assessing the quality of other MSS., it seems that readings to which it alone (or almost alone) bears witness should await further confirmation. Zuntz holds that such readings should "never be accepted unless their intrinsic quality can stand the severest

²⁴Hoskier, op. cit., p. 18. Cf. also the "Addenda" for a list of the "shorter text" readings, p. 2.

²⁵Cf. Sanders, op. cit., p. 28.

²⁶Cf. Zuntz, op. cit., p. 23.

test.²⁷ But few, if any, in the Pauline letters considered stand this text.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

²⁷Ibid., p. 23.

TABLE OF RESULTS

Ref. No.	Adopted by Scribe	Further Adopted	Σ with Scribe	Σ by Adopted
1	1 - 1	1 - 2	800	1
2	15 - 13	1 - 1	1000	1
3	1 - 13	1 - 10	800	1
4	1 - 13	1 - 8	800	1
5	15 - 13	2 - 13	1000	1
6	1 - 13	2 - 6	800	1
7	1 - 13	1 - 13	800	1
8	1 - 13	0 - 13	800	1

Σ = 176 (13.6%) Σ = 131 (13.7%) Σ = 11 (1.0%)
 Parentheses are last possible exceptions in the MS.

From the above table many noteworthy conclusions are apparent. Where the MS. tradition is fixed, there are relatively few readings in which the papyrus agrees with the united testimony of all three primary codices. This seems that the early textual tradition is strongly divided. Consideration of a greater number of cases would have undoubtedly increased the adopted readings beyond eighty per cent. There are more agreements between the papyrus and S - B than with X - B. The papyrus has therefore not only defied definition of the Alexandrian tradition as a narrow entity, but has also given a special support to Western readings that are also found in the Vaticanus. Although the purely Alexandrian tradition has the best readings, a comparison of the three duplex groups shows that the presence of the Western witness lowers the number of cases for which the support of the papyrus can be cited. This is also evident when the singular supports

CHAPTER XII

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

TABULATION OF RESULTS

<u>Pl⁶ with</u>	<u>Adopted by Nestle</u>	<u>Further Adoptions</u>	<u>% with Nestle</u>	<u>RSV Adoptions</u>
B $\frac{s}{s}$ D	3 - 5	1 - 2	80%	1
$\frac{s}{s}$ B	10 - 13	3 - 3	100%	1 (1)
BD	9 - 19	4 - 10	68%	2 (1)
$\frac{s}{s}$ D	4 - 12	3 - 8	59%	2 (1)
$\frac{s}{s}$ B	14 - 47	4 - 33	38%	4 (2)
$\frac{s}{s}$ D	4 - 10	2 - 6	60%	(1)
D	1 - 22	1 - 21	9%	1 (1)
Alone	0 - 48	0 - 48	--	(3)
<hr/>		<hr/>		
	45 - 176 (25.6%)	18 - 131 (13.7%)		11 (10)
	Parentheses enclose possible adoptions in the RSV.			

From the above table many noteworthy conclusions are apparent.

Where the MSS. tradition is fluid, there are relatively few readings in which the papyrus agrees with the united testimony of all three primary uncials. This means that the early textual tradition is strongly divided. Considerations of a greater number of cases would have undoubtedly increased the adopted readings beyond eighty per cent.

There are more agreements between the papyrus and B - D than with $\frac{s}{s}$ - B. The papyrus has therefore not only defied definition of the Alexandrian tradition as a narrow entity, but has also given a special support to Western readings that are also found in the Vaticanus. Although the purely Alexandrian combination has the best readings, a comparison of the three duplex groups shows that the presence of the Sinaiticus witness lowers the number of cases for which the support of the papyrus can be cited. This is also evident when the singular support

of the three uncials is observed. Although the readings of the Sinaiticus (supported by P46) are more trustworthy, they are less common than those of P46 - D.

The relatively high frequency of correspondence between P46 - B reaffirms the antiquity of the Vaticanus text. But few of these readings seem genuine and Nestle has almost gone the limit in adopting this class. This constitutes a caution against the validity of such readings.

It is especially the first hand of Aleph that finds support in the papyrus. Its uncorrected text is therefore an early one, but the quality of this text might well be distorted in the above percentage since the number of cases is small.

The Western text finds a surprisingly large support in the papyrus. Although this indicates the antiquity of many Western readings, very few of these readings seem genuine.

The great number of readings attested by P46 alone reveal a textual tradition of its very own. This implies a wider Alexandrian tradition in earlier times. Its shorter text in such frequent occurrence indicates that it has suffered little from scribal polish and some of its peculiar readings might even be genuine. But these should await further confirmation.

In all of the cases that were adopted by us as genuine, the papyrus has played a considerable part in effecting the balance of evidence, both external and internal. On this basis the Nestle text, which sometimes was found to present inadequate (or incorrect!) evidence, can be considerably revised. With special attention to the witness of P46, it is found that 13.7 per cent of the total number of unadopted citations in the

Nestle apparatus seem genuine!

Since the readings selected in this thesis are not cited in logical progression from beginning to end, the "further adoptions" and "RSV adoptions" are here cited by designated numbers:

Further adoptions: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 21, 24, 38, 41, 56, 57, 59, 64.

RSV adoptions: 2, 3, (4), 6, 9, (12), 17, (18), 21, 24, (39), 41, 43, 47, (53), (59), 64, (82), (95), (104), (125).

A revision of the Nestle text ought to incorporate especially a reconsideration of the Western text (D) when it is aligned with B or Aleph, but certainly not when it stands alone even though it has the support of the papyrus! Further conclusions in comparing the papyrus with the Western text cannot be made, since this must involve the other Western MSS. But only one of these has been given attention in this thesis.

The RSV, in adopting eleven (possibly 21) of the readings considered, has, to a commendable degree, recognized the papyrus and substantiated the claim: "We have made considerable use of the Chester Beatty fragments; in fact we have consulted them constantly, and have occasionally adopted readings from that source, when supported by others."¹ In these letters, P46 should have been only slightly more significant for these revisers.¹ This involves a reconsideration of Gal. 1:4(16); 1:11(57); 1:18(7); Eph. 4:24(5); 4:32(38); 6:12(10); and Col. 3:23(56). But the overall recognition of the papyrus testimony has been good.

¹F. C. Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 41f. For a contrary opinion, in which it is claimed that P46 has not borne much weight with the revisers of the thesis, based on 39 readings, by George Krause, The Employment of Textual Critical Methods and Principles by the Revision Committee in the RSV with Special Reference to the Pauline Epistles (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1953), pp. 23, 26, 37.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 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), 180-89.
- "Book Review of 'The Key to Ephesians' by Edgar Goodspeed," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVII (December, 1956), 978f.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and edited by William Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1957.
- Beyer, Herman W., and Others. "Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus," Das Neue Testament Deutsch. VIII. 6th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- Buck, Charles H. "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (May, 1949), 351ff.
- Clark, Kenneth W. A Descriptive Catalogue of New Testament Manuscripts in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- Colwell, Ernest C. What is the Best New Testament? Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Dobschuetz, Erich von. "Zur Liste der Neu-Testamentlichen Handschriften," Zeitschrift für die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXII (1933), 185-206.
- Glaue, Paul D. "Der Aelteste Text der Geschichtlichen Bücher des Neuen Testaments," Zeitschrift für die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XLV (1954), 90-108.
- Goodspeed, Edgar G. The Key to Ephesians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1956.
- Grant, Frederick C. An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. Edited by Luther A. Weigle. Distributed by International Council of Religious Education, n.p., 1946.
- Hatch, William. The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

- Hoskier, H. C. A Commentary of the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus. London: Bernard Quartich Ltd., 1938.
- Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles Known as P₄₆, with Addenda, in the Journal of Theological Studies. Oxford: University Press, 1937.
- Howard, Wilbert F. The Romance of New Testament Scholarship. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.
- Kenyon, Sir Frederic G. Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- The Bible and Archaeology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- The Bible and Modern Scholarship. London: John Murray, 1949.
- Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. 4th edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.
- The Text of the Greek Bible. London: Duckworth Press, 1948.
- The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculi I, III, III Supplement. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933-36.
- "Book Review of 'A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul' edited by Henry Sanders," American Journal of Philology, LXII (January, 1936), 91-95.
- Krause, E. George. "The Employment of Textual-Critical Methods and Principals by the Revision Committee in the R.S.V. with Special Reference to the Pauline Epistles." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1953.
- Lake, Kirsopp and Silva. "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (January, 1936), 89-98.
- Lietzmann, Hans. "Zur Wuerdigung des Chester Beatty Papyrus der Paulus Briefe," Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Phil.-Hist. Klasse, XXV. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934.
- Moeller, Elmer. "P₄₆ and Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (May, 1946), 340-50.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. Novis curis elaboravit Erwin Nestle. Editio vicesima prima. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.
- Paret, Oscar. Die Bible: Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift. 2nd edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelandtalt, 1950.

- Parvis, Merrill M., and Allen P. Wikgren, editors. New Testament Manuscript Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- . An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. New York: Doran Co., ca.1925.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Epistle to the Romans. In The International Critical Commentary. 5th edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1952.
- Sanders, Henry A., editor. A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXXVIII. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935.
- Schmidt, Carl. "Die Neuesten Bibelfunde aus Aegypten," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXX (1931), 285-93.
- Schmoller, Alfred. Concordantiae Novi Testamenti Graeci. 10th edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1953.
- Seeseman, Heinrich. "Der Chester Beatty Papyrus 46 und der Paulustext des Clemens Alexandrinus," Zeitschrift für die Neu-Testamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVI (1937), 90-97.
- Souter, Alexander. The Text and Canon of the New Testament. Revised by C. S. Williams. London: Duckworth and Co., 1954.
- Stoeckhardt, George. Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians. Translated from the German by Martin Sommer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.