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Notes on Chapter 12

12:1.1

The shifting position of αδελφοί makes it suspect,¹ and we have seen elsewhere (11:2.3) that the vocative has frequently been added to the manuscripts. It may have been added here under the influence of αδελφοί just a few lines above at 11:33. Furthermore, there is only one firm example of αδελφοί used by Paul in a sentence introduced with περὶ δὲ (1 Thes. 5:1). This is not however, the only place where αδελφοί appears in different positions. One of these is 7:24, where D F G stand alone in a secondary shift of αδελφοί. But at 12:1 the bilinguals are joined by 336 629 630 1739 1881, most of the Latin tradition, and a citation in De Trinitate 24,7 (attributed to Didymus the Blind). That 1739 agrees with D F G is striking;² we have already seen D F G join with only B 1739 in preserving the archetypical text at 9:27. The reading of D F G, therefore, cannot be immediately dismissed as another unique example of their tendency to alter word order.

Both positions have limited support from Pauline parallels. Οὐ θελω (θελομεν) υμας αγνοειν αδελφοί also occurs at Rom. 1:13 (ουκ οιομαι D² G), 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; 2 Cor. 1:8 (omit αδελφοί P⁴⁶ vid); and 1 Thes. 4:13. In each of these cases, however, an object or object clause follows αγνοειν so that αδελφοί does not end the sentence. Support for the earlier position is also found in the parallel at 1 Thes. 5:1, where αδελφοί stands immediately after the genitive substantives governed by περὶ (1 Thes. 5:1: Περὶ δὲ τῶν

¹J. Weiss (p. 294 n. 1) suggests that it is a gloss; the lack of αδελφοί at either position in 247 is unlikely to be traceable to the archetypical text, even if von Soden’s citation is correct.

²Zuntz does not notice the agreement of D F G with 1739 in his discussion of the “Western” text and agreements with B or 1739 on pp. 100-103.
χρόνων καὶ τῶν καρπῶν, ἀδελφοί). Given the more common usage of οὐ θελῶ (θελομεν) υμᾶς αγνοεῖν αδελφοῖ, it is more likely that scribes would move the noun to the later position than that it would have been moved to the earlier position from the later. This wording at 1 Cor. 10:1 may have had a distant influence as well. An interpolation is unlikely, for it would require that a single insertion had been misread in order to result in these two readings. Given that there are seventeen letters separating the two potential positions, it is doubtful that such a correction could have been so badly misread.

12:1.2

The shift in the number of the verb (1508) is the result of familiarity with the similar Pauline phrase οὐ θελομεν υμᾶς αγνοεῖν (2 Cor. 1:8, θελω K 88 467; 1 Thes. 4:13, θελω 1 204 642 794 2138 506).

12:2.3; 12:2.5

Modern editions and commentators assume the Ν Α Β Δ text. This form of the text, however, has “incomplete and ambiguous Greek syntax”3 which results in the need to disentangle several grammatical problems even if one disregards the significant variation.4 First, the juxtaposition of οτι οτε “lacks elegance.” Its only potential Pauline parallel is Phil. 4:15, though there a prepositional phrase intervenes. Second, οτι is an “unnecessary repetition”; the text flows much more smoothly if ως depends on οιδατε without the intervening οτι. Third, ἀν is unusual outside of a conditional construction, particularly with

3Thiselton, p. 911.

4These difficulties are outlined by B. Weiss, p. 294.
an indicative verb. While most commentators understand ὡς ἀν as having iterative force, this would be unique to Paul (though Acts 2:45; 4:35). In the NT (including Paul) ὡς ἀν is typically used as a temporal conjunction similar to ὅταν. The grammarians have noted that amending the printed text to ὡς ἀν (see below) may be preferable.

Even assuming that these difficulties do not make this form of the text impossible, it is still not clear how best to understand its syntax. There are at least two solutions. The first (until recently the most common) assumes anacoluthon: ὡς must refer back to ὅταν after the sentence had abruptly ended. This would be rendered "You know that, when you were Gentiles - how you were led astray [and] carried away by mute idols" or, moving the prepositional phrase, "You know that, when you were Gentiles - how you were led astray to mute idols [and/being] carried away." The need to insert an assumed conjunction, such as κατ' shows the difficulty of this interpretation.

The second solution is adopted by the Peshitta and virtually all recent commentators.

5 Elsewhere in Paul ἀν is frequently used with the imperfect in conditional sentences. Aside from 2 Cor. 10:9, the three other occurrences of ὡς ἀν are all followed by the subjunctive (Rom. 15:24; 1 Cor. 11:34; Phil. 2:23). Thus ὡς ἀν ἡγεσθε would be unique in Paul.


7BDR §455(2).

8BDR §§367, 453.

9Adopted by Conzelmann, p. 204 and Barrett, p. 278; noted as a possibility by Schrage III, p. 120.

10As in Barrett, p. 278. The Peshitta also adds a conjunction, though it also repeats the verb. See the next note.

11W. A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Washington: University Press of America, 1982), p. 156 n. 69; Fee, pp. 576-7; Schrage III, pp. 114, 120; Thiselton (p. 911) goes so far as to claim that "alternative hypotheses seem unnecessary." The Peshitta uses ἐρχομαι both at the beginning of the sentence and as a periphrastic at the end:
ως αν ηγεσθε is understood as relative clause, which requires an assumed ἦτε for the clause with απαγομενοι. This would be rendered, “You know that, when you were gentiles, you were carried away, as you were continually being led about to mute idols” or, moving the prepositional phrase, “You know that, when you were gentiles, you were carried away to mute idols, [as/however] you were continually being led about.” Hering, however, notes that an assumed ἦτε is “rather clumsy.” Furthermore, this solution does not deal with all of the objections raised above.

A third solution is to recall that word division and accent did not exist in the earliest manuscripts (cf. N B C D). There was not any visual distinction between ους ἄν Ηγεσθε, ους ἄν Ηγεσθε, or (as is assumed in the solutions above) ους ἄν Ηγεσθε. One may therefore read ὡςάν as a single word, understanding it as an adverb: “you were, so to speak, led away.” The attachment of ὡςάν to a verb in this way, however, would be unattested. Another alternative is to read ἄνηγεσθε as a single word. This removes the difficulty of ἄν followed by the indicative ἦγεσθε. A few witnesses divide the words in just this way (B² F G⁵ 1241⁹). The congruence of F G⁵ show that this is the reading of their shared immediate

———


13For this reason ως αν ηγεσθε is not a conjecture, as is stated in the apparatus of NA²⁷.

14J. Weiss, p. 294; Hering, p. 124.
predecessor. In addition, two patristic citations support this reading: a catena attributed to Severian of Gabala (discussed below), and Augustine’s *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 21,8 (quomodo ascendentebatis).

One difficulty with resorting to an alternative word division is the meaning of \(\text{ἀνάγω} \) in this context. Hering notes that in the NT the word “seems to be a technical term for snatching away into the world of invisible powers.” This is rejected by Schrage, who notes that elsewhere it is used of animals brought up for sacrifice (Acts 7:41) and even in a positive way of Christ (Rom. 10:7). While no example of the word used in a similar context by a patristic writer is cited by Lampe, BDAG discusses the possibility of this reading without noting any particular difficulty in meaning. Furthermore, the interpretation attributed to Severian, which uses \(\text{ἀνάγωνται} \), fits the context quite well:

But because he says “you are led up to the idols” (πρὸς τὰ ἔδωκα ἀνήγεσθε) he makes clear the great corruption of prophecy and divination. For those possessed by an unclean spirit are not going to the idols sober-minded, rather they are led up (ἀνάγωνται) by the unclean spirit, not by a self-chosen will. For this is shown by the ἀνήγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι. Therefore it means: you know the working of the unclean spirit because of which you used to suffer, but the things of the Holy Spirit have a pure working. For the one who practices divination darkens the soul and he does not know what he says, but the soul of the prophet becomes a brighter light and what it had not known — what was made clear to it — it speaks.

\(\text{ἀνήγεσθε} \), according to Severian, implies what Hering suggests: that the person is brought

---

15 The parent text is preserved in F: F: WC Ö H G*, which is full of incorrect word divisions, reads WC Ö H G*. This was corrected with punctuation: WC Ö H G*

16 Augustine’s citation occurs in a block of text; since he does not comment on this portion of the citation it is impossible to determine how he understood *ascendentebatis*.

17 Schrage III, p. 120 n. 38.

18 BDAG, s.v. ἀνάγω (1).

under the control of dark powers. This suits the context of 1 Cor. 12, particularly since immediately following this passage Paul states that only by the power of the Spirit can one confess Jesus as Lord. This had not been possible when they were “gentiles,” for they had been under a different power. Not only does ἀνηγεσθε fit the context better than ἀν ἣγεσθε, it also removes the difficulty of the ἄν. Even if ὃς ἀνηγεσθε is adopted, however, this alone does not resolve the problem of ὃς with ὅτι ὅτε nor in itself determine whether ὅτι ὅτε, ὅτι, or ὅτε should be read.

The manuscripts resolved this difficulty in various ways. Some witnesses omit ὅτι (K2 0150 1 69 2464 pc). This removes a major difficulty with ὅτι ὅτε, since ὃς would attach directly to οἶδατε. The conjunction may have been added in order to supply an object for οἶδατε, not realizing that the distant ὃς could fulfill the same function. The insertion of ὅτι could easily be accounted for as an addition based on the frequent Pauline use of οἶδατε ὅτι. While it seems unlikely that a scribe would have added ὅτι immediately before ὅτε, it is possible that the reading ὅτι ὅτε may be the result of a correction which was intended to replace ὅτε with ὅτι. Subsequent users of the text misinterpreted the notation and wrote both. This form of the text is adopted by both Héring and J. Weiss, the latter of whom concludes that “only [οἶδατε, ὅτε . . . , ὃς] can seriously be possible, not because of its weak attestation, but for internal reasons.”

20 That the text reads more smoothly with ὅτε than with ὅτι ὅτε is shown by a paraphrase in Chrysostom which omits ὅτι (also altering ὃς to

20J. Weiss, p. 204; cf. Héring, p. 124, both of whom also adopt ὃς ἀνηγεσθε. Both also claim, however, that οἶδατε ὅτε is the reading of the Textus Receptus, which is in error (instead reading οἶδατε ὅτι).
πως) even though the lemma reads οτι οτε. This indicates that he also saw the οτι as superfluous.

Another solution found in the manuscripts is to read only οιδατε οτι (F G 424 915 pm VL 61 75 89). This allows ως αν νηεςθε to be read as relative clause without requiring an additional ητε: “You know that you were gentiles drawn to mute idols just as you were led.” While the text construes more easily, it is difficult to account for the addition of οτε in many witnesses, which could not have been accidental. But why would a scribe/reader introduce a word that creates such difficulty? In addition, it is more likely that οτε would be altered to οτι after οιδατε than that the corruption moved in the other direction. While satisfying in context, this reading is unlikely to have given rise to the others.

Two manuscripts go their own way in attempting to resolve the difficulties. 323 reads οτι οτε . . . ωστε ανηγεσθε, removing the problem of ως by creating a result clause. 630 removes the need for an assumed ητε by placing the participle immediately after αφωνα so that ητε . . . απαγομενοι may be read as periphrastic (οτι οτε . . . απαγομενοι ως αν νηεςθε). These early conjectures, both in manuscripts that read οτι οτε, confirm the difficulty of that reading and presage modern conjectures.

The difficulties of the text as found in the “best witnesses” and the fact that the seemingly best text is found in “poor witnesses” has led some commentators to emend the text. Westcott and Hort, who rarely resorted to conjecture, proposed that ΟΤΙΟΤΕ was corrupted to ΟΤΙΟΤΕ due to the similarity of letters. This is an attractive solution, for it

21 καὶ γὰρ οιδατε οτε Ἑλληνες ἤτε, πως ἀπήγεσθε ἐλκόμενοι τότε = “for you also know, when you were Gentiles, how you were pulled, at that time being dragged away.” This passage is discussed by Héring, p. 125 n. 7.

22 Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 116, with comparison to οτι ποτε at Eph. 2:11 and ποτε at Rom. 11:30; Eph. 2:13; 5:8; Tit 3:3. This is accepted by Robertson and Plummer, p.
resolves the difficulty of the στ, although it does not address the unusual αυ ηγεσθε. It also has a near parallel at Eph. 2:11. The resultant rendering would be: “You know that once you were gentiles, carried away by mute idols as you were led.” It is not clear, however, how Π would simply have dropped out rather than been confused with other letters.

Given the dissatisfaction with all these solutions, another conjecture may be hazarded. ὁτιστε may have been corrupted from ὁτε, a change that would have resulted from the misreading of a single pen stroke. Gregory cites two examples of the confusion of Π and Τ in NT manuscripts: ΜΗΤΙΕΙΟΝΑ written as ΜΗΤΙΠΕΙΟΝΑ (John 7:31) and ΠΕΜΟΙ written for ΤΙΕΜΟΙ (037 at Mark 5:7).23 The error is possible also in the book hand script of the first century.24 While ὀπότε does not occur elsewhere in Paul, and in the NT potentially only at Luke 6:5 (where the alternative is οτε), it should not for this reason alone be dismissed. It is found in the papyri, frequently with εν but also with the indicative and specifically, as potentially at 1 Cor. 12:2, the imperfect:25

“... would the daughter have pledged herself to the State by another deed when she was liable to be deprived of the property whenever he chose? (οπότε ἔκεινυ ἐδόκει)” (P.Oxy. 472,2,40; AD 130)

“... in accordance with the disposition made by Papontos in his lifetime (οπότε

260, who claim that it “gets rid of all grammatical difficulty.” Even Fee (p. 576 n. 32) remarks that this is “one of the more attractive options.”


24For example, E. M. Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912), p. 124 contains a photo of a first-century Greek manuscript which writes Π with left horizontal stroke extending far to the left of the left vertical stroke and not always clearly connecting to the right vertical stroke. Similarly, in ΠΑΡΑΚΕΥΣΟΝΤΕΣ (col. 1, l. 2), ΠΡΑΤΤΕΙΝ (col. 1, l. 9), and ΠΡΑΤΤΟΝΤΩΝ (col. 2, l. 7-8) the form of Π could easily be confused for ΤΙ.

25Mayser II,1, p. 273, who cites P.Teb. 72,240 as an example of ὀπότε used with the imperfect. BDAG (s.v. ὀπότε) cites P.Oxy 243 (AD 79) and P.Ryl 245 (III cen.).
This adverb also occurs with the imperfect in literary texts: "But you turn it [i.e., ability] aside just then, when you ought (οὗτος ἔδει) to keep it open and seen." (Arrian, *Epicteti dissertationes* I,12,31). This text is comparable to the NT in date and style, showing that such usage would not be impossible for the Pauline epistles.

In conclusion, the reading οτι or οτι οτε must certainly be an error since οτι ... ως is so difficult that it cannot be archetypical, yet is easily explained as a corruption. But a corruption of what? There are two possibilities. First, if οτε is the earlier form, οτι can easily be explained as having been introducing by scribes/readers expecting οιδατε οτι. If standing alone, οτι would be a simple replacement for οτε. οτι οτε could have resulted either from the intentional addition of οτι or from a misreading of a notation that had intended οτι to replace οτε, but instead resulted in its insertion. Second, οτι οτε could be a corruption of οποτε. Though unattested, its loss can be explained as a a simple confusion of letters.

It is likewise clear that αν ηγεσθε is incorrect. The use of αν in this way would be unparalleled in Paul. Here manuscript "weight" or "authority" is of no value since the early manuscripts do not employ word division. All difficulties are cleared up, however, if the text is read as ανηγεσθε. The resultant text would be either οιδατε οτε εθνη ητε προς τα ειδωλα τα αφωνα ως ανηγεσθε απαγομενοι or οιδατε οποτε εθνη ητε προς τα ειδωλα τα αφωνα ως ανηγεσθε απαγομενοι: "You recall how you were led up when you

26 See also IV,1,160. An additional example, though in an interrogative, is used following a form of οιδα: "Which of them knows when it ought (ὅποτε δέι) to be used and when not (πότε μὴ)?" (II,23,9).

27 This is the solution adopted by J. Weiss, p. 294 and Héring, p. 124.
were gentiles, being led away to mute idols.”

12:2.4

Most Latin witnesses have a reading which must be a secondary adaptation resulting from a sight error in Greek. Matching the overwhelmingly attested Greek reading τα ἐιδωλα τα αἴωνα is ad simulacra muta in VL 78 and the Vulgate.28 Several Latin witnesses, however, depart from any Greek witness: idolorum formae (VL 89); idolorum forma (Rufinus, Origenis in librum Numeri 20,3); or simulacrorum formae similis (VL 61 Pel).29 F G read τα ἐιδωλα τα ομορφα, which differs from the Latin texts in two respects. First, F G retain the prepositional phrase προς τα ἐιδωλα, where idolorum and sacrorum assume only a noun in the genitive. In addition, F G reads an alpha privative ομορφα, not ομορφα (discussed further below). The resultant Latin text construes quite differently from either F G or the rest of the Greek tradition: “You know that you were gentiles living as forms of idols just as you were being led.” Just what a “form of an idol” could mean in this context is explained in the Ambrosiaster commentary:

Wanting to provide spiritual things to them as examples he reminds them of their previous conduct, that just as they were forms of idols when they worshiped idols and were willingly led by a demonic leader, so also when worshiping God they should be forms of the dominical laws while walking in such a way as to please God. Now the form of any kind of law ought to be seen in the profession and conduct of the worshiped. For that one is the form and image of the law of God in whom shines the truth of the gospel by faith and conduct.30

28 Also ad idola muta (Amst(A) Rufinus, Origenis Commentarius in epistulam ad Romanos 7,1); and ad simulacra sine voce (Augustine, Contra Faustum Manichaeum 21,8).

29 The NA27 apparatus inaccurately displays this evidence: “(ar b; Ambst) Pel.” In fact, VL 61 (= ar) matches the reading of Pelagius, VL 89 (= b) differs from any Latin witness in reading the plural formae, and all Latin witnesses should be enclosed in parentheses since none read anything corresponding to the alpha privative in F G.

30 Commentarius in epistulas Pauli, on 1 Cor. 12:2.
While ancient commentators may have been able to make sense of this reading, it cannot be archetypical. The former way of life described in v. 2 is contrasted with speaking “by the Spirit” in v. 3. But can an explanation be given for the rise of this reading?

The original D-text reading can be reconstructed as either *idolorum forma* or *idolorum formae*. The latter is the reading of VL 89, but the plural *formae*, formed from the singular by the addition of a single letter, may be an adaptation to the number of *gentes*.

*Idolorum*, however, is firm since it is present in both VL 75 and 89. This is also confirmed by VL 77, which has partially adapted his Latin text based on the Vulgate to the Greek: *ad simulacrorum* is a unique reading that combines the Vulgate’s *ad simulacra* and the D-Text’s *idolorum*. Further adaptations are seen in VL 77, where *formationes* is an attempt to bring the Latin of Claromontanus into correspondence with the Greek, though this unique rendering is based on *μορφα*, not the *αμορφα* of F G. VL 75 also goes its own way, reading the genitive *idolorum* that it found in its predecessor but altering *forma(e)* to *sine voce* in order to match the Greek equivalent that it read (*αφωνα*). This suggests that the reading of D is again adapted from witnesses outside the bilingual tradition. When the attempt was made to bring the Latin into line with the Greek, a translation found nowhere else in the Latin tradition of this passage resulted.\(^1\) The Greek of the predecessor of D F G cannot be reconstructed with certainty, since (as discussed below) it is likely that an error in transcription is involved. \(\tau\alpha\ \varepsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\alpha\) is firm in D F G, but \(\tau\alpha\ \alpha\phi\omega\nu\alpha\) (D) was not the reading of the shared ancestor since it is attested neither in F G nor any Latin D-Text witnesses. F G’s \(\tau\alpha\ \alpha\mu\rho\phi\alpha\)\(^2\) may also...

\(^1\) Similar unique readings occur in VL 75 at Rom. 16:25-27. [Discussed in chapter on D F G].

\(^2\) G evidences its typical difficulty with word division. Written in the manuscript is: \(\varepsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\alpha\tau\alpha\ \cdot\ \alpha\mu\rho\phi\alpha\), with the article assumed to be attached to the preceding noun. F divides the words: \(\varepsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\alpha\ \cdot\ \tau\alpha\ \cdot\ \alpha\mu\rho\phi\alpha\).
reflect an early error, one which these manuscripts make elsewhere (see τιμία for ατιμία at 11:14.58) Upon finding it in their source manuscripts, the various scribes and translators repaired the difficult reading in different ways. D resorted to replacing it with a reading from a second Greek witness, then altering its Latin text to match. The D-Text reviser may have assumed that χωρφα was simply an error for μορφα and used forma, much as the editor of the ad hoc Latin translation in VL 77's did by creating the reading formationes, which ignores the alpha privative. Though unattested, the Latin equivalent to the presumed τα έιδωλα τα μορφα would have been ad idola forma (with forma construed as an accusative). From this text idolorum forma could easily have arisen (with forma construed as a nominative), particularly given the difficult syntax of this sentence, as discussed at 12:2.3. From this reading, ultimately, the various permutations of the D-Text witnesses which were outlined above can all be explained.

Unsolved, however, is the rise of the reading τα μορφα. Προς τα έιδωλα τα μορφα ("to formed idols," i.e., "idols made by hands") does construe in this sentence. It is also similar to the understanding of idols described at Cor. 10:19 ("What do we say, that an idol is anything?"). However, it is not suited to Paul's discussion of "speaking" in 1 Cor. 12. Simple letter confusion is not very likely, though sound confusion is a remote possibility. Yet the error must have occurred in Greek, for the alternatives in the Latin tradition more are more easily explained as the result of adaptations of a text which translated (α)μορφα than that forma could have arisen from αφωνα. If this reading is not a error of the ear, aided by 1 Cor. 10:19, then we are only able to agree with J. Weiss that this reading is "Rätselhaft."33


33J. Weiss, p. 294 n. 3.
Further examples ωμ-/ημ- variation in 1241.

12:3.9

Omission of the possessive genitive is common, even in cases involving *nomina sacra* (see also 3:10.42).

12:3.10

D F G and the non-Vulgate Latin tradition omit λαλων / loquens. Zuntz's explanation is most likely: the participle was omitted because it was mistakenly judged to be redundant, as in ελαλησε λεγων. However, the participle best suits the context since it clarifies that Paul is speaking of glossolaly, not confession.\(^{34}\)

12:3.11 [discussed at 7:8.28]

12:3.12; 12:3.13; 12:3.14

In the nominative case the statements αναθεμα ησους and κυριος ησους (A B C 6 1739 pc) would reflect direct speech, while in the accusative the statements would be understood as indirect or reported speech. The latter would require that λεγει, used with the double accusative, be understood as identifying ησους in a specific manner, i.e. "to call" or "to name."\(^{35}\) The second statement (12:3b), given NT usage, must be direct speech since Paul, and the NT in general, uses the infinitive of λεγω to introduce direct speech. A parallel

---

\(^{34}\)Zuntz, p. 141; followed by Fee p. 574, n. 24. For this interpretation of v. 3 see Schrage III, p. 124.

\(^{35}\)BDAG, s.v. λεγω (4). Cf. the KJV: "Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord . . ."
example, which also uses δοναμα + infinitive of λέγω, occurs later in the chapter (12:21). The first statement, one would therefore assume, would likewise be in direct speech. There are no grammatical features to require it, and in fact Πελαγίους read the accusative in the first statement and the nominative in the second. The contrast between the first and second statement, however, requires that both be either direct or indirect speech. Since the latter is virtually certain to be direct speech, the former should be also. The shift to the accusative and indirect speech could have resulted simply from an unintentional incorporation of the statements into the syntax of the main clause, a change that required only a single letter.

12:4.15

δε is used here as a discourse marker to set off the introduction of the issue from the argument itself, not with contrastive force. Several witnesses make this clear by altering the conjunction to γαρ (385) or adding κατ (1311).


36 Also Luke 6:42; without δοναμα also Rom. 3:8. See BDAG s.v. λέγω (1aβ).

37 Though perhaps in indirect discourse the infinitive might be expected in the dependant clause, as at Rom. 4:1; 15:18. Cf. Erasmus' attempts to understand this statement in the Annotationes (p. 474) appended to his Novum Instrumentum. He uses the nominative Iesus in his notes, but retains the accusative iesum in his text, commenting: "it says Anathema Iesus in the accusative case, that is, it says that Jesus is anathema (Iesum esse anathema) ... that is, he calls him anathema (vocat illum Anathema).

38 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 653. This witness contains a lemma text that was adopted directly from a continuous text manuscript, not from the textual tradition of Pelagius' commentary. See Alexander Souter, Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul. vol. 1: Introduction, Texts and Studies 9 (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), pp. 245-72, esp. p. 259 and 262-3.

39 Cf. BDAG, s.v. δε (2).
The repetition of the comparison/contrast between "distinctions" and "the same Spirit/Lord/God" has led to assimilation throughout the tradition, but especially in B and its relatives. At 12:4, the δε in the first clause is not contrastive but marks of the beginning of the unit. This δε is repeated in the subsequent clause, το δε αυτο πνευμα. One manuscript, 424, alters this to και το αυτο πνευμα. This may have been in the interest of conformity to και ο αυτος κυριος at 12:5. It is also possible that the correction was written in at the wrong location, for at 12:6 the manuscript leaves uncorrected ο δε αυτος where its sister witnesses (Ψ B 1739) all read και ο αυτος. A second clear example of assimilation is found at 12:5, where και ο αυτος κυριος is assimilated to the preceding δε αυτος (even though και stands at the beginning of the sentence) by a handful of witnesses (33 57 103 218 256 441 1827 1831 1926).

The situation at 12:6 is more complex. The first two contrastive sentences use the same conjunctions to introduce the clauses: δε . . δε at 12:4 and και . . και at 12:5. Since και introduces the first clause of 12:6, one should expect και in the second clause as in Ψ B C 0201 vid 81 1175 1611 1739 pc. However, assimilation to either the και at the beginning of 12:6 or the και ο αυτος κυριος at 12:5 (or to both) is more likely than that o δε αυτος κυριος (or ο αυτος δε κυριος; see below) was added from 12:4. Zuntz notes that the breaking of the και . . και pattern here serves to conclude this series of parallel

---

40 Basil also reads και το αυτο πνευμα at Homilia de spiritu sancto MPG 31, p. 1429, but he does not use a conjunction in the first clause of 1 Cor. 12:4. In four other citations he reads το δε αυτο (De spiritu sancto 16,37; Adversus Eunomium MPG 29, pp. 664, 729, and 768).

41 0201: [ . . . ] και . . τα . . | ο ενελεγγυ εστιν. The final α cited in line 33 in the edition princeps appears to be a misreading for o in αυτος.

sentences. Furthermore, this is another example of Ψ B suffering from assimilation to the near context.

One final problem remains at 12:6: D F G read ο αυτος δε against either ο δε αυτος or και ο αυτος. Recognizing the tendency toward assimilation throughout this section would immediately suggest that the D F G reading would have been altered to either of the other two, both of which occur at 12:4 and 5. Two problems are then raised, however. First, why would ο δε αυτος be used at 12:4 but ο αυτος δε at 12:6? There appears to be little reason for the difference. Second, and more decisively, is ο αυτος δε a “stylistic improvement”? 44

First, regarding the stylistic issue. Postponement of the position of δε is not uncommon in the NT, though apparently not as common as earlier Greek. Denniston outlines the several situations in which δε is postponed in classical prose, 45 most of which Paul avoids. For example, Paul does not place δε after two definite articles and a substantive. 46 Neither does he place δε third in clauses that open with a preposition governing a substantive without the article. 47 This occurs nine times the in the NT, but in never in Paul. In fact, he

43Zuntz, p. 203.

44Lietzmann, p. 61.

45Denniston, Greek Particles, pp. 185-9.

46Cf. η δε του κοσμου (2 Cor. 7:10) and οι δε του χριστου (Gal 5:24), both without variation.

47Paul does place δε after a pronoun being governed by a preposition: εξ αυτου δε (1 Cor. 1:30); προς υμας δε (1 Cor. 16:6); εν ω δ' αν (2 Cor. 11:21 omit δ' Δ'); κατ' ιδιαν δε (Gal. 2:2). But notice also επι δε σε (Rom. 11:22; επι σε 1646); περι δε ων (1 Cor. 7:1). There is also one example involving the articular infinitive, which occasioned much difficulty in the manuscripts: Gal. 3:23 προ του γαρ ελθειν 489 927; προ δε του ελθειν 547 945 1611 1827; προ του ελθειν 104 205 460 614 1315 2412; προ του δε ελθειν rell.
places δέ between the preposition and the noun at 1 Cor. 7:15 (ἐν δὲ εἰρηνῇ; ἐν εἰρηνῇ δὲ 629; ἐν εἰρηνῇ 796) and 1 Cor. 16:12 (πέρι δὲ απολλῶ). In two situations, however, Paul does postpone δέ. First, he consistently postpones δέ when it would follow immediately after the negative particle. Second, he occasionally places δέ after an arthrous noun or participle at the beginning of a clause, though far more frequently δέ follows that article. While δέ is found in the third position without variation at 1 Cor. 3:8 (ο φυτεύων δέ), it has frequently been altered:

1 Cor. 10:4 η πετρα δε Ν Β Δ 330 629 1739
πετρα δε F G
η δε πετρα rell

1 Cor. 11:7 η γυνη δε Ν2 Β Β Δ F G Ψ 330 927 941 1175
η δε γυνη 441 463 1108 1611
γυναικι δε 614
γυνη δε rell This has frequently invited alteration

We have already argued that δε should be read after the noun in each of these cases. What is significant is that D F G has preserved the original word order in each case.

This examination of Paul's placement of δέ shows that it rarely occurs outside the postpositive position except following a negative particle. He occasionally places it after an article and noun and after a preposition and pronoun. With the intensive pronoun αὐτος,

48Rom. 1:13; 4:23; 5:3; 5:11; 8:23; 9:6; 9:10; 1 Cor. 4:18; 9:15; 10:20; 12:21 (omit δε in many witnesses) 15:10 (omit δε 365); 2 Cor. 7:7 (omit δε F G); 2 Cor. 8:19.

49From Romans and 1 Corinthians come the following examples: Rom. 5:4, 5, 16 (omit δε 1505 2495); 6:23; 7:25; 8:6; 10; 9:13; 10:17 (omit η 1646'); 11:7; 12:4 (παντα τα δε μελη 1827); 13:12; 15:5, 9 (omit δε 1646), 13 (omit δε 1319), 33; 16:20; 1 Cor. 6:13, 14; 8:1 (omit δε 131 547); 14:14, 20 (omit δε 205 424; ἵνα τας φρεσιν F G), 22; 15:38, 56 (bis; omit δε(1) 2147), 57 (τω δε χαρισμα θεω 1646').

50ἐκαστω διδοται δε is found at 1 Cor. 12:7 in 915, possibly to avoid the repetition of δε followed by δι-. At 1 Cor. 14:1 048 reads ζηλουτε τα δε πνευματικα.

51F G lose the article at 10:4, a frequent occurrence in these witnesses.
however, we find a consistent usage: δε is always placed between the article and the pronoun (in addition to 1 Cor. 12:4 see 2 Cor. 6:13 την δε αυτην αντιμισθιαν and Phil. 2:18 το δε αυτο. Only D F G read a different position at 12:6: ο αυτος δε. Based on Pauline style, this reading has little claim to being the source reading.

To dismiss the D F G reading as secondary, however, does not account for its rise. Lietzmann, as we noted, sees it as a stylistic improvement. Denniston notes, however, that both positions are common in classical writers. Might the Latin text have influenced the Greek? It seems unlikely, for although D F G’s ο αυτος δε θεος at 12:6 matches the Latin tradition’s idem vero deus VL 75 77 78 89 Vg (also idem autem deus VL 78 Vg\textsuperscript{lat}), the same word order in the Latin of 12:4 (idem autem spiritus VL 75 77 78 89 Vg; idem autem et spiritus VL 61; idem vero spiritus Spe Amst(A)) did not lead to the alteration of το δε αυτο πνευμα in D F G. Similarly at 2 Cor. 6:13 and Phil. 2:18 the Latin word order differs, but the Greek of D F G was not altered. Influence from the Latin therefore seems unlikely at 12:6.

12:6.20

In a confusion of similar vocabulary, C writes διορησεις in place of διορησεις. The latter does not fit the context and may have been influenced by the same form at 12:10.

---

52Elsewhere in the NT only Matt. 27:44 το δ[e] αυτο, without variation.

53Denniston, p. 186.

54The Latin interlinear in G reflects the difficulty of matching the Latin to the Greek word order. At 12:4 idem is written above το δε and a ligature for autem squeezed in tight so that αυτο does not have any Latin above it, whereas at 12:6 idem stands above αυτος and a ligature for vero above δε. Cf. 2 Cor. 6:13, where eandem autem is centered above την δε αυτην, even though the sequence does not match. At Phil 2:16, improper word division and the end of a line produced the confused το δαυ | το (sic) in G, with id ipsum on the one line and autem above the orphaned το.
The addition of the copula is common in the tradition. It is seen in the “Byzantine”
witnesses at 1 Cor. 3:22; 7:8; and Eph. 5:23; in D F G at 1 Cor. 7:26; in B D* at 1 Cor.
15:17,\(^{55}\) and in A \(\Psi\) at 1 Cor. 15:56.\(^{56}\) Further calling into question its presence at 12:6 is the
fact that it appears both before \(\theta\epsilon\sigma\zeta\) and after \(\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu\).\(^{57}\) The unique reading of B 0201 and
1739 shows the special relationship among these witnesses.

12:6.24 [discussed at 12:19.80]

12:8.27

Among the Greek witnesses, \(\Upsilon\)\(^{56}\) is alone in reading the word order \(\delta\iota\delta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\zeta\), though a large number of Latin witness reflect the same order (\textit{datur per
spiritum}).\(^{58}\) Either reading may have been caused by an accidental leap, either from \(\Delta\Lambda\) to
\(\Delta\Lambda\Delta\omicron\omicron\Lambda\) or \(\Delta\Lambda\Delta\omicron\omicron\Lambda\) to \(\Delta\Lambda\), with the missing text filled in after prepositional phrase or
verb, respectively, was written.\(^{59}\) If not accidental, the variation may have resulted from
assimilation to the word order of nearby clauses. As we have already seen, the parallelism

\(^{55}\text{Cf. Zuntz, p. 187.}\)

\(^{56}\text{At 1 Cor. 15:56 the Latin tradition (apart from the D-text) reads \textit{mortis peccatum est}, which should not be taken as support for the addition. The position of the verb differs, and the Latin tradition frequently adds a copulative which is absent in Greek (e.g., \textit{inanis est} / \textit{vacua est} 1 Cor. 15:14; \textit{animale est} 1 Cor. 15:46).}\)

\(^{57}\text{J. Weiss, p. 298 n. 2.}\)

\(^{58}\text{VL 61 89 P Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem} 5,8,8; the reading of 629 is adapted to
this Latin word order. Ambrose reads \textit{datur per spiritum} at \textit{De spiritu sancto} 2,99; 13,143
\textit{Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam} 10,180; \textit{Expositio de Psalmo CXVIII} 10,31 but \textit{per
spiritum datur} in manuscripts of \textit{Explanatio super Psalmos} 45,12,2.}\)

\(^{59}\text{Royse (p. 261) sees this as the cause of what he considered a singular reading in
\(\Upsilon\), but the Latin witnesses, whose shorter reading could not have been caused by an
accidental leap, also attest this word order.}\)
that runs throughout this section has caused numerous cases of assimilation. In this case, it is more likely that the verb διδωται has been moved to the position after the conjunction, the position in which it stands in the preceding sentence. However, the context would seem to favor having the prepositional phrase in a more prominent position, since Paul’s argument through 12:11 is that the various gifts come “through the Spirit.” Final judgment is not yet possible.


At 12:9-10 Paul offers a list of the φανέρωσεις (12:8) given by the Spirit. This list is framed by two pairs of clauses that begin with ετέρω and αλλω (12:9a-b; 12:10d-e).\(^{60}\) It is composed of short verbless clauses comprised of a dative pronoun followed by the noun expressed in the accusative. At issue in the textual tradition is whether or not δε is to be read in all, a few, or none of the clauses. The manuscripts read as follows:

\(^{60}\) Ψ\(^{46}\) reads ετερω in the last clause (12:10), assimilating to the previous clause.
As the table shows, no clause is free from variation. The tradition divides itself into four main groups of readings: Read δε in every clause (A C Ψ cett) or none (D'), only after αλλω (N'), or after only one (F G) or a few examples (B pc) of αλλω. Two factors have influenced the tradition. First, the tendency to avoid asyndeton has already been pointed out. Second, the firm example of αλλω δε at the end of 12:8 must have prompted the addition of δε in a few cases, most likely immediately following in the first clause of 12:9. This would explain the text of Ψ⁴⁶, for example, which adds δε after ετερω at 12:9a but not after the same pronoun at 12:10d. The δε of 12:8 also led to its insertion in and P and 1881, which read δε in the first several clauses but not the last several. The set of readings most likely to have been influenced by these two factors is that found in A C Ψ and most manuscripts, which reads δε in every clause. Furthermore, if this set of readings was archetypical there would be no explanation for the seemingly random loss of δε in the different groups of witnesses. Also

---

61 Ψ⁴⁶ reads ετερω δε here.

62 B omits due to an accidental leap: ΦΑΩΛΣΜΠΝΩΔ ΔΑΓΛΑΩΑ ΕΠΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΓΑΩΛΩΑΩΝ.
unlikely is the set of readings in B 6 424° 1739°° Clement (Stromata 4,21,132), for while the use of \( \varepsilon \tau \varphi \omega \ldots \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \delta \epsilon \) at the beginning and end of the list provides symmetry, the \( \delta \epsilon \) in 12:10a would certainly be secondary. Nevertheless, this set of readings firmly binds these witnesses (including \( \Phi^46 \)) together.

This leave three viable sets of readings. First, \( \mathbf{R}^* \) alone reads \( \delta \epsilon \) after every occurrence of \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) but not after \( \varepsilon \tau \varphi \omega \). Fee argues that this provides a “subtle” clue as to how the list is to be grouped. However this grouping has already been accomplished by the use of \( \varepsilon \tau \varphi \omega \) and \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \), and it is more likely that \( \delta \epsilon \) has been added to \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) and not \( \varepsilon \tau \varphi \omega \) under the influence of \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \delta \epsilon \) at 12:8. A second set of readings is found in F G, which read \( \delta \epsilon \) only in the last clause. While this is not supported by D or the Latin tradition (apart from VL 77, which has again been adapted to the Greek of G), all other witnesses read a \( \delta \epsilon \) in the final clause in the series. This \( \delta \epsilon \) would then signal the end of series. However, elsewhere Paul frequently structures an asyndetic series without attaching a conjunction to the last element. Examples include Rom. 2:19-21; 13:7, 13; 1 Cor. 9:20-22; 12:29-30; 14:26; 15:52, 58; 2 Cor. 6:4-10; 7:7; 11:20; 13:11. This makes \( \delta \epsilon \) unlikely in the final clause. The

---

63 0201 may also attest to this set of readings, but it is fragmentary for both potential occurrences of \( \delta \epsilon \) at 12:9. At 12:9a the editio princeps of Bell and Crum, followed by NTaP, cites 0201 as potentially reading \( \delta \epsilon \), while Güting (“Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente,” p. 105) argues that there is insufficient space for it. At 12:9b, the editio princeps and NTaP cites 0201 as probably lacking \( \delta \epsilon \), but Güting does not see any letters on the line which would allow for a reconstruction.

64 Fee, p. 584-5, n. 9.

65 F G add \( \delta \epsilon \) καί to \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \omicron \mu \nu \) and harmonize \( \gamma \gamma \omega \omicron \nu \alpha \) to \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \omicron \mu \nu \).

66 A adds καί before \( \omega \mu \eta \tau \alpha \kappa \iota \nu \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \).  

67 List adapted from Güting and Mealand, p. 59.
remaining text is found in D* and the Latin tradition,68 which maintains asyndeton for each clause. The sense-line layout of D, which so often leads scribes to bring lines into harmony (see chapter on D F G), is not a factor here because the Latin tradition shares the reading. Given the parallels cited above, this is most likely to be the archetypical text, with both a distaste for asyndeton and assimilation to the near context the cause of the various additions.69


The accidental addition or omission of τα at the end of -ματα stem nouns is common. At 12:9 2138 is the only Greek witness to attest the singular χαρισμα,70 although much of the Latin tradition reads the singular gratia (VL 75 Vg Amst Amst(A)) or donum (Mcion† Hilary).71 The singular ευεργημα is also read in the paired witnesses 056 0142 at 12:10, a corruption of ευεργηματα.72 The examples at 12:28 and 12:30 must be plural, since the other

68Tertullian's presentation of Marcion's text of this passage makes it impossible to determine whether or not the conjunctions were present; see Schmid, p. 122.


70G* divides the words as χαρισματα ταιοματων. Tischendorf cites F* and G* as reading χαρισματα τα ταιοματων. However, there is no correction in F and it is not clear that the two small marks above the initial τα indicate a correction in G. If they do, G° would read: χαρισμα ταιοματων. Of course this reading is nonsense and simply mistaken word division, for the Latin equivalent dona vel gratia requires the plural χαρισματα.

71The Latin tradition has had difficulty with these forms as well. Although gratia (10:9) may simply be a corruption of gratiae, especially in the D-text witnesses (VL 75 Amst), donum cannot be so easily explained and must be derived from a witness that read χαρισμα. At 12:28, 0151 is the only Greek witness to read the singular, but only Ambrosiaster and Ambrose read gratiam, a corruption of gratias. At 12:30, however, many Vulgate witnesses read the singular gratiam where the Greek tradition unanimously preserves χαρισματα, although Vg°8 read gratias and the D-text donationes.

72Though see the separate discussion of ευεργεια in D F G at 12:10.38.
“gifts” in the section are in the plural. Given this usage, the plural form should also be read at 12:9, even though \( \chi\alpha\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha \) is paired with the singular \( \pi\omicron\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \) earlier in the sentence. Nevertheless, the wide range of Latin witnesses with the singular there points to an early corruption, which is preserved in Greek now only in an eleventh century minuscule. This again reminds us that some early readings preserved in the versions have been repaired – and at times perhaps corrupted – in the bulk of the Greek tradition.

The same difficulties are to be found with \( \sigma\chi\iota\sigma\omicron\alpha \). The plural is unanimously attested at 1 Cor. 11:18, but at 1:10 \( \Psi^{26} 33 69 \) read the singular. The singular is in error there, likely the result of assimilation to the number of the verb (\( \bar{\eta} \)). At 12:25 D F G is joined by \( \aleph \) and witnesses that typically align with the “Byzantine” tradition in reading the plural. An immediate difficulty with the singular is that it is the only time that \( \sigma\chi\iota\sigma\omicron\alpha \) occurs in the singular in Paul. Again, assimilation to the number of the verb is likely,\(^3\) with the identical verb form used here as at 1:10. In fact, 1:10 (\( \mu\eta \bar{\eta} \epsilon\nu \omicron\mu\omicron\nu \sigma\chi\iota\sigma\omicron\alpha \)) shows that Paul elsewhere uses this neuter noun in the plural with the singular of \( \epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\iota \). It is, however, too remote and too small a change (comprising only two letters) to have been the cause of a shift to the plural.

A similar assimilation to the near context takes place in the following clause of 12:25. Here virtually the entire Greek tradition uses the plural verb \( \mu\epsilon\rho\iota\mu\nu\omega\sigma\iota\nu \) with the neuter plural noun \( \tau\alpha \mu\epsilon\lambda\eta \). However, elsewhere Paul uses the singular verb with this plural noun form (Rom. 12:4; 1 Cor. 12:26). D F G read the singular verb \( \mu\epsilon\rho\iota\mu\nu\alpha \), which, though not

\(^{3}\)Fee (p. 608 n. 3) argues that “some manuscripts anticipate the application to the church and make this singular plural.” Why this should have taken place here and not at 1:10 is not explained. Moreover, given the frequent interchange of the singular and plural forms of \( \mu\alpha\omicron \) stem nouns, it is more likely that the context influenced the alteration in the opposite direction than that theological editing is involved.
attested elsewhere\textsuperscript{74} is likely the archetypical reading.

While D F G avoid assimilation of the subjects and verbs in 12:25, it does alter the object τὸ αὐτὸ to the plural τὰ αὐτὰ. In the \textit{Corpus Paulinum} the plural occurs only at Eph. 6:9; Phil. 3:1; 1 Thes. 2:14, while the use of the singular here is similar to Rom. 12:16 (τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες) and 15:5 (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις). The alteration may be a simple copying error, for it is not matched by D F G’s Latin relatives.

12:9.35

Assimilation to the near context likely explains the reading ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνευματί, for the phrase occurs twice previously (12:8b; 12:9).\textsuperscript{75} Neither αὐτῷ nor the text of Ὑ\textsuperscript{46} can give rise to ἐντ. Ὑ\textsuperscript{46} alone lacks any modifier while retaining the article, but this shorter reading is easily explained as omission of αὐτῷ by leap (Τῷ ἄγαντί), a common error in this manuscript.\textsuperscript{76} This is one example of Ὑ\textsuperscript{46} matching D F G, here joined by 6 424\textsuperscript{c}, yet departing from B 1739.\textsuperscript{77}

2:10.38; 12:10.42 [cf also 12:9.32]

In one of Paul’s longest lists of various “gifts,” there is a mixture of singular and plural forms. The textual tradition is uncertain as to whether the singular or plural should be read in

\textsuperscript{74}Though the Latin does not follow the Greek convention of using singular verbs with neuter plural subjects; cf. \textit{conpatiuntur omnia membra} at 12:26, where the Greek unanimously reads συμπάσχει πάντα τὰ μέλη.

\textsuperscript{75}Metzger, \textit{Textual Commentary}, p. 497; Fee, p. 584 n. 4; Thiselton, p. 944.

\textsuperscript{76}Royse, p. 258.

\textsuperscript{77}Though 1739 reads ἐντ without the article.
three places. In the other lists of "gifts" in the epistles, only the singular or only the plural form is used. For example, the list at 1 Cor. 12:28 is similar in content to that of 12:8-10, but in the later passage the plural form is used for each of the χαρισματα since more than one example of each is "placed" in the "church." For this reason the use of the plural in this passage does not require the plural at 12:9-10, even for items repeated from 12:8-10 (χαρισματα ισματων and δυναμεις). Conversely at Rom. 12:6-7 the singular form is used for both of the χαρισματα which are "given" (προφητεια and διακονια; cf. the singular προφητεια at 1 Cor. 12:10). Again at 1 Cor. 14:26 all the gifts that "each person has" (εκαστος εχει; cf. ετερω and αλλω at 12:8-10) at the assembly are listed in the singular. However, at 12:8-10 at least one item is firm in the textual tradition as a plural: γενη γλωσσων. This makes the mixture of singular and plural forms unique in the list of χαρισματα at 1 Cor. 12:8-10. But what of the other three items?

The use of the plural form γενη γλωσσων may help to determine whether or not the plural should be read for the other nouns. Thiselton shows the need to take seriously the plural form γενη. It indicates that there are several "types" or "species of tongues," which manifest themselves differently (unintelligible, 1 Cor. 14:2, 7-9; perhaps angelic, 13:1; benefits the speaker, 14:4, 5) but share the common characteristic of being given "by the Spirit." "Prophecy" (12:10) on the other hand, is expressed in the singular because there is only one source, type, and goal. Therefore the plural "types of tongues" at 12:10 encompasses the several different examples that are described in the succeeding chapters of the letter.

The transcriptional issues involving the plural form of χαρισματα (12:9) were

discussed earlier. There is no variation involving ταματων. In this case the use of the plural matches that of γενη γλωσσων: "the plural denotes various kinds of healings enacted in a diversity of ways to address a variety of conditions." Both transcriptional and internal grounds confirm that χαρισματα ταματων is the archetypical reading.

Is the plural also necessary for διακρισεις πνευματων? There are different types of "spirits" that are to be distinguished, thus requiring the plural πνευματων (for which there is no variation). But are there different "distinctions" or "discernings" (διακρισεις)? The decision between the singular and the plural must rest exclusively on internal grounds, since the interchange of ει and ι is far too common to allow the "worth of the manuscripts" to be decisive. In addition, while the singular form may have arisen from assimilation to the singular form προφητεια, it is also possible that the plural is adapted to the previous two plural forms that were also modified by a genitive or even to the three occurrences of the similar-sounding διαφεσεις earlier in the chapter (12:4-6). The singular is most likely in that there are not different kinds of "distinctions."

The most difficult unit of variation to resolve is the first "gift" described at 12:10a. Transcriptional probability weighs heavily against the reading ενεργηματα δυναμεων since it matches the χαρισματα ταματων which is almost universally attested at 12:9. Furthermore, assimilation or other transcriptional causes cannot account for the alteration of

---

79 See Thiselton, p. 948, within the larger discussion provided on pp. 947-50.
80 This likely refers to distinguishing the Holy Spirit's action from human action that claims to be from God's Spirit. See Thiselton, p. 967-8.
81 Schrage III, p. 156 n. 235.
82 Conzelmann, p. 209 adopts the singular without comment.
83 Zuntz, p. 100.
ενέργηματα δυναμεον to the other known readings. Assuming the reading found in Ν B 1739 Byz requires that any change must have been deliberate. Fee argues that the readings of both Ψ and DFG are "an attempt to 'improve' a difficult plural that seemed tautologous." However, this does not account for the DFG reading in which both nouns are written in the singular. Furthermore, the similarly "tautologous" διακρισεις δυναμεων of Rom. 14:1 was not altered in either the Greek or the Latin. Finally, the singular of either noun alone would have resolved such perceived difficulty, as in ενέργημα δυναμεον (056 0142) or operatio virtutum (VL 78 Vg Amst) as well as the reading of Ψ. This makes it unlikely that the intentional editing assumed by Fee has taken place.

The DFG reading (ενεργεια δυναμεως) has much to commend it. It uses a common Pauline word (ενεργεια), though it is not used in the Hauptbriefe. 'Ενέργημα, on the other hand, occurs only at 1 Cor. 12:6, which may have led to its introduction here a few lines later. It is also difficult to account for the use of ενεργεια as an intentional alteration, for if the singular was desired, ενέργηματα would have easily been altered to ενέργημα (as in 056 0142).

However, all these potential strengths of the reading ενεργεια δυναμεως are undone by the close relationship of DFG with the Latin tradition. At 1 Cor. 12:8-10 the Latin tradition writes each "gift" in the singular form, apart from genera linguarum (12:10). This indicates intentional editing. However, this editing is limited to the Latin tradition.

---

84Fee, p. 584 n. 5.
85Eph. 1:19; 3:7; 4:16; Phil. 3:21; Col. 1:29; 2:12; 2 Thess. 2:9, 11.
86As noted by Zuntz, p. 100. Note that also at Rom. 14:1, where there is another use of unusual use of the genitive plural modifying a plural head noun (διακρισεις διαλογισμων), the Latin tradition does not alter to the singular (though D' alone reads διακρισις)
Furthermore, it is not attested by the earliest Latin witness, Tertullian. His adaptation of this passage to Isaiah 11:2 in *Adversus Marcionem* 5,8,7 results in some uncertainty as to his text. Where the Greek reads ενεργηματα δυναμεων (or one of the other readings) Tertullian reads only virtutum. This plural genitive form assumes a head noun, so it could render either ενεργηματα δυναμεων or ενεργηματα δυναμεως. However, the reading of D F G (ενεργεια δυναμεως), in which both nouns occur in the singular, cannot be the Greek basis for Tertullian’s reading. Likewise the Peshitta, which typically matches the “Western Text,” does not support it here. The reading of D F G is therefore likely to be adaptation to an edited Latin text, with ενεργεια adopted as the more likely equivalent for *operatio*.

This leaves the reading of Ψ (ενεργηματα δυναμεως). On internal grounds this reading has much to commend it. It can serve as the source reading for all other readings, with ενεργηματα δυναμεων adapted to the preceding χαρισματα ταματων, ενεργημα δυναμεων either an intentional or unintentional loss of the final -τα, and ενεργεια δυναμεως an adaptation to the edited Latin text, though retaining the singular δυναμεως. It can also be the base of the readings preserved in Tertullian and the Peshitta, as described above. It also matches the use of the genitives elsewhere in this list (12:8-10). Reading ενεργηματα δυναμεων one must assume an attributive genitive (“miraculous powers”).

---

87 See the discussion in Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos*, pp. 81-2.

88 The Peshitta’s ρειμα (“mighty works”) is a similar simplification, which may also support either ενεργηματα δυναμεων or ενεργηματα δυναμεως. The same form is used by the Peshitta at 12:28, 29 to render only δυναμεις.

89 In every place that the Greek text of Paul uses ενεργεια the Latin tradition uses *operatio*.

90 Cf. BDAG, s.v. ενεργημα. Fee (p. 584 n. 5) asserts that “miraculous powers” must render the Ψ text, but BDAG provides this gloss for ενεργηματα δυναμεων.
This, however, would be the only attributive genitive in a list (12:8-10) where all the other genitive forms are descriptive. The singular genitive would then indicate that while there are many “workings” or examples (cf. ἑργάζομαι at 12:6), they are all from the same “power” (the Spirit).

12:10.48; 14:26.122; 14:28.132

The addition/omission of the prefixes of compounds is discussed at 7:13.47. Paul’s use of the prefix for the verb διερμηνευω is consistent (12:30; 14:5, 13, 27). On the other hand, the nouns based on διερμηνευω lack the prefix. At 12:10 A D* read διερμηνη[ε]ια, another reading which ties these witnesses together. At 14:26 D F G read διερμηνειαν, influenced by the compound verb at 14:5, 13, 27. Finally at 14:28 B D* F G pc avoid the same influence by reading ερμηνευτης.

12:10.49

D* has added γενη under the influence of the γενη γλωσσων in the preceding clause.

12:11.50 [discussed at 10:11.46]

12:11.51

The omission of the article is made likely by its distance from its head noun (το εν και το αυτο πνευμα), which would account for its loss in Ps-Ignatius, Epistula ad Philipenses recensio longior 2,3 and some citations of Chrysostom. This, and the fact that

9104 reads διερμηνευη.

92In epistulam ad Romanos MPG 60, pp. 533; 602; In epistulam I ad Corinthios MPG 61, pp. 244; 245; 246; 249; 252; 266. But the citations at De Anna MPG 54, p. 653; De sancta pentecostae MPG 50, p. 464 (bis); and In epistulam ii ad Corinthios MPG 61, p. 608 read the article.
omission of the article is frequent in D F G make it more likely that the article has been lost than that it has been added.

12:11.52

D* alone reads the plural middle/passive participle διαπομενα in place of the singular active form. This is likely a slip, perhaps the result of reading the antecedent of the participle as παντα instead of πνευμα.

12:11.53

According to Zuntz, iδι* with έκαστος is "typically Attic." He suggests, however, that at 1 Cor. 12:11 iδια was intentionally deleted (93D* F G 0201 νιδ 1175 sy) due to "aversion against an expression of literary flavour." This begs the question, however, of whether scribes typically added or avoided stylistic improvements. However, the phrase occurs nowhere else in Paul, in similar situations elsewhere Paul uses a preposition phrase (κατ' iδιαν; Gal. 2:2; 2 Tim. 1:9), and no obvious motivation for its deletion is evident. Instead, the witnesses that read iδια frequently polish Paul's Greek, especially A B and the "Byzantine" witnesses.

12:12.56

D* F G read δε in place of κα, which makes clear the contrastive relationship between the two clauses. This reading, however, reflected in the Latin tradition's autem, was made for the sake of clarity. Whether this alteration initially occurred in the Latin or in the Greek cannot be determined.

93Zuntz, p. 98.
The loss of the adjectival phrase \( \text{CUMATOCTOYENOC} \) may be an example of parablepsis. However, it is more likely that the phrase was added (\( K \Psi 056 0142 0150 0151 6424 \)) in conformity to the use of \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \) with the two other occurrences of \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \) at 12:12.\textsuperscript{94}

F G's loss of \( \epsilon\nu\iota \) may reflect an early harmonization in the Latin tradition. The D-text likely avoided the use of a preposition before \textit{uno spiritu} (VL 75) or \textit{spiritu} (VL 89) to match the lack of a preposition before \textit{unum spiritum} in the next clause. The editor of the predecessor of F G read \( \epsilon\nu \epsilon\nu\iota \) (as in D) and may have assumed dittography. Finding more words in his Greek column than the Latin, he may have adopted \textit{in} from the Vulgate's \textit{in uno}. The unique reading of F G is therefore the result of assimilation to the Latin.

Assimilation to the near context is responsible for several adaptations at the end of 12:13.\textsuperscript{95} Several witnesses add \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \) to \( \epsilon\nu \) (\( D^2 K L 0150 0151 88424 \textit{pm} \)) in order to match the \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\nu \) of the previous clause. Other witnesses alter \( \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \) to \( \epsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \) (\( L \textit{pc} \)), which are similar in sight and sound, to match better the subject (\( \pi\nu\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha \)). Still other

\textsuperscript{94} Fee (p. 600 n. 2) rejects \textit{του ενος} as secondary without explanation.

\textsuperscript{95} In addition, A alone reads \( \epsilon\nu \sigma\omega\mu\alpha \epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu \) in place of \( \epsilon\nu \pi\omicron\mu\alpha \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \). This matches precisely Rom. 12:5, usually too distant a parallel to be considered as a cause of corruption. However, since the context and language of Rom. 12 is very similar to that of 1 Cor. 12, intentional harmonization is not unlikely — perhaps the result of a marginal note later adopted in the text of a predecessor witness.
witnesses assimilate the noun to the verb, writing ποµα (056 0142 pc) for the nomen sacrum of πνεµα. 96

This last corruption is the result of a visual error which is more likely in minuscule script but possible also in majuscule. The only nomen sacrum found in the biblical manuscripts is Πξεµα, not Πεµα. 97 But if the initial vertical stroke of a minuscule ν is written with a horizontal serif, the result is a letter which looks very similar to a minuscule µ. This possibility is made more likely by the fact that the horizontal lines above the nomina sacra regularly fail to extend over the entire word in minuscule manuscripts. This shortened line is not very distinct from an accent mark. For example, in 1243, one of the witnesses that reads ποµα at 12:13, the nomen sacrum πνεµα at 12:11 is written with a ν that resembles a µ and short horizontal line. The πνεµα at 12:13 in 1241 has a similar appearance to that in 1243; in fact, the ν here resembles even more closely the example of µ written nearby. This error likely occurred independently in several different witnesses. For example, the Greek text of the bilingual 629 rarely departs from its Latin text, but it does so here. The error is not limited to manuscripts written in minuscule script. It must have occurred at least by the time

96 This reading resulted in various conflation: εν ποµα εποτισθηµεν εις εν πνεµα (35 101 242 385 1905 1927); εις εν πνεµα εν ποµα εποτισθηµεν (1982); and εις εν πνεµα εποτισθηµεν εις εν ποµα (629c).

97 See A. H. R. E. Paap, Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D. Papyrologica Lugduno-Batavia 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), pp. 82-83; 102-13; and L. Traube, Nomina sacra. Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 2. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1907), 93-5. Traube cites only the Greek portion of a Coptic manuscript as using Πξεµα and Π机电 (Codex Sangermanensis) as using Πνι where D 05 (Codex Bezae) uses Πνι. For this reason the solution to the textual problem at 1 Cor. 12:13 proposed by Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, Third, Enlarged Edition (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 187, which claims that Πξεµα is the "usual contraction of the word πνευµα", is only partially correct since it must instead be a corruption of Πξεµα.
of Thomas of Harkel's revision of the Syriac text in the early 7th century. This visual error, in addition to having been influenced by the verb, may also have recalled the text of 1 Cor. 10:4: πομα πνευματικον επιν (in most witnesses).

Recognizing that this error is far more likely in minuscule script than in uncial helps to explain a reading that had been ascribed to Clement of Alexandria (Paedagogus 1,6,31,1). Tischendorf cites his text here as reading ενι ποματε επιΟμεν, but this is drawn from the edition of Heinsius and Sylburgius as cited by Griesbach's Symbolae criticae. No modern editor cites this reading, nor is it found in any NT manuscript. Modern editors of Clement's text also have puzzled over this reading. The edition of Stählin and Treu as well as that of Marrou and Harl print εν πομα εποισθμεν. In fact, no manuscript of Paedagogus reads this. A single manuscript, designated M, reads εν πομα εκοτισα, at which point the manuscript has a gap. The confusion of κ for π in the verb sparks little confidence in its having read properly the noun, particularly in a 12th cen. minuscule manuscript that is a poor copy of the best manuscript of Paedagogus. Furthermore, the context of the citation

98. Another early example of letter confusion with a nomen sacrum is found at Rom. 12:11, where ῥῷδ is corrupted to καιρω in D F G and results in the Latin tempori VL 75°; tempori VL 77 78° Amst Or. Both the Ambrosiaster commentary (ad loc.) and Rufinus' translation of Origen's commentary on Romans (9,10) discuss this difference between the Greek and Latin manuscripts.

99. J. J. Griesbach, Symbolae criticae, vol. 2 (Halae: Io. Iac. Curtii Vitudae, 1793), p. 521. His source is a 1592 edition by Fredericus Sylburgius, Clementis Alexandrini opera Graece et Latine quae extant, published in Heidelberg. This edition is unavailable to me, but the reading is found in the 1642 edition published at Halle (on p. 98, not p. 117 as the 1592 edition is cited by Griesbach). The source of Tischendorf's information is provided by C. R. Gregory in the Prolegomena (vol. 3) of Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Graece, p. 1176.

100. M. Marcovich, Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. ix-xi describes the three witnesses to the text. The best manuscript (P) begins only at 1,11,96,1. The other two witnesses are derived from P: M (11th cen.) and F (12th cen.). According to Marcovich: "F was copied not directly from P, but from an intermediary apograph of P which occasionally offered variae lectiones independent of P."
suggests that πνεῦμα is the intended reading, for he is discussing the need for instruction by the Spirit: "For instruction leads to faith, and faith with baptism is trained by the Holy Spirit." (1,6,30,2). As evidence for his argument he then cites Gal. 3:23-28 followed by 1 Cor. 12:13. Marcovich, breaking from previous editors, prints πνεῦμα in his text supported by M (noting it as the NT reading). In addition, Mees' study of Clement's citations also accepts πνεῦμα as Clement's text. While Mees does not discuss the passage, he does note that this is the reading of Ψ. The text of this manuscript, as his study clearly demonstrates, shows close similarity to Clement's citations. Clement should therefore no longer be cited as supporting the reading πνήμα.

Apart from sight confusion, is theological motivation a cause of corruption?

Specifically, Schrage notes that the reading πνήμα may have arisen from making a connection to 1 Cor. 10:2-4, where Christian baptism and the Eucharist ("spiritual food" and "spiritual drink") was read into the text. However, no clear connection between 12:13 and the Eucharist is to be found before at least John of Damascus (8th cen.), and even here it is not clearly derived from 12:13b. The only pre-Reformation interpretation to discuss the

---

101Marcovich comments that "Stählin's edition, however, is far from being satisfactory. The main reason is that the editor was not attentive enough to the meaning of Clement's text and to the textual problems involved" (p. x).


103Further evidence that the mss. of Paedagogus had the same difficulties that the NT scribes had is that a corrector of M writes φω above πο in εποτίσθημεν.

104As is done by Tischendorf, von Soden, and NA27.

105Schrage III, 218.

106Cf. the examples of this interpretation listed in Schrage III, p. 218 n. 617, of which only Theophylact and John of Damascus are cited from the pre-Reformation period. John of Damascus, however, cites 12:13a, but skips over the "Eucharistic" 12:13b to 12:14 before commenting: "That is, we enter by means of the same initiation, we have the benefit of the
Eucharist based on this passage is Theolylact in the 11th century. This, however, is too late to serve as evidence for a "Eucharistic reading" of the passage which would have led to its alteration by the 7th century. Furthermore, while the alteration makes a Eucharistic reading possible, no patristic citation reads πηγα and then connects it to the Eucharist. Since this variant arose from a sight error, the passage was read eucharistically only after the first millennium, and no discussion can be found that sees πηγα at 12:13 as explicitly Eucharistic, evidence that would allow one to claim that theological alteration has taken place is nonexistent. As in the other alterations in this passage, this sight error was made more likely by similar items in the near context as well as perhaps the distant recall of 1 Cor. 10:4.

12:15.65[discussed at 7:8.29]

same table. If therefore one Spirit prepares us, and in the Spirit we were also baptized into the body, and he provides one table for us, why do you bring up to me a distinction, when it is like the [metaphor] about the tree, that from the same stream all the branches are watered?"

(Theolylact writes: "And all were given to drink into one Spirit." He appears to speak about the spiritual table, that of bread and wine. For by his saying, 'the Spirit which gave us to drink,' he indicates both the bread and the wine. More than this it is true that he speaks of the coming of the Spirit, who came to us after our baptism and before the sacraments. 'But we were given to drink' he says, through the metaphor of the trees which are nourished from the same stream. Therefore, one Spirit gives us to drink and nourishes us and makes us one body." (Commentarit in epistles Pauli MPG 95, p. 669).

107Theolylact writes: "And all were given to drink into one Spirit." He appears to speak about the spiritual table, that of bread and wine. For by his saying, 'the Spirit which gave us to drink,' he indicates both the bread and the wine. More than this it is true that he speaks of the coming of the Spirit, who came to us after our baptism and before the sacraments. 'But we were given to drink' he says, through the metaphor of the trees which are nourished from the same stream. Therefore, one Spirit gives us to drink and nourishes us and makes us one body." (Commentarit in epistles Pauli MPG 95, p. 669).

108If J. A. Cramer's edition of the catenae is accurate, a comment by Theodoret concludes with a citation of 1 Cor. 12:13 that ends καὶ πάντες ἐν πηγα ἐποτίσθημεν (Catenae graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum, vol. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844), p. 235). However, two other citations of the passage by Theodoret read πνεόμα: Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli, MPG 82, p. 328; and Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum, MPG 81, p. 141. Neither of these makes reference to the Eucharist.

109According to Fee (p. 600 n. 4), the reading makes this passage "a reference to the Lord's Supper".
Two Greek manuscripts (D* K*) lack κατ at the beginning of the clause. The addition of the conjunction may have taken place in order to avoid asyndeton. However, it is more likely that the κατ has been deleted. A direct parallel occurs at 12:21, where the same imagery is used in another pair of sentences. Because 12:21 uses a conjunction (η), it is likely that a conjunction would have been used at 12:16. The reading in D* may again be attributed to the tendency in this manuscript to bring its sense-lines into parallel. A lack of access to a photograph of K prevents one from determining whether its correction is an immediate repair to a mistake or a later addition.

\[12:16.70\]

\(\phi^6\) assimilates το ους to the similar sounding \(ο πους\) of 12:15.

\[12:16.71\] [also discussed at 7:8.29]

A skip from the first \(ουκ ειμι\) of the verse to the second \(ουκ ειμι\) resulted in \(ουκ ειμι εκ του σωματος\) being copied after οτι in 88. Upon recognizing the error, the scribe repaired the text by adding \(ει\) to \(ο ωθησαμος\) and continuing with the rest of the sentence.

\[12:16.73\] [discussed at 7:8.29]

\[12:18.75\] [discussed at 5.11.30]

---

\(^{110}\)Güting and Mealand, pp. 50, 62, and 101. They also note that this occurs in a "series" of asyndetic clauses, though in fact it is only a pair (12:15-16) and so different from, e.g., 12:8-10.

\(^{111}\)0151 writes κατ in place of η, likely a harmonization to 12:16.
There are several examples of the subject being moved to the position prior to the
verb:

2:10 ἀπεκαλυψεν ο θεὸς ] 23,1 L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 104 614 syρ
10:5 εὐδοκησεν θ θεὸς ] 23,1 547 1311
11:10 οφειλει η γυνη ] 23,1 H 33 69 pc

Strikingly, two of the cases involve a nomen sacrum, and specifically θεὸς.

This evidence can be brought to bear in two more difficult cases. At 12:18 only a
handful of witnesses, but included among them Ψ46 and Origen,112 place ο θεὸς after the
verb. This is the more likely word order, particularly in view of the same word order at 12:28.
This parallel, however, is too remote and of so small a significance that one can hardly claim
12:18 as an adaptation to the later passage. Another variation involving ο θεὸς takes place at
12:24, where A alone reads συνεκερασεν ο θεὸς. Given the shift tendency in the tradition
and the lack of any obvious reason for an alteration to the verb-subject word order, A may be
the only witness to preserve the original word order.

12:18.77

The parenthetical ἐν εἷς ἑκαστον αὐτῶν, with the singular being abrupt after the plural
τὰ μελη, was smoothed in two different ways. Each of these construes the first ἐν of the
sentence with the έθεσο rather than with εἷς ἑκαστον. K 0151 add εἰς, which results in the text
reading: “God placed the parts into one [body], each of them . . .” The sister manuscripts 056
0142 add ως: “God placed the parts as one [body], each of them . . .”

12:18.78

---

112 Commentarii in evangelium Matthei 14,1.
915 has an omission which cannot have been caused by a scribe having accidentally skipped over similar text. However, because the lost text can be implied from the context and the resultant sentence is not nonsense, it may indicate that this scribe is copying by sense, not word or syllable.

The presence of τα before παντα is in question at twenty places in the Corpus Paulinum, ten of which occur in 1 Corinthians. This variation often has significant exegetical and theological implications. In two cases (1 Cor. 2:15; 15:28 (3)) NA²⁷ brackets the article. The inconsistency of the more “important” witnesses has likely caused this uncertainty.

Instead of relying on certain witnesses, a more helpful approach is to analyze Paul’s use of παντα and τα παντα as substantives in order to determine which reading is most suitable in each place. Only then is one able to evaluate the witnesses to see if they fall into any patterns.

Paul’s use of the neuter of πας as a substantive without the article is consistent. Paralleling his use of the masculine of πας (“everyone”), the neuter form refers to “everything,”¹¹³ though some examples may be uses of the accusative of general reference.¹¹⁴ His use of τα παντα¹¹⁵, however, falls into three specific categories¹¹⁶: First, and most

¹¹³BDAG, s.v. πας (1dβ)). Pauline examples without variation are: Rom. 8:28; 14:2, 20; 1 Cor. 2:10; 3:21, 22; 6:12 (3x); 9:12, 25; 10:23 (4x); 31, 33; 13:7 (4x) 14:26, 40; 15:27 (1); 16:14; 2 Cor. 2:9; 6:10; Phil. 2:14; 4:13, 18; Col. 4:9; 1 Thes. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:10; Tit. 1:15.

¹¹⁴E.g., 1 Cor. 11:2 where P reads instead παντοτε, and 2 Cor. 7:14 where C F G reads παντοτε. Cf. BDR § 154³.

¹¹⁵The singular το παν never occurs in Paul.

¹¹⁶All of these are grouped into one entry in BDAG, s.v. πας (4dβ).
commonly, τὰ πάντα refers to "all created things," which in the firm examples does not include actions, emotions, or feelings but does appear to include creatures, created things, and even creation itself. Second, τὰ πάντα is used in a demonstrative manner ("all these"). In each case the adjective refers to items previously mentioned in the context, usually when Paul is concluding a discussion. Third, τὰ πάντα is used adverbially. This usage is rare, and limited to writings outside the Hauptbriefe.

The care with which Paul distinguishes πάντα and τὰ πάντα can be demonstrated from two passages where the adjective is used both with and without the article. At 1 Cor. 15:27-28 πάντα occurs five times. The first of these is a citation from Ps. 8:7, "For he will subject everything (παντα) under his feet." The second example is in the succeeding clause, where Paul begins to explain the referent of παντα. This likewise occurs without the article, for Paul is referring back to the παντα from the Psalm text. These two example, because they are citations, should not be expected to reflect Pauline style. At the end of 15:27, however, Paul reflects his own usage when he explains that παντα refers to "all created things" (τα παντα), i.e, everything except the "God and Father" (15:24): "But when he says that he subjected παντα, it is evident that it is apart from the one who subjected τα

117 Examples without variation are Rom. 8:32; 1 Cor. 15:28 (2); Eph. 1:10; Eph. 1:23; 4:10; Phil. 3:21; Col. 1:20; 1 Tim. 6:13.
118 Without variation at 2 Cor. 5:18; 12:19; Phil. 3:8b; Col. 3:8b; Eph. 5:13.
119 Only Eph. 4:15 without variation. See BDR §1602.
120 Ν 1270 add τα before the second παντα of 15:27. This addition is likely the result of assimilation to the near context, since τα παντα occurs several times in this context. It cannot be determined if Ν also read τα παντα in the first occurrence at 15:27 since the text was lost due to an accidental leap (ΤΟΥΣΠΟΔΑΣΚΑΥΤΟΥ [v. 25] . . . ΤΟΥΣΠΟΔΑΣΚΑΥΤΟΥ [v. 27].
παντα to him." This example of τα παντα is certain,\textsuperscript{121} as also are the first two of 15:28.\textsuperscript{122}

At the end of 15:28, however, the presence of the article is in question. Whereas the previous three examples of τα παντα referred to "all created things," it is clear that this cannot be the case for the final example, "That God may be all in all ([τα] παντα εν πασιν," since God cannot be included among "all created things." However, reading παντα without the article matches the Pauline usage described above. The addition of the article is easily explained as assimilation to the previous three example of τα παντα; only A B D* 0243 6 33 81 547 1241\textsuperscript{1739} preserve the archetypical text for this final unit of variation.\textsuperscript{123}

A second example in the Corpus Paulinum where a careful distinction is maintained between πας used with and without the article is found at Eph. 5:13-14. The τα παντα of 5:13 must be understood as "all these" referring back to the "empty" and "unfruitful works" of 5:6-12. This reflects the second of the three uses of τα παντα outlined above. The conclusion then states, "But all these (τα παντα), when revealed by the light, become visible." 5:14 then states the general premise: "For everything (πας) that is made visible is light."

With the distinction between τα παντα and παντα now clear, we may assess passages where the presence of the article is in question. At Col. 1:16 the context requires that τα παντα ("all created things") be read twice. In the first example K 0151 omit the article and in the second Ὑ46 alters it to ὦτι. At Col. 3:11, τα παντα would properly convey the sense of "all these" with reference to "Jew and Greek, circumcised and uncircumcised."

\textsuperscript{121}It is omitted by F alone. Because it departs from G, it is an error unique to this manuscript.

\textsuperscript{122}0243 omits the first τα at 15:28, again by assimilation to the near context.

\textsuperscript{123}Though Ὑ46 I are not extant here.
A C omit the article. The article is added by \(\Psi^{61}\) 075 at Phil. 3:8, where \(\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) alone would convey the correct sense of “everything.” Several problems occur in Ephesians. At 6:21, the article is to be read since “these things” refers back to “how I am and what I am doing.” One manuscript (L) replaces \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) with the equivalent demonstrative pronoun (\(\tau\alpha\omega\nu\tau\alpha\)) while D F G incorrectly drop the article. D F G also drop the article at 3:9, where the reference to “created things” makes the article necessary. However, the lack of the article in D F G at 1:11 should not be dismissed as a mere “tendency” of these witnesses, for “everything” suits the context better than either “all these” or “all created things.” The presence of the article in all other witnesses is easily explained as an addition based on the \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) (without variation) of the preceding verse, where it clearly refers to “all created things.”

Turning to the Hauptbriefe, the article is lost by F G K \(\Psi\) at Gal. 3:22 in a context where “all created things” is needed. Likewise, B alone omits the article at 2 Cor. 4:15. Since “everything” is too general for this context, it is likely that \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) in this summarizing sentence refers to “all these things” that Paul endured for his preaching, which are described in 4:8-14. At Rom. 8:32b, \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) most likely refers to “all these things” that God gives—the freeing of the children of God, the aid of the Spirit, the working of good by God, and glorifying those whom he has called (8:18-30). The loss of the article in D F G may be attributed to the lack of an article before \(\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\omega\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu\) earlier in the verse. Assimilation to the near context has also impacted the text at Rom. 11:32. At issue is whether God imprisoned “all creation” (\(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\)) or “all mankind” (\(\tau\omicron\zeta\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\zeta\)) in disobedience. The presence of \(\tau\omicron\zeta\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\zeta\) at the end of the verse has no doubt led to its replacing \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\) earlier in the verse. It also resolves a superficial difficulty, for why would God
imprison all creation so that he might be merciful to mankind? However, Paul also speaks of creation being “under bondage” and “subject to decay” at Rom. 8:19-22, and, as at 11:32, this is followed (8:23-24) by a statement that mankind would be saved.¹²⁴ ὑποκείμενον καὶ θανάτῳ πάντα, supported by the entire Latin tradition, including Irenaeus, apart from Jerome and Augustine. F G preserve only πάντα.

The majority of the variation involving τὰ before πάντα takes place in 1 Corinthians. At 2:15 the article is read by ὑποκείμενον τὰ πάντα, although X46 AC D* P 6 33 88 1739 pc. This is likely an addition made to clarify that all things are to be judged, not all people.¹²⁵ The use of πάντα without the article here parallels the same at 2:10, where the Spirit “searches out everything.” Zuntz argues that the omission of the article is the result of assimilation to the example in 2:10, which bears, he claims, only a “superficial” similarity to 2:15.¹²⁶ This line of argumentation is problematic for two reasons. First, assimilation to the near context usually results in addition, not omission. This is particularly true when a large amount of text intervenes, as it does here. Second, the similarity between 2:10 and 2:15 is quite significant. Just as the “Spirit” searches out everything (2:10), so the “spiritual person” evaluates everything (2:15).¹²⁷ This requires the reading πάντα. The addition is avoided by Ἐκκλησία, B F G and the “Byzantine” witnesses. D differs from its sister witnesses not because FG have deviated from D (as Zuntz describes), but because an addition was made to D based on a manuscript similar to Ἐκκλησία A, which share the addition here. Furthermore, twice in 1 Corinthians D' departs from F G and all other

---

¹²⁴The argument that τὰ was added based on a parallel in Gal. 3:22 (cf. Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 365) is doubtful. Can so distant a parallel really have led to the addition of a mere article?

¹²⁵Schrage I, p. 265; Thiselton p. 271.

¹²⁶Zuntz, p. 109.

¹²⁷Thiselton, p. 272. Conzelmann, p. 57 n. 8 also argues for not reading the article.
witnesses in omitting the τα. At 8:6 τα παντα is required since Paul is identifying the source of "all creation." It is also required by the parallel in the fourth colon. Again at 12:6 D* is alone. The τα παντα refers to all the things (described in 12:4-6) that "God works." This parallels the παντα δε ταυτα at 12:11.\textsuperscript{128}

At 1 Cor. 12:19 the article is lacking only in B F G 33. Again, Zuntz argues for the longer reading, with B 33 joining F G in the accidental omission of the article. Here his contextual argument is convincing: τα παντα is necessary because it conveys "the notion 'all of it. '" This matches an infrequent Pauline usage of τα παντα, i.e., "all this," the "preceding things."\textsuperscript{129} However, the agreement of B F G may not simply be accidental, for these witnesses often share unique readings. Instead of accidental omission, the article may have been dropped intentionally by a reader/corrector who knew the common Pauline usage of τα παντα to refer to "all creation," which clearly cannot fit the context. The context is again decisive at 9:22, where παντα without the article refers to "everything."\textsuperscript{130} "All these things" would too greatly limit the force of Paul's claim to have done whatever is necessary in order to "save some." Its addition in K L P Ψ and the "Byzantine" witnesses is likely due to the three previous occurrences of the article in the sentence.

This allows the individual manuscripts to be analyzed for their "tendencies" involving this type of variation. This argumentation plays a large role, for example, in Zuntz's discussion. He points out, for example, that D alone omits the article in such situations twice

\textsuperscript{128}Schrage III, p. 142.

\textsuperscript{129}BDAG, s.v. παντα (4dβ), which cites 2 Cor. 4:15 and Phil 3:8b as close parallels to Col. 3:8. The same entry cites 1 Cor. 12:19 with the translation "they all (of the members of the body)" but without giving any parallels. It would seem, however, that "they all" and "all these" are quite similar.

\textsuperscript{130}Cf. Thiselton, p. 706.
He further argues that D F G typically omit the article before παντα, a phenomenon "which may be connected with the inability of the Latin to render the Greek article." He cites Eph. 1:11; 3:9 and Col. 1:17 as examples where these witnesses alone omit the article, and indeed in each case the common Pauline usage of τα παντα to refer to "all creation" or "all these things" requires the article. He does not also point out the F G are alone in omitting the article at Rom. 11:32 and F alone at 1 Cor. 15:28(3). Furthermore, the tendency in the other manuscripts is to add, not remove, the article. This is seen at 1 Cor. 2:15; 9:22; 15:27(2); and 15:28(3). Indeed, no witness avoids adding the article in at least one of these passages. That D F G omit but do not add the article does therefore indicate that a unique influence is at work in these witnesses. Almost certainly it is influence from the Latin.

12:20.81 [discussed at 5:11.30]

12:20.82 [also 1:18.60; 2:15.65]

At 2:15 μεν is almost certainly secondary. Nothing can account for its omission, while its addition can be explained as an attempt to balance δε in the following clause. Its addition, however, must be early. While appearing in the "Byzantine" text, it is also found in B131, Irenaeus134 and the entire Latin tradition.135 ψ46 appears to have lost μεν at several

131 Güting ("Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente," p. 101) reconstructs 0201 without the article: παντα[τα] εν πασιν. The editio princeps, followed by NTaP, reconstructs it as: τα παντα[τα] εν πασιν. If 0201 joins D* here, as Güting argues (p. 108), it must be due to independent error.

132 Zuntz, p. 198; Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 482.

133 Though neither Origen Commentarii in evangelium Joannis 10,7,28 nor Clement Stromata 1,11,50.

134 Adversus Haereses 1,8,3, both the Greek and Latin texts.

135 One of the few places were D F G split from the Latin tradition.
places: Heb. 7:18 (joined only by 1241); 2 Cor. 10:10; and 1 Cor. 1:18. The last example is the only which has additional early support. Several Latin witnesses lack an equivalent particle (VL 64 75* 89 Cyprian136). However, the use of γάρ earlier in the clause may have made the μεν seem superfluous, leading to its omission by Ψ46 and its not being translated in some Latin witnesses. The fact that the Greek text of Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses 1,3,5 reads μεν but no equivalent is found in the corresponding Latin supports this conclusion.

"Weighty" witnesses also lack μεν at 1 Cor. 12:20, among them again Ψ46* 137 However, as at 1:18 the use of a conjunction (δέ) earlier in the clause may have made the μεν seem awkward, leading to its omission. Parablepsis may have also occurred.138 Furthermore, D may have been influence by the lack of the particle in the Latin text, though as noted above the absence of an equivalent to μεν in the Latin is the result of translation choice, not textual differences. D also loses μεν where F G retain it at 2 Cor. 10:1, where the D-text (VL 75 89 Amst Sedul) lacks an equivalent. Other secondary additions of μεν, always to balance a subsequent δέ, are found at Rom. 6:21139 (Ψ64 B D F G); 7:25 (avoided by Ν F G); 1 Cor. 2:15140 (avoided by Ψ46 A C D* F G); and 1 Cor. 15:50 (avoided by Ψ46 B C* D* 0243* 38* 1739).

---

136Cyprian's citation is found at Ad Quirinimum 3,69.

137The identity of the corrector who added μεν in a cursive hand is unclear. NTaP suggests only a "user" of the manuscript.

138Zuntz, p. 198; B. Weiss, p. 117.

139B. Weiss, p. 117.

140Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 482.
The δε at 12:21 was bracketed by Westcott and Hort but dismissed by most commentators due to the "exceedingly strong" evidence. Zuntz claims that a scribe who misunderstood v. 21 as a conclusion rather than a continuation of the argument intentionally removed the conjunction. However, The fact that δε occurs four times in the preceding three sentences may have prompted its addition here. Furthermore, the argumentation and structure of 12:20-21 is very similar to that of 12:14-16. Both 12:20 and 12:14 use a conjunction to introduce a sentence which asserts that there is one body even though there are many parts. At 12:15, no conjunction is used to introduce the supporting statement, which in both places (12:15-16; 12:20) is an imagined "discussion" among the parts. A δε at 12:21 turns the supporting statement into one of contrast, thereby disrupting the flow of argument. Aside from A C F G and part of the "Byzantine" tradition, the absence of a conjunction is supported by the D-text and a united Syriac tradition.

12:21.85

The loss of the article before ὀφθαλμὸς (Ψ al) may be an example of haplography. That it is required is seen by the parallel κεφαλή in the next clause.

12:21.87 [discussed at 12:26.107]

12:21.88 [discussed at 12:16.69]

141 Zuntz, p. 190. Güting and Mealand indicate that it is secondary (p. 140) without discussion.

142 That δε is a poor choice to indicate the continuation of the argument is shown by the secondary addition of καί - not δε - in some witnesses.

143 The presence of δε / autem in D and VL 75 against all their typical supporting witnesses (including the Peshitta) is again likely from a Greek witness that is similar to A.
FG read the singular o for α. This must be an accidental confusion of the vowels, for its equivalent is not attested in the Latin tradition and the plural is required by ατιμοτερα.

Meλη is added following ατιμοτερα by D F G and before it by 0150 33 to match δοκουντα μελη in the previous sentence. Virtually the entire Latin tradition also makes the harmonization.

12:23.94 [discussed at 7:13.47]

12:23.96

The infinitive εξειν (F G) is either assimilation to the ειναι earlier in the verse or a simple error. The fact that F G is not followed by any of the Latin or Syriac tradition, including VL 77, suggests that a unique error is involved. The indicative εξει is required as it parallels the εξει in the succeeding clause.

12:24.98

D F G and the Peshitta add τιμης, the noun implied from the context (cf. 12:23, 24b). This example of addition by harmonization to the near context is similar to what D F G did at 12:23.92. The presence of honorem in VL 75, alone among the Latin witnesses, is likely the result of assimilation to the Greek column.

12:24.99 [discussed at 12:18.76]

12:24.101; 12:24.102

An understanding of Paul’s argument is necessary in order to decide between the
active and middle forms. The antecedents of the participle are the "weak" and "unpresentable" parts discussed in 12:22-23. These characterizations of certain parts as inferior are, according to Paul, incorrect perceptions (δοκεω is used twice in 12:22-23).

12:24a concludes with the (again false) perception that the Corinthians had of the "presentable" parts: They do not have need of the "greater honor we bestow" (the implied object stated in the parallel at 12:23a). Paul encourages the adoption of God's perspective, who himself gives greater glory even to those perceived to be of lower status. How does this help clarify the variant? Pauline usage of ὄστερεω is consistent. The active form refers to something lower in status while the middle/passive form is used to indicate a lack or deficiency in something. Since the false perception being addressed is that the "weaker" are lower in status (not that they lack something), the active form is that which best suits the context. God gives glory to those parts which are perceived to be of less value. The reading ὄστερουντι has the additional benefit of being the earliest attested, found in P46 D F G, Origen, and the Peshitta, although the Latin tradition likely translates

---

144BDAG, s.v. ὄστερεω (4) and (5b), with references.

145Zuntz, p. 128. Thiselton (p. 1009-10) adopts the argument of Robertson and Plummer (p. 276), that the middle form best suits the context because it conveys "feel inferior" whereas the active implies "be inferior." This argument, however, does not match the usage of ὄστερεω described BDAG (see previous note). Schrage (III, p. 228 n. 684) argues that there is little difference in meaning between the middle and active forms.

146Fee (p. 614) argues that the sentence is saying that God gives glory to the parts that lack it, hence the need for the middle form. However, he admits that his understanding results in a lack of clarity: "It is less clear, however, what Paul had in mind by 'greater honor.' Most likely he means that the parts that appear to be weak and less worthy are in fact accorded the greater honor of having important functions or receiving special attention." It should be noted that his explanation is precisely what the text says if the present form ὄστερουντι is read.

147Commentarii in evangelium Joannis 10,36,238.

148τα μικρά καταμετροῦμαι = "to the part which is least."


At 12:26, the εἰτε has been corrupted twice. In the first clause, the similarity of sight and sound led to εἰ τι (B F G Ψ 1175 1739), ετι (P46), and ητι (915). The reading of 915 is nonsense as it stands, and although εἰ could function to create the protasis of a conditional sentence, τι (another nominative) would be superfluous since έν μέλος must be the subject of the clause. The reading ετι (P46) is a legitimate form, but does not construe in this context. P46 makes a similar error involving the same vowels at 12:21, where ειπεν is written for ειπειν in a clause where the infinitive is required. One further corruption is found in 1739. The reading ει τι in the second clause is the result of assimilation to this manuscript’s reading in the first clause.

Similar vowel confusion takes place at 12:31. before the prepositional phrase καθ υπερβολην is found ετι (most witnesses), ει τι (P46 D), ειτει (F), and ετει (G). The latter two readings, being nonsense, must be derived from either ετι or ει τι. F’s ειτει is likely

----

149 VL 77 78 89 Vg read ei cui deerat (of which si cui deerat in 75 is an obvious corruption); 61 Amst Sedul read ei cui deest. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:11 where minus fui or minus feci renders the active υπερτηνα and 2 Cor. 11:5 minus fecisse renders υπερηκεναι (but inferiorem esse 77; inferiorem fuisses Amst; and inferiorem Sedul).

150 Hence et si patitur unum membrum (Augustine bo 30; par 2,16) and si patitur unum membrum (Augustine ep 48,1; fau 21,8; Jo 65,1,26; 1 Jo 3,3; par 3,3 etc; Cyprian ep 17,1; 55,15; 62,1 must be derived from either removing τι or ignoring it in translation.

151 While F G make very numerous spelling errors, the confusion of ει for I (and the reverse) is extremely common not only in these witnesses but in all early witnesses. Examples in this chapter alone are found at 1 Cor. 12:4 εισειν F G; 12:6 εισειν F G (yet 12:5 εισιν preserved in F G!); 12:23 ατειμωτερα P46 D; 12:10 ερμηνια F G; 12:24 εχει ] + τειμης D (+ τιμης G; + τημης F); τειμην P46 D; 12:28 ειπειτα F G; αντειμηψεις F
the result of confusion similar to that at 12:26 (see above), so that \(\varepsilon\tau\iota\) should be understood as the reading of F G. But what of their shared ancestor D? The Latin equivalent is *adhuc* (= \(\varepsilon\tau\iota\)), and this is matched by Peshitta's \(\phi\alpha\delta\), which is significant because this witness frequently agrees with the archetype of D F G. The reading in D is therefore likely a simple vowel interchange. The same should be concluded with regard to \(\mathfrak{P}\)\(^{156}\). We have already seen this manuscript twice exchange \(\varepsilon\) for \(\varepsilon\iota\); \(\varepsilon\iota\) is written for \(\varepsilon\) also at 14:9 (\(\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\)).\(^{152}\)

Furthermore, the iota in the immediately preceding \(\kappa\alpha\iota\) may have influenced the addition of the same letter to the epsilon in \(\varepsilon\tau\iota\). While the reading \(\varepsilon\iota\ \tau\iota\) construes ("And if there is anything else, I will show you the more excellent way"),\(^{153}\) it is more likely independent unintentional error rather than an indication of consanguinity and still less likely the archetypical reading. Adjectival \(\varepsilon\tau\iota\) should therefore be understood as strengthening the comparative \(\kappa\alpha\theta'\ \upsilon\varepsilon\rho\beta\omicron\lambda\eta\nu\), not in a temporal or adverbial sense.\(^{154}\) D adds \(\kappa\alpha\iota\) from other Greek witnesses, an addition which disrupted its sense-line format (see the chapter on D F G).

In addition to the vowel confusion, interpretive and grammatical difficulties have played a role in contributing to alteration here. The most directly relevant issue is whether the two clauses of 12:31 should be taken together or divided into two sentences, with 12:31b

---

\(^{152}\)See Royse, p. 245. Examples of the these interchanges in the Roman papyri are cited by Gignac, vol. 1, pp. 257-259.

\(^{153}\)BDR §272\(^2\). Zuntz, p. 90, hesitatingly thinks that this reading is at least partially correct, though he seems to think that the end of the verse is corrupt as well.

\(^{154}\)Lietzmann, p. 65; Schrage III, p. 281. Examples of this usage are provided in Liddell and Scott, s.v. *\(\varepsilon\tau\iota\)* (II,2)
more closely connected to 13:1. Suggestively, the earliest witnesses to physically divide the two halves of the sentence also read καὶ. Ν and B both make a division at 12:31b by means of indentation (A begins the section at 12:31). On the other hand, witnesses that do not read καὶ (notably F G) do not show signs of marking a new unit of thought at either 12:31b or 13:1, though because these witnesses break the text into sense lines, 12:31a and 12:31b stand on separate lines. Given that 12:31b likely introduces the material in chapter 13, it is more likely that the καὶ was removed in order to make clear that a new discussion was beginning rather than being grammatically connected to 12:31a.


The numeral ἐν is used twice at 12:26, but omitted both times in A and the second time by Ψ6 Ν* A B158 1611 1739. No obvious motivation for its omission can be identified, particularly since it was not omitted in the previous two examples in chapter 12 (12:14, 19). Furthermore, assimilation to the near context would be possible, particularly for the second example. However, this chapter consistently uses the numeral with the singular of μέλος (12:14. 19). Furthermore, the numeral is needed in both examples to contrast with the two occurrences of τὰ παντα μὲ η. While no cause for the omission can be clearly identified,

Other issues which may be relevant are whether ζηλοῦτε is indicative or imperative; the possibility that τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μεῖζονα may be sarcastic; and whether καθ’ ὀπερβολὴν is adverbial (modifying δείκνυμι) or adjectival (modifying ὀδὸν).

F uses a large initial letter at 12:31 ζελοῦτα (sic) and 13:1 ον, though these are so common throughout the manuscript that it is not clear that indicate paragraphing or sense units. Any divisions that may have been present in Ψ6 are no longer visible since καὶ begins the line and the end of the column is missing.

So Lietzmann, p. 65; Schrage III, p. 281, etc.

Swanson sees a correction in B which adds εν, but this could not be discerned from the facsimile.
the context and author’s usage requires that it be read in both places.

12:27.114

F G read the accusative υµας for the nominative υµετς. The former does not construe in the context, and is likely simply the result of vowel confusion.

12:27.116

A few witnesses (D' Ψ; perhaps ex membro VL 75; de membro VL 78 Vg) write εκ µελους under the influence of the immediately preceding µελη.159

12:28.117

The list of “gifts” in 12:28 is compiled asyndetically. Two witnesses add conjunctions, however, both for the third item: D' adds δε after τριτον and 69 adds και prior to it. Why only this element in the list should receive such additions is not obvious, though in the case of D it may be an example of dittography (ΔΕΔΙΚΑΛΟΥ). Nevertheless, it shows again the tendency of the tradition to add conjunctions that was seen at 12:8-10, where, ironically, D alone avoids such additions.


Paul most frequently uses ετα and επετα in temporal contexts, but occasionally they stand in lists as simple transition markers.160 A sequential list appears at 12:28 that begins with three “offices” concludes with fives “gifts.” That Paul is in fact making a distinction between the “offices” and “gifts” is shown by the enumeration of the first three

---

159Lietzmann, p. 63 and Thiselton, p. 1012 both explain this reading as a scribal error.

160BDAG, s.v. ετα.
items. The transition then takes place at δυνάμεις, which is introduced with the transitional ἔπειτα to set it off from the previous three items. This matches Paul’s use of πρῶτον . . . ἔπειτα elsewhere (1 Cor. 15:46, 1 Thes. 4:16-17) though at 12:28 the context is not temporal.

D F G preserve this structure by reading ἔπειτα before δυνάμεις but not reading any adverb before χαρισματα. The Ψ66 N A B C 1739 group, here joined by a few other witnesses, read ἔπειτα before χαρισματα. This destroys the structure of 12:28 and is easily explained as an addition based on the preceding ἔπειτα. Most witnesses read ἐιτα, producing an alternation of ἔπειτα and ἐιτα which is likely a stylistic improvement.161 A few later manuscripts then assimilate ἐιτα to the preceding ἔπειτα, hence the unusual agreement of late witnesses with Ψ66 N A B C 1739.

Similar use of ἐιτα and ἔπειτα to indicate structure occurs at 15:5-7. ἔπειτα is firm at 15:6162 and 15:23, both places where a new element is introduced. This would suggest that ἔπειτα should be read at the beginning of 15:7 (only D reads ἐιτα), and that ἐιτα should be read at 15:5b and 15:7b, both introducing elements which are thematically and even temporally connected with the previous clause. ἔπειτα at 15:7b (Ψ66 N A F G pm) is easily explained as assimilation to the same word at 15:7a, while many of the same witnesses make the same alteration at 15:5b (N A 049 0151 33 pm). This connection between the appearance to Cephas and to the Twelve (which ἐιτα indicates) caused problems for some scribes (see the discussion at 15:5).

161 For examples see Liddell and Scott, s.v. εἰτα (1,1).

162 The minuscules related to the Harklean Syriac edition (1505 1611 2495) read εἰτα.
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12:28.120

N* alone omits γενή, either due accidental leap (桓XWCCων) or because the γενή is somewhat superfluous with the plural γλωσσών.

12:28.121

Ερμενεια γλωσσών has been added from the parallel list at 12:10. Only a narrow band of witnesses attests the addition: 1505 1611 1295 and the Harklean, all of which are related, and Ambrosiaster.

12:31.125

The decision to accept μειζονα is often based, aside from the “value” of its supporting witnesses, on two arguments: First, that the usage of κρείσσον here would be non-Pauline. Second, that κρείσσον is incorrect because Paul’s arguing that some gifts are merely “better” than others is a mere truism; he in fact argues that some gifts are “greater” because the benefit the community. The first argument is only partially correct. While κρείσσων is not used as an attributive elsewhere in Paul, the same could be said of μειζων, which likewise never occurs as an attributive adjective in Paul. In fact, μειζων occurs only as a substantive (Rom. 9:12; cf. κρείσσον at 1 Cor. 11:17) and in predicate constructions (1 Cor. 13:13; 14:5; cf. κρείσσον at 1 Cor. 7:9; Phil. 1:23). Second, it is doubtful that a

163See NTSU, pp. 22-27.

164Zuntz, p. 135; he is followed by Fee, p. 616 n. 2. Schrage III, p. 240 n. 757 argues that κρείσσονα is the incorrect reading because it is the least offensive in this context, hence a scribal adaptation. However, he too sees κρείσσονα as referring to “better” and “more useful” gifts, though not in a moral sense

165Here the NA27 text departs from its usual orthography and prints κρειττον, apparently because this spelling is found in B.
semantic distinction between can be made between κρεισσον and μείζων, at least not one that bears the weight that Zuntz, et al., place on the words. The Louw-Nida lexicon, for example, places κρεισσον and μείζων in the same entry and suggests the same glosses for each: "pertaining to or having a higher status in comparison to something else — 'better, greater, superior to.'" While these two comparatives cannot be significantly distinguished in meaning in the way that some do, most commentators understand the force of μείζονα in this context to be equivalent to a superlative. This is based on Pauline usage elsewhere, in particular 1 Cor. 13:13.

The reading μείζων has probably been adopted by most commentators because of the "superior" attestation. The "weight" of this evidence may be lessened somewhat, however, by the evidence of Origen. In Book 2 of his Commentarii in evangelium Joannis he writes:

But it is evident that the commandment made by Paul is observed by them: "Seek the better (τὰ κρειστῶνα) gifts." But greater (μείζων) than the gifts is what is placed before all else, that is, the word of wisdom, and the word of knowledge which follows after. (2,24,157)

Origen draws a contrast between the "better" gifts, presumably those mentioned by Paul, and what he sees as the "greater" gifts, namely wisdom and knowledge. This makes clear that Origen's text read τὰ κρειστῶνα. Elsewhere, Origen only alludes to this passage and since

---


168 Hannah, p. 129 n. 233 dismisses this citation: "The allusions seem to indicate that the κρειστῶνα of the citation is a scribal harmonization to the majority text." It must be pointed out, however, that this is not a mere allusion since Origen cites it as coming from Paul and his comments play on the difference between κρειστῶνα and μείζων. This makes assimilation to the majority text unlikely.
the allusions vary as to the use of articles and word order, the fact that he uses μείζων in these cases is not decisive.169

Whether or not Origen’s text was κρείσσονα or μείζων, “external evidence” can never be decisive. Contextual factors must also be considered. As we saw in the discussion of 12:31.125, there are several ways to understand both the grammar and the tone of this sentence. Some understand 12:31a as ironic, that Paul does not actually call for the Corinthians to seek the “greater/est gifts,” but to seek instead “love” (chapter 13).170 However, such an understanding is difficult given Paul’s positive use of ζηλώτε ἡ τὰ πνευματικά at 14:1. Indeed this occurs immediately after he commands them to διώκετε τῆν ἀγάπη, thereby commending the seeking of certain gifts using language identical to that of 12:31a.171 14:1 concludes with an exhortation to seek one specific gift above the others (μᾶλλον δὲ ἕνα προφητεύητε), further confirming that at 12:31a Paul is encouraging the Corinthians to seek a few gifts - the greater ones - more than others. Since 14:1 helps clarify 12:31, we may now evaluate κρείσσονα and μείζων. As we have already seen, μείζων would most likely be understood as a superlative. This would fit well were the passage understood to be ironic. However, as 14:1 shows, the seeking of “gifts” is encouraged, not denigrated, though they are not as important as “love,” which in 13:13 is described as the “greatest” (μείζων) of what remains. This is made clear also by 12:31b, in which Paul

169 Exhortatio ad matryrium 15: ζηλῶν χαρίσματα τὰ μείζωνα (not cited by Hannah) Commentarii in evangelium Matthei 14,23: ζηλῶν τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζωνα; Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis 32,9: ζηλοῦντες τὰ μείζωνα χαρίσματα. This allusion differs from the citation earlier in the commentary, though the fact that it took Origen thirteen years to write the commentary, though the fact that the it


171 Schrage III, p. 239.
introduces the "way" which is even more superior (ἐτι καθ’ ὑπερβολήν) to the seeking of gifts. Chrysostom’s exegesis shows this understanding:

But saying this he gently hinted they were responsible for receiving the lesser things, and that they had the power, if they wished, to receive the greater things (τὰ μείζονα). For when he said, "Be zealous," he demands effort from them and a desire for spiritual things. And he did not say τὰ μείζονα, but τὰ κρείττονα, that is, the useful, the beneficial. But what he means is this: Remain desirous of the gifts, and I will show you the way of gifts. For he did not say χάρισμα but δῶν, so that he might more greatly lift up that which he is about to say. For it is not "I will show you one or two or three gifts" but one "way" which produces all these things. And it is not merely a "way," but also "most excellent" and set commonly before all.¹⁷²

This distinction between the τὰ κρείττονα (= gifts) and the τὰ μείζονα described in 1 Cor. 13 matches the argument of 12:31, in which the seeking of "better gifts" is a positive thing, yet there is one "way" which surpasses even these gifts. With this interpretation, τὰ μείζονα is out of place,¹⁷³ for how can a "more excellent way" of 12:31b stand in comparison to "the greatest gifts"?

No only is κρείσσονα the reading most congruent with the context, it is also more likely to have given rise to the alternative reading. Elsewhere in the Corpus Paulinum there is no variation between μείζων and κρείσσων except at 1 Cor. 14:5, where a handful of minuscules (69 365 1319) read κρείσσων. The last previous occurrence of κρείσσων in this letter occurred at 11:17 in a completely different context, which means that κρείσσων cannot be explained as an assimilation. However, μείζων occurs again at 13:13 at the conclusion of a section of the letter that was very familiar to early readers of 1 Corinthians.¹⁷⁴ As we saw above, the earliest manuscripts divide 12:31 into two clauses, and read the second half of the

¹⁷²Chrysostom, In epistulam I ad Corinthios MPG 61, p. 267.

¹⁷³As Schrage III, p. 240 n. 757 acknowledges.

verse with chapter 13. In these witnesses the problem of Paul saying that “the greater things” are surpassed by a “more excellent way” is removed, for 12:31b is not read in light of 12:31a. Furthermore, 12:31 now ends the unit. “Seek the greatest gifts” would serve as an appropriate conclusion, comparable to 13:13. Such delineation of the structure of the letter clearly shows careful attention to the beginning and ending of the major portions of text. It is not unreasonable to conclude that μετάζωνα was noticed by a reader or user at the end of chapter 13 and deemed to be more appropriate than κρείσσονα at the end of what was made the end of the unit in chapter 12. Significantly, the witnesses that set themselves off from the rest of the tradition here (𝔓46 B 1739 pc) assimilate to both near and distant passages at 2:4; 11:4; etc.

12:31.126 [discussed at 12:26.107]
Notes on Chapter 13

13:1.1 [discussed at 9:1.1]

13:1.2; 13:2.8

1241 twice writes the participle \(\varepsilon\chi\omega\nu\) for the indicative \(\varepsilon\chi\omega\). While this manuscript is rife with similar minor adjustments to the text, this specific addition may have been influenced by the near context in which a large number of words end with \(-\nu\).

13:1.4 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

13:2.7; 13:2.12; 13:3.17; 13:3.19 [see also the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

Modern editions show little consensus in resolving the potential crasis involving \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\) at 13:2-3. The Westcott-Hort text is alone in printing, with only the support of A 1739, \(^1\) \(\kappa\alpha\nu\) in each place. Tischendorf and the early Nestle editions follow D F G and the Byzantine text in reading \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\) in each place. Other editions, including the Greek New Testament edited by R. V. G. Tasker and the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland follow the exemplar of B \(^2\) by printing \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\) for the first and fourth examples and \(\kappa\alpha\nu\) for the second and third. The 27th edition of Nestle-Aland and von Soden depart from all manuscripts by printing \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\) at the first, second, and fourth occurrences but \(\kappa\alpha\nu\) at the third.

The manuscript testimony is most easily digested in table format:

---

\(^1\)Though of course 1739 was not known to them.

\(^2\)Presuming that the reading \(\kappa\alpha\iota\\alpha\nu\) for the final example at 13:3 is a corruption of \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\); the identical error occurs in B at Gal. 1:8.
The tradition behind \( \Psi^{46} \) B is unreliable for this type of variation. At Gal. 1:8 B alone reads \( \kappa \alpha \nu \) for \( \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \); \( \Psi^{46} \) alone make the same alteration at Heb. 10:38, but also stands alone in writing \( \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \nu \nu \) for \( \kappa \kappa \varepsilon \nu \nu \) at 1 Cor. 10:27. Rather than relying on these "best witnesses," other considerations should prevail. While B. Weiss argues that it unlikely that the different forms would have arisen if all the forms had been identical in the archetype, a single contraction in an early witness would account for all the variation. Because such contractions regularly take place in \( \Psi^{46} \) B, their readings, and those of their successors, are cast into doubt. Furthermore, there is no firm example of \( \kappa \alpha \nu \) meaning "and if" in the Corpus Paulinum. \( \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \), by contrast, is found (in addition to the examples listed above) at 1 Cor. 7:28 and 12:16. Both B and C preserve \( \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \) at least once in 13:2, further demonstrating that the direction of alteration is typically from \( \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \nu \) to \( \kappa \alpha \nu \).

---

3 Cf. also John 8:16, where \( \eta \) alone reads \( \kappa \alpha \nu \), likely under the influence of \( \kappa \alpha \nu \) at 8:14.

4 B. Weiss, p. 63.

5 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \) at 2 Cor. 11:16 (\( \Psi^{46} \) \( \kappa \alpha \nu \)) is a particle meaning "at least" and is not an example of crasis. See BDAG, s.v. \( \kappa \alpha \nu \) (3); BDR §§ 182; 374 

6 209 630 \( \rho \iota \) \( \kappa \alpha \iota \) \( \alpha \nu \), which is identical to the error of \( \beta \) at 13:3 (2) and K 048 at 13:2 (1).

7 \( \Delta \ast \) \( \kappa \alpha \iota \), matched by \( \alpha \varepsilon \nu \) \( \text{VL 75} \) \( \text{VG}^{m} \): A. Ambrose Ambrosiaster.
Therefore, καὶ εἰς is the most likely reading for the first three occurrences at 13:2-3.

The final occurrence, however, presents a different issue. The reading καὶ / et without the conditional particle is attested by Π 56 VL 75 89, a combination which may point to an early reading, not a mere error in transcription. However, 467 and other Latin witnesses (VL 78 Vg) lose the second εἰς at 13:2, and Π 56 frequently loses text when the result produces good sense.\(^8\) It is most likely that these witnesses share a common error.

13:2.8 [discussed at 13:1.2]

13:2.9 [also 2:9.30; 2:11.38; 2:12.50]

Similarity in the pronunciation of diphthongs led to the readings εἰςῶ, ἵδω (A D\(^*)\) 0150 33 pc) and οἰδα (F G). Caragounis shows that already in classical antiquity the pronunciation of diphthongs that were accented on the second vowel were pronounced as the second vowel, hence εἰς- οἰς- and οὐς- would sound like simple τ-.\(^9\) Similar confusion occurs at 2:9 (οἰς.ev 216 423 1518); 2:11 (εἰς.ev 6 330 1831); and 2:12 (ἵδωμεν Π 56 D F G).

13:2.10

Paul consistently places πας without an article after the noun (Rom. 12:4; 15:13; 16:16; 1 Cor. 7:17; 10:1; 15:7; 16:20; 2 Cor. 7:4). Variation involving the article is frequent in F G, as discussed in the chapter on D F G.

13:2.14

The use of thematic stems in place of athematic, such as ἵστημι and τιθημι, was

---

\(^8\)Royse, p. 258.

taking place already in the classical period. This practice is condemned by Moeris. Of the twenty-six occurrences in the Corpus Paulinum of the infinitive form of verbs based on the athematic stems, twenty-four use the athematic stem without variation. This is strikingly different from the situation involving the participle forms of -ιστημι, where six of thirteen occurrences involve the same type of variation (discussed below). The two passages where variation of stem occurs are:

1 Cor. 13:2 συνισταναι Ψ'6 B D F G 33 1739(μεθίστημι)
συνιστανειν A C K L etc (μεταστάνω; Ν parablepsis)
2 Cor. 3:1 συνιστανειν Ν A C K L P etc (συνιστάνω)
συνισταναι F G; (συνίστημι)
συνισταν Ψ'6 B D' 33 (συνιστάω)

Atticism may be suspected to have created the reading συνισταναι in both passages. However, two factors argue against this. First, Paul nowhere else uses the thematic stem for the infinitive. Second, the manuscripts behave similarly when participle forms of -ιστημι are involved. The -ιστημι stem is firm in six passages. Where there is variation, some

10 Moulton and Howard, Accidence, p. 202-205. BDR §93 discusses the issue in the NT, but does not distinguish indicative from infinitive or participle forms (as does Moulton and Howard).

11 Atticista 17: ιστάναι Ἄττικοι· ιστάνειν Ἠλληνες.

12 The stems used in the Pauline epistles are διδωμι, ιστημι, ημι, and τιθμι; approximately fifty compounds based on these stems that occur in the NT. These are listed in William D. Mounce, The Morphology of Biblical Greek (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), pp. 314-315.

13 Other variation involves only mood or tense: Rom. 12:1; 10:3 στησαι (στηναι 056) παραστησαι (παραστησατε 0151); 2 Cor. 11:2 παραστησαι (παραστηναι 056 0142); Eph. 4:28 μεταδιδουσι; (μεταδουναι D F G 0150); Col. 1:22 παραστησαι (παραστησας Ψ).

14 Rom. 8:38 ενεστωτα (ενίστημι); 13:2 ανθρωποκοτες (ανθίστημι); 15:12 ανισταμενος (ανίστημι); 1 Cor. 3:22 ενεστωτα (ενίστημι); 7:26 ενεστωσαν (ενίστημι); 1 Tim. 3:12 προισταμενοι (προίστημι).
witnesses fare better than others.\textsuperscript{15} Ρ reads the thematic stem in four of six places, three alone or nearly alone; A is legible for only four passages, but reads the thematic stem twice (see also 7:3.9), which is similar to the “Byzantine” witnesses (Κ L etc) and B, which read the thematic stem three times in six passages. The witnesses that most frequently preserve the athematic stem for the participle are Ψ\textsuperscript{46} Κ D,\textsuperscript{16} in five of six passages, and F G in four of six.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore, Ρ Α Κ L and even B should be considered unreliable for variation involving the thematic stem both for participles and infinitives. Given the proclivity away from the athematic toward the thematic stem, the reading συνιστάνειν at 1 Cor. 13:2 should be considered to be an alteration prompted by increasing use of the thematic stem in Greek.

This leaves the reading συνισταν at 2 Cor. 3:1. Moulton and Howard suggest that it “has good claim.”\textsuperscript{18} However, while the -αν termination is common in the LXX,\textsuperscript{19} it occurs

\textsuperscript{15} Rom. 12:8 προισταμενος (προϊστημι); προισταμενος Ρ (προϊστάνω); 2 Cor. 4:2 συνιστάνετες Β C D F G (συνιστήμι); συνισταντες Ψ\textsuperscript{46} Β Ρ 075 0243 (συνιστάνω); συνιστώντες Κ L Ψ (συνιστάω); 6:4 συνισταντες Ψ\textsuperscript{46} Ρ C D F G 0225 0243 (συνιστήμι); συνιστωντες Κ L Ψ 048 (συνιστάω); συνισταντες Β Ρ (συνιστάνω); 2 Cor. 10:12 συνισταντων (συνιστάνω); συνισταντων Ψ\textsuperscript{46} 0243 (συνιστήμι); 10:18 συνιστανων Ψ\textsuperscript{46} Ρ B D F G H Ι\textsuperscript{rd} Ρ 0121 0150 0243 (συνιστάνω); συνιστων Κ L Ψ etc (συνιστάω); 1 The. 5:12 προισταμενους (συνίστημι); προισταμενους Ν Α (συνιστάνω); 1 Tim. 3:4 προισταμενον (προϊστημι); προισταμενον F G (προϊστάνω); προισταμενον Ρ (προϊστάνω). It may be observed that in three places Ρ alters to the -στανω stem, as with the infinitive at 2 Cor. 3:1.

\textsuperscript{16} For this reason, at 2 Cor. 10:12 συνισταντων (Ψ\textsuperscript{46} 0243) may be correct.

\textsuperscript{17} προισταμενον at 1 Tim. 3:4 may simply be an error for προισταμενον, influenced by the Latin equivalent praepositum. Such alteration is not equivalent to the intentional shift to προισταμενον by Ρ in the same place.

\textsuperscript{18} Moulton and Howard, \textit{Accidence}, p. 205.

\textsuperscript{19} BDR §93\textsuperscript{3}. 
nowhere else in Paul. The fact that several early fathers read the same for at 1 Cor. 13:11, without any manuscript support, suggests that the use of this thematic form is also influenced by the development of the Greek language itself.

Hiatus may have played a further role in both passages. Only one of the twenty-four firm examples of the infinitive are followed by a word beginning with an ε, α, or η (Eph. 6:13 αντιστηναι εν). However, at 1 Cor. 13:2 μεθισταναι is followed by αγαπην and at 2 Cor. 3:1 συνισταναι is followed by η (or the v.l. ει). Avoidance of hiatus may have therefore led to the termination -ειν in the A C and the typical "Byzantine" witnesses at both 1 Cor. 13:2 and at 2 Cor. 3:1 as well as the otherwise unPauline -αν at 2 Cor. 3:1.

That development in the Greek language accounts for the use of thematic forms is shown by another unique reading of F G, this at Rom. 14:15. Here these witnesses F G do read a thematic termination for απολλυειν, the only Greek manuscripts to read the infinitive (απολλυε / απολυε cet). This reading results, however, from adapting the Greek to the Latin text, here the equivalent perdere, a common phenomena in F G. Recognizing the cause of this corruption is not only helpful in clarifying that F G adapts its Greek text to the Latin (further discussed in the chapter on D F G), but also that this adaptation took place relatively late in the transmission of the Greek text, for it took place after the widespread use of thematic terminations in Greek.

13:2.16

A alone assimilates ειμι to the ωφελουμαι at the end of 13:3. Since one would normally expect the second verb to have been assimilated to the first, this indicates

---

20 μεθισταν in Methodius, Symposium 9,4,249; Basil, Epistulae 204,1; Ephraem Institutio ad monachos 320; Sermones paraenetici ad monachos Aegypti 26; 46 (both in Greek).
intentional editing or correction, not merely accidental error.  

13:3.20 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

13:3.22

Did Paul favor “love” over giving oneself to “boasting” or to “burning”? This is one of the most well-known and much-discussed textual problems in the Corpus Paulinum. The manuscript and versional evidence is easily ascertained. Only Ψ46 Α B 0150 33 296 425* 1739* read καυχήσωμαι, with a handful of related witnesses (048 1175* 1985*) attesting the phonological alternative καυχήσομαι. These are joined by the Coptic. All other manuscripts and versions read some form of καίω. The derivation of all these readings from καυθησομαι is quickly described. Καυθησεται, read by six minuscules, is an adaptation to the implied subject of the verb (τὸ σῶμα). Καυθη does the same in the active voice, read by seven minuscules and the Syriac versions. Καυθησομαι is the most widely attested reading, though it is the result of a development in the Greek language, as described below. Therefore, the source for all the readings based on καίω is καυθησομαι (C24 D F G L 056 0142 6 pm).

---

21In one citation Pseudo-Macarius transposes ειμι and ωφελομαι (Epistula magna 249-250). Since his citation in Sermones 43,1 matches all other witnesses, the transposition is likely an error in citation, not evidence of a different form of the text. A paraphrase by Didymus (Didymus, Commentarii in Ecclesiasten 176 ll. 16-21) reads ωφελομαι . . . εστιν, but the style of citation prevents any firm conclusions regarding his text here.

22Zuntz (p. 35) notes discussions by Griesbach; Schrage (III, p. 290 n. 76) by Erasmus and Semler. Jerome’s observations are discussed below.

23Because the subjunctive form ardeam is required with ut, it cannot be used as evidence that the Latin tradition, which is universally derived from a form of καίω, renders the “subjunctive” καυθησομαι as opposed to the indicative καυθησομαι.

24The evidence of C is not firm; von Soden, Lyon and NA27 cite it as reading καυθησομαι while Tischendorf and TuT cite its reading as καυθησομαι.
Some of the patristic evidence has been debated. The earliest potential reference to 1 Cor. 13:3 is Clement of Rome’s *Epistula ad Corinthios* 55. In a context which points out the sacrificial actions of “Gentiles” (55,1) and “women” (Judith and Esther; 55,3-4), Clement writes that “many among us have had themselves imprisoned, that they might ransom others. Many have had themselves sold into slavery, and with the price received for themselves have fed others.” Some have pointed to this passage as support for the reading καυχησομαι at 1 Cor. 13:3, for while it uses a form of παραδίδωμι (ἐαυτοῦς παρέδωκαν) it does not mention “burning.” Furthermore, the actions described there clearly benefit others, and would presumably give the person who takes this action a “boast.” However, a direct reference to 1 Corinthians is not likely. First, no reference to anything in the context of 1 Cor. 13 is mentioned by Clement. Second, παραδίδωμι is used several times in section 55: Rulers παρέδωκαν ἐαυτοῦς εἰς θάνατον (55,1); “Many among us” gave themselves into “imprisonment” or “slavery” (55,2); and Judith gave herself into “peril” (55,4). The use of παραδίδωμι thus reflects general usage, and nothing specific to 1 Cor. 13. Third, the phrase “among us” (ἐν ἡμῖν) never refers specifically to the Corinthians, but makes either general reference to Christians (6,1) or more specifically to Christians in Rome sent from Clement to the Corinthians (63,3). However, when Clement refers to Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, he uses the second person pronoun: “He wrote to you in the Spirit about himself and Cephas and Apollos . . .” (47,3). It is therefore more likely a reference to the actions of Christians beyond

---

25 Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 116. A. Harnack (*Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe (1 Kor. 13) und seine religions-geschichtliche Bedeutung*, Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1911), p. 140) argues: “It is probably not to be denied that Clement our has our passage in mind, but nothing is read in it of death by fire. He combines παραδίδοναι with εἰς θάνατον, εἰς δεομά, εἰς δουλεῖα, But he passes over death by fire, because he was not led to do so by 1 Cor. 13:3. He cannot have intentionally omitted it, therefore he did not read it.”
Corinth, not an allusion anything in 1 Corinthians 13. Clement's comments cannot be attributed to dependence on 1 Cor. 13:3, and therefore cannot be cited as evidence that Clement knew the reading καυχησώμαι.\footnote{The same conclusion is reached by Lindemann, p. 285 and Caragounis, p. 548. There is no reference to Clement in the NA\textsuperscript{27} at 1 Cor. 13:3.} We may now move on to firm evidence of the use of 1 Cor. 13:3.

The patristic evidence for a form of καῦμ is just as overwhelming as the manuscript evidence, both in terms of numbers and date. In a discussion of the value of "love," Clement of Alexandria (\textit{Stromata} 4,18,1-2) paraphrases 1 Cor. 13:1-3: "For example, the apostle Paul says, "If I give my body (τὸ σῶμα ἐπίδω) but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal." A few lines later he alludes specifically to 13:3: "For there is a people who love with the lips, and there is another that gives the body to be burned." There can be no question that Clement's text read a form of καῦμ.\footnote{Harnack, \textit{Das hohe Lied}, p. 140.} That he departs from ýp\textsuperscript{46} B here is significant, since Clement shares an almost unique textual relationship especially with the papyrus.\footnote{See the concluding chapter on the "Alexandrian" witnesses.}

Origen, who likewise shares affinities with the text of ýp\textsuperscript{46} B, also attests to a form of καῦμ, though some have called this into question.\footnote{See esp. the appendix to Westcott and Hort, \textit{The Text of the New Testament in the Original Greek}, p. 116-7 and the severe critique of their conclusions regarding Origen's evidence by Zuntz, \textit{Text of the Epistles}, p. 35, n. 6 and p. 36, n. 5.} The Latin translation evidence is firm (Rufinus, \textit{Origenes in Leviticum homiliae} 9,9) for the discussion in the context presumes a form of καῦμ. However, whether or not this reflects Origen's or Rufinus' thinking cannot be known. The only Greek evidence is from catenae manuscripts, and here the evidence has
been disputed. Cramer\textsuperscript{30} prints the text of a manuscript in Paris (Regius 227) in which both the text of 1 Cor. and the comment by Origen read καυθήσωμαι. This is followed by Tischendorf in his apparatus. Jenkins later edited Vatican manuscript gr 762, which he believed was the exemplar for the Paris manuscript.\textsuperscript{31} This manuscript also read καυθήσωμαι both in the lemma and in Origen’s comments. Hort conjectures that the Paris manuscript has been corrupted on the basis of the comments Origen makes immediately following his citation, so that Origen’s original text read καυχήσωμαι.\textsuperscript{32} Jenkins, though not citing Hort, makes the same conjecture.\textsuperscript{33} Hannah accepts Jenkins’ judgment, though as he relegates the catenae material to secondary authority he does not attempt a reconstruction of Origen’s text for this passage.\textsuperscript{34} Zuntz argues that the conjecture of Hort and Jenkins, which argues that Origen’s reading is the opposite of what is actually in the available manuscripts of Origen, is not likely. The comments made by Origen do not require καυχήσωμαι and in fact can be best understood as explaining καίω.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, while there is the possibility of Origen’s comments having been altered to match the scriptural text as written, it should be noted that the citation begins with κατακεκαιμένος, whereas Origen’s comments are preserved as κακοειμένος. This reading agrees with Π\textsuperscript{v} A B C against the “Byzantine” text, thus suggesting that the adaptation claimed by Hort is unlikely. While both the Latin and the catenae evidence is not

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{30} Catenae graecorum patrum in novum testamentum, tomus V, Oxford, 1844, p. 252.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek, New York, 1882, Appendix, p. 117.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Jenkins (1909), p. 34.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Hannah, p. 250.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Zuntz, pp. 35 n.6 and 36 n.5.
\end{itemize}
finally decisive, the fact that both support the same reading gives stronger (though not
decisive) support to Origen's text having read καυθησώμαι (or some other form of καίω)
rather than καυχησώμαι. This conclusion becomes even more firm when compared with
Clement's evidence, who uses a text of the epistles very similar to that of Origen.

Beyond Clement and Origen, the patristic support is nearly universal. In the late
second and early third century a form of καίω is presumed by Tertullian (Adversus Praxeann
1,4,20), Cyprian (De ecclesiae catholicae unitate 14,343; Ad Quirinum 3,3), a paraphrase by
Methodius (πυρὶ παραδόσω; Symposium 9,4,249), and slightly later the Syriac fathers
Aphraat and Severian. The later fathers, who typically read with the "Byzantine" text,
unanimously do so here as well.

Only two fathers attest a form of καυχάομαι. Jerome's evidence has been known for
some time. He cites 1 Cor. 13:3 twice, both times noting the variation. In Commentarii in iv
epistulas Paulinas, Ad Galatas 3,453,14 he sides with his "Greek" witnesses but in
Commentarii in Isaiah 16,58,3 he simply notes the two readings. More recently available
evidence is found in Didymus, whose Commentarii in Psalmos 35-39 was recovered at Tura.
As with Clement, Didymus paraphrases the passage (fol. 281) but clearly presumes one form
of the text, in this case the reading καυχησώμαι (the passage is translated and discussed
below). There is a tantalizing personal connection between Jerome and Didymus, though of

36 Syriac text provided in Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung, ad loc. The
Greek translation evidence for these fathers is uncertain, as J. Molitor, Der Paulustext des Hi.
Ephraim, Monumenta biblica et ecclesiastica 4 (Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1938), p. 45
notes.

37 Jerome also cites the reading ardeam without comment, though this in a translation
of a letter of Theophilus (Epistulae 98,6).
course this is insufficient to establish Didymus as the source for Jerome's reading.\textsuperscript{38}

The "external evidence" – apart from the alleged "excellent quality of the Alexandrian witnesses"\textsuperscript{39} – decisively attests a form of καύω. Only Didymus and the Coptic version, both of which routinely match the text of \textit{P46}, support the small handful of manuscripts that read a form of καυχάομαι. Yet even Clement and Origen, who also typically read with the "Alexandrian witnesses," depart from them here. Nonetheless, external evidence is never decisive, particularly for a problem as challenging as this. Therefore, in attempting to assess the direction and causes of corruption two questions must be answered: Which reading best suits the context? And which reading is more likely to have been altered in the manuscript tradition?

Previous discussion has focused on the contextual issues, though without any consensus. Many commentators have relied too heavily on a morphological issue, dismissing καυθησώμαι as a "grammatical monstrosity" both in form and in context (where ἰνα καυθῃ should be expected, not a 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular verb).\textsuperscript{40} However, more recent studies have shown that the form is not impossible. Elliott has shown that τὸ σῶμά μου can function as a

\textsuperscript{38}See R. A. Layton, Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria: Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2004), p. 6.

\textsuperscript{39}Fee, p. 629 n. 18. J. H. Petzer, after a lengthy discussion of the internal evidence, virtually dismisses it at the conclusion of his essay: "What remains to be considered is the external evidence. Not much needs to be discussed, since it is rather obvious that καυχήσομαι has by far the best attestation . . . This evidence speaks for itself." ("Contextual Evidence in Favour of καυθησώμαι in 1 Corinthians 13.3," \textit{New Testament Studies} 35 (1989): 229-53; citation from p. 251); Clark, \textit{Textual Criticism and Doctrine} (p. 61) summarizes: "Now the additional witness of \textit{P46} strengthens the case for καυχήσομαι so that the textual evidence would seem conclusive."

\textsuperscript{40}Fee, p. 629 n. 18; Metzger, \textit{Textual Commentary}, pp. 497-98291.
reflexive, so that passage may be understood to say, "If I give myself to be burned. . .".  
Furthermore, Caragounis vigorously denies any argument that καυθησόμα&upsilon; is "ungreek" in any way, noting that writers such as Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom have no difficulty with the form.  
He demonstrates that the form is not, as it has been labeled, a "future subjunctive," but a "future indicative (καυθησόμα&upsilon;) which under the inroads and influence of the subjunctive has come to be spelt with the thematic vowel (ο) of the subjunctive as καυθησόμα&upsilon;." This development had previously been noted by grammarians such as Hatzidakis, Sophocles, and Jannaris, but not recognized in the standard NT Greek grammars. Caragounis shows, therefore, that καυθησόμα&upsilon; and καυθησόμα&upsilon; are grammatically equivalent, the latter being the form to which later scribes altered the earlier form.  
The textual decision must therefore be made on grounds other than "poor Greek."

A second contextual issue is whether or not it would have been possible for Paul to make reference to martyrdom by burning. Typically appeal is made to Daniel 3 as the source for this idea; other potential sources have been identified, such as 2 Macc. 7:5 and 4 Macc. 6:26; 7:12. Paul is not making reference to specific events in 13:1-3 (such as moving mountains), so a direct dependence by Paul on these LXX examples is not likely. However,  

42Caragounis, p. 553.  
43Caragounis, pp. 556-8.  
44The same argument is made for the derivation of καυθησόμα&upsilon; from καυθησόμα&upsilon; by Elliott, "In Favour of καυθησόμα&upsilon;," p. 298.  
45E.g., Clark (p. 61), who claims that καυθησόμα&upsilon; "does not suit well the primitive Christian era when burning was neither a form of execution nor of torture nor of personal purification." Cf. also Barrett, p. 302.  
46Schrage III, p. 291 and notes 80 and 81.
these passages do elevate martyrdom by fire as a pre-eminent sacrifice: “The king commanded that he be taken, still breathing, to the fire and to fry. But as the smoke spread around from the fry-pan, they with their mother encouraged one another to die nobly, saying, ‘The Lord God is looking on.’” Likewise, writers contemporary with Paul speak positively about martyrdom by fire, both within Judaism (Heb. 11:34; Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae 17,167) and outside. Tertullian (Ad martyras 4), for example, refers to both Romans (Mucius, Dido, and the wife of Hasdrubal) and Greeks (Heraclitus and Empedocles) as well-known, positive examples of suffering by fire, all accounts and descriptions that predate Paul.47

Third, Pauline usage of καἰω and καὐχάομαι must be considered. The latter is common in Paul, with thirty-two occurrences (aside from 13:3) in the Hauptbriefe and four previously in 1 Corinthians. The word is used positively by Paul (2 Cor. 5:12; 9:2; 10:8-17; Phil 2:1648), though in 1 Corinthians it is otherwise only censured (1 Cor. 3:21; 4:7). On the other hand, καἰω is nowhere else used in Paul. In 13:1-3, however, several Pauline hapax legomenon are present χαλκός, κύμβαλον, and αλαλαζω.49 Paul may simply never have had need to discuss clanging symbols and burning, so the usage here should not be considered secondary on this basis alone. The evidence of vocabulary usage is therefore not decisive in this passage.

A fourth contextual issue, one which has been viewed as decisive by proponents of both alternatives, is which reading best suits the hyperbole of this statement, the last of three to extol “love” over all else. Those who argue for καὐθησομαι have noted that “boasting”

---

47 Further examples in Schrage III, p. 291-2 and n. 83; Conzelmann, pp. 222-3 and notes 44 to 48.

48 Also 1 Cor. 1:31, though here the boasting is in God’s action.

49 In addition, μεθίστημι occurs only at Col. 1:14 and ὑπος at Gal. 4:24-25.
can hardly be held up as the greatest virtue which is surpassed by “love.”

This requires that the ἵνα καὐχησόμαι be understood to indicate the purpose or motivation for the self-sacrifice. However, some have argued that boasting can be viewed positively by Paul, an argument based on the development of the argument in 13:1-3. Petzer, in the most thorough attempt to evaluate the readings on the basis of the context, carefully describes the syntactic and thematic structure of 13:1-3. He notes the three sections, equivalent to the modern verse divisions, which use conditional sentences to contrast “love” with several of the “gifts” valued in Corinth. Petzer claims to recognize a previously unnoticed literary feature, that of “defamiliarization,” where an author presents “familiar, ordinary objects . . . in an unfamiliar, or defamiliarized way” so as to force a re-reading of the text and reconsideration of previous held values. This takes place in 1 Cor. 13:1-3, according to Petzer, through building up to a climax from the least to the most important “gift.” In each section the protasis is divided into two parts, with the second half of the protasis (introduced with καί in v. 1 and καὶ ἐὰν in vv. 2, 3) serving to “extend or exaggerate the issue posed [in the first half of the protasis] and to put it beyond the reach of ordinary human beings.”

This is a key statement in Petzer’s argument in favor of the reading καὐχησόμαι, for, as he argues, “the notion of self-burning is very much achievable by human beings” while “boasting” in giving up one’s body is –

---

50 Zuntz, p. 36; Barrett, p. 302.

51 Esp. Petzer, p. 243, though he does so on the basis of a questionable connection between πορεῖν τὸ σῶμά μου and Jesus’ words at Luke 22:19 (see below); also Thiselton, pp. 1043-4, who explicitly rejects Petzer’s proposed parallel.

52 This structure is described by many, most succinctly by Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation, pp. 277-78.

53 Petzer, p. 239; cf. Also p. 243, 246.

54 Petzer, p. 241.
like speaking in the tongues of angels and moving mountains—“out of human reach.” It is out of reach, Petzer argues, because παραδώ τὸ σώμα μου should be connected directly to Jesus’ words in Luke 22:19: “The giving up of one’s body in the same way that Jesus did can be understood as an act that represents the highest form of giving one’s belongings for his neighbor... since it resembles the highest proof of Jesus’ love for mankind.” According to Petzer, the reading καυθησομαι would break this pattern of denigrating human action.

Petzer’s interpretation requires two further specific arguments against καυθ-. First, that τινα καυθησομαι, which must be taken as “completing the meaning of the παραδώ τὸ σώμα μου” breaks the parallel syntax of ὅστε μεθιστάναι, a result clause. Second, that “The alleged relation between giving up one’s belongings for the poor and self-martyrdom in this context is not very clear to me. How could someone else benefit from the death of a martyr?”

While Petzer’s essay is admirably detailed and closely argued, and some, such as Thiselton, find it persuasive (with qualification), several insurmountable difficulties prevent his conclusions from being accepted. First, the proposed connection between παραδώ τὸ σώμα μου at 1 Cor. 13:3 and Luke 22:19 is unlikely. This is not a mere guess that is tangential to Petzer’s argument, as Thiselton believes, for Petzer repeats the claim (p. 243)

55Petzer, p. 242.
56Petzer, p. 243.
57Petzer, p. 247.
58However, although Thiselton accepts what he sees as the main points of Petzer’s argument regarding “defamiliarization,” he dismisses the key move that Petzer makes in viewing “that I may boast” as a divine action: “But such an interpretation of ‘that I may glory’ is unnecessary and misleading” (p. 1043) and “it is not necessary to endorse of all Petzer’s proposals...” (p. 1044). Thiselton adopts Petzer’s structural arguments and the manner in which the structure creates meaning without accepting the exegesis that Petzer then draws from these own arguments.
and uses it to refute other arguments (e.g., 246). However, Petzer fails to appreciate that the phrase is common in martyrological contexts. Even in non-biblical literature παραδείν το σῶμα typically makes reference to self-sacrifice. This occurs in the context of death in battle (Alciphron, Epistulae 14,3), surrender to enemies (Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Antiquitates Romanae 6,47,3; Josephus, De bello Judaico 6,350) or even suicide to avoid shame (Chariton, De Chaerea et Callirhoe 3,1,6). In the post NT period, the Acta Petri 37 ("Ὣρα δὲ σοι, Πέτρε, παραδοναί τὸ σῶμα τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν") and the Pseudo-Ignatian Ad Heronem diaconum ecclesiae Antiochenae 2 use the phrase in the context of martyrdom, the former by crucifixion and the latter by burning (καὶ ν παραδῷ τὸ σῶμα εἰς καύσιν).

Therefore, παραδῷ τὸ σῶμά μου at Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 13:3 are similar because they share the same linguistic background, not because Paul is dependent on a tradition preserved by Luke.

Second, he fails to present any evidence for his argument that καὶῶ fails to suit the context because no one else would benefit from martyrdom by burning. This argument does not take into account Paul’s explicit statements that other’s benefit from his own sufferings (e.g., 2 Cor. 1:6; Col. 1:24). In the same vein, early writers frequently pointed out the benefits that others would receive through someone else’s enduring of martyrdom.59 Furthermore,

59E.g., Origen, Exhortatio ad martyrum 41: "Let us, then, lay down our lives, not I shall say for Him, but for ourselves—and, I think it may be also, for those who will be built up by our martyrdom;" cf. also 30 and 51. A larger discussion, with examples, is provided by B. Dehandschutter (“Example and Discipleship. Some Comments on the Biblical Background of the Early Christian Theology of Martyrdom.” pp. 20-26 in The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity, ed. J. den Boeft and M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1999): “The function of those people as exempla needs to be looked at more closely. Their exemplary character is not only related to the understanding of martyrdom in the sense that they persevered in persecution and suffering until death. The example of the Old Testament ‘precursors’ implies at the same time more ethical qualities. They are models of perseverantia in their ‘daily’ lives, apart from the specific situation of persecution. In other words, they are models of the ‘martyr quotidien’. Patientia is also a
there is no evidence that “faith that can move mountains” (13:2) inevitably benefits others. More likely, the three “gifts” listed in 13:1-3 (speaking in tongues, faith, and martyrdom) are cited because they were viewed as supreme examples of spirituality. All could potentially, but not inevitably, benefit others. But “love” will always benefit others. Interpreted in this way, καφω would function within the structure of 1 Cor. 13:1-3 in the same way that Petzer proposes that καφωματι does: It is a positive action that is “defamiliarized” so that the behavior of the Corinthians would be altered.

Third, and most significantly, τα καφωματι cannot function syntactically as complement of παραδω. Petzer, as noted above, claims that τα καφωματι must serve as a result clause, parallel to ὠστε ὑπηρετονταναι (13:2). However, τα does not express result when used with παραδιδωμι. At 2 Cor. 4:11 Paul follows παραδιδωμι with τα (here expressing purpose), then using ὠστε to introduce the subsequent result clause.60 In a context similar to 1 Cor. 13:3, Origen also uses τα to introduce the complement of παραδιδωμι, followed by a clause which uses ὠστε to introduce a result clause: “For they were handed over in order (τα) to discipline them, with the result (.dataGridViewTextBoxColumn) that their flesh was destroyed, that is, the arrogance of the flesh.”61

In fact, quite the opposite must be the case. Παραδω το σωμα μου when used with reference to physical suffering requires a complement. Although pointed out by previous quality of the whole life of these ‘martyrs.’ This idea was applied at a very early states to the Christian martyrs themselves.” (citation from p. 22).

60 Cf. also Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 233 “But if we are not persuasive, we give ourselves to destruction, lest by (παραδιδωμεν εαυτους εις ἀπαλειαν, τα μη) living we see something more terrible and evil than death.” A complement is provided for παραδιδωμι, with the τα clause indicating motivation.

61 Commenting on 1 Cor. 5:5 in Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistolam ad Corinthios 24.
commentators, this fact is ignored by Petzer. Hort had recognized the problem, but claimed that the “unfamiliar absolute use of παραδίδωμι” led scribes to make the alteration to καυθήσομαι in order to supply the necessary complement. He cites a passage from Plutarch in support of this absolute usage, but as Caragounis demonstrates, this passage is not parallel because a complement is unnecessary in that context. The need for a complement with παραδίδωμι when used in the sense of “deliver someone/someth. into someone’s hands” is shown by numerous examples in the LXX and NT as well as non-biblical writers.

For example, Deut. 1:27 uses the simple infinitive as a complement (παραδοῦναι ἡμῶς εἰς χείρας Αμορραίων ἐξολοθρεύσατι ἡμῶς; also Testamentum Jobi 20,5) even though it is clear from the context that the “delivering” would entail a physical punishment. The articular infinitive is used in the same way at Jer. 33:24.

The NT examples of this use of παραδίδωμι are decisive: When παραδίδωμι is used to mean “hand over to some kind of death,” ἵνα introduces the complement (Matt. 27:6; Mark 15:15; John 19:16). When ἵνα is not used, the NT writers, as in the LXX, either use a prepositional phrase (1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 4:11), or a complement is not necessary due to context. This is most obvious in the several Pauline examples where Jesus is described as “handed over,” but because the reader would already know that to which Jesus was handed

62 Elliott, “In Favour of καυθήσομαι” p. 298 (with additional examples). Cf. also Barrett, p. 302: “handing oneself over; is a far from explicit expression, and needs a supplementary clause, such as to be burned, in order to make it clear,” and Zuntz, p. 36: καυθήσομαι (sic) “is indispensable because otherwise the action implied remains vague.”

63 Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 117.

64 Caragounis, p. 548, n. 224. Similar examples occur in the LXX: 1 Macc. 4:30; 1 Esd. 1:50; Dan 7:25; 11:11; Jer. 39:4, 36, 43.

65 BDAG, s.v. παραδίδωμι (1b), where this usage is labelled a “semitic construction, but paralleled in Latin.”
over there is no need to supply the complement (Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25).

However, when no complement is used and the action of “handing over” is not clear from the context, bare παραδίωμι does not necessarily entail death. It could simply refer to a handing over to authorities or in betrayal (Judith 6:25; Matt. 17:22; 26:25; Mark 9:31; 14:41; Luke 9:44; 24:7). Other examples where the context supplies nothing are ambiguous as to what the “handing over” entails. For example, at Sir. 11:6 no complement is present (παρεδόθησαν εἷς χείρας ἐκτέρων). The reader is therefore left in the dark regarding what those “held in esteem” will suffer. Basic principles of Hebrew poetry require that this colon be understood in light of the previous colon: “Many rulers have been greatly dishonored.” To whatever παρεδόθησαν εἷς χείρας ἐκτέρων refers in Sir. 11:6, it does not refer to any sort of suffering or death. Thus, without the complement, παραδώ τὸ σῶμά μου at 1 Cor. 13:3 would be unclear, not necessarily indicating that suffering, let alone death, was in view.

The contextual evidence, therefore, makes it unlikely that ἵνα καυχησόμασι is either semantically or syntactically suitable at 13:3, whereas ἵνα καυχησόμαι suits typical NT and Pauline usage. In addition, it has sufficient ancient parallel to have been used by Paul as a supreme example of spirituality and therefore well suits his argument in 13:1-3.

What would have been the motive for the alteration? Simple letter confusion is a

---

66 This ambiguity is reflected in English translations. The REB reads, “found themselves at the mercy of others,” while the KJV simply gives a word for word rendering: “delivered into other men’s hands.”

67 The addition of εἷς κρισίν in the “Western Text” of Acts 3:13 may be an example of removing the ambiguity of παρεδώκατε – was Jesus simply “handed over”? Was he betrayed? Or was he condemned? Cf. the discussion of the meaning of παρεδώκατε in this passage in BDAG, s.v. παραδίωμι (1b).
strong possibility, particularly since both consonants are voiceless. The direction of error could have taken place in either direction. Nevertheless, the identical error is made — from καυθοί to καυκχ — by one of these same “reliable” uncials at LXX 2 Kings 23:7 (καὶ εν πυρὶ καύσει καυθησονται αἰσχῦνη αὐτῶν). For καυθησονται (καυθησεται A; θησονται B) N reads καυχησονται. The reading of N is clearly in error, and should have been protected by εν πυρὶ καύσει in the preceding clause. Nevertheless, the direction of error is from καυθοί- to καυκχ-, the same as that proposed at 1 Cor. 13:3.

Some authors cite assimilation to a specific phrase at Daniel 3:95 LXX (παρέδωκαν τα σώματα αὔτῶν εἰς πῦρ). However, strict assimilation is unlikely. First, because in the complement to παραδίδωμι in Daniel is εἰς πῦρ, while at 1 Cor. 13:3 it is quite different: οἷα καυθησομαι. On the other hand, a recollection of the familiar account in Daniel may have prompted the shift to καυθησομαι at 1 Cor. 13. Such a possibility cannot, strictly speaking, be ruled out. However, there may be other influences that have impacted the transmission of the passage.

The second century context provides possible influences. As seen above, Paul had numerous antecedents for the use of self-sacrificial death by fire. However, some have claimed that it would be more likely for a scribe to alter καυχησομαι to καυθησομαι in

---

68 Caragounis, p. 564; this possibility is expressed by nearly every commentator, dating back to Jerome, Commentarii in iv epistolulas Paulinas, Ad Galatas 3,453,14: “καυθησομαι et καυχησομαι una litterae parte distinguitur.”

69 This variation was not caused by a shift in the pronunciation of Greek. Gignac I, p. 98 states: “There is little evidence for the shift of the aspirated stops / ph kh th / to fricatives / f x θ /.” Instead, consonantal changes such as θ and χ are likely “scribal errors” (p. 99). The evidence of Ν at 2 Kings 23:7 bears this out.

70 Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 117.
view of the growing urge toward Christian martyrdom in the second century. Such an argument, of course, presumes that καυχησομαι is contextually suitable and grammatically appropriate. However, it would be a strong argument only if martyrdom by fire were actually encouraged by Paul in this passage. In fact, his argument denigrates martyrdom in favor of "love," as early commentators noted. This forces Didymus, the only early father to read καυχησομαι, to read "boasting" as a negative action – which, as seen above, it cannot be if it is the correct reading – since martyrdom in itself could not possibly be negative:

There are some who endure, not because they are able to endure, but either by stubbornness or sometimes the love of glory. For this reason the Apostle says, "I do not give my body in order to boast" (οὐ μὴ παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα καυχήσωμαι). If he had sent forth the body and the soul for the sake of approval, he would not have been "enduring patiently." For this [giving of the body] was always done wisely and as it was necessary to endure, not that he might receive either glory or approval from men. The one who endures in this way, when it is necessary, is acting just as it is said, 'in accordance with wisdom I acted wisely.' (Commentarii in Psalmos 35-39 fol. 281, on Ps. 39:2 LXX)

Likewise Basil (Epistulae 204,1), who read καυθησομαι, takes pains to point out that with love, the speaking in tongues, faith, and martyrdom are able to be done: "Not that each of the enumerated items are able to be accomplished apart from love, rather the saint wishes, as he himself says, to confirm the far-surpassing greatness of the commandment in a hyperbolic manner (τῷ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τρόπῳ)." Of course, in 1 Cor. 13:1-3 Paul does not encourage any of the actions, even with "love," but the ideal of martyrdom is so great that it must be "rescued" from Paul by the early fathers. Furthermore, when martyrdom is explicitly

---

71Esp. Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 117. Fee, p. 629, n. 18; the possibility of such motivation is mentioned by Lindemann, p. 285. Petzer (p. 250), without discussing any of the evidence, dismisses discussion of the impact of the history of the church as "speculative."

72Though he does not cite παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου, Origen (Commentarium in Mathaeum 12,28) views the previous clause of 1 Cor. 13:3 ("giving his whole substance, that his possessions may feed the poor") as spoken of negatively, parallel to "What can a man give in exchange for his life" (Matt. 16:21). It is reasonable to assume that he also would read
encouraged by the fathers, this passage is completely ignored. It is absent, for example, from Tertullian’s *Ad martyras* and Origen’s *Exhortatio ad martyrium*. It seems unlikely that second-century scribes would intentionally change a reading that denigrates boasting to one that denigrates martyrdom, particularly when Paul earlier in the letter spoke against the Corinthians’ “boast” (5:6; also Rom. 4:2).

An additional possibility is generally not given much weight, but in view of several similar alterations in 1 Corinthians it should not be dismissed outright. Because Paul uses the first person singular, and he, one might presume, could “speak in the tongues of men and angels” and had great faith, the statement that he gave himself “to be burned” would have been incorrect to scribes familiar with the tradition that Paul did not die in that manner.73 Similar alterations were made in the manuscripts in order to bring his first person statements into line with perceptions of Paul (1:1; 3:5; 9:5; 9:20-21; 11:2). While not in itself decisive, this possible motive for alteration should not disregarded.

There is little or no evidence in the second century that would find a motive for intentional alteration from καυθησομαι to καυχησομαι.74 In addition, the semantic and grammatical problems with ενα καυχησομαι make it unlikely that it stood as the archetypical reading at 13:3.

the next clause negatively.

73Elliott, “In Favour of καυθησομαι at 1 Corinthians 13:3,” p. 298.

74Harnack claims that the motivation for alteration away from καυχησωμαι is that Paul uses καυχησαθαι in an “unusual way:” Hellenistic writers viewed “boasting” as wicked, but the Pharisaic upbringing of Paul, “not only took no offense at demands, legal titles, glorific titles in relation to God, but demanded them” (pp. 144-45). However, recent research into Palestinian Judaism (cf. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977)) at the time of Paul has shown that these understandings of a legalistic “Judaism” or “Pharisaism” are not borne out by the evidence. Furthermore, a glance at the patristic use of καυχομαι and καοτμαι, etc. in Lampe shows that early Christian writers did not have difficulty with the idea of “boasting” before the Lord, when properly understood.
13:4.24; 13:4.25; 13:4.26 [see also the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

It was probably too much to ask scribes to successfully negotiate 13:4-6 without dropping, adding, or moving at least one of the occurrences of \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \). Because the second \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) could serve as the subject for either \( \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \epsilon \zeta \lambda \) or \( \omicron \upsilon \upsilon \zeta \lambda \), all subsequent verbs were liable to having a subject shifted or added. Even D F G, which share the same text, show by their different sense-line divisions that they read \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) with different verbs:

\begin{align*}
\text{F G VL 89} & \quad \text{D VL 75} \\
\text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{M}\text{A} \text{K} \text{R} \text{O} \text{O} \text{H} \text{M} & \quad \text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{M}\text{A} \text{K} \text{R} \text{O} \text{O} \text{H} \text{M} \\
\text{X} \text{P} \text{C} \text{T} \text{E} \text{Y} \text{E} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I} & \quad \text{X} \text{P} \text{C} \text{T} \text{E} \text{Y} \text{E} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I} \\
\text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{H} \text{O} \text{Y} \text{Z} \text{H} \text{A} \text{O} \text{I} & \quad \text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{H} \text{O} \text{Y} \text{Z} \text{H} \text{A} \text{O} \text{I} \\
\text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{H} \text{O} \text{Y} \text{N} \text{E} \text{P} \text{N} \text{E} \text{P} \text{E} \text{Y} \text{E} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I} & \quad \text{H} \Delta \gamma \gamma \Delta \Pi \text{H} \text{O} \text{Y} \text{N} \text{E} \text{P} \text{N} \text{E} \text{P} \text{E} \text{Y} \text{E} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I} \\
\text{O} \text{Y} \text{F} \text{Y} \text{C} \text{I} \text{O} \text{U} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I} & \quad \text{O} \text{Y} \text{F} \text{Y} \text{C} \text{I} \text{O} \text{T} \text{A} \text{I}
\end{align*}

In D, starting at \( \omicron \upsilon \zeta \lambda \), eight consecutive lines begin with \( \omicron \upsilon \) / \( \omicron \upsilon \kappa \omicron \). This likely reflects D’s penchant for making its sense-lines as similar as possible, seen also at 6:9-10; 8:5; 12:13, 16. Nonetheless, it demonstrates the plasticity of the word order and the possibility of alteration, both intentional and unintentional.

Can the original wording be determined? The main textual problem is the whether \( \omicron \upsilon \) \( \phi \omicron \sigma \iota \omicron \upsilon \omicron \tau \omicron \alpha \omicron \tau \alpha \omicron \) is preceded by \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) (most manuscripts), followed by \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) (\( \text{B} \) \( \text{p} \) \( \text{c} \) only), or has no expressed subject (B 33 104).\(^{75}\) This also makes the patristic evidence unusable here.\(^{76}\)

---

\(^{75}\) Fee (p. 634 n. 1) lists four forms of the text; his options 1 and 2 are not differences in wording, but the result construing the noun with different verbs (the reading of B pc).

\(^{76}\) For example, Cyprian (\textit{Ad Quirinum} 3,3,21) and Cyril of Alexandria (\textit{Epistulae of paschales sive Homiliae of paschales MPG} 77, p. 541) add \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) before \( \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \epsilon \zeta \lambda \), without any manuscript support. Neither Tertullian, (\textit{De patientia} 12,9) nor Clement of Alexandria (\textit{Paedagogus} 3,1,3,1) can be cited for any position of \( \eta \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \pi \) since they never use the noun in their citation.
The issue has often been determined on the basis of the "music" or "beauty" of a given reading, although, as Fee points out, "it is also possible that Paul was not thinking rhythm." Furthermore, there is no "control" for such criteria, since the passage does not match any Greek poetic meter. Furthermore, even those who employ this argument differ as to which is more elegant. It may be that the question is irresolvable. However, we shall see B alone have difficulty with word order at 13:11, and \( \Psi^{46} \) is makes numerous similar transpositions without the support of any other witnesses.

13:5.27

\( \varepsilonυχημονει \) for \( \alphaσχημονει \) in \( \Psi^{46} \) is a nonsense reading, for why would Paul argue that love does not behave decorously? Since there does not appear to be any likelihood of simple vocalic interchange, it is unlikely to be a simple blunder.

---

77The former by Zuntz, p. 68; the latter by Harnack, Das hohe Lied, p. 145 n. 1.

78Fee, pp. 635-6, n. 1. Zuntz's argument is severely undermined by an uncharacteristic error of evidence. First, he cites \( \Psi^{46} \) and B as sharing the same reading, which they do not. Second, he bases his argument on the "well-balanced" structure, but fails to include \( \phiοσιουται \) (which no manuscript omits) in his layout, which would destroy the balance. This had been pointed out by Tasker, "The Text of the 'Corpus Paulinum',," p. 191; Güting and Mealand's claim (36 n. 45), that "there is a slight error in the presentation of the evidence by Zuntz, but it does not destroy the argument" seems to fail to appreciate the scale of Zuntz's mistakes.

79Zuntz favors the reading of B (though citing it incorrectly, as described above); Harnack favors the reading of \( \Xi \text{ C D F G K L} \Psi \text{ etc.} \)

80So Fee, p. 635 n. 1.

81Royse, pp. 260-61.

82Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 499.

83Particularly in light of Caragounis' work, which argues that the diphthongs \( \alpha \omega, \epsilon \upsilon, \) and \( \eta \upsilon \) would have typically been produced with the \( \upsilon \) sounding like the consonant \( v \) or \( f \). See pp. 375-77. Gignac (1, p. 226) also notes that in the Roman period papyri "\( \alpha \omega \) and \( \epsilon \upsilon \) are frequently written simply \( \alpha \) and \( \epsilon \)." Had the exemplar of \( \Psi^{46} \) written \( \varepsilon\chi\eta\mu\nu\epsilon \), the
The variation between τα and το μη (𝔓⁴⁶ς B Clement) can only be the result of intentional editing. Even though both addition/omission of the negative particle and change in the number of the article are not unusual in the manuscripts, the combination of the two here cannot be attributed to mere oversight. The reading τα εαυτης fits best in the context, since seeking one's own gain is "the very definition of the factionalist." It has the additional advantage of having parallels in similar phrases at 1 Cor. 10:24 and 33 without being so identical that assimilation is a possibility. The resultant meanings are shown in two citations by Clement of Alexandria, one of each form of the text:

But learn the "most excellent way" which Paul shows about salvation: "Love does not seek its own things" (τα εαυτης ου ζητει) but is poured out on the brother. About that brother it is passionately excited, about that brother it is wisely driven mad. (Quis dives salvetur 38,1)

For this reason he adds, "it does not behave disgracefully," for an image which is alien to it and not according to nature is disgraceful. But that which is feigned is alien to it, as is clearly explained, "it does not seek" it says, "what is not its own" (ου ζητει το μη εαυτης). For the truth calls its own that which is proper to it, but the love of adornment seeks what is alien to it, because it is separated from God, the word, and love. (Paedagogus 3,1,3,2)

Clement's use of the passage in both citations matches the form of the text cited, so his text is certain in both places.

Secondary adaptation to ευσ- is possible, though still not likely (see p. 229).

84 E.g., addition at 9:15, 17; 10:19; omission at 4:6; 6:9.


86 Cited by Schrage III, p. 298 n. 118.

87 A catena attributed to Origen cites the passage as τα εαυτης and argues that the kind of love may be compared to that of a mother or father for a child, or for the self-sacrificing love of Christ, which is described in a paraphrase of Phil. 2:6ff. Cited from Jenkins, p. 51.
The reading το μη εαυτης introduces a foreign element into the context, that of avoiding seeking after something that is not one's own. While such encouragement reflects pious thinking, e.g. in the Ten Commandments, it does not focus directly on the good of the other person, which is Paul's objective in this context.  

13:6.29 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

13:7.33

B reads παντα στεγει παντα στεγει, an obvious dittography. See also the discussion of B in the chapter on the "Alexandrian" witnesses for other examples of singular readings in B in 1 Cor. 13.

13:8.35 [see the discussion of B in the chapter on the "Alexandrian" witnesses]

13:8.36

𝔓46 and B frequently drop the compound from verbs (see discussion at 7:13.47). Here they are joined by several witnesses that typically align with them (𝔓* A C* 048 0151 0243 33 424° 436 1241* 1739). That Clement of Alexandria, who frequently agrees with these witnesses, reads ΕΚΠΙΠΤΕΙ (Qui dives salvetur 38,2) points to scribal difficulty unique to the NT manuscripts. Fee adopts ΠΙΠΤΕΙ on the basis of a strong semantic differentiation between two words, arguing that ΕΚΠΙΠΤΩ means "comes to an end."  

88B. Weiss (p. 103) dismisses the 𝔓46 B reading as "completely arbitrary" and an "impossible reading."

89Fee, p. 641 n. 1.
in the sense of “fail” also at Rom. 9:6,90 as is required by this context.91

13:8.37

δε is lost in several witnesses, including Ψ46 C* D* F G K P, the D-text, and the Vulgate. It is necessary in the context since a contrast is being drawn between διάπη, which “does not fail,” and various “gifts” held up by the Corinthians, which do fail. Its loss can be attributed, as at 13:11 and 13:12, to an accidental leap (€ΙΤ€Α€).92

13:8.38; 13:8.40; 13:8.41 [discussed in the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

13:9.42

A handful of witnesses write δε for γαρ (K L 049 056 0142 0151 88 424* 915 pc), which assimilates the conjunction to the δε used throughout 13:8-13. The γαρ is necessary in this sentence because it provides the ground for the argument that prophecies, tongues, and knowledge are only temporary.

13:10.43

The addition of τοτε is the result of influence from the two examples of the same word in the parallel at 13:12. While loss due to accidental leap is a possibility (ΤΟΤΕΤΟ), it would not explain its omission from D F G, which read το after καταργηθεται. It is

90Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἐκπίπτω (4).

91Harnack (Das hohe Lied, p. 148 n. 1) accepts ἐκπίπτει as the “better attested and more difficult reading.”

92This unit of variation is not discussed by Zuntz, even though it is shared by Ψ46 D* F G with only a few other witnesses. Güting and Mealand also overlooks this potential case of asyndeton in their Asyndeton in Paul.
missing from the entire Latin tradition, the early fathers (in particular Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4,9,2), and all Greek witnesses save those related to the "Byzantine text" (K L 049 etc). While the adverb (τότε) is present in both the Peshitta and Harklean, it is absent from the Syriac church fathers. The use of ὑστερον without a succeeding τότε is not common, but does occur elsewhere in 1 Corinthians (14:26; 16:3). Assimilation to the near context is a trait of the "Byzantine" witnesses, and appears to have been at work here.

13:10.44; 13:11.49

In the section 13:8-11, which is rife with parallelism and the assimilation which results in the manuscripts, two variations in word order are attested by D F G pc (13:10, 11). In such situations, assimilation to the word order of the near context would be considered the most likely cause of corruption, especially in these witnesses which frequently make similar alterations. However, in this context any of the potential readings may have arisen by assimilation. At 13:10 the verb stands first in the immediately preceding clause (13:10a), but εκ μερους begins the two preceding clauses in 13:9. Here D F G are joined by the Peshitta and Titus of Bostra in reading the verb at the beginning of the clause. Irenaeus (*Adversus*

---

93 Also Methodius, *Symposium* 9,1,241 and Didymus Alexandrinus, *Commentarii in Psalmos* 29-34 fol. 226; *In Genesim* fol. 163. Origen’s evidence is varied. *De enagstrimonytho* 9 reads the adverb, but not *Contra Celsum* 6,20. *Commentarii in Joannem* 20,304,36 reads κατί following τελειον.

94 Titus of Bostra (4th cen., two citations), Babai the Great (7th cen.), and the translations of Severus (6th cen.). Evidence cited from NTSU, p. 353.

95 Fee (p. 641 n. 4) argues that the addition would be logical, not temporal as is required by the context, but the insertion would match other Pauline examples; cf. BDAG, s.v. τότε (2).

96 *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, p. 353.
"haereses 4,9,2)" is the only Latin evidence prior to Augustine and Jerome to read the verb at the end of the clause. This again shows the close relationship among D F G, the Latin tradition, and the old Syriac. Nevertheless, in this case these witnesses are in error. The placement of the verb in the initial position appears to best match Pauline usage elsewhere. After a temporal clause which uses either δταν or δτε, the next clause typically uses the subject-verb (S-V) word order (Rom. 2:14; 6:20; 7:5; 1 Cor. 14:26; 15:28; 16:2; 2 Cor. 13:9). The reading καταργηθοσεται το εκ μερους has been assimilated to ελθη το τελειον. Lineation may have played a role here, as elsewhere. The predecessor of D F G read:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OTAN} & \text{AE \ EXEH TO TELEION} \\
\text{ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ} & \text{TO EK ΜΕΡΟΥΣ}
\end{align*}
\]

D, as is typical, highlights the parallelism even more:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OTAN} & \text{AE \ EXEH} \\
\text{TO TELEION} \\
\text{ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ} \\
\text{TO EK ΜΕΡΟΥΣ}
\end{align*}
\]

A further complication at 13:10 is the number of the article. A single letter distinguishes the singular (το) from the plural (τα), read by F G, most Latin witnesses, and both the Greek and the Latin of Irenaeus’ citation. The reading το may have resulted from assimilation to the singular verb (καταργηθοσεται). However, the plural cannot be correct in this context, for Paul is not discussing “the things in part” that will pass away, since indeed

\[\text{97 Both the Greek and the Latin are extant for this section; both agree in reading the plural τα / quae with F G and most of the rest of the Latin tradition.}\]

\[\text{98 Two passages use the V-S word order: Gal 4:4 and 1 Cor. 15:54, which introduces the second clause with τετε. Gal. 2:12, 14 have the verb in the initial position, but the subject is entailed in the verb form. 2 Cor. 12:12 places the predicate in the initial position, with the subject entailed in the verb. It should also be noted that Paul also typically uses object-verb word order, not verb-object (1 Cor. 16:3; 16:5; Gal. 2:11).}\]
knowledge will continue, though made perfect, when the "in part" passes away (13:12). It is unlikely that F G have simply made an error, comparable to τα αυτα for το αυτο at 12:25 without any Latin support, for the Latin tradition uses both the plural pronoun and the plural verb form (quaer ex parte sunt). Nor is it likely that the plural τα has been assimilated to τα του νηπιου at 13:11, for it seems unlikely that F G would assimilate the number of the verb without also assimilating the word order. Instead, assimilation likely took place in the Latin.

Quae parvulierant (13:11) either produced quae ex parte sunt at 13:11 or, perhaps more likely, an error in the Greek Vorlage of the Latin translation had the error τα for το (as in Irenaeus, which is an independent error) and translated the plural. The Greek predecessor of D F G and the Peshitta both avoid the same error, but F G take it up again by assimilation to the Latin.

While D F G etc are in error at 13:10, they preserve the archetypical word order at 13:11. At the end of 13:11, D F G and most of the Latin tradition again stand apart from the "Alexandrian" witnesses, though this time with the additional support of witnesses that frequently match D F G (Ψ 1611 syh). Furthermore, the earliest Latin evidence supports the D F G reading (Tertullian, De pudicitia 1,12). In addition as discussed below (13:11.46), the manuscripts related to Ν Α Β are in error in word-order variations in this verse. The same word order evidence discussed at 13:10 applies at 13:11. The S-V word order is typical for Paul, and there is no immediate parallel that would have influenced the layout of the predecessor of D F G, as was the case at 13:10. Furthermore, the word order τα του νηπιου κατηργηκα cannot have been influenced by the word order of 13:10, for there the same witnesses read the V-S word order.

13:11.45; 13:11.47
Δε is either added or omitted twice in 13:11. D⁷ alone adds δε after the first στε, likely by assimilation to σταν δε in the preceding sentence. However, addition by assimilation is not as certain after the second στε (lacking only in Ε² A B D⁷ 048 0243 6 424ε 1739), especially since such a narrow band of closely related witnesses attest the reading. Contextual and transcriptional probabilities further call the shorter text into doubt. In 13:9-12, Paul draws contrasts between former and present circumstances. Three of these four use δε to introduce the clause that describes the present condition. This leaves only the contrast made in 13:11 without δε. The highlighting that would result from this asyndeton, however, serves no purpose in this context, for why would attention be drawn only to this contrast? A more likely scenario is the δε has been accidentally lost after στε (ΟΤΕΑΕ). This is identical to the error made by Ε² at 13:12. Without any contextual or transcriptional argument in support of the shorter text, appeals made to the excellence of the witnesses that lack δε appear to be special pleading. Furthermore, D should not be relied upon when analyzing this type of variation, for it is unique in either adding or omitting δε is several places. It reads δε for αλα at 10:20, omits δε (with some Latin support) at 12:10, adds δε at 12:28, and, as noted above, adds δε earlier in 13:11. Its agreement with the "good Alexandrians" here may simply be a shared error, or perhaps another example of the correction toward "Alexandrian" witnesses which so frequently takes place in the Greek text of D.

13:11.46

A narrow band of witnesses, most of which are related to Ε A B (also 048 0150 0243

99 Only the second occurrence in 13:12 has any variation, where its absence is easily explained as accidental omission (see 13:12.55).

100 Eg., Zuntz, p. 189 n. 8; Fee, p. 641 n. 6; Güting and Mealand, p. 58.
places the verb before ως νηπιος in each clause. This is likely an accidental error in which the first ως νηπιος was skipped, the verb connected with the ως νηπιος that follows, and then the missing words written at the end. The argument of the passage supports the alternative reading, for the emphasis gained by standing in the first position belongs to ως νηπιος, not the verb. Comparison may be made to 13:9-10, where εκ μερους likewise stands before the verb in consecutive clauses.

13:11.48 [see 13:8.38]

13:12.50, 13:12.51

As Zuntz notes, asyndeton is “indeed suitable.” However, he explains the shorter text as haplography, noting that Ἡδρεια retains γαρ but omits αριτι, as he argues, also an example of haplography. However, the mistakes typical of Ἡδρεια should not be attributed to D F G, the entire Latin tradition (here including the Vulgate), and the Peshitta. Furthermore, the omission of αριτι is more likely than that of γαρ, since both by sight and by sound αριτι is easily lost (ἐλεπομένων ἀπρτήλη). In addition, while γαρ is occasionally lost by D* alone (1:19; 3:19), there is no example in 1 Corinthians of the conjunction being omitted by D F G and the Latin tradition against the other witnesses. Neither does haplography occur in D F G or in the Latin witnesses in other examples of ἢδραπ . . . (Rom. 13:3; Heb. 5:1; 8:3). In this case, however, the fact that γαρ is unemphatic has likely led to its omission, much like the

101 Zuntz, pp. 128-9; followed by Fee, p. 641 n. 5. A similar case of variation is the shifting position of η αγαπη at 13:4.

102 Zuntz, p. 193, noting also Mill’s similar argument in n. 193.

103 Followed by Güting and Mealand, p. 36 n. 45.
omission of ὅτι. There is no reason to add this conjunction when in this context it would not have its typical causative force. As Güting and Mealand (p. 97) note, “The manuscripts generally don’t add γὰρ very much,” likely precisely because it would introduce a logical relationship between clauses that would be foreign to the context.

13:12.52 [see also 9:20.74; 9:22.85]

The early versional and patristic evidence is split. The bulk of the Latin tradition, including VL 75, lacks the particle. This is followed by F G as well as virtually all the patristic evidence, including Origen and Didymus. However, ως is widely attested. It is firm in Clement’s text as well as that of Tertullian (Adversus Praxeans 14,8) and Methodius (Symposium 9,2,241). Among Greek manuscripts the particle is found prior to δι εὐστρεπου in D 0243, the “Western minuscules” 88 915, and several later witnesses that typically follow the Π B line of transmission, including 1175 1881 and, most significantly, 1739. The presence of ως following δι εὐστρεπου in a few witnesses (0150 5 33) may suggest that the particle is a secondary correction that was added in different locations. Because of the lack of cohesiveness and relatively late date of the witnesses that read ως in this location, it is better to interpret this reading as either shared error or correction, not access to an

---

104 See discussion at 7:8.28; notably, D F G omit unemphatic ὅτι at 10:20.

105 Both in works firmly attributed to him (Commentarii in Joannem 1,16,93; 2,37,229; 10,43,306; 13,10,58; Contra Celsum 7,38; 7,50; Exhortatio ad matryrium 7; De oratione 11,2) and all catenae citations.

106 Commentarii in Ecclesiasten fol. 171; Commentarii in Zacchariam 1,196.

107 Ως is read at Stromateis 1,19,94,2; 5,1,7,5; 5,11,74,1; only Excerpta Theodoti 1,15,2 lacks it.

108 Likely also an allusion by Basil, De fide MPG 31, p. 681.
extremely early form of the text. The addition of ως is therefore likely secondary, an attempt to soften the non-literal image of seeing “through a mirror.” Under similar circumstances, ως was added at 9:20 and 9:22 (though there it also stands in the near context; see the discussion *ad loc.*).

13:12.53

The omission of the second προσωπον is a nonsense reading that is further evidence of the close relationship between 056 and 0142.

13:12.55

The combination of similar sounds in TOTEΛΕ led to the accidental omission of either ΤΕ (Ν*') or ΔΕ (81 205 1243*). G* alone repeats εκ μερους following τοτε δε, perhaps by dittography (from επιγνωσατι back to εκ). The Latin interlinear (ex parte) was added, upon which point the scribe apparently noticed the error and wrote a line through εκ μερους. There is no indication in F of any difficulty here, so the error is limited to the copyist of G.

13:12.56 [discussed at 7:13.48]

13.12.57

The readings of several witnesses is uncertain here. D is damaged. Tischendorf, followed by Vogels,109 cites it as reading καιω; NTaP cites its reading as καιγω. Examination of photographs is inconclusive; given the reading of F G and the D-text, it is likely that καιγω is the proper reconstruction. Cyprian’s text (*Ad Quirinimum 3,53*) is equally uncertain. The

109"Codex Claromontanus," p. 278.
critical edition prints sicuti ego, but several manuscripts read sicut et, others sicut et ego, and
two simply sicut.

 Nonetheless, there is little question as to which reading is secondary. Paul rarely uses
unemphatic nominative εγώ, a usage which is similar to the Ptolemaic papyri. Furthermore,
accidental omission is possible (ΕΓΩΕΙΓΜΩ), but loss of the pronoun does not take place in
similar examples elsewhere (e.g., Rom. 11:19 εγώ εγκεντρισθώ). At the same time,
however, there is no apparent motive for the addition, since εγώ does not appear in the
context.

 The reading εγώ / ego (without καί) is found only in VL 75 and some manuscripts of
Cyprian. It must be an error, since Paul regularly uses adverbial καί immediately after
καθώς if the same verb is present in the two clauses which are being compared (see 10:7.23).

13:13.59

A transposition is shared by Ρ⁴⁶, Clement (Quis dives salvetur 38,2 and Stromateis
4,7,54,1) and the early Syriac tradition (Peshitta and Aphraat, Dem 1/33,4), which places τα
τρία ταύτα πριν το πιστίς ελπίς αγαπη. This is likely simply accidental error, one that is
common in Ρ⁴⁶. Many fathers omit the adjectival phrase altogether, indicating that it
may have been accidentally passed over and then reinserted after the nouns independently in

---

¹⁰Mayser II,1 p. 63.

¹¹The Vulgate manuscripts F and R omit et and ego.

¹²Royse, pp. 261-2 and 320.

¹³E.g., Rufinus, Origenis in librum Numeri 14,4; Tertullianus, De patientia 12;
Didymus, Fragmenta in Job 306.
several witnesses.\textsuperscript{114}

13:13.61

A few witnesses (6 255 2298) substitute παντῶν for τούτων. Since this substitution is common in the fathers,\textsuperscript{115} the alteration may have been directly influenced by familiarity with patristic texts or, more likely, a simple intensification of the comparative.

\textsuperscript{114}Metzger (\textit{Textual Commentary} p. 499) attributes the sequence of $\Psi^46$ to intentional conformity to "a much more commonplace sequence," though it must be noted that no precise parallel to this use of the demonstrative could be located in the NT.

Notes on Chapter 14

14:1.1 [discussed at 12:4.16]

14:1.2

Two minuscules replace πνευματικα with similar sounding words from the context: προφητικα from 14:1 (436) and χαρισματα from 12:28, 30, 31 (2004).

14:2.3; 14:4.12; 14:6.23; 14:18.83; 14:27.124

Variation involving the number of γλωσσα, in question five times in chapter 14, may be resolved by examining Paul's usage in 1 Cor. 12-14. When referring to a singular act of utterance the singular of γλωσσα is used (1 Cor. 14:9, 13, 14, 19, 26), whereas the plural form is used when the reference is to ecstatic utterances in general (12:10, 28, 30; 13:1, 8; 14:5 bis, 22, 23, 39). With this information the places of variation are easily resolved. At 14:2 and 4 Paul is discussed not the general activity of "speaking in tongues" but what happens in a specific utterance: When a person speaks in a tongue he "speaks not to people but to God" (14:2) and "builds oneself up" (14:4); the singular is required in both cases. At 14:2 D F G pc read the plural, though this stands against the singular lingua of the Latin tradition. At 14:4 D, joined by 181, again reads the plural against singular in the Latin. Both cases are likely assimilation to the same form at 12:28, 30; 13:1, 8; and 14:5 bis. 1 At 14:18 the plural form is required, since the discussion is regarding speaking in general and not a specific example of an utterance: "I rejoice that I speak in tongues more than all of you." Here γλωσσαις is not limited to a narrow band of witnesses (as at 14:2, 4), attested here by \( \text{N A D}^{4} \text{ F G} 33 \) and most

---

1B. Weiss, p. 16.
Latin witnesses. The singular may have been introduced based on the examples at 14:13, 14, or by assimilation to the singular subject (λαλω). While the “Byzantine” witnesses here preserve γλωσσαίς, they assimilate λαλω to the more common λαλων (14:2, 4, 6, 13).

Assimilation to the singular verb (ελθω) is also the likely cause of the singular γλωσση at 14:6 (1448 Sedulius Scottus) since the two examples of γλωσσαίς at 14:5 should have protected the plural. Hence the assimilation to the context for this type of variation was caused either by the same form in the context or by the number of the subject. Finally, at 14:27 the plural is read by 0150. Since the singular is necessary given Pauline usage, 0150's reading is probably a simple slip in conformity to the numerous occurrences of the plural in the chapter.

14:2.5 [discussed in chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

14:2.8 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:3.9 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:4.11 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:4.12 [discussed at 14:2.3]

14:4.14; 14:5.20 [also 8:6.21; 10:29.116]

The shift from the singular εκκλησια to the plural εκκλησιαίς takes place in 056 0142. This same pair fails to make the same shift to the plural in the next verse, though they

---

2B. Weiss, p. 16.

3Sedulius Scottus makes the same change by reading the singular lingua at 14:5b; he does not cite 14:5a.
drop the article before εκκλησία, as they do before πατήρ at 8:6 and with a few others before ετερού at 10:29. Lack of care in copying seems to be a trait of the shared predecessor of these witnesses.

F G add θεοῦ after εκκλησίαν, an assimilation to other examples of εκκλησία [τοῦ] θεοῦ in the letter (1 Cor. 1:2; 10:32; 11:16, 22; 15:9; all without variation involving θεοῦ). The unique addition in F G, however, may stem from the Latin. The addition of θεοῦ is not paralleled in the D-text, nor is dei found in VL 78. It is found, however, in two Vulgate mss.: S and V, the former of which is closely related to the local Vulgate text of St. Gall from this period and which formed the basis of the Latin text of VL 77.4 While this source is not certain, it does account for the addition in F G as well as the lack of the addition in VL 78.

Both the shift to the singular and the addition of θεοῦ may have taken place at 14:4, while not at 14:5, because 14:4 could be interpreted as a more general statement. At 14:4, those who “prophecy” may be able to “build up” more than a single assembly, whereas the interpretation of a specific “tongue” (14:5) would take place only in a single assembly. This is another example of scribal activity that indicates an awareness of the sense of the text in the process of copying, even if the alterations may not be strictly “intentional.”

14:5.15

Among several minor variations at this place are two which are either early or cannot be dismissed as insignificant. First, Ƥ46 loses of the final sigma from παντας, which, though it construes, does not suit the argument of this section (“I desire that you speak all things in tongues”). Second, A 547 read υμᾶς παντας for παντας υμᾶς. The former word order is

---

4 Frede, Alttlateinischen Paulus-Handschriften, pp. 54-59. Another manuscript related to this local text (Φ7), however, does not have the addition.
never found in Paul, while the latter is firm in seventeen places in the *Corpus Paulinum*; with only B at Phil. 2:26 reading the pronoun prior to the adjective. The alteration in A was likely caused by a leap, with παντας initially skipped but then immediately added after υμας. Another word order variation occurs in A (joined by 547) with the next words: γλωσσαις λαλειν is written for λαλειν γλωσσαις. The scribe of A has frequently shown difficulty with word order.6

14:5.16 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:5.17 [discussed at 12:31.125]

14:5.18 [also discussed in chapter on D F G]

Transcriptional probabilities are balanced here. The smoother reading is γαρ, since it makes clear that 14:5b is the ground for the statement of 14:5a. On the other hand, δε may have been written here under the influence of the same conjunction in the two preceding clauses. Given the fact that D F G and the “Byzantine” text tend to prefer conjunctions that clarify the relationships among the clauses (see also 15:50.199), γαρ is likely secondary.

14:5.19

The unique readings attested by the 0243 6 424c 1739 group and the D F G and the Latin tradition help to clarify the relationship among these witnesses. Discussions of those interrelations are found in the appropriate conclusions. The addition of τις (0243 1739; 6

—

5Rom. 1:8; 15:33; 1 Cor. 14:18; 16:24; 2 Cor. 2:3, 5; 7:13, 15 (υμων Ν'); 13:13; Gal. 3:28 (απαντες Ν A B2); Phil. 1:4, 7, 8. 25; 2:17, 26 (υμας παντας B; πεμψαι προς υμας 

6Further examples are provided at 14:33.148.
reads τι) and the shift to the participle (διερμηνευών D* (ἡ o διερμηνευών F G) both, in
their own way, create a different description of what is entailed in “speaking in tongues” and
“interpreting.”” In the standard text, the one who speaks in tongues is also the one who
interprets. This is the way the situation is described by Origen (in catena): “But if the one
who speaks in tongues also has the act of interpretation for the building up of the church, the
one who prophesies is no longer greater.”8 This understanding of the situation coheres with
the description in 14:13 (where there is no variation). There is a prima facie contradiction
with other passages in this context. At 12:30 a distinction is made: ”not everyone” speaks in
tongues and “not everyone” interprets. Again at 14:28 there is an “interpreter” of the
speaking, though the passage does not explicitly state that the speaker and the interpreter
must be two different people. In light of 14:13, where the one speaking in tongues is
encouraged to pray for the gift of interpreting what that same person has spoken,9 the
conclusion that the interpreters in 12:30 and and 14:28 are necessarily different from the one
speaking in tongues cannot be sustained.10

Nevertheless, the readings of 0243 6 1739 and D F G distinguish the speaker and the

7Schrage III, p. 389 n. 72.

8Origen, Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios, fr. 54. Cf. also
Ambrosiaster: “Because if he will be able to be interpret, he will not be less, because he
builds up the church. This one is greater, because he reveals to all. For here he who speaks in
tongues by the gift of God is also he who interprets, as did those Twelve in the Acts of the
Apostles.” (In epistula ad Corinthios prima, ad loc. 1 Cor. 14:5); Chrysostom: “For he adds
also, ‘Unless he interprets,’ because if he is able to this, I mean the act of interpreting, he has
become equal to a prophet, Paul says, because many reap the benefit of it.” (In epistulam I ad
Corinthios, MPG 61, p. 297).

9Cf. Also Ambrosiaster on 14:13: “The one who seeks to speak in tongues ought to
pray that he might receive the gift of interpretation, so that his effort might be useful to
others.”

10Fee, First Corinthians, p. 659 n. 39; Conzelmann, p. 235.
interpreter. This may have been influenced, at least indirectly, by the interpretation of 1 Cor. 12:30 and 14:28. More likely, however, is that both of those passages and, in these witnesses, 14:5, were understood against the development of an understanding of γλώσσα
διερμηνεύειν. As discussed above, Origen, Ambrosiaster, and Chrysostom all understood διερμηνεύη 14:5 to refer to the one speaking in tongues. However, at least by the time of Theodoret the “interpretation of tongues” is understood to refer to the interpretation or translation of foreign languages. Citing 1 Cor. 12:10 he writes:

But to another is given the interpretation of tongues” (ἐρμηνεύα γλώσσαν). For this also was a spiritual gift. For often a man who knows only the Greek language, but the Scythian and Thracian of another language, carried forth the interpretation to those who heard. So everywhere he put forth “according to the same Spirit, and in the same Spirit” teaching as if through different water spouts but one source of all.11

This understanding of “the interpretation of tongues” is then applied to “speaking in tongues” – which becomes “speaking in foreign languages – for example in Cyril of Alexandria. This line of interpretation continues through the middle ages and into the Renaissance and Reformation periods.12

But did our scribes interpret the passage in this way? There is direct evidence of such in the case of G. At 1 Cor. 12:28 and 12:30, which note the gifts of “kinds of tongues” and “interpretations,” is written the name “Iso.”13 Iso (d. 871) was a celebrated teacher at St. Gall, where G was copied.14 This may indicates that Iso was a teacher of Greek. Frede goes so far

11Theodoret, Interpretationes in Pauli epistulas MPG 82, p. 325.

12Thiselton, pp. 974-5.

13Though separated by only two lines, “Iso” is spelled ΓΥΣΩ at 12:28 and ΓΙΣΩ at 12:30, further evidence of the inconsistency of spelling in G.

as to suggest that Iso was responsible for a Greek-Latin Psalter produced at St. Gall, ms. 17.\textsuperscript{15}

Of course, the shift to the participle in the bilinguals occurred prior to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, as evidenced by the reading of D. Nevertheless, G shows the continued understanding of “interpretation of tongues” which likely led to the alteration at 14:5.

As discussed in the conclusions, the 1739 group and the shared bilingual ancestor of D F G all postdate the end of the third century. This is chronologically distant enough from Paul’s context for a developed understanding of διερμηνεύω to have influenced the understanding – and transmission – of this passage.

14:6.21 [discussed at 5:11.30]

14:6.22 [discussed at 6:5.15]

14:6.23 [discussed at 14:2.3]

14:6.24

A narrow band of witnesses (κ 0243 6 33 424\textsuperscript{e} 1739; Ψ\textsuperscript{46} lac) lacks the first particle in a series of contrasted elements. This, however, matches typical Pauline usage (Rom. 8:35; 1 Cor. 5:10; Eph. 5:5, 27; Col. 2:16; 1The. 2:19 and likely 1 Cor. 5:1\textsuperscript{16}). When the first contrasted element is marked with a particle, Paul uses either ητοι . . . η (Rom.6:16) or εἴτε . . . εἴτε (1 Cor. 3:22; 10:31; 12:13; Col. 2:16). The addition of η before εν αποκαλυψει has probably been prompted by the use of the particle in the following elements. At Eph. 5:4, the same witnesses (A D F G etc) alter καί . . . καί . . . η to η . . . η . . . η, which again changes

\textsuperscript{15}Frede, Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften, pp. 78-9.

\textsuperscript{16}The η preceding πορνος could be either the verb ἡ or the particle η; NA\textsuperscript{27} and the Latin tradition (which does not translate it) understand it as the verb, which is likely correct.
first particle to match those that follow.

14:6.26

The εν was likely added before διδοχη, as B. Weiss, describes, as the result of "mechanical conformity" to the preceding three examples in the sentence. In addition, it removes the potential ambiguity of the use of the dative, a cause of the addition of εν at 14:11 (see below). Only a handful of witnesses avoid the insertion: Π46 and relatives Ν* 0243 216 630 1739 1881, but also D* F G. The Latin tradition, however, adds the preposition, which the predecessor of D F G managed to avoid bringing into the Greek.

14:7.27

B alone frequently alters the number of substantives. This has already been observed at 13:5 (το μη εωτης; with Clement) and 13:8 (προφητεια καταργηθησεται). At 1 Cor. 14:7, Weiss notes also that the singular "gives the same thought as τοις φθογγοις, but overlooks that it not dealing with the tone intervals at all, but the distinction which is given to the tones brought out by the instrument through the intervals." This is not the only place that B F G virtually alone omit the article. They do so in error before παντα (with also 33) at 12:19 (see discussion ad loc), and almost certainly in error at 11:3. Because D reads the article, it is likely that F G lose the article and hence

---

17B. Weiss, p. 108.

18VL 89 avoided the preposition by using the accusative doctrinam, but omitted the preposition and used the accusative for the two previous nouns as well: aut scientiam aut prophetiam aut doctrinam.

19B. Weiss (p. 17) notes two other singular readings in B: Heb. 1:14 (διακονιας) and 8:9 (εν ημεραις).

20B. Weiss, p. 17.
independently produced an error also found in B, rather than the combination of B F G reaches back to an early point in the tradition. Finally, the loss of the final -ν of διατολῆν by F G is an error common in the papyri\textsuperscript{21} and, given the frequent misspellings in these witnesses, likely accidental.

In addition D’ F G read μη after εαν rather than before the verb.\textsuperscript{22} Of the twelve other examples of εαν . . . μη in the Corpus Paulinum, only at 1 Cor. 14:6 does εαν μη not immediately preceded the verb, and even there only υμιν stands between εαν μη and λαλησω.\textsuperscript{23} It is therefore difficult to establish a “tendency” either in Paul or in the manuscripts. Only at 14:7 did the manuscripts have the opportunity either to connect μη to εαν (as D’ F G) or to move μη before the verb (all other Greek witnesses). Elsewhere we have seen the manuscripts add a negative particle to the position prior to the verb (6:10\textsuperscript{24}) for clarification. However, in this case it is more likely that D’ F G have been affected by the Latin nisi distinctionem.


The tenses of several verbs are assimilated in these deliberative questions. At 14:7b, the present διδω (𝔓\textsuperscript{46} D\textsuperscript{2} L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0289 33 424\textsuperscript{r} pc) matches διδοντα in the preceding clause. However, the aorist form should be used, since the question of 14:7 (εαν . . . μη δω) is structurally parallel to that of 14:6 (εαν μη . . . λαλησω). At 14:7c, D’ F

\textsuperscript{21}Gignac I, pp. 111-12; Mayser 1,1, pp. 169-71.

\textsuperscript{22}The reading εαν μη is apparently supported also by 1424; 2400 reads μη both after εαν and before δω.

\textsuperscript{23}1424 shifts μη to the position prior to the verb: εαν υμιν μη λαλησω.

\textsuperscript{24}B D avoid the addition here, as do also Ψ\textsuperscript{46} Α C 6 424\textsuperscript{g} 1739 pc; F G are not extant here.
G alone reading the aorist γνωσθη in place of the future γνωσθησεται / scietur. While the aorist is common in deliberative questions, the future is typically used with πως. The reading of D* F G may be explained as assimilation to the aorist δω in the preceding clause, perhaps made more likely be the fact the γνωσθησεται is easily shortened to γνωσθη. Similarly, the loss of the termination is likely to explain the shortening of the second person δωτε (14:9) to the third person δω in L, a form found also at 14:8.

The variation between ευλογησης and ευλογης at 14:16 presents a more difficult problem. As at 14:7, there is confusion of similar verb forms. Further examples are seen at 2:8 (εγνωκεν / εγνω Ψ46); 8:2 (εγνω / εγνωκεν D2 K L 056 0142 0151), 13:3 (παραδω / παραδωσω F G); 15:29 (ποιησουσιν / ποιουσιν F G); 15:22 (ζωοποιηθησονται / ζωοποιησονται Α*vid); 15:24 (παραδιδω / παραδω K L 0243 1739*) and 15:57 (διδοντι / δοντι Ψ46 D 049 056 0142 6 424 pc). Assimilation to the same tense in the near context is the usual cause of corruption in these examples, an error to which Ψ46 D F G appear to be prone. At 14:16 Ψ46 D F G K L Ψ pm, supported by the Latin tradition, read the aorist ευλογησης. However, apart from the concluding clause of 14:19, only present tense verbs are used in 14:12-19. On this basis the present form ευλογης may be considered secondary, especially when noting, as described above, that the aorist is typical in deliberative questions. However, the parallel at 14:14 (εαν προσευχομαι) uses the present tense, which would make the present more likely at 14:16. Comparison may also be made to alteration of the tense in deliberative questions elsewhere in 1 Cor. 14. At 14:14 Chrysostom writes the aorist

---

25 BDR §366(1)6. Paul uses the future at Rom. 3:6; 1Cor. 14:9, 16; the aorist at 1 Cor. 7:32, 33, 34 (all the same form) and 1 The. 1:9.

26 Cf. εγνω (F G) for εγνωκεν at 2:11.

27 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 667 n. 2.
προσευξώματα\textsuperscript{28} and at 14:24 a few witnesses (0150 pc) write the aorist προφητευσώσιν in place of the present forms.

14:7.30; 14:9.38

0243 1739 are joined by 33 614 999 1424 in altering οὐλομένον to the λαλομένον of 14:9, while Ψ\textsuperscript{66-29} and 0150 read οὐλομένον at 14:9. The first must have been an intentional alteration, bringing the earlier passage into harmony with the second. Both alterations, however, are clearly secondary in context, for a flute does not "speak," nor does a voice "pipe." Ψ at 14:9 has a further assimilation to 14:7, adding the phrase η το κιθαριζομένον to το λαλομένον.

14:8.33

The reading αδηλον φωνην σαλπιγξ (B F G K Ψ 6 915) places the adjective next to the noun it modifies, making it the less difficult reading.\textsuperscript{30} The alternative, to place the subject between the adjective and the noun it modifies, is attested nowhere else. However, the focus in this clause is the lack of distinction in the sound of the trumpet, so the adjective should be in the emphatic initial position.

14:9.35; 14:18.82; 14:37.167

All further examples of plural pronouns written for the singular in 1241\textsuperscript{8}.

14:9.37 [discussed at 14:7.28]

\textsuperscript{28}Joannes Chrysostomus, \textit{Homiliae in i Corinthios} MPG 61, p. 147.

\textsuperscript{29}The reading of Ψ\textsuperscript{66} is corrected by the first hand.

\textsuperscript{30}B. Weiss, p. 130.
There is a marked tendency to the addition of prepositions, and of \( \epsilon \nu \) in particular:

\[
\begin{align*}
1:5 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \pi \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \ 33 \ 103 \ 162 \ ] \ \pi \alpha \sigma \ \text{cett} \\
2:3 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \phi \sigma \omega \ \text{cett} \ ] \ \phi \sigma \omega \ \text{F G 614 1812 2147 2412} \\
2:3 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \tau \rho \omicron \omega \ \text{cett} \ ] \ \tau \rho \omicron \omega \ \text{D F G 1827} \\
2:3 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \pi \omicron \lambda \lambda \omicron \ \Psi^{46} \ ] \ \pi \omicron \lambda \lambda \omicron \ \text{cett} \\
9:18 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \tau \eta \ \varepsilon \xi \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \iota \omicron \text{cett} \\
9:19 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \pi \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \ \text{D VL 75 \ ] \ } \pi \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \\
10:8 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \mu \iota \ \text{cett} \ ] \ \mu \iota \ \Psi^{46} \ \kappa \ \beta \ \delta \ \text{F G} \\
14:6 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi \ \text{cett} \ ] \ \delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi \ \Psi^{46} \ \kappa \ \beta \ \delta \ \text{F G 0243 1739} \\
14:10 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \tau \omicron \ \kappa \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \text{D' F G K pc} \ ] \ \tau \omicron \ \kappa \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \text{cett} \\
14:11 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \epsilon \mu \omicron \ \text{cett} \ ] \ \epsilon \mu \omicron \ \Psi^{46} \ \text{D F G 049 0150 0243 5 6 88 424e 1739 pc} \\
14:16 & \quad \epsilon \nu \ \pi \nu \varepsilon \omicron \mu \mu \mu \omicron \ \kappa \ \beta \ \delta \ \text{D' P pc} \ ] \ \kappa \ \lambda \ \psi \ \text{1739 pm} \ ] \ \Psi^{46} \ \kappa \ \beta \ \delta \ \text{A F G 0150 0243 0289vid}
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \Psi^{46} \ \text{D F G} \) frequently add the preposition, it is striking that they avoid the additions at 10:8, 14:6, 11, 16 (in the latter three passages joined by 0243). Zuntz claims that the omission at 14:11 is the result of assimilation the lack of a preposition before \( \tau \omicron \ \lambda \alpha \omicron \upsilon \nu \tau \upsilon \) in the previous clause. The parallelism of the two passages is obvious, as Chrysostom (who does not read \( \epsilon \nu \)) points out.\(^{31}\) However, assimilation by excision is not typical of scribes; the examples pointed out above bear this out.\(^{32}\) Instead, another motive is likely in involved. BDR suggests that the addition of \( \epsilon \nu \) was made to prevent \( \epsilon \mu \omicron \) from being construed with \( \omicron \ \lambda \alpha \omega \nu \nu \).\(^{33}\) This matches Pauline usage in that the indirect object of \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \omicron \nu \nu \) is always a dative

\(^{31}\)After citing 14:11a, he writes: “Next, that he may not render the charge grievous, he makes equal the complaint . . .” and then cites 14:11b. Joannes Chrysostomus, Homiliae in i Corinthios MPG 61, p. 299.

\(^{32}\)The only clear example found in 1 Corinthians of assimilation by omission of \( \epsilon \nu \) is 9:18 \( \tau \omicron \ \epsilon \upsilon \omicron \gamma \gamma \epsilon \upsilon \omicron \lambda \omicron \) (81 614).

\(^{33}\)BDR § 220\(^{1}\).
without \( \epsilon \nu \),\(^{34} \) hence the presence of \( \epsilon \nu \) before \( \epsilon \mu o \) prevents it from being wrongly construed. It is more likely an addition to example made to prevent ambiguity rather than an omission which creates it. Similar motivation may be found for the addition at 14:6. The only reading which can serve as the source for the other two is \( \pi \nu e u m a t i \) (\( \Psi^{16} A F G 0150 0243 0289^{\text{vid}} \)). \( \tau o \) \( \pi \nu e u m a t i \) (K L \( \Psi \) \( \text{pm} \)) is based on the same form at 14:15,\(^{35} \) while the addition of \( \epsilon \nu \) (K\( ^2 \) B D\( ^1 \) P \( \text{pc} \)) makes certain that the dative is understood as instrumental, perhaps influenced by the examples in chapter 12 (12:3, 9, 13).

14:10.44; 14:26.120

   The \( \omega d e \nu \) at 14:10 is left ambiguous; it may refer either to languages, none of which are unintelligible, or to people, none of whom do not have a language. In this context the latter is more likely.\(^{36} \) The addition of \( \alpha w t o \nu \) (\( \Psi^{2} D^{2} K L \Psi 049 056 0142 01518 \) \( \text{pm} \)) supplies the implied referent, so that Paul’s argument is to be understood to say that all people speak.\(^{37} \) Schrage observes that the Vulgate’s \textit{nihil sine voce est} (followed also by the Latin fathers) assumes this interpretation as well.\(^{38} \) The ambiguity of the bare \( \omega d e \nu \) makes it more likely that \( \alpha w t o \nu \) was added than that it was accidentally omitted.

Likewise at 14:26, bare \( \epsilon k a s t o c \) could be interpreted to include \( \tau i s \) \( \epsilon p i s t o c \) \( \tilde{n} \)

\(^{34} \)E.g., 1 Cor. 3:1; 14:3, 6, 28; 15:34; 2 Cor. 7:14; 12:4. No examples of \( \epsilon \nu + \) dative as indirect object of \( \lambda o l e o \) have been located in Paul. The addition of \( \mu o i \) to \( \tau o \) \( \lambda o l o u n t i \) at 14:11a in several minuscules, including 104 365 1611, shows this same usage.

\(^{35} \)Compare also the addition of \( \tau o \) before both \( \theta e o \) and \( \pi \nu e u m a t i \) (\( \Psi^{2} A D^{2} \Psi 0243 \) \( \text{pm} \)) at 14:2.

\(^{36} \)Fee, \textit{First Corinthians}, p. 665, n. 37; Schrage III, p. 395.

\(^{37} \)Schrage III, p. 395, n. 115.

\(^{38} \)Schrage III, p. 395 n. 114.
\(\delta\iota\iota\omega\tau\varsigma\) (14:24-25). The addition of \(\upsilon \mu \omega \nu\) is attested by the entire Latin tradition, the bilinguals, and the "Byzantine" text. However, because it also removes the ambiguity of the word it modifies it is likely secondary.

14:11.46

\(\varepsilon \iota\) in P alone is the result of assimilation to the same word at 14:10.

14:11.46

\(\Phi\) loses \(\sigma \omicron \nu\), as Royse notes probably by a leap.\(^{39}\)

14:11.48 [discussed at 8:2.4]

14:12.53; 14:32.145

Paul occasionally uses \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omicron\omega\alpha\) as metonymy to described the manifestations of the activity of the Spirit among the Corinthians (5:3-4; 14:14). The plural form caused particular difficulty. At 14:12 P 1175 sy\(\upartial\) alter \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omega\mu\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) to the literal \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omega\mu\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\), while Amst(A) writes the singular \(\textit{spiritus}\). The move to the singular is made again at 14:32 by D F G \(\Psi\) 424\(\epsilon\) and much of the Latin tradition,\(^ {40}\) making clear that only one Spirit is able to produce such manifestations. Other examples of the confusion of the singular and plural of neuter nouns are discussed at 12:9.32.

14:12.56

"Abounding" is a goal to which Paul encourages the Corinthians (8:8; 15:58), but in

---

\(^{39}\)Royse, p. 258. Güting and Mealand (p. 141) mark the omission as secondary without comment.

\(^{40}\)D F G and the Latin tradition at 14:32 are further discussed in the chapter on D F G.
this context of encouraging προφητεία rather than λαλεῖν γλώσσαίς, it is not surprising that
scribes made the shift from περισσεύτε to the similar-sounding προφητεύτε (A I pc).  
Ambrosiaster makes the same alteration, though the phonological similarity does not exist in
Latin (prophetetis for abundetis).

14:13.57

Διόπερ is firm in the Corpus Paulinum only at 1 Cor. 8:13. At 10:14, 440 and 547
read διό (omit 1898) and at 14:13 primarily “Byzantine” witnesses read διοπερ.  
By the
Hellenistic period both διό and διοπερ function as a particle and no longer as a relative.  
The two certain examples of διοπερ function to introduce major concluding statements,
while at 14:13 διό would suit the flow of argument better, since it has less an inferential than
a transitional force than does διοπερ.

14:13.59 [noted at 8:9.39]

14:14.60

B Weiss argues that γάρ is frequently accidentally lost, citing Phil. 1:23 and 1 Cor.
14:14 as specific examples where it was lost due to scribal carelessness.  
However, in both
places the γάρ removes ambiguity by creating a logical relationship with the previous

---

41Zuntz, p. 113, n. 3.

42Although here the “Family 1739” witnesses split: 6 424 read διοπερ, 0243 1739
read διό.


44B. Weiss, p. 120.
This took place in similar witnesses at 1 Cor. 14:5 (γαρ for δε), and γαρ has been added by ν at 4:4 and 11:14.

14:15.67; 14:15.70 [discussed in chapter on D F G]


Variation involving δε και is common in the Corpus Paulinum:

Rom. 3:29 δε και L P Ψ 049 056 6 33 88 424 ] και Ν Α Β Δ Φ Γ Κ
Rom. 8:34 δε και Ψ46 D F Γ K 049 056 Ψ 88 424 1739 ] δε Ν Α Β C 489
1 Cor. 1:22 επειδὴ δε και 0150 ] επει F G ] επειδὴ Ψ46 ] επειδὴ και cett
1 Cor. 14:15 δε και (1) Ν Α Β Δ Ψ L Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0243 1739 ] και F G K P 0151
1 Cor. 14:15 δε και (2) Ν Α Δ Ψ K L P 048 049 056 0142 6 424 1739 ] και Β F G 0150 0151*
1 Cor. 14:23 δε και Ψ46 0150 0201 88 915 pc Vgms ι και cett
1 Cor. 15:6 τίνες δε και Ν2 A2 D2 L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 33 88 ] τίνες δε Ψ46 Ν* Ανυδ B D F Ψ 0243 6 424c 1739 ] τίνες δε εξ αυτων και K
1 Cor. 15:14 κενη δε και D2 K L Ψ 049 0151 6 424 489 pm ] κενη και Ψ46 Ν Α Β Δ Ψ F G P 0150 0243 0270 ] κενη δε 056 0142
1 Cor. 15:15 δε και cett ] και D* 2495
2 Cor. 5:16 ει δε και Ν2 C2 D2 Ψ pm ] ει δε K ] ει και Ψ46 Ν* Α Β Ν* 0225 0243 33 1739 ] και ει F G
2 Cor. 13:9 δε και Ν2 D2 K L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0151 ] και Ψ46 Ν* Α Β Δ* F G

Where δε is in question, the issue is whether or not there is a contrast being drawn, in which case the δε should be read. It appears to be secondary at Rom. 3:29; 2 Cor. 3:16; and 13:9.

Where και is in question, the issue is whether it is conjunctive or ascensive (adverbial). At Rom. 8:34, the work of Christ is described in a series of short clauses. Και is firm in the

---

45Zuntz, p. 194.

46Güting and Mealand (p. 141) list the addition of γαρ at 14:14 as secondary without comment.

47At Rom. 3:29, the first question does not contrast with the first, but builds upon it; ει και at 2 Cor. 3:16 provides the necessary concessive force; and at 2 Cor. 13:9 it may have been added to match δε in the preceding clause.
fourth and final clause in the series (ος και εν τη χαριτωμα υπερ ημων). B lacks και in the second clause (before εγερθεις) but reads it before εστιν. Although this is the reading of the NA27 text, it is unlikely to be original, for why would the second clause only lack the ascensive και? B’s text is more likely the result of conflation. NA C 0289 have made several clarifying alterations to the passage, adding εκ νεκρων after εγερθεις and deleting και in the second and third clauses (before εγερθεις and εστιν). On the other hand, Ψ46 D F G and the “Byzantine” text read και in all three places, which corresponds to the same use of και in a similar series of clauses at 1 Cor. 15:4-5. The reading of B, then, can be attributed either to simple blunder or to a partial correction from the NA C text back to the Ψ46 D F G text. This handling of the text by B is paralleled at 1 Cor. 14:15, where δε και is read at 14:15b but και only at 14:15c – and again here B alone attests this combination of readings.48 Indeed, the witness of 0151 here shows what probably took place in B: The original hand of 0151 accidentally drops the second δε, which is added back in the correction.49 Because B betrays the same alteration both at 1 Cor. 14:15 and at Rom. 8:34, it cannot be correct in either place.

The singular reading of B at 1 Cor. 14:15 is incorrect, but whether και or δε και should be read twice in that passage must still be determined. The loss of the first δε in KP and the second in B 0150 0151* are both likely accidental, which leaves only F G, the Latin tradition, and the Peshitta with only και in both places. This makes clear that praying and

---

48 B. Weiss attributes B’s loss of δε at 1 Cor. 14:15 to scribal blunder (p. 118), but accepts its readings at Rom. 8:34 as the only possible source for both the Ψ46 D F G and NA C 0289 readings (p. 111). However, Weiss does not notice the intentional alteration shown by NA C 0289 elsewhere in this passage.

49 Accidental loss of και after δε takes place in D* at 1 Cor. 15:15.
singing with the spirit and doing the same with the mind or both encouraged activities, but
removes the contrast placed on "with my mind," a contrast that the context requires (cf. ἀλλα at 14:19).

At 1 Cor. 15:14, the addition of καί after ἀρα (N A D F G K P 049 0151) creates a
"both . . . and" relationship between 15:14b 15:14c, so that both are "empty" if "Christ is not
raised." The conclusion of this section (15:18) provides the only other example of ἀρα καί
in Paul, which may have suggested the addition at 15:14. The δὲ καί following κενη at
15:14c (D² K L Ψ 049 0151; δὲ 056 0142), likely suggested by δὲ καί in the next clause
(15:15), makes clear that this clause is logically dependant on the preceding, a relationship
that had been lost with the addition of καί after ἀρα.

The "Byzantine" witnesses add καί after δὲ at 1 Cor. 15:6. The result is an emphasis
on the statement that "even" (or "also") some eyewitnesses of the resurrection have fallen
asleep. While the emphasis on the final clause may anticipate the argument that begins at
15:12, such an emphasis is not in view in the immediate context, which focuses on the
"objective reality" of Christ's resurrection. There does not appear to be any obvious
motivation for its deletion. However, its insertion can be attributed either to a preference for
δὲ καί, which is found four other times in Byzantine witnesses against all others, or to an
attempt to clarify Paul's argument. καί is also secondary at 1 Cor. 14:23 (𝔓⁴⁶ 0150 0201 88
915 pc; several Vulgate mss.), for it clarifies the logical relationship between 14:23a and
14:23b. Bare δὲ could be misunderstood as contrastive.

14:16.72 [discussed at 14:7.28]

---

50 Fee, First Corinthians, pp. 731-31.
The reading of F G, ἐταίρος for ἐτερος, appears to be a simple phonological error common to this pair of witnesses. ἐταίρος does not suit the context, neither is it used elsewhere in Paul. The reading is not matched by any of the Latin tradition (which reads alius or alter) but does find a partner in the Peshitta’s ܢܝܢܐ. With some Latin support one may be tempted to posit an early shared error, but it is more likely an independent error in the Peshitta later matched by the direct predecessor of F G.

Zuntz argues that the textual tradition has been turned upside-down in this unit of variation, in which the “Byzantine” text preserves the oldest reading, while ܡܝܐ, the earliest
witness, attests a reading that is three or four steps removed from the archetype. His argument is based on Marcion's reading, δια τον νομον, which he claims (as did Mill) is a corruption of δια του νοος μου. In this reconstruction, an intermediary witness wrote δια του νομου. The genitive, however, does not construe in this context, so this was corrected to the reading now attested only by Marcion. This reconstruction gains additional support in TuT, which happily cites 1107 with this precise reading (δια του νομου). Whether a late corruption or a vestige of a previously lost reading, 1107 at least shows that such a corruption is possible. According to Zuntz, then, τω νοι μου (N A B D' P Ψ 0150 0243 1739 sy') is a secondary assimilation to 14:15, with the addition of εν (P 46) a further assimilation to εν γλωσση in the final clause of 14:19. However, Zuntz is misled in some of his data, which impacts his analysis of this unit.

Based on Holt's edition of Epiphanius' *Panarion*, Zuntz argues that Marcion's text (δια τον νομον) is a conflation of the Ν B reading and the Byzantine reading. This would place Marcion's text at least two steps removed from the archetype. However, Schmid has shown that Holl misunderstood the passage in Epiphanius and inserted both μετα το and προσεθετο (as well as λαλησαι) to make it appear that Epiphanius reads δια τον νομον "after" (as an addition to) rather than as a replacement for τω νοι μου. Therefore, Marcion's reading cannot provide evidence for what Zuntz describes as "the collation of

---

51 Zuntz, p. 230.

52 Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos* p. 189. Clabeaux, *Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul* (pp. 111, 136, and 155) accepts Holl's reconstruction; however, Schmid is certainly correct here. The conflation is actually found in the Book of Armagh (VL 61), two manuscripts of another Irish witness, Pelagius, and perhaps the Vulgate witness Z* (a corrector erases per legem). The role of the Latin witnesses is discussed below.
different manuscripts before Marcion’s time.” Instead, Marcion’s reading ΔΙΔΟΝΟΜΟΝ is simply a scribal corruption of ΔΙΔΟΝΟΟΜΟΥ.

In addition to the corruption attested by Marcion, the early origin of the reading δια τοῦ νοοῦ μου is demonstrated in the Latin tradition. Most significantly, the reading of VL 75, loqui per sensum meum, can only be a rendering of δια τοῦ νοοῦ μου λαλησαί. In 1 Corinthians, 75 renders every example of δια + genitive with per + accusative, while every example of δια + accusative is always rendered with propter + accusative. Examples of dativus instrumentalis are rare in the NT. However all the examples of γλωσσή / ταῖς γλώσσαις in 1 Cor. 14:1-13 are rendered by 75 with the simple dative. Furthermore, other Latin witnesses also read a form of lex. Ambrosiaster and VL 89, both of which but especially the latter show close affinities to the text of 75, read loqui per legem. This reading can only be based on the Greek corruption now attested only in Marcion, for it is impossible to see per legem as a corruption of per sensum meum. Paulinus of Nola (†431) has a slightly different form: in lege. This may be either the vestige of a corruption of εν τω νοι (perhaps

53 Zuntz, p. 231.

54 Clabeaux (Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul, p. 111) cites a conversation with H. J. Frede in which the latter saw δια τοῦ νοον as a corruption of τω νοι μοι.

55 1 Cor. 1:1, 10, 21 (bis); 2:10; 3:15; 4:15; 6:14; 7:2, 26; 10:1; 11:12; 12:8; 15:57.

56 1 Cor. 4:10; 7:5; 9:23; 10:25, 27; 11:9. Latin particles are used for certain phrases: ideo (4:17) and propterēa (11:30) for δια τουτο; quare (6:7 bis) for δια τι.

57 BDR §195.

58 Unfortunately, the leaf containing the 75’s text of 1 Cor. 14:7-18 has been destroyed. However, for ο δε νος μου at 14:14 no Latin witness reads a preposition: mens autem mea 77 78 89 V; sed mens mea 76 Or Amst(A); again at 14:15 [δε] και τω νοι the Latin witnesses consistently read et mente; and for πνευματι (14:15, 16) all Latin witnesses read spiritu.

59 Epistula 23,36.
missing the μου) rather than διά του νοος μου, or simply a paraphrase of the passage. In addition, several Latin witnesses do attest the conflation that has been shown to be wrongly attributed to Marcion. Now that Marcion’s text is properly reconstructed, several Latin witnesses can be added to his evidence for an early corruption. The reading διά του νοος μου is not, therefore, speaking, an exclusively “Byzantine” reading.

But is it the archetypical reading, as Zuntz argued? At the outset it must be observed that confusion of ω and ou is common in the papyri. Examples may also be found among early NT papyri. Ψ writes κοπίουσας for κοπίωσας and Ψ writes δωναί for δουναί. The corruption could have gone in either direction. However, it is more likely that ΤΩΝΟΙ was corrupted to ΤΟΥΝΟΟΣ than that ΔΙΑΤΟΥΝΟΟΣ was corrupted to ΤΩΝΟΙ, for the first involves only vowel confusion while the second require deletion of the preposition in addition to the vowel shift. Subsequent to the vowel confusion, which changed the case to genitive, a preposition (δια) was needed in order to construe. This reconstruction is made more likely by noting that 1) λαλέω + διά to express means is found nowhere else in Paul; 2) post-classical Greek preferred for διά + genitive over the simple dative (or εν + dative) to

60 Strikingly, neither Ambrosiaster nor Paulinus mention anything about the “law” in their comments.

61 The conflation is found in VL 61 (volo u verba sensu meo loqui per legem ut alios instruam), two manuscripts of another Irish witness, Pelagius (G reads loqui sensu meo per legem; D sensu meo loqui per legem) and perhaps the Vulgate witness Z* (a corrector erases per legem).

62 Mayser, I, pp. 78-79 (ω in place of ου) and pp. 76-77 (ου in place of ω); Gignac I, pp. 208-11. Perhaps the most ironic shift is διορθοσιγν for διορθωσιγν (POxy. 2005, line 5) though in reference to building a wall, not correcting a manuscript.

63 Royse, pp. 245 and 120.

express means; 3) the “Byzantine” witnesses (N² D² K L pm) make a similar shift at 2 Thes. 3:12: διά τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν ησου χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ εν κυρίω ησου χριστοῦ.

14:19.86

𝔓⁴⁶ and some minuscules (547 614 1896 2147 pc) lose λογοῦς due to a leap: Η ΜΥΡΙΟΥΚ ΛΟΓΟΥΚ. Because the noun (λογοῦς) stands in the previous clause its presence is not necessary to understand the passage, thus making its loss more likely.

14:20.87 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:21.89; 14:21.91

Although damaged, 0201⁶⁶ now supports a reading previously only attested by F G and the entire Latin tradition. The Latin’s aliis linguis cannot be attributed exclusively to F G’s ετεραῖς γλωσσαῖς, since Latin apparently did not have an equivalent term for ετερογλωσσοῖς.⁶⁷ The evidence for Marcion’s text confirms this, with Epiphanius citing his text as ετερογλωσσοῖς and Tertullian as aliis linguis.⁶⁸ Furthermore, the support of 0201 prevents attributing the reading solely to influence from the Latin. However, 0201 may have arrived at the reading independent of F G. These witnesses may have later been adapted to the Latin.

---

⁶⁵Jannaris, §§ 1381 and 1531-32.

⁶⁶The reconstructions of both Crum and Güting are identical: ||[ε]ν[ετ]ερ[αίς]γλωσσαίς καὶ εν χεί| except that Crum lacks a dot under the first ν. The reading is made certain both by the available space and the feminine termination.

⁶⁷The Oxford Latin Dictionary cites only adverbs formed as a compounds with alius apart from aliquantus, from which are formed several nouns. Similar issues are involved in Syriac; both the Peshitta and Harklean use two vocables to render ετερογλωσσοῖς.

⁶⁸Epiphanius, Panarion 42,11,8 and 42,12,3; Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem 5,8,10.
The second major unit of variation in this “citation” is whether ἑτερών (A B Ψ 0201, 0243 6 33 81 424 1241 1739 pc) or ἑτεροίς (cett) follows χείλεσιν. Assimilation to ἑτεροίς γλῶσσαὶς or ἑτερογλώσσοις is the most likely led to the alteration to ἑτεροίς. It is also possible that influence from the LXX has occurred in both cases. According to the Philocalia of Origen,69 Aquila’s translation of Is. 28:11 (which Paul here paraphrases) reads ἑτερογλώσσοις and ἑτεροίς.

14:21.92; 14:21.93; 14:22.97; 14:22.100[discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:23.101

The reading of ὑΠ` may be either εαν συνελθη ο ὑν ουν ελθη,70 matching B. If the latter, it matches the tendency of both ὑП₄ and B to omit the prefix of compound verbs, as has already been noted (7:13.47). This tendency contributed to reading θΥΝ as ΘΥΝ, creating a syndetic relationship with the preceding result (ὡστε) clause. However, nowhere else in 1 Corinthians does a clause introduced by ονυ follow a clause introduced by ὡστε. In fact, six times the following clause is asyndetic.71 Either dittography or conflation produced the most widely attested reading, εαν ουν συνελθη, which also stands opposed to the tendency toward asyndeton after a ὡστε clause. The archetypical reading is preserved by F G72 and

69If, indeed, the Philocalia is Origen’s work at all. See the discussion in M. Harl, ed., Origène Philocalie, 1-20, SC 302 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983), pp. 19-41.

70ὑП₄ reads: ἔδΝ ΘΥΝ| ἐλθη.

715:1; 5:8; 7:38; 10:12; 11:33; 15:58. A ὡστε clause is followed syndetically by καὶ at 1:7; 4:5; δε at 3:7; 11:27; 13:2; 14:39; and γαρ at 3:21. Güting and Mealand (p. 43) compare 14:22 with examples of “Pauline instructions referring to alternatives,” but here the ονυ would connect logically with the preceding ὡστε clause.

72In G σουν is written with cramped letters into the space between εαν and ελθη by the original hand. Its loss may be an example of parablepsis, but the reading of the immediate
much of the Latin tradition,73 joined here by a group which typically aligns with \( \mathbb{P}^{46} \). B: 0243 5 6 424\(^e\) 1245 1739 1881.

14:23.102

Paul consistently places the adjective in the position before an arthrous noun.74 The adjective in the position after the noun is found only in two places, both with variation. At Romans 16:23 L \( \Psi \) Maj read της ἐκκλησιας ὅλης, and at 1 Cor. 14:23 all Greek witnesses apart from D F G 629 read η ἐκκλησια ὅλη. In both cases the position of the adjective runs counter to typical Pauline usage, but the usage is not so prominent that scribes would assimilate to the regular Pauline word order. Furthermore, in both passages the Peshitta and the Latin tradition75 read the adjective before the noun, thereby extending the support for the D F G reading\(^76\) at 1 Cor. 14:23. The placement of the adjective after the arthrous noun is shared predecessor of F G is shown by F.

73 VL 78 joins the Vulgate in reading *si ergo conveniat*, the rest of the tradition *si conveniat*. The Latin, of course, does not have the issues caused by the similarity of the Greek letters.

74 Rom. 1:8; 8:36; 10:21; 1Cor. 5:6; 12:17; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 5:3, 9; Phil. 1:13; 1 Thes. 4:10. The article is not found at Gal. 5:9 in \( \mathbb{P}^{46} \) (ὁλον φύραμα) and Tit. 1:11 (ὅλους οἰκους).

75 The Latin tradition corresponds to the Greek word order in every occurrence of “all the church(es)” in the *Corpus Paulinum*: Rom. 16:16 omnes ecclesiae 89 Vg; 16:21 ecclesiae universae 61 75\(^e\) 77; 16:23 universae ecclesiae 75 77 78 Vg; universa ecclesia 61 89 Vg\(^{mass}\) Amst; 1 Cor. 4:17 in omnis ecclesia 61 75 77 78 Vg; in omnibus ecclesiis 89; in omni ecclesia Amst; 14:23 universa ecclesia; 14:33 in omnibus ecclesiis; 2 Cor. 8:18 per omnes ecclesias; 11:28 omnium ecclesiarum; Eph 1:22 supra omnia ecclesiae 77 Vg; supra omnem ecclesiam Vg\(^{mass}\); super omnem ecclesiam 61 64 78; super omnia ecclesia 75 89.

76 The singular reading in 629 (ποσα η ἐκκλησια) is simply another Latinism in this witness.
found elsewhere in the NT, perhaps accounting for the shift here.  

14:23.103; 14:24.106

Several witnesses have assimilated the tenses of the verbs of 14:23-24. The aorist, which here is a background tense, describes the action which must precede: εὐθη / συνελθη (14:23; see above), εἰσελθὼσιν (14:23), and εἰσελθη (14:24). The "speaking" or "prophesying" is expressed in the present, which foregrounds these verbs so that attention is drawn to the actions about which Paul is concerned.  

At 14:23, P⁴⁶ F G have assimilated the present tense λαλωσιν to the aorist λαλησωσιν. While an attractive group of witnesses, the parallel present tense προφητευωσιν at 14:24 requires the present λαλωσιν. Some witnesses make the same alteration to the aorist at 14:24 (προφητευωσιν 0150 Ἐνο), but since no witnesses read both λαλησωσιν and προφητευωσιν, it is likely that both readings are independent assimilations to the preceding aorist verb form. This is further evidence of a close relationship between P⁴⁶ and F G which, though attesting to early forms of the text, both show alterations to make the use of the verb in this section more consistent.

14:23.105

The loss of η απιστοι in P⁴⁶ vid B VL 89 may have been lost either by accidental leap

---


78Most common in narrative using a aorist participle, other Pauline examples include Rom. 3:23 and, also in a conditional sentence, 1 Cor. 8:8.

79F has blundered with λαλησωσιν.

80A few witnesses read the future προφητευωσιν at 14:24 (33 88 102 464 915), which is similar to the subjunctive both in form and meaning.
or simple carelessness, perhaps induced by the similarity of the two terms. B makes a similar omission at Rom 14:23: το μη τιθεναι τω αδελφω σκανδαλον for το μη τιθεναι προσκομια τω αδελφω η σκανδαλον. Both here and at 1 Cor. 14:23 the particle and one of the nouns are omitted, though in Romans the omission can hardly be accidental. Zuntz suggests – without ultimately defending – that the longer reading has been assimilated to απιστος η ιδιωτης at 14:24. However, one might expect the assimilated reading to match the word order to which it has been assimilated. Furthermore, 14:16 uses ιδιωτης without any attempt at assimilation.

14:24.107

The difficulty of two consecutive clauses that employ δε is resolved by either replacing with the similar sounding τε (A⁸³) or removing it altogether (1845). Similar difficulties with conjunctions affect the text also at 14:21 (see above).

14:25.112

Once again, the witnesses differ in relating clauses together. At 14:25b και ουτως] πεσων, which is textually firm, introduces the result of “prophesying” (14:24). Most witnesses also read και ουτως before τα κρυπτα (25a) which would make this clause also a result of the prophesying. The Latin tradition (apart from VL 77 78 Vg Amst) also reads a conjunction at 14:25a. However, this is not to be interpreted as early support for the

---

⁸¹B. Weiss, p. 125 with further examples in B.

⁸²Cf. BDAG, s.v. η (18). The loss of η σκανδαλιζεται η ασθενει in Α C 6 424 Β 1506 1739 seems an obvious case of homoeoteleuton, but nonetheless adopted by NA²⁷.

⁸³Both von Soden and Tischendorf cite the Peshitta as matching the reading of A, but because it uses the prefix η- (“and”) at both 14:24a and 24b it is more likely that the same conjunction was read in both places.
“Byzantine” reading, for different conjunctions are used at 14:25a and 25b: VL 75 89 read
etiam . . . tunc; Amst(A) quoque . . . tunc; VL 77 78 Vg read only tunc at 14:25b, all of which
understand 14:25a to connect with 14:24 and 25b serving as the conclusion. Because this is
the way the clauses must be related in the Ψ⁴⁶ Λ A B D* F G pm reading, the Latin tradition is
attempting to render that form of the text, not the “Byzantine” form, and therefore is evidence
for the shorter reading even though it reads a conjunction. While the Latin tradition cannot be
cited as support for the reading καὶ οὖτως . . . καὶ οὖτως, it does give evidence of a
perceived need to clarify the relationship of the clauses which also resulted in the addition in
the “Byzantine” text. Since the addition of καὶ οὖτως at 25a clarifies the relationship of the
clauses, and was easily inserted from 25b, it must be secondary addition. Furthermore, there
is no apparent reason for its loss, either intentionally or by accident.

14:25.113

Ψ⁴⁶ alone reads δίανοιας for καρδίας.⁸⁴ Zuntz⁸⁵ points to the same substitution at
Eph. 1:18. This example, however, is found only in late witnesses⁸⁶ and not much help for
assessing Ψ⁴⁶. Of more significance is other evidence cited by Zuntz: the virtual interchange
of δίανοια and καρδία in the LXX and early Christian writers.⁸⁷ In fact, the similarity of the

⁸⁴Gregory of Nyssa uses the phrase τὰ κρυπτα τῆς διανοιας (Contra Eunomium
2,1,209), but in this context he is discussing the thinking hidden inside a person which is then
able to be expressed in spoken words or written letters.

⁸⁵Zuntz, Text of the Epistles, p. 19.

⁸⁶For the reading δίανοιας von Soden lists four minuscules (255 635 642 2298),
Cyril of Jerusalem (Catecheses ad illuminandos 35,28) and Theodoret (Interpretationes in
Pauli epistulas, MPG 82, p. 516). To these may be added Pseudo-Macarius, Sermo 28, p.
167. Tischendorf mentions minuscules with the reading (though he does not list them). The
TR, opposed by the “Byzantine” text, adopts δίανοιας at Eph. 1:18.

⁸⁷Zuntz points to Clement of Rome (To the Corinthians 36,2) as an example of an
early use of καρδία as equivalent to δίανοια: “Through him the eyes of our heart are
two words is seen already in the NT at Eph. 4:18 and Heb. 8:10, the former especially referenced numerous times by Clement and Origen. This makes it difficult to sustain Royse's extension of Zuntz' argument, that the alteration in Ψ was made in order to remove a Semitism. It seems to have been simply a substitution with a virtually synonymous word, as this manuscript does also at 11:9 in replacing ανδρα with ανθρωπω. 

14:25.116

Whether απαγγελλων or αναγγελλων is the archetypical reading is of no consequence semantically, which may explain the common variation in the manuscripts between these verbs.

Rom. 15:21 ανηγγελη (αναγγελή Ν; αναγγελη F G) ] απηγγελη C; αναγγελθη Ψ est adnuntiam VL 75 V; est nuntiam VL 61 77 78 89
1 Cor. 14:25 αναγγελλων ] αναγγελλων F 90 635; απαγγωνελλων G; pronuntians VL 61 77 78 V Amst Amst(A); adnuntians VL 75 89; annuntians VL 77*
2 Cor. 7:7 αναγγελλων ] απαγγελλων 489; διαγγελλων 206 1758 referens VL 78 89 V nuntians; VL 61 75 77; annuntians Amst
1 Thes. 1:9 απαγγελλουσιν; adnuntiant VL 78 V; renuntiant VL 75 77 89

Because there is variation at every place where these verbs occur in Paul scarcely allows for any criteria on which to base a decision other than the vast numbers at each place. 

14:25.117

What can account for the shifting position of (o) θεος? The adverb οντως is opened, through him our senseless and darkened reasoning sprouts afresh into the light." This reference must have come to him from Tischendorf's apparatus at Eph. 1:18. Origen uses "eyes of their reasoning" (with reference to the family of Jesus who do not recognize his true nature) in his Commentary on Matthew (10,17), but this is not a reference to Eph. 1:18.

88 Though in later witnesses, cf. also the substitution of διδασκαλον for διδαχην at 14:26 by 323 1912.
89 See the chapter on D F section for a discussion on the corrections in F G.
90 Addition/omission of the article before a nomen sacrum is discussed at 1:17.55.
appropriately placed at the beginning of the clause (N D F G 1739 0243 cf. Gal. 3:21), though some witnesses move θεος to the first position (K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0201 6 pm), likely for emphasis. However, the focus of this passage is not that God – as opposed to some other being – be recognized as present, but that he is truly present. Ἰφ., however, moves θεος to the end of the clause. Royse attributes this to loss by a leap (ΟΝΤΟΩΚΟΘΕΣΙ), though it would seem that the presence of the nomen sacrum would make this unlikely. Influence from the LXX of Is. 45:14 (ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός ἐστίν) is unlikely, for although italicized as a direct citation in the NA text, it is more accurately labeled an allusion. Paul adds οὐρως, uses a different prepositional phrase, and follows a different word order. None of these impact the manuscripts at 1 Cor. 14:25.

An alternative explanation is that (ο) θεος is a secondary insertion into the text, which ended up in different locations in the manuscripts. While no manuscripts attest such a reading (in contrast to the secondary insertion of ἐντολαί at 14:37, which also shifts positions but does have manuscript evidence for the shorter text), the addition of (ο) θεος was easily suggested by τω θεω in the preceding clause, and perhaps the LXX of Is. 45:14. (Ο) θεος is grammatically unnecessary, it simply supplies the implied subject. Furthermore, in several places in 1 Corinthians the manuscripts add a secondary (ο) θεος (8:3; 10:5; and 14:33, for which see below). This conjecture, however, does not alter the meaning of the passage.

14:26.120 [discussed at 14:10.44]

14:26.121; 14:26.122 [also discussed at 12:10.48]

---

91 Royse, pp. 261-62.
The string of several short clauses ending in εἰς ἐκκλησίας was bound to produce problems for the scribes. A and several minuscules lose διδάσκαλον εἰς ἐκκλησίας, a few minuscules (6 69 915 pc) lose ἀποκαλυπτικόν εἰς ἐκκλησίας, and K 0151 pc lose διερμηνευτικόν εἰς ἐκκλησίας. L and the "Byzantine" text read γλώσσας ... ἀποκαλυπτικόν where Ὑ 46 A B D F G and the Latin tradition have the nouns ἀποκαλυπτικόν ... γλώσσας. Either reading may have been produced by the accidental omission of a clause, which was noticed and thereupon replaced after then next clause.

14:27.124 [discussed at 14:2.3]

14:28.132 [discussed at 12:10.48]

14:29.135; 14:29.137; 14:30.140

Güting and Mealand argue that the original form of vv. 29-30 lacked conjunctions since, in their view, it conforms to other examples of "Pauline instructions referring to alternatives." According to their understanding of the argument of 14:26-30, v. 29 should be asyndetic because it marks a shift in topic from that of v. 28. In addition, v. 30 is only loosely connected to the preceding material, hence asyndeton should be expected here as well.92 Ὑ 46 lacks a conjunction in all three places; D F G only at v. 30.

However, the section is not a loose amalgam of instructions. 14:27-28 follow the pattern described by Güting and Mealand, where alternatives are stated with asyndeton in the first clause and a syndetic alternative clause. Vv. 28-30, however, extend the series of alternatives, so that v. 27 states one possible action and 28-30 three alternatives (ὅτε is not in question at v. 27). 14:31 then shifts to the basis (γοροφ) for the instructions given in 26-30. Furthermore, κοινωνία at v. 29 has a parallel at v. 27. There one person speaks and another

---

92 Güting and Mealand, pp. 43-44.
interprets, while at 14:29 prophets speak and others evaluate. Güting and Mealand apparently accept κατ at 14:27, but for the identical structure at 14:29 they reject it.

It is more likely that Ψ⁴⁶ has simply blundered here. Royse observes that Ψ⁴⁶ alone omits κατ eleven and δε ten times. It is likely that the scribe of Ψ⁴⁶ simply lost these conjunctions accidentally. This reconstruction is strengthened by noticing that both omissions were caught immediately by the original scribe, who then wrote both conjunctions supralinear. The same factors are not at work in the addition/omission of δε at 14:30, for neither does Ψ⁴⁶ add a correction nor is it a singular reading. D* F G also lack the conjunction, though the Latin tradition (apart from VL 77) reads et. However, the structure described above requires the conjunction. We have already seen Ψ⁴⁶ D* F G virtually alone, though at times also with the Latin tradition, lose conjunctions (11:20; 13:8).

14:29.139

Either διακρίνομαι or ανακρίνομαι (D* F G) are suitable in this context, both entailing the reaching of a judgment. Influence from the Latin on D F G is unlikely here, given the fact that the Latin tradition (and the D-text in particular) uses several words to render the Greek verbs. Instead, influence from ανακρίνεται at 14:24 may have led to the alteration.

93 They do not note the omission by 104 pc.

94 He fails to note, however, both singular readings of Ψ⁴⁶ at 14:29.

95 Cf. BDAG, s.v. διακρίνομαι (3) and ανακρίνομαι (1), esp. the parallels at 1 Cor. 10:25, 27. Ψ⁷⁴ reads ανακριναντα instead of διακριναντα at Acts. 11:12.

96 1 Cor. 10:25, 27 interrogantes = ανακρίνοντες; 11:29 discernens VL 75 77 89; diiudicans VL 78 V = διακρίνων; 11:31 iudicaremur = διεκρίνομεν; 14:24 interrogatur VL 75 77 89; diiudicatur VL 78 V = ανακρίνεται; 14:29 diiudicent VL 78 V; examinet VL 61 75 89; deiudicent vel examinent VL 77 = ανακρινέτωσαν D' F G / διακρινέτωσαν cet.
Ψ and, according to von Soden, 2004, add the negative particle ou at the beginning of the sentence. While occasional additions of the negative are scattered in the manuscripts, most frequently in questions (e.g., 9:11), ψ does not evidence any other unique readings in this section which would indicate discomfort with the argument, and nothing in the near context would give rise to the addition. It appears to be a random addition, possibly from the common use of ου with δύναμι.98

Two alterations bring the number of the subject and verb into harmony: L writes the plural ὑποτασσόνται to match the number of πνευματα, while D F G and the Latin tradition read the singular subject πνευμα. Alteration in D F G toward the Latin, common in these witnesses, may be the cause of their alteration rather than conformity to the number of the verb, as the πνευμα in Ψ 0151 424ε must be. 0285* drops πνευματων, perhaps simply losing the modifying genitive, which is not an uncommon error in the manuscripts. The lost of πνευμα by 6, however, is not so easily accounted for. The reading of 424ε suggests that an exemplar marked the final -τα for deletion. 6 then read the same correction as indicating

97While ψ appears to differentiate between minor stops (with a point on the baseline) and major stops (a point on the top line), no specific punctuation is used for questions, so it cannot be determined if ψ understood the sentence as a question.

98Ου δυνασθε (10:21) and ου δυναται (12:21) are too distant to have directly caused the addition.
omission of the whole word. Other corruptions caused by corrections that affected 6 424
1739 have already been pointed out (e.g., 7:34; 12:4; 12:15; further discussed in the chapter
on the “Alexandrian” witnesses).

14:33.146

The logical relationship between 14:32 and 33a, and 33a and 33b have been difficult
exegetical problems. In what way is God’s attribute of peace (not disorder) the basis (γάρ)
for the argument that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets? And is the
practice of all churches to inform the Corinthians’ prophetic activity, or their women’s
activity? Both Fee and Thiselton see v. 33a as reflecting the larger argument of 1 Cor. 12-15,
that God “acts coherently” and “without self-contradiction.” The instructions to the
Corinthians are “ultimately theological,” and the conduct of worship of God is contrasted
with the “deities of cults” who are disorderly. Hence, because the spirits of the prophets in
Corinth were not under control, and God is not a God of disorder, then the prophetic speech
is to be rejected. Both commentators, however, must go outside of Paul to James 1 and 3 to
find parallel language for this argument.99 They differ in understanding the relationship
between the two halves of v. 33. Fee, who regards 14:34-35 as an interpolation, connects 33b
to that which precedes. Thiselton, who regards vv. 34-35 as original, connects 14:33b to that
which follows. What neither notice, however, is that a textual problem exists in this passage,
the resolution of which may remove these difficulties.100

99Fee, First Corinthians, pp. 696-97; Thiselton, pp. 1145-46.

100This textual problem is barely noticed in the commentaries. Schrage (III, p. 457 n.
537 ) notes the variant, but does not defend the longer reading. His reference to K. Maly,
Mündige Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zur pastoralen Führung des Apostels Paulus im 1.
Korintherbrief (Munich: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), p. 221 hardly settles the question,
for while he notes the variant (although citing the evidence in Ambrosiaster incorrectly) his
argument for its Pauline nature is that it conforms to the phrase “God of peace” in the
The reading in question is the presence or absence of (o) θεος\(^{101}\) at 33a. Harnack, followed by Zuntz, drew attention to the citation of this passage by Tertullian (though both attribute it to Marcion) and Ambrosiaster,\(^{102}\) whose text they also incorrectly reconstruct. Nevertheless, in spite of these errors, Tertullian and Ambrosiaster can be cited as providing evidence for a textual tradition that lacked (o) θεος.

In book four of *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian interacts with the gospel narratives in order to refute Marcion's claims, but there is no discussion of Marcion's text of the epistles *per se* (the focus of book five). In the section in which 1 Cor. 14:33 is cited (4,4,5), Tertullian attacks Marcion for altering the "gospel," specifically Luke. He draws upon several NT passages to argue that Marcion has overstepped his authority:

If Marcion were a disciple, nevertheless he is not above his master [Matt. 10:24]. And if Marcion were an apostle, whether I, says Paul, or they, thus we preach [1 Cor. 15:11]. And if Marcion were a prophet, also the spirits of the prophets will be subject to the prophets, for they are not a source of destruction, but of peace [1 Cor. 14:32-3]. Even were Marcion an angel, he would sooner be labelled "anathema" than "evangelist," he who preached a different gospel [Gal. 1:8].

Hence, this is not, as Harnack claimed, Marcion's text.\(^{103}\) Nevertheless, as evidence for Tertullian's text it is no less significant. None of the passages cited here are mere allusions. This is true especially of his text of 1 Cor. 14:32-3: *et spiritus prophetaorum prophetis erunt*

benedictions of the letters. As is argued below, however, this is more likely a source for the insertion of θεος.

\(^{101}\) The addition/omission of the article is discussed at 1:17.55.


\(^{103}\) The passage is rightly ignored by Schmid in *Marcion und sein Apostolos*. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul* cites this passage as evidence of Marcion's text, even indicating (by symbols) that it is the correct text (p. 164), but he offers no discussion of the passage.
*subditi non enim eversionis sunt sed pacis*, which matches the presumed Greek base text precisely, down to the word order and use of particles.\(^{104}\) The form of the text is not mere adaptation to Tertullian’s argument, but a verbatim application of a Pauline text directly to Marcion, as is also Gal. 1:8 and even more clearly 1 Cor. 15:11. Had \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\) been present in his text, Tertullian could not have applied 14:33a to Marcion, for the passage would be making a point about the nature of God, not, as Tertullian reads it, about correct speech in the congregations.

Harnack also cites Ambrosiaster’s commentary as preserving evidence of a text that did not read \((\sigma)\ \theta\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\). Because he (and Zuntz) had access only to an inaccurate pre-critical edition, they cite his reading as *auctor* where most NT witnesses have *deus / \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\)*.\(^ {105}\) No manuscript of the commentary reads *auctor*, instead *res* is found at that place.\(^ {106}\) Ambrosiaster’s lemma text is therefore: *non est enim dissensiones res, sed pacis*. His commentary confirms that “God” is not the subject of the sentence:

> Therefore, because the matter of peace (*pacis res*) is spoken by the savior, “My peace I give to you, my peace I leave with you,” no one may prevent the other from speaking nor will he stand in the way of his speaking by the zealousness of his objection, that there be no discord in the body. For he who is called in peace ought to be zealous for patience, so that the laws of peace not be loosed.

The reading *res* is not attested elsewhere, but its presence in Ambrosiaster can be explained

---

\(^{104}\)That Tertullian’s *subditi* and *eversiones* are not attested elsewhere in the Latin tradition is not surprising, given Tertullian’s *ad hoc* translation. The verbs are rendered in the plural simply because Latin does not use singular verbs with neuter plural subjects, as does Greek. For a discussion of the confusion of the singular and plural of *spiritus* in the Latin tradition, see 14:12 and the D F G chapter on 4:21.

\(^{105}\)Presumably, both had access to Ambrosiaster’s reading through Tischendorf’s apparatus. The reading *auctor* is found in the 1690 Paris edition by Du Friche and Le Nourry and from there in the 1883 Milan edition of P. A. Ballerini. See the apparatus (*ad loc.* ) in H. J. Vogels, *Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster*.

\(^{106}\)Amst(A,T), as they frequently do, adapt to the Vulgate by replacing *res* with *deus*. 
as an addition to a text that did not read *deus* / *θεος*, a reading known to exist from Tertullian. Ambrosiaster’s text simply supplies the lack of the predicate for the verb *est*.

Tertullian and Ambrosiaster therefore supply evidence of a text of 14:33 that lacked *θεος*.

Can this reading, however, be archetypical? The text with *θεος* has difficulties. First, because *ακαταστασιας* and *ειρηνης* are anarthrous it is difficult to construe them with *ο* *θεος*. This difficulty is removed if *θεος* is read (Harnack, of course, does not have access to *Φ* and generally mistrusts D F G). Harnack’s argument therefore supports either regarding *ο* *θεος* as secondary or reading *θεος* without the article. Second, Zuntz argues that the transposition *ο* *θεος* *ακαταστασιας* in A 218 is evidence for the interpolation of *ο* *θεος*. However, A creates several singular readings involving word order. Indeed, the shift in position of *ο* *θεος* places the genitive after the nominative. This sequence is more common in Paul and places *ακαταστασιας* and *ειρηνης* into parallel position. It is therefore more likely that A has altered the word order than that it preserves otherwise lost evidence of the insertion.

More significant is the fact that a *nomen sacrum*, usually *θεος*, is interpolated into the

---

107 In the apparatus of his critical edition, Tischendorf also connected Ambrosiaster’s *res* with Tertullian’s text of 14:33.


109 Cf. 2 Cor. 1:3 θεος πασης παρακλησεως. With the article: Rom. 15:5 ο δε θεος της υπομονης και της παρακλησεως; 15:13 ο δε θεος της ελπιδος; 15:33 ο δε θεος της ειρηνης; 2 Cor. 13:1 ο θεος της αγαπης και ειρηνης.

110 E.g., 12:24 συνεκρασαν ο θεος; 14:5 υμας παντας; Rom. 16:20 εν ταχει υπο τους ποδας υμων.
text of 1 Corinthians in at least two and perhaps three other passages. At 8:3 we observed and Clement preserving the shorter text, and at 10:5 Marcion and again Clement do so.

The conjecture of an insertion of θεος at 14:25 is discussed above. 14:33 lends further support to the conclusions reached in those places. In addition, the common phrase “God of peace” in the Pauline benedictions (Rom. 15:33; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9; 1 Thes. 5:23) may have played a role in suggesting the noun which would best fill the gap – note that at 2 Thes. 3:16 κυριος της ειρηνης is replaced in FGL with the stereotypical θεος της ειρηνης.

Finally, the passage without θεος suits the context better, as Harnack summarized:

Now the justifying sentence [33b] really justifies the first sentence [33a], and at the same time each difficulty regarding the words removes itself. Because the spirits of the prophets are not of disorder, but of peace, therefore they subordinate themselves to the ordering will of the prophets; the Apostle had this experience in all the churches. Then a new paragraph of the letter begins [14:34].

Πνευματα is now the subject of the verb εστιν, so it is it is the prophets who are not to be “of disorder,” not God. This is precisely how Tertullian understood the passage, so that he could apply the passage his disorderly prophet, Marcion. While this suits the context well, it is difficult to imagine a scribe deleting θεος in order to smooth the text. The addition of θεος has caused great difficulty in deciding whether to read 14:33b with the first part of the verse or with the mulier taceat. The ambiguity of the connection of “as in all the churches of the

---

111 One may also compare the probable addition of (του) θεου at Gal. 3:21, secondary θεου after πιστεως in 0278 at Gal. 3:24 (though the same ms. omits θεου at 3:26), του θεου after χαρις αυτη at Eph. 3:8 and after εκκλησιαν at Phil. 3:6 in F G, and του θεου after πολυποικιλος at Eph. 3:10 in 056 0142

112 The variation between πνευμα and πνευματα του discussed at 14:32.145.

113 In addition to the commentaries, see G. Clarke, “As in All the Churches of the Saints (1 Corinthians 14.33),” *Bible Translator* 52 (2001), pp. 144-47, who concludes that it should be read with 33a. See also the discussion below of the contextual suitability of 14:34-35.
saints” has led to its being connected to 14:34-35 instead of 14:33a. This connection between a proscription on women’s activity and the practice of “all the churches” may have contributed to the discomfort which led some witnesses to move 14:34-35 to the end of chapter 14 (see below).

14:34.149

The most debated textual problem in 1 Corinthians, and in recent times perhaps in the entire NT, is the authenticity of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Virtually every matter is under dispute, including the external evidence itself, the extent of the potentially secondary text, and what criteria should be used in evaluating the evidence. G. Fitzer observes that the evaluation of this passage requires the use of several methods: “Textkritik, Literarkritik, historische Kritik und theologische Kritik.” Because of the complex nature of the problem and the amount of secondary literature, a more extensive discussion is required here than that provided for other problems in 1 Corinthians. An outline is provided to guide the reader:

I. The Situation in the Manuscripts
   A. Codex Fuldensis
   B. Manuscript 88
   C. Codex Vaticanus
   D. Patristic Evidence

II. The Extent of the Proposed Interpolation

III. Internal Evidence
   A. Contextual Evidence
   B. Linguistic Evidence
   C. Ideational Evidence
   D. Situational Evidence

E. Source-Critical or Comparative Evidence
F. Motivational Evidence
G. Locational Evidence

IV. The "Marginal Gloss" Theory

V. Lengthy Insertions in the Corpus Paulinum

VI. Insertions and Displacements in D F G and the Latin Tradition

The arguments for the secondary nature of the *mulier taceat* (1 Cor. 14:34-35) are founded on different pieces of evidence. For example, a prominent feature in G. Fee's proposal that this passage is a secondary gloss is the argument that "displacements of this kind do not occur anywhere else in the NT" and that "no adequate reason can be found for such a displacement were these words originally in the text after 14:33." On the other hand, those who argue that numerous interpolations have been introduced into the Pauline letters, such as W. Walker, do not require direct text-critical evidence in order to view the passage as a later addition. Neither is the problem of the displacement a feature of P. Payne's argument, who puts forth evidence of manuscripts that do not have the passage at all. Nevertheless, the argumentation overlaps. Both Fee and Payne, for example, use "internal evidence" arguments in ways that resemble those who discuss the passage alongside other potential interpolations. Moreover, those who focus on the interpolations in the epistles typically mention the problem presented by the manuscripts. But since these are separate arguments, we will consider, first, the manuscript evidence itself, primarily in interaction with Payne; next, the "internal evidence"; and finally, in view of Fee's arguments, the

---

115 Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 700.

I. The Situation in the Manuscripts

The manuscripts provide direct evidence of two readings: Either 1 Cor. 14:34-35 appears after 14:33 or it appears after 14:40. Text und Textwert, an attempt to provide a basic analysis of every known Greek NT manuscript, uses this as one of its Teststellen; it cites only D F G 88° 915 for the placement of 34-35 after v. 40. While only a small number of Greek witnesses attest this reading, it is found in virtually the entire non-Vulgate Latin tradition: VL 61, 75, 77, 78, 89, F, R, Ambrosiaster and Sedulius Scottus. This study has already argued that D F G and the Latin tradition (with and without the Vulgate) often preserve the archetypical reading without the support of the manuscripts which are typically regarded as "better." Therefore, the placement of the passage after 14:40 should not be dismissed too quickly as secondary, and an explanation must be given which would account for this early form of the text.

The consensus that only two readings are preserved the tradition, however, has been vigorously challenged by Payne. He has argued in several places that corrections and

---

117 The total number of manuscripts with the more common position is 593 (the total of readings 1/2, 1/2B, 3, and U); one manuscript is unreadable (048), and 148 are not extant for this passage.

118 Fee ("Excursus on the Text of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35," pp. 272-81 in God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), p. 273) incorrectly cites VL 61 (Codex Ardmachanus = NA 27 ar) as omitting 1 Cor. 14:36-39. The ms. in fact reads the sequence 14:33, 36-40, 34-35 without any notation or correction. Perhaps 61 is confused with the Codex Fuldensis (which he does not cite), although that ms. reads 36-40 both in the text and in the margin. Both Augiensis and Ardmachanus are misspelled on this page.

119 See especially the chapter on D F G.

notations in three manuscripts and the lack of use of the passage by church fathers provides evidence that manuscripts did exist in which 1 Cor. 14:34-35 was not present at all. If this is true, then theories of marginal glosses or interpolations are unnecessary. For this reason, Payne's analyses of Codex Fuldensis, 88 (a twelfth century minuscule manuscript), and the notations in Codex Vaticanus will be considered first, followed by a review of the patristic evidence.

I.A. Codex Fuldensis

Codex Fuldensis (VL F) is a sixth century Latin manuscript that was corrected by Victor, Bishop of Capua. It contains numerous corrections, one of which is the focus of Payne's analysis. This manuscript matches the Vulgate text in placing 1 Cor. 14:34-35 between 14:33 and 14:36, and vv. 36-40 are followed by 15:1 as is typical (fol. 246v). However, at the end of 14:33 the symbol Q is written, and at the foot of the leaf is written again 14:36-40, which concludes with the symbol $\overline{Q}$. Payne lists three arguments for the conclusion that this marginal note intends to indicate awareness of manuscripts that did not have the mulier taceat. First, "it would not make sense that Victor intended to indicate that

---

121 Description and transcription in E. Ranke, Codex Fuldensis (Marburg and Leipzig: Elwert, 1868).


123 Payne ("Fuldensis," pp. 241-2) notes that Metzger's Textual Commentary had incorrectly described which verses were in the margin. This had been correctly described in Ranke's edition, p. 485 (though his opinion as to the motivation for the correction is questionable). Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate simply reproduces Ranke's note for this passage, though inexplicably at 14:29. More recently, A. C. Wire, The Corinthian Women Prophets. A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), p. 285 had already noted the error in Metzger and correctly described the situation in the manuscript. Payne does not note Wire's discussion.
14:36-40 should be read both before and after vv. 34-35;" second, no other witness reads
14:34-35 both after 14:33 and after 14:40; and third, ordine replaces ordinem (otherwise the
text and margin are identical), a further example of "the nearly universal pattern in these
corrections to bring Fuldensis into conformity with the standard Vulgate text."\[^{124}\] He then
goes on to argue that the marginal text (14:36-40) is intended to replace all of 14:34-40,
though this contradicts his previous observation that the corrections bring the text into
conformity with the standard Vulgate text. He nevertheless concludes: "It is safe, therefore,
to assume that Victor had what he believed to be sufficient manuscript evidence" for
"removing" 14:34-35 from his text. Payne maintains his interpretation,\[^{125}\] even after a
response\[^{126}\] that argued a different evaluation of the manuscript. None of Payne's arguments
attempt to decipher the \(\text{\textit{h}}\) and \(\text{\textit{hs}}\) symbols themselves.

Shortly after Payne's article appeared, Niccum responded to his interpretation of both
Codex Fuldensis and Codex Vaticanus. With regard to Fuldensis, Niccum argued that the
correction intended to indicate a knowledge of manuscripts that read 14:34-35 after 14:40.\[^{127}\]
This is based on the fact that "90% of the corrections in Fuldensis conform its text to that of


\[^{125}\]P. Payne, "The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special
Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Response to J. Edward Miller," Journal for the Study

\[^{126}\]C. Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External

\[^{127}\]According to Niccum ("The Voice of the Manuscripts," p. 246): "Victor ... began
to write the comparison reading at the point he realized the two texts differed, i.e.,
immediately following v. 33. He copied vv. 36-40 in the margin. When he then reached v. 34
in the comparison text [which in that text is after v. 40], he stopped since it [v.34] was
already present."
Reginensis" (R). R is the only manuscript with a Vulgate text-form that reads 14:34-35 after 14:40. Thus, where Payne argues based on what Victor might have or should have done, Niccum locates a specific textual source for the correction, one which did not omit the verses but read them after 14:40.

In addition, the meaning of the $\text{h\!\!d}$ and $\text{hs}$ symbols must be considered. There are seven $\text{h\!\!d}$ notations in Fuldensis: One is in the Evangelium (the missing text is all of Matt. 20:10, in the section numbered CX) and another at 1 Pet. 3:14 (propter . . . conturbemini). The others are in the Pauline epistles, and, as Niccum indicated, the marginal text is indeed closely connected to Codex Reginensis. The supplied text of 14:36-40 in F$^\text{mg}$ corresponds in even minor details to the text of R: The suspension of itaque (as itaq:) is identical in both, and the medial points (likely marking sense-lines) correspond in all but one case (F$^\text{mg}$ lacks one break). Furthermore, in every example of the corrections using $\text{hs}$, the former symbol marks a place where text is missing and the latter supplies the missing text in

---

128 Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts," p. 247. While Reginensis postdates Fuldensis, a predecessor manuscript very similar to it must have been used by Victor to make the corrections.

129 A fact noted by Payne, "Fuldensis," p. 245, but dismissed as a possible source for the corrections in Fuldensis.

130 Payne mentions that he also finds seven ("Fuldensis," p. 243 n. 14), though he lists only six (not including the one in the gospel section of the manuscript).

131 1 Cor. 7:35 et quod . . . obsecrandi (obsecrandi is the reading of F$^\text{mg}$ R against observandi in most of the Vulgate tradition); 9:4 numquid . . . bibendi; 2 Thes. 3:10 hoc denuntiabamus vobis; Col. 1:2 gratia . . . nostro; 2 Tim. 2:20 et . . . honore. Payne, as remarked above, finds significance in the fact that the marginal note at 1 Cor. 14:35 spells ordinem as ordine. Common orthographic differences, however, cannot be used to determine textual relationships, shown by F$^\text{mg}$ again dropping the final -m of honorem at 2 Tim. 2:20 and spelling praebet as prebeat at 1 Cor. 7:35.

132 The same form of the suspension of itaque at 14:34 is found in VL 61, another Latin witness that reads 14:34-35 after v. 40.
the margin. The symbols never, as Payne proposes, indicate replacements for text. This corresponds to the meaning of the symbols themselves. Ranke had already identified these as abbreviations for *hic deest* ("here it is absent") and *hoc supple* ("supply this"). With this evidence, the situation in the manuscript is clear. The text in the margin is to be supplied where the $\overline{\text{h}}d$ symbol stands in the text, so that 14:36-40 is to be understood as standing before 14:34-35 (as well as after). This, of course, creates an otherwise unattested form of the text. However, given that the textual basis from which these marginal notes are supplied has been identified (an ancestor of Codex Reginensis), its purpose is to match a manuscript that had 14:34-35 after 14:40. Therefore, the marginal correction in Codex Fuldensis cannot be cited as evidence for a textual tradition that omits 1 Cor. 14:34-35.

**I.B. Manuscript 88**

Payne has also argued that 88, a twelfth-century minuscule, provides "[e]vidence for a text without 1 Cor. 14:34-35." As in the case of Codex Fuldensis, the interpretation of a correction is at issue. Payne acknowledges that 14:34-35 stand after 14:40 in this manuscript and sees the correction as indicating that the verses are to be read after v. 33. He goes on to

---

113 Ranke *Codex Fuldensis*, p. 472, at the first occurrence of the $\overline{\text{h}}d$ and $\overline{\text{h}}s$ symbols in the *commentarius diplomaticus* labels the $\overline{\text{h}}s$ symbol as "hic supple," but given that the symbol stands in the margin the neuter accusative form *hoc* must be intended. This identification for these symbols is given in Adriano Capelli, *Dizionario di Abbreviature. Latine ed Italiane*, Quinta edizione (Milan: Hoepli, 1954), pp. 158 and 165.


115 E. J. Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), pp. 14-20 accepts most of Payne's conclusions regarding the umlauts in Codex Vaticanus but does not mention Payne's work on Codex Fuldensis. It is therefore not clear whether Epp accepts Payne's reconstruction of the witness of this manuscript.

argue that this is nonetheless evidence that 88 had access to a manuscript that did not have 14:34-35. He proceeds by rejecting alternative explanations, first ruling out, rightly in my opinion, the possibility that the scribe of 88 either intentionally or unintentionally moved the verses. He then also rules out, incorrectly (as we shall demonstrate), that the exemplar of 88 is derived from a manuscript that had vv. 34-35 after v. 40. He does so for two reasons. First, because 88 does not have a “Western” text; second, because a “Western” reading could not have been preserved in a “non-Western” manuscript. He therefore sees himself with only one option: to conclude that 88 is derived “from a non-Western manuscript without vv. 34-35.” The scenario he adopts to explain the corrections in 88 is that its exemplar did not have vv. 34-35 at all. Before the scribe realized the problem, he had already written v. 36. So he continued writing through the end of v. 40, the next logical break. The scribe then left a large gap between words in order to indicate that a distinct unit was being added, placed a double slash in the text, then wrote vv. 34-35 in the text. This scenario is entirely dependent on two assumptions: 1) “There is no evidence from any other manuscript that a non-Western Greek manuscript ever existed with vv. 34-35 after v. 40.” 2) There is evidence of manuscripts that do not read vv. 34-35 at all, and that 88 had access to them. We shall demonstrate that both assumptions are incorrect.

Regarding Payne’s first assumption, the data provided in the Text und Textwert series

---

137 Payne, “MS. 88,” p. 154. For Payne’s argument to succeed, one must accept that unless an manuscript is completely “Western” it cannot have any “Western” readings. However, at numerous points in the transmission of the epistles, manuscripts were compared to one another and adaptations made to the texts. That this took place in the tradition preceding 88 915 is demonstrated in the chapter on the “Byzantine” text. In 88 (and 915) we have a tradition that is basically “Byzantine,” but that has a fair number of readings that connect it loosely – not obviously stemmatically – both to D F G and to 9 Ralph 46 A B 6 1739.

138 Payne, “MS. 88,” pp. 155; this assumption is so essential to his argument that it is similarly stated on pp. 154 and 156.
had already noticed, apparently for the first time, that 915 also reads 14:34-35 after 14:40.\textsuperscript{139}

This volume appeared in 1991, in sufficient time for Payne’s work on 88 (1998) to have taken it into account. He fails to do so, and so fails to recognize the close connection between 88 and 915. 915 evidences no discomfort with the passage – no corrections, spaces, or notations of any kind. It places a lectionary αφιη before v. 33 and a τελος after v. 35 (immediately before 15:1), which indicates that these verses (14:33-40 and 34-35) are to be understood as a single unit. This in itself falsifies a key assumption in Payne’s argument, that no “non-Western” manuscript reads 14:34-35 after 14:40. Even more, however, 88 and 915 are from the same textual tradition. This relationship is discussed more fully in the chapter on the “Byzantine” manuscripts, but at this place it is sufficient to note that they not only share numerous unique readings, they also share similar Euthalian material and, most relevant to the problem at 14:34-35, a series of alternative readings in the margins. However, 915, the more recent of the two, cannot be a copy of 88, for neither their texts nor all of their marginal notes and corrections are identical. 88, for example, makes corrections that 915 does not, indicating a more careful attention to wording of the text per se.

Additional evidence of the common ancestry of 88 and 915 is the use of medial points, a vestige of the sense-line divisions that were part of the Euthalian edition.\textsuperscript{140} At 1


\textsuperscript{140}von Soden, p. 677. Payne (“MS. 88,” p. 152 n. 2) incorrectly describes these “dots” as “marking punctuation.” He finds significance in the fact that the “dot” marking the end of 14:35 is the “largest red spot on the page.” Such large points are in evidence, however,
Cor. 14:34-35 these sense-line divisions are nearly identical. The text of 915 is laid out as follows:

> Θω· αἱ γυναικεῖς ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις συγάτωσαν· || Οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν· ἀλλὰ ὑποτάσ | σεσαθαί· καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει· εἰ δὲ τίνα μαθεῖν θέ | λουσιν· ἐν ὀίκῳ τοὺς ἱδίους ἀνδρὰς ἐπερωτάτωσαν· | ἀσχρόν γαρ ἐστὶν γυναιξίν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις λαλεῖν· ε/τ | Γνωρίζω...

88 has the identical Euthalian divisions, with an additional point placed before συγάτωσαν.¹⁴¹

Textually, the two witness are also very similar – not identical – as is the case throughout 1 Corinthians (see discussion in chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses). The only difference in this passage is at 14:35, where 88 reads ἐκκλησίασ for ἐκκλησίαις (D F G L 056 0142 915).

Their shared textual base is seen, however, in the reading εἰ δὲ τίνα at the beginning of the verse, which is otherwise attested only by 823 1243 2815. Therefore, not only is there at least one other extant “non-Western” manuscript that reads 14:34-35 after 14:40, that manuscript is from the same tradition as 88 and shows what the predecessor of 88 read – not an omission of 14:34-35, as Payne argues – but a reading already known in the tradition.

Furthermore, these witnesses show awareness of the readings of other manuscripts outside their typical “Byzantine” stream. They share marginal notations, some of which are glosses but some of which give alternative readings which had been found “in another manuscript” (ἐν αἵλλω). Notably, all these corrections move toward the “Alexandrian” text.

88 goes beyond 915, however, in making additional corrections that are not found in 915.¹⁴²

This means that the predecessors of 88 915 placed the alternative readings which they elsewhere in the ms., particularly in connection with the beginning and end of lectionary units.

¹⁴¹915’s use of enlarged capital letters extended into the left margin to indicate paragraphing is not employed anywhere in 88; 915’s unusual practice of capitalizing the initial letter of each page accounts for the large omicron of οὗ (14:34).

¹⁴²These are discussed in the chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses.
encountered in their margins rather than altering the text. This helps to explain how the unusual position of 14:34-35 could have been retained in these witnesses. The textual basis of 88 915 is to be found in much older traditions. As their predecessors were copied, comparison was made to other witnesses. However, rather than consistently altering the text itself, some alternative readings were noted in the margins. By the twelfth century, the texts were adapted to the overwhelming force of the “Byzantine” text, yet the position of 14:34-35 after 14:40 escaped correction. Finally, the corrector of 88 brought 14:34-35 into the “correct” position, but 915 retains their shared ancestor’s placement of the passage.

The second assumption that Payne makes in positing that an ancestor of 88 did not read vv. 34-35 is that 88 would have had access to such witnesses. He cites specifically Codex Fuldensis (though see the discussion of this witness provided above), and early patristic evidence, which will be considered below. What his argument requires is that 88, a twelfth century minuscule, has somehow preserved a form of the text which goes back to the archetype of the Corpus Paulinum, and, indeed, that this textual stream, in spite of the addition of the Euthalian material and adaptation both to “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings, has preserved in just this place the “original” form of the text. This is possible, but one might expect other examples of early readings in 88 915. Possibility and plausibility, however, are two different things, particularly when the exemplar of 88 915 is known to have read v. 34-35 after v. 40.

What took place in 88 is easily described when we have knowledge of 915. The scribe wrote v. 36 immediately after v. 33, before he realized that the verses were in an unfamiliar position. He added a superscript double slash at the beginning of v. 36, as well as in the

\[143\] Which, as discussed above, are not “Western,” since they do not show patterns of readings that identify them specifically with D F G or the Latin or Syriac traditions.
margin, to mark the location at which the verses should be placed. He then continued writing
until the end of v. 40, where he placed a double slash both in the text and in the margin. After
this the scribe wrote vv. 34-35. This is precisely what stood in his exemplar, now known
through 915. Payne had described this as a possibility before ruling it out.¹⁴⁴ Yet further
comparison with 915 yields additional clues regarding the cause of certain features that
Payne finds puzzling. For example, as noted above, both 88 and 915 marks the Euthalian
sense lines with a medial point. This was done in 88 using red ink, for which space had to be
left after the text had been written with black ink. 915 marks the τέλος of the pericope after
14:35 (immediately before 15:1). 88, however, does not mark the end of the pericope, only
the αφιερώτατο of the next reading.¹⁴⁵ By this point the scribe of 88 knew that a τέλος mark should
be placed after v. 40, and so space is left there so that it can be written in red. However, he
instead used that space to write the double slash which indicates that vv. 34-35 should be
read after v. 33 (not omitted). Because the end of v. 35 was not the proper place for the end of
the pericope,¹⁴⁶ the scribe does not write a τέλος there, since his correction indicates that v.
34-35 are to be moved to the position after v. 33, which would have resulted in vv. 36-40
being omitted from the lectionary.

Payne’s argument that 88 is “evidence for a text without 1 Cor. 14:34-35” relies too
heavily on arguments that assume what a modern editor assumes thinks a scribe could or


¹⁴⁵ The αφιερώτατο in the margin of 15:1 accounts for the indentation at that point in 88;
Payne, (“MS. 88,” p. 152) apparently sees some other significance in the fact that this is “the
only line on this page to be indented.”

¹⁴⁶ This accounts for the large gap between vv. 40 and 34, to which Payne draws
could not have done rather than on the specific evidence of the scribal activity in 88 and in
the tradition that preceded it, made clear now by its sister 915. 88* reads 1 Cor. 14:34-35 after
v. 40, and the corrector moves them to after v. 33. This is the interpretation of the scribe’s
activity shown by every editor who has taken notice of the manuscript, from Tischendorf and
von Soden to the recent editions of NA27 and the Text und Textwert material.148 A close
analysis of 88 shows that they were correct, and Payne incorrect, on its witness to the text of
1 Cor. 14.149

I.C. Codex Vaticanus

Given the familiarity of the “Great Uncials” Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, it seems
unlikely that anything new could be discovered in them. After all, as eminent a scholar as
Tischendorf edited them, and images of their magnificent leaves have appeared in countless
publications. Nevertheless, Payne has recently recognized that a series of marks in the
margins, labeled “umlauts” because of their appearance, mark textual variants. A series of
articles by Payne and those who dispute some of his conclusion nonetheless agree that “it
demonstrates that its scribe was aware of textual variants and believed them to be sufficiently
important to note.”150 A complete analysis remains to be done, which is not possible here.

147For example, “it does not make sense” is found at the beginning of five paragraphs
on pp. 153-4, and “it makes sense” for the paragraph that introduces his solution on p. 154.

148Also Wire, The Corinthian Women Prophets, p. 149-50, though her description of
why the scribe of 88 used the correction notations in the way that he did is unnecessary once
the relationship of 88 to 915 is recognized. Puzzlingly, von Soden, who first noticed the
relationship between 88 and 915, cites only the former as reading 14:34-35 after 14:40.

149Epp (Junia, p. 19) tepidly states only that “a case has been made” concerning
Payne’s conclusions on 88.

150P. Payne and P. Canart, “The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex
This discussion will focus only what these "umlauts" and other marks in Vaticanus, such as "bars," tell us about the textual problem in 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Indeed, this passage has been the primary focus of Payne's work, as is clear from the subtitles of his (and his respondents') articles.

The relationship between the "umlauts" and the "bars" has not always been clearly defined (or perhaps described). Initially, Payne suggested that the two may function independently, with the bars perhaps reflecting "section breaks," though he insisted that at least some function together to indicate knowledge of alternative readings. Niccum responded by completely distinguishing the umlauts from the bars. Based on a discussion of their development and use by E. M. Thompson, Niccum argues that the bars merely represent the beginning of a παράγραφος. Miller also attempted to demonstrate that the "bar" and the "bar and gap" function as a kind of textual division, at the same time attempting to categorize these divisions. Unfortunately, Miller's analysis relies heavily on comparison to paragraphing and textual divisions in modern editions, though he does note similarity between the divisions in Codex Alexandrinus and the bars in Codex Vaticanus in one passage. Finally, Payne responded to Miller's conclusions regarding the relationship between the umlauts and bars. There Payne again acknowledges that "[a] fair number of the

---


152 "The Voice of the Manuscripts," pp. 244-5.

bars following umlauts are probably just marking some kind of break in the text.”

Nevertheless, Payne believes that at least some bar-umlaut combination may mark “interpolations,” and in particular that this is the function of the bar-umlaut between 1 Cor. 14:33 and 34. In order to determine whether or not the bars in Vaticanus mark divisions, I compared them with the paragraph divisions in two other manuscripts. Alexandrinus was selected because Miller had already noticed one series of breaks that are similar to the bars in Vaticanus; Sinaiticus was also selected because it may have been produced in the same scriptorium as Vaticanus. As noted above, Thompson had described the \( \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \varphi\omicron\varsigma \) divisions. The earliest form was a “short dividing stroke,” though other symbols were used as well. Eventually, the space left at the end of the preceding paragraph was filled in with the first words of the next paragraph. The sample specimen provided by Thompson (p. 59, top) matches those found in B precisely. Subsequent developments were “to draw back the first letter of the first full line of the new paragraph, and leave it slightly


\[155\] E. J. Epp (Junia, pp. 14-20) accepts some of Payne’s conclusions, most significantly “the view that the umlaut siglum in Codex B at 1 Cor. 14:34-35 indicates an interpolation” (p. 19) but does not discuss the arguments concerning the relationship between “bars” and “umlauts” which are central to Payne’s thesis. He does not, for example, note that the umlaut in Codex Vaticanus is placed on the line that ends v. 33 and its connection to vv. 34-35 is what is debated. Epp’s summary does not add any new data or conclusions to the debate.

\[156\] T. C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine,” Journal of Theological Studies 50 (1999), pp. 583-629. He concludes, based on shared “scribal tradition” and the colophons, that “both manuscripts are the work of the same scriptorium, and—which is just as important—were written at approximately the same time” (p. 603).
projecting into the margin, and lastly to enlarge it." The former is often found in N\textsuperscript{157} (though usually the new paragraph begins on a new line); the latter precisely describes that of A.

There appears to be little question that B (and N A) are using a well-established system of text-divisions.

This is borne out in 1 Corinthians, where B has seventy "bars." Remarkably, of these seventy only four do not correspond to the paragraphing of either N or A (94.3% agreement):\textsuperscript{158} Forty-seven are found in all three manuscripts,\textsuperscript{159} twelve in only B and N, and three only in B and A. Granted, N and A both have many more paragraph breaks than does B. At the same time, there are places where each manuscript skips several consecutive section markers, at times for an entire column or more. Nevertheless the correspondence between the markers, particularly between N and B, cannot be accidental. For example, at 1 Cor. 16 these manuscripts share bars/breaks at the beginning of 16:10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 19 (\textit{ασπαζηται}; N \textit{ασπαζονται} B), 20, 20 (\textit{ασπαζεσθε}).\textsuperscript{160} The identical division of the text in this chapter cannot be random or accidental. The agreement may be even more extensive, for it is likely that the "gap" (usually also with a point) in B is intended to mark the same breaks, but the scribe failed to add the bar. An alternative explanation is that while the umlauts are original,

\textsuperscript{157}There may be at least one example of a bar marking a paragraph in N. At 1 Cor. 15:22, \textit{ουτως και} does not extend into the left margin. However, the preceding line ends with a space of two letters before the end of the column, and a line is placed above the omicron of \textit{ουτως}.

\textsuperscript{158}The are located at 1 Cor. 1:9; 10:14, 19; and 15:21.

\textsuperscript{159}An additional four agreements between N and B could not be checked in A due to damage at the top inside corner of the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{160}They may also share a break at 16:21, but this place in B has been obscured by a library stamp.
the bars may stem from the work of a later scribe.\textsuperscript{161}

To this point we have confirmed only that the "bars" in Vaticanus are παράγραφος marks. Payne argues in addition that at least some "bar-umlaut" combinations are intended to mark the awareness of textual variation, specifically interpolations. He notes three in particular (Luke 14:25, John 7:53ff., and 1 Cor. 14:34-35) then cautiously concludes, "Whether this bar is intended by its scribe to mark the interface between the text and the interpolation, it has the effect of underlining the interface between the text of Vaticanus and the interpolation or the variant block of text."\textsuperscript{162} One might point out, however, that if the bar is not \textit{intended} by the scribe to mark a textual variation, either alone or in combination with an umlaut, it has no significance (apart from the umlaut) for marking an alternative text.

Comparison with Ξ and Α is again instructive. At Luke 14:25 both Ξ and Α have a paragraph, which the bar in B likely indicates. The umlauts on the previous lines in B may well mark the lengthy insertion found in some manuscripts, but the "bar" likely has a different function. Unfortunately, the same comparison cannot be made for John 7:53. Α lacks John 6:50-8:52, and Ξ fails to mark any paragraphs in that column — not until halfway through the next column is a paragraph again marked (8:20). There is a space and a medial point before πολίν (8:12), similar to one at 7:39 (where B has a bar). However, for whatever reason (perhaps awareness of the textual problem?), because Ξ does not mark any paragraphs, either here or nearby, comparison to the bar in B at that place cannot be made. Payne’s final example, the bar above the line that begins 1 Cor. 14:34, is matched by paragraph marks in both Ξ and Α.

\textsuperscript{161}While Payne and P. Canart ("The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus") have demonstrated that the umlauts in B are written in the same ink as that used by the original hand, they have not decisively demonstrated that the bars are also linked to the original hand.

\textsuperscript{162}Payne, "Response to Miller," p. 108.
It therefore marks the paragraph, and has a function independent of the umlaut on the preceding line. Therefore, Payne's suggestion that the "bars" in B somehow interact with the umlauts to indicate a textual problem, indeed more specifically an "interpolation," cannot be sustained. Instead, as had been previously suggested, they mark paragraph divisions.

Turning to the "umlauts" at these three places, it is significant that in each case it does not stand on the line that begins the questionable text, but on the preceding line. For example, the umlaut is actually on the last line of John 7:52, not the line where the disputed John 7:53 would begin. What variant this marks is open to interpretation. The "bar" is also on the line above the proposed interpolations at Luke 14:24 and 1 Cor. 14:33. Once the bar is disassociated from the umlaut, the variant being marked is more likely to be associated with the line on which umlaut stands rather than the line following. At 1 Cor. 14:33 the umlaut placed to the left of the line that concludes the verse, which is also marked with a medial point. The next line begins with ἡ γυναῖκες (14:34), and, as noted above, a "bar" is placed above the line. A significant difference of interpretation of this umlaut exists between J. Miller and P. Payne. Miller holds that the umlaut functions independent of the bar, and because the umlaut stands on the line that ends v. 33 it is likely unconnected with the problem of 14:34-35. He suggests that it marks the insertion of διδάσκει (F G pc VL 61 77 78 Vg^mas Amst sy^p), which would be placed immediately at the end of v. 33 in B. Payne, on the other hand, argues that the bar-umlaut functions to mark interpolations (a conclusion rejected above), and that "by far the most significant variant at this point is the disputed 14.34-35." Furthermore, he disputes Miller's assertion that "Since there remains enough space at the end of the line [of 1 Cor. 14:33] to begin another word, especially a long word,

---

163Payne sees it as marking the insertion of the Pericope de adultera, Miller as marking the reading ἐγνυερταί for ἐγειρεταί (Payne, "Response to Miller," p. 110).
the marginal notation [umlaut] is provided next to this line.\textsuperscript{164}

Payne appears to be correct in rejecting this part of Miller’s interpretation, for the first letter of διδασκόω would not fit on this line. However, whether or not there is space to write the “missing” word(s) appears not to be a factor in similar situations. In two other places in 1 Corinthians a line marked with an umlaut ends at precisely the place where other manuscripts add text. At 1 Cor. 5:1 (1465a 1.1) the line ends with ενεσιν, but many manuscripts add ονομαζεται immediately afterward (𝔓\textsuperscript{68} Ν\textsuperscript{2} D F G L P Ψ, the “Byzantine” text, and most Old Latin witnesses). Again at 16:15 (1476c 1.14) the marked line ends with στεφανα, after which some manuscripts add either και φορτουνατοι (Ν\textsuperscript{2} D 0150) or και φορτουνατου και αχαικου (C\textsuperscript{9} F G sy\textsuperscript{h} ms). In neither place is there sufficient room to begin the word(s) in question, and they parallel precisely one possible interpretation of the umlaut at 1 Cor. 14:33: that it marks the place where other witnesses add διδασκόω.\textsuperscript{165} Both of Payne’s other passages where he sees significance in the “bar-umlaut” combination also match this pattern: the umlauts at John 7:52 and Luke 14:24 would mark the place where other manuscripts add text – at the end of the marked line. There is therefore evidence that B places umlauts on lines in which other witnesses add text at the end of that line, and that sufficient space to write any portion of the additional word(s) is not needed for the umlaut to be placed on that line. Payne dismisses the reading διδασκόω at 14:33 (and Miller’s proposal for John 7:52) as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[164] Payne, “Response to Miller,” p. 110, citing Miller, “Observations,” p. 235. Payne's consistent use of “interpolation” to describe places where other manuscripts have text that is not present in B unwarrantedly prejudices the text-critical decision.
\item[165] The umlauts occasionally indicate knowledge of less well-attested readings, including some now known only from the versions, most prominently at 1 Cor. 6:20 and 11:10.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
“so minor that neither is listed in the NA” However, what is significant variant to one modern editor may not be the same as what was considered significant by a fourth-century scribe. Even a cursory review of the umlauts reveals that some relatively “unimportant” variants must have been marked, otherwise the thesis that the umlauts mark known variations would be called into question.  

A complete description of the “umlauts” in Vaticans is still lacking.

Undetermined, for example, are descriptions of the types of variation (addition, omission, etc.) typically marked by the umlauts, which witnesses these seem to be drawn from, full consideration of the possibility of readings marked in B but lost to the rest of the tradition, etc. However, it cannot be dismissed out of hand that the umlaut at 1 Cor. 14:33 may indicate knowledge of the reading διδασκαλω after αγιων. Payne’s arguments do not provide decisive evidence against this. Such a possibility turns to probability when 1) the connection between the bars and the umlauts has been severed and 2) the thesis that both Codex Fuldensis and 88 give evidence of manuscripts without 1 Cor. 14:34-35 has been proven incorrect.

I.D. Patristic Evidence

The patristic evidence has received less than complete attention in discussions regarding the mulier taceat. The nature of most citations preclude evaluation as to whether or not their text located the passage after 14:33 or 14:40. Furthermore, evidence from the early

---


167To cite only one example, at 1 Cor. 15:48-49 (1475c 1.30) an umlaut stands next to a line where the only known variants are οἱ οὐρανοὶ (9 alone omits οἱ; D* F G) for οἱ εὐρανοὶ of B and the rest of the tradition; NA takes no notice. The omission of και in G and its substitution with αφα in F G is a Latinism unique to these witnesses; the reading did not exist when Codex Vaticanus was written.

168Miller’s M.Th thesis (“Scribal Sigla for Variant Readings in Vaticanus”) remains the most thorough study.
second century, when the proposed marginal gloss or interpolation would have taken place, is notoriously fragmentary. Nevertheless, Payne claims that there is evidence in the earliest fathers that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 was not present in some manuscripts.

Payne’s most significant evidence is Clement of Alexandria. Because Clement cites individual passages from 1 Cor. 14 (from 14:6-20, but nothing from 14:21-40) “yet calls both men and women without distinction to silence in church,” it is evident that he did not know of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. For evidence of this Payne cites two passages. First, he discusses Paedagogus 3,11,79,3-4, which fails to mention 1 Cor. 14:34-35 in Clement’s instruction on proper attire for men and women at worship. His discussion parallels 1 Tim. 2:9 (which he cites verbatim earlier at 3,11,66,3) in encouraging “decent” (κοσμίως) behavior, contrasted with the ostentatious dress of women discussed extensively previous to this section. Clement is discussing “how one must go to church” and the external appearance specifically of women (πλεῖον τοῦτο ἐχέτω ἡ γυνὴ – Payne’s citation elides this), not who carries out which roles in worship itself. Therefore Clement naturally alludes to the “veiling” of women in 1 Cor. 11:2-16, not 1 Cor. 14. Indeed, immediately after the citation he cites the example of Aineias, who flees unveiled from Troy. Clement’s silence on 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is therefore not unexpected.

Payne’s second cited passage likewise fails to support his argument that Clement did not know 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Drawing from the conclusion of Stromateis 4,19 (at 124,1), Payne highlights Clement’s positive view of women. Indeed, Clement does argue in 4,19 that women are equally capable of “perfection” (τελείωτητος 4,19,118,1) as are men, citing numerous women from Greek literature as examples (Lysidica, Philotera, the daughters of Diodorus, etc.). But, as at Paedagogus 3,11,79,3-4, Clement is not here discussing appropriate behavior in worship. Instead, he encourages education, excellence, righteousness,
sobriety, etc. In spite of this, immediately before this citation given by Payne, Clement still reflects something of the cultural background that lies behind the *mulier taceat*. Payne also contrasts Tertullian’s subordination of women (*De baptismo* 15,17) with Clement, but Clement himself later in 4.19 writes:

> Therefore the wise woman first attempts to persuade her husband to be her co-participant in that which produces true happiness. But if she unsuccessful, she must press on alone toward excellence, yielding to her husband in all things so as to do nothing against his will (πάντα μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρι πειθομένη ὡς μηδὲν ἀκοντος ἐκείνου πράξει) except what is considered to be important for excellence and salvation. (*Stromateis* 4,19,123,2-3)

While Clement does not cite 1 Cor. 14:34-35, the reason may be that the topics he addresses and his style of argumentation did not make its use necessary for his purposes. Furthermore, his description of the relationship between husband and wife is not as sharply contrasted with 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and Tertullian as Payne implies. Given that it is at least as likely that Clement knew 14:34-35 but did not cite it than that his text of 1 Corinthians lacked the passage, Payne’s *argumentum ex silentio* does not demonstrate that Clement can be cited as evidence of manuscripts of 1 Corinthians that lacked 14:34-35.170

---

169 C. Niccum (“The Voice of the Manuscripts,” p. 244) points out that an argument from silence can ultimately prove only that the passage is not cited. He notes that Clement knows 1 Tim. 2 but does not cite vv. 11-12; by Payne’s logic one would conclude that neither were these passages were in Clement’s text. Walker, noting the same problems with the argumentation employed by Payne, suggests that such evidence be used to determine interpolation “with great caution,” but that “it may serve a corroborative function and thereby strengthen the case for interpolation.” (*Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, pp. 71-2).

170 The other ancient writers listed by Payne (“Codex Fuldensis,” p. 247) as not having cited 1 Cor. 14:34-35 (the writings of the “Apostolic Fathers,” Irenaeus, Tatian, Caius, Hippolytus) may all be explained on similar grounds: Some rarely cite Paul at all, others are addressing apologetic issues and not internal matters of worship practice, and the writings of all are a mere fragment of what they are known to have produced. An argument from silence based on the evidence of these writers is no more decisive than one based on Clement. Furthermore, there appear to be problems with Payne’s evidence. He claims that Athenagoras cites 1 Cor. 14:32 and 14:37 (without providing a reference) but not 14:34-35. I was not able to verify either citation; in *Legatio* Athenagoras cites 1 Cor. 6:7 (1,4) and 15:32 (12,3) and in *De resurrectione* 15:32 (19,3) and 15:53 (3,2; 18,5). See the indices of W. Schoedel,
On the other hand, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is known and cited explicitly by several early fathers. The earliest firm evidence is Marcion, whose knowledge of the text is shown by Epiphanius (Panarion 42,11,8 42,12,3; cf. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem 5,8,11), though whether he read the passage after 14:33 or after 14:40 cannot be determined.171 Tertullian himself also uses the passage.172 In the third century173 it is found in Cyprian,174 and most likely Origen.175 Though somewhat later, the passage is also cited in the Armenian translation of Ephraem’s commentary,176 apparently the only Syriac father to cite the passage.177

Athenagoras. Legatio and De Resurrectione (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). Given the titles and contents of these writings, it is hardly surprising that 1 Cor. 15 is cited while 1 Cor. 14 is not. In any case, the authorship of the latter writing is disputed; cf. M. Marcovich, Athenagorae. Qui fertur De resurrectione mortuorum, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), esp. pp. 1-3.

171Fitzer (“Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde,” pp. 7-8) concludes not only that it was part of Marcion’s text but that Epiphanius’ use of εὔταξία and οὐκ ἀτακτος in the Elenchus to the passage suggests that he knew the passage in the position after v. 40. U. Schmid (Marcion und sein Apostolos, p. 134), however, notes that while previous researchers on Marcion (Harnack, Blackman, Clabeaux) have universally considered the passage as a firmly attested reading in Marcion’s text, whether he read it after v. 33 or after v. 40 cannot be determined. The linguistic evidence cited by Fitzer only points generally to the context of 1 Cor. 14.

172De baptismo 17,5; De virginibus velandis 9,1 and perhaps 3,2.

173The Biblia patristica cites also a hymn (15) of Commodianus, but this is clearly based on 1 Tim. 2:9 (esp. the reference to women’s adornment) and not 1 Cor. 14:34. See J. Martin, Commodiani carmini, CCSL 128 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1960), p. 54.

174Ad Quirinium 46.

175Origen’s evidence comes from the cantenae manuscripts edited by C. Jenkins in Journal of Theological Studies 10 (1909), pp. 41-42 (§ 74). On the uncertainty regarding this material see D. Hannah, The Text of Origen in the Writings of Origen (Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1997), pp. 7-8. It is also cited in a translation by Rufinus of Adversus haereticos 2,18 and in Libri Adamantii Origenis adverses haereticos 2,18, though here Rufinus’ and Origen’s material is not easily distinguished. Payne does not list Origen as one of the early authors who do not cite the passage (“Codex Fuldensis,” pp. 247-48).


177Cf. NTSU II,1, pp. 452-53.
Forty years ago Fitzer lamented that we do not yet have a Pauline manuscript that does for 1 Cor. 14:34-35 what ἕλατο did for John 7:53-8:11: provide incontrovertible evidence for the absence of a lengthy portion of text that, on internal grounds, was widely regarded as secondary. Despite the sustained efforts of Payne, still today there is neither manuscript nor patristic evidence, direct or indirect, for the omission of 14:34-35 from any Pauline manuscript.

II. The Extent of the Proposed Interpolation

Determining whether or not any manuscripts lacks 14:34-35, or assessing whether the displacement of the text is an indication of the secondary nature of the passage, is significant only for those who limit the proposed interpolation to 14:34-35. Others consider the passage secondary not on the basis of marginal notations in early manuscripts, but as only

---


179 The terms "gloss," "interpolation," and "redaction" have not always been used with precision. W. Walker clarifies these terms in his Interpolations in the Pauline Letters: "A gloss is an explanatory note or comment, generally written in the margin or occasionally between the lines of a manuscript by a reader, scribe, or perhaps even the author of the document in which it now appears." (p. 22) "Unlike a gloss, an interpolation is foreign material inserted deliberately and directly into the text of a document. As already noted, however, a gloss might be copied by a scribe into the body of a manuscript, be reproduced in later transcriptions, and thus now appear in some or perhaps even all of the surviving texts. In such cases, the distinction between gloss and interpolation becomes problematic." (p. 23) Last, citing Charlesworth, redactions "are passages embedded into the fabric of the document and cannot be excised; 'early sources are so reworked from a new perspective that they cannot be distinguished from the more recent sections... [I]t is often impossible to distinguish between an interpolation and a redaction.'" (pp. 23-24) Walker's monograph deals primarily with this precise definition of "interpolation." Though "gloss" is the term used by Zuntz and Fee, their description of the problem at 1 Cor. 14:34-35 falls into Walker's category of "Interpolation." Redactional activity has apparently not been proposed in order to account for the passage; indeed, its alleged unique character would rule out redaction.

One example of extensive redactional activity that took place prior to the Pauline letter collection. W. Walker, in a series of articles and now a monograph, has argued that there is "a priori probability" for interpolations in the Pauline letters. This is based on evidence of extensive editing in other ancient literature, including Jewish and Christian texts, the fact that the Pauline letters have been transmitted only in a single collection that likely underwent revision in the process of gathering the individual letters together, and evidence of "short additions" in the subsequent manuscripts of this collection. Walker discusses Fee's arguments on 1 Cor. 14:34-35, but does not see the shifting position in the manuscripts in itself as decisive proof of interpolation. This is not the place to interact with Walker's theory of extensive interpolations in the epistles. At this place it is necessary only to note

181 Walker, Interpolations in the Pauline Letters. Walker's extensive research leading up to the publication of the monograph is listed in that book's bibliography, pp. 254-55.

182 Though this process would seem to fall into his category of "redaction" rather than, strictly speaking, "interpolation."


184 Fee's third scenario—the original absence of 1 Cor. 14:34-35—is one possible explanation for the varied location of the passage in the surviving manuscripts, and as such it should be given serious consideration" and "the different locations in various witnesses does indeed constitute evidence, inconclusive though it may be, that the passage may be an interpolation." Walker, Interpolations in the Pauline Letters, pp. 70-71. Cf. also E.g., C. Mount, "1 Corinthians 11:3-16: Spirit Possession and Authority in a Non-Pauline Interpolation," Journal of Biblical Literature 124 (2005), pp. 313-40, who argues that in several apparently interpolated passages, "appeals to the manuscript tradition are of little value for reconstructing the redaction of the Corinthian correspondence." (p. 316). Further, specifically regarding 1 Cor. 14:34-35 he notes that "some evidence of tampering exists in the manuscript tradition . . . In itself, however, this is very weak manuscript evidence for vv. 33b-46 as an interpolation." (p. 316 n. 10); also J. Weiss, p. 342; Conzelmann, p. 246 n. 54.

185 Walker ("Interpolations in the Pauline Letters," pp. 215-6) describes Marcion's text as one of two "significantly different versions of the Pauline corpus [that] circulate in the century: that accepted by Marcion (no longer extant) and that recognized by his opponents." This, for him, is evidence that the "historical winners" suppressed his text. While he uses 1 Cor. 14:34-35 as a "test case" for recognizing interpolations, he apparently fails to notice that both Marcion's and the alternative text contain 14:34-35. This fact would seem to rule out the
that for some who argue that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is non-Pauline, the fact that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 appears in different locations in the manuscripts is not decisive evidence of interpolation/redaction, but at best corroborative evidence. For them, its secondary nature is based on content and structure.

The differing proposals for the extent of the interpolation make clear the distinction between those who attempt to resolve the problem of the *mulier taceat* on the basis of text-critical principles and those who do so on the basis of arguments that take little notice of the manuscripts themselves. Zuntz, for example, apparently did not consider the evidence of the different locations in the manuscripts to be decisive, as is evident from that fact that he considers 14:33b-35 to be the marginal gloss, not 14:34-35. He stands in a long tradition of viewing the interpolation as encompassing 14:33b through 35 (or 36). Others expand the proposed interpolation further. Dautzenberg argues that κυρίον ἔστιν ἐντολή at 14:37 cannot apply to all of 1 Cor. 12-14, but does refer specifically to 14:33b-36. V. 38 is clearly connected to v. 37, so the entire unit (33b-38) must represent an interpolation. Munro is forced to conclude that the connections within 14:32-38 are so clear that the entire section most be post-Pauline. When the issue is divorced from the witness of the manuscripts, the differing criteria make consensus regarding the extent of the proposed interpolation impossible. This study limits itself to the text-critical problem as presented in the use of this passage as an example of such interpolations.

---

186 Weiss, p. 342; Klauck, p. 240; Conzelmann (p. 246) sees 33b-36 as interpolated.


manuscripts. Therefore it will not directly interact with the theory that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is one of numerous examples of interpolations letter prior to their collection in the *Corpus Paulinum.*

**III. Internal Evidence**

The internal arguments against the authenticity of 14:34-35 (and surrounding material) do not differ significantly among those who argue against the authenticity of the *mulier taceat.* In order to ultimately settle the "internal evidence" question one would need to resolve every issue of language, rhetoric, and setting of 1 Cor. 14. This is not possible here. Instead, it will be shown that the arguments against situating the *mulier taceat* after 1 Cor. 14:33 are not as decisive as is sometimes portrayed, and that other solutions are equally and at times even more convincing. The categorization of the types of argumentation follows that used by Walker in the discussion of interpolations in the epistles.

**III.A. Contextual Evidence**

Every argument for the secondary nature of 14:34-35 points to the disruption that it creates to the structure of 14:33-36 and the larger argument of 1 Cor. 12-14: "One can make

---

189 This does not rule out the possibility that the entire tradition has been corrupted in places, as conjectures have already been posited at 1:2; 6:5; 10:5; 14:25, 33. However, each of these corruptions can be identified as having taken place after the "publication" of the archetype of the *Corpus Paulinum,* as distinct from proposed pre-collection interpolations.

190 A summary of early- to mid-twentieth century research on 1 Cor. 14:34-35 may be found in Munro, *Authority in Paul and Peter,* pp. 15-16. The present study will focus on material from the last thirty years.

much better sense of the structure of Paul's argument without these intruding sentences."  
On the sentence level, it is claimed that with 14:34-35 removed, 14:33b completes the sentence begun in 14:33a. Furthermore, the argument of 14:34-35 is seen to lack correspondence with the argument of the surrounding material. First, the command to silence is not made regarding an activity but is limited to only one group of people (women); this is done only here and at 14:29 with reference to prophets. Second, the speech rebuked in 14:34-35 is not connected to the Spirit's activity, whereas all other instructions in 1 Cor. 14 center on speech in the community which has been given by the Spirit.

This approach to the passage, however, falls short on two counts. First, the fact that there is no consensus over the extent of the proposed interpolation (as discussed above) indicates that the passage is not as out of place in the immediate context as is typically described. Second, those who approach the epistle from the perspective of rhetorical analysis find that 14:34-35 is not out of place in the argument of 12-14. Some see the entire section as a carefully constructed argument that singles out a particular group of Corinthian women for rebuke, the point made most clearly at 14:34-35 itself. Wire is able to conclude:

---


"Paul's forcing a spiritual vote of confidence at exactly this point shows that the women's silencing is not a parenthetical matter but the turning point in his argument concerning the spiritual. Once he has called for their silence he has done all he needs to do."

It may therefore be safely concluded that 14:34-35 is suitable within the micro-structure of 14:26-36. This section is then followed by the peroratio of 14:37-40, an appropriate conclusion to the argument of 1 Cor. 12-14. Not all who apply rhetorical analysis to 1 Corinthians see 14:34-35 as rhetorically appropriate. However, at least one scholar who previously rejected the passage as post-Pauline later accepted it as authentic; in 1988 B. Witherington saw it as part of a later anti-feminist tendency, but in 1995 he is able to say that "Vv. 34f. Are, in any argumentation of 1 Corinthians 12-14, Paul has been preoccupied with the two finite questions οἱ πνευματικοὶ and τὰ πνευματικά; the spiritual people and the spiritual gifts (notably glossolalia). These two themes have been subtly interwoven in his argumentation, but finally they are explicitly stated. There is a group among the spiritual people with whom Paul is especially concerned, a group of tongue speaking women. Paul's solution to the disorder in the worship services is therefore that the women pneumatics should stop speaking in tongues in public" (p. 93). Cf. L. A. Jervis, "1 Corinthians 14:34-35: A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women," Journal for the Study of the New Testament 58 (1995), pp. 51-74 (esp. p. 71); Wire, The Corinthian Women Prophets, pp. 152-58.


199 Dautzenberg (p. 254) describes a tripartite structure to 14:26-36: Instructions for tongue speakers (14:27-28), prophets (14:29-33a), and women (14:33b-36). Eriksson ("Women Tongue Speakers, Be Silent," pp. 80-104) uses this argument to argue that the passage is an integral part of the context of 1 Cor. 14, noting that all three instructions have the same structural elements: "a general regulation, a reason supporting the rule, and an example in conditional form telling what to do in a given case" (p. 89). Also E. Schüssler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins, (London: SCM Press, 1983), p. 230. Wire (The Corinthian Women Prophets, pp. 153-54), however, notes that there remain "significant differences" among these instructions, but that the differences can be accounted for either as "premeditated or intuition" on the part of Paul.

200 J. Smit, "Argument and Genre of 1 Cor. 12-14," in Rhetoric and the New Testament, ed. S. A. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 211-30. On p. 219 n. 25 he argues that because the prohibition is not included in the partitio (14:1-5) it is not to be expected, and further "the conformity in the structure between 12:4-30 and 14:1-33a leaves no room for this prohibition."
case definitely not a digression . . . The theory that vv. 34f. are, in fact, a post-Pauline
interpolation should be rejected for several reasons.\textsuperscript{201}

The suitability of 14:34-35 withinvv. 33-36 at the same time argues against the
possibility that the passage could have originally been located after v. 40 and then moved to
the position after v. 33. The ωστε at 14:39 indicates that Paul is concluding that section of his
argument, as he does also at 7:38; 11:33; and 15:58. To introduce, after the ωστε, what would
be at that point a new argument is scarcely possible.\textsuperscript{202}

III.B. Linguistic Evidence

Arguments for and against the authenticity of a passage based on linguistic usage are
notoriously difficult. With respect to the mulier taceat, appeal is typically made to rare
usages that are more obviously non-Pauline when compared with the surrounding context.
Every example, however, can be shown to be less difficult than is frequently described. First,
εν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις is seen as difficult, particularly in such close proximity to “as in all the
churches” (14:33).\textsuperscript{203} Second, σιγάω is firm in Paul only at 14:28-30.\textsuperscript{204} Fee contrasts the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{202}Cf. Fitzer, \textit{“Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde,”} p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{203}Schrage III, pp. 482-83. Fee also points to “the use of the plural ‘in the churches,’ which occurs nowhere else in Paul” (“Excursus on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35,” p. 279). By this he apparently means the use of the phrase without πός (1 Cor. 7:17; 14:33). Nevertheless, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ (Gal. 1:22) and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ refers to groups of relatively unspecified assemblies and are not so different from 1 Cor. 14:34, where the Corinthians would presumably be able to understand that Paul is referring to their assemblies, not “all the assemblies” referenced in 14:33. Furthermore, the text is not firm, and the singular is more likely the archetypical reading, with the plural form assimilated to the form at 14:33 (see the discussion at 14:34.152).
\item \textsuperscript{204}Walker, \textit{“Interpolations,”} p. 230.
\end{itemize}
usage at 14:34 with that later in the chapter, claiming that “in vv. 28-30 it is of an otherwise legitimate activity that in some circumstances is being curtailed, whereas the injunction to silence is absolute.” However, it is possible to view these injunctions not as “absolute,” but as response to specific situations in Corinth (see below). Third, ἐπιτρέπω is never elsewhere used in the passive, and does not refer to regulation regarding human conduct. Fourth, the “absolute use” of λαλέω in both vv. 34 and 35 is described as foreign to 1 Cor. 14, where it is always connected with “tongues.” However, as Keener notes, “Unless Paul changes the subject from women’s submissive silence (1 Cor. 14:34) to asking questions privately (1 Cor. 14:35) and back again to silence (1 Cor. 14:35), asking questions is at least a primary example of the sort of speech he seeks to forbid.” Fifth, ὑποτάσσω refers to submission to humans only at Rom. 13:1; 1 Cor. 14:32; 1 Cor. 16:16. This hardly seems problematic. Furthermore, the noun is so used at Gal. 2:5 and possibly 2 Cor. 9:13. Sixth, ἐπερωτάω is found only at Rom. 10:20, in a citation of Isa. 65:1. However, it may simply reflect the fact that Paul simply does not have need to use the verb elsewhere; note that αἰτέω (1 Cor. 1:22) and ἐρωτάω (not used in the Hauptbreife) are no more common. Seventh, αἰσχρός is found only at 11:6, “part of another suspected non-Pauline interpolation. This is the only other

---

205 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 702.
207 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 702.
occurrence of the adverbial form in the *Hauptbriefe*. However, the cognate verbs are common (*αἰσχύνω* 2 Cor. 10:8; Phil. 1:20; *καταισχύνω* Rom. 5:5; 9:33; 10:11; 1 Cor. 1:27; 11:4, 5, 22; 2 Cor. 7:14; 9:4; 10:8). Fee argues that the example at 1 Cor. 14:35 appeals to shame as "a general cultural matter," unlike the usage at 11:5 (a verb, not an adjective).\(^{212}\) However, this contrast depends on his interpretation that "shaming her head" (11:5) refers exclusively to her husband, an interpretation which too narrowly defines the referent.\(^{213}\)

Eighth, particular attention is given to the phrase *καθώς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει*. This is regarded as unviable since *νόμος* is used "in the absolute sense, without quoting or referring to a specific passage—which is unknown in Paul."\(^{214}\) The phrase has been interpreted in various ways, however. Some note the similarity to 1 Cor. 7:19, where Paul appeals to "commandments of God" abstractly.\(^{215}\) Others claim that the "law" referenced here is not the Scriptures but local customs or manners.\(^{216}\) Furthermore, the Law's "speaking" corresponds to similar Pauline expressions (1 Cor. 9:8; Rom. 3:19; 7:7).\(^{217}\)

Many of these descriptions are extremely narrowly defined, so much so that they are

\(^{212}\)Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 708; Fitzer, "*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde,*" p. 36.

\(^{213}\)Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 508 n. 68, where he acknowledges that it is possible that 'her head' is more ambiguous and refers also to her own shame." Both Thiselton (pp. 828-33) and Schrage (p. 501) argue that the referent of *κεφαλή* at 11:5 cannot be limited to the husband.


unhelpful. The burden of proof is placed intolerably high if a word is secondary because it only occurs in the very same context (στησω), or if a word that Paul uses elsewhere in the same letter is suspect simply because only here is the passive form used (ἐπιτρέπω). By way of comparison, the analysis of the problems of linguistic usage in the clearly non-Pauline addition at Rom. 16:25-27 is much more decisive. The linguistic arguments made in the case of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 are more tentative.

III.C. Ideational Evidence

As with the linguistic criteria, there is an element of uncertainty with “Ideational Evidence” since it involves prejudgments on what an author could have written. Nevertheless, this is often cited as a key argument against the authenticity of the mulier taceat. Fee sees “obvious contradiction” with 11:2-16, but Walker claims that both passages are non-Pauline. Therefore, he contrasts the content of 14:34-35 with “Paul’s avowed egalitarianism as articulated in Gal. 3:27-28... his surprisingly even-handed discussion of sex, marriage, and divorce in 1 Corinthian 7; and the very positive and non-discriminatory manner in which he speaks of women with whom he has been associated in

---


219 “[T]he ideational type of argument can easily be a circular one. The perception of a writer’s point of view depends on what he is take to have written. Thus to decide in advance what he thinks can predetermine the judgment as to what he has or has not written.” Munro, Authority in Paul and Peter, p. 21.

220 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 702; Schrage III, pp. 484-5 describes “Der offensichtliche Widerspruch zu 11,5.” Cf. Fitzer, “Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde,” p. 15-17. Conzelmann (p. 346) notes the “contradiction” between 11 and 14, but since he presumes that 1 Corinthians is a composite document and chaps. 11 and 14 likely distinct Pauline letters, “the contradiction remains.”
the work of the church.”

The relationship to 11:2-16 is a critical issue. Lietzmann represents a more traditional approach, claiming that 11:2-16 is in fact arguing for appropriate women’s dress, not for their “right” to pray or prophecy. Paul does not bring up the issue of “silence” at that point because there he is dealing with a different matter. However, in chapter 14 the issue is proper and improper speech, so that “here the actual opinion of the Apostle comes to light,” that women should be “silent.” Other plausible reconstructions are possible. T. Paige describes the situation as arising from the social interaction between men and women in Greco-Roman society:

“The ‘speech’ that is branded ‘shameful’ by Paul in 1 Cor 14 was not sacral speech at all; it was ordinary conversation with men who were not relatives. What the content of this conversation was we do not know, for it is not Paul’s main concern. The main danger is clear from the fact that Paul turns them away from speaking to men in the assembly, directing them to speak with ‘their very own personal men’ (i.e., husbands) and to do so ‘at home.’ Women’s leadership is not the issue; rather, it is modesty and honorable behavior.”

He notes that 1 Corinthians itself shows that problems related to sexuality and marriage are prevalent in Corinth (1 Cor. 5:1; 6:12-20; 7:1-5, 13-14; 11:5-10).223

Others who analyze the passage using situational and rhetorical analysis find even stronger ideational connection between the two passages. Mitchell sees the instruction of 14:34-35 as “authentic because it fits well the argument for concord throughout 1

---


222 Lietzmann, p. 75. His additional note on p. 190 considers in addition that 11:2-16 discusses different types of speaking than that described at 14:34-35. Cf. also Hollander, “The Meaning of the Term ‘Law,’” p. 128.

Corinthians.” While 1 Cor. 11 discusses women’s speaking in worship, 14:34-35 deals with “questions from non-officiants in the ceremony.”224 Wire argues that the basis of Paul’s arguments regarding the practices of women is consistent in both places: “As in his argument on head covering, Paul has argued from nature (in this case God’s nature), community practice, sexual subordination, the written tradition, and shame.”225 More recently, J. Økland has argued that both 1 Cor. 11:2-16 and 14:34-35 conform to Pauline argumentation regarding the distinction between what should take place ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ and what is proper to ἐν οἴκῳ.226

Furthermore, while there is apparent tension between Gal. 3:28 and 14:34-35, this is true for many Pauline instructions. The “egalitarianism” expressed there does not evidence itself, for example, in his discussion of “slave” and “free” (1 Cor. 7:17-24). Schüssler Fiorenza reconstructs the rhetorical setting of 1 Corinthians itself as Paul’s response to alternative interpretations of the baptismal formula used at Gal. 3:28. Since the passage is a pre-Pauline tradition other interpretations must have existed. She concludes that Paul’s rhetoric in 1 Cor. 14 encourages “his model, [which is] order and decency, as well as subordination and silence.”227 While Gal. 3:28 may not be the central issue prompting the

224Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation, pp. 281-82.


problems in Corinth, this is only one of several proposed settings which demonstrate that there is, in fact, correspondence, not tension, between 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and other passages in the Corpus Paulinum and 1 Corinthians 11 in particular. The ideas expressed in the mulier taceat are not so unique that the only way to account for its presence in 1 Corinthians is to regard it as a post-Pauline interpolation.

III.D. Situational Evidence

Here again, a key assumption is that Paul was “egalitarian” while those who later used his letters were not. It is claimed that apart from 1 Cor. 11:3-16 (which itself is often considered non-Pauline), there is no evidence in the undisputed letters to suggest that the activity of women was regarded as a problem by Paul. Instead, the positive depiction of women, such as Prisca and Phoebe, indicates their important role in the Pauline communities. However, as described under the heading “Ideational Evidence,” there are compelling descriptions of the situation and argument of 1 Cor. 12-14 which would see 14:34-35 as part of a larger argument dealing with specific problems in Corinth. Furthermore, the absence of evidence is only that. By the same argument, one could claim that there is no evidence that practices regarding the community meal were ever a problem apart from a single discussion in 1 Cor. 11:17-34, or that recourse to local courts was an issue apart from 1

228 J. Delobel concludes: “The contradiction then with 1 Cor. 11 and Gal. 3 is only apparent. It must be added that the extremely accidental and fragmentary nature of Paul’s remarks on the situation of women does not facilitate a systematic and logical synthesis.” “Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?” in New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Church History, ed. B. Aland and J. Delobel, CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), pp. 98-117; citation on p. 111.

229 Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 232. Conzelmann (p. 246) describes it as a “bourgeois consolidation of the church, roughly on the level of the Pastoral Epistles.”

Cor. 6:1-8 (which would also apparently contradict another discussion in Rom. 13). Are these also to be considered post-Pauline insertions? Every Pauline letter is contextual, and it is well known that the setting of the congregation in Corinth was unique politically, socially, and economically among the Pauline churches.\textsuperscript{231} It should not be surprising that Paul is forced to address issues in the Corinthian correspondence which never occurred in the letters written to other assemblies.

III.E. Source-Critical or Comparative Evidence

Some have proposed that the source for the interpolation is 1 Tim. 2:9ff. Fee makes this suggestion without developing it.\textsuperscript{232} While thematic parallels between the two passages are most often highlighted, specific linguistic connections are also taken as indications a close relationship. Επιτρέπω, ὑποταγή, and ἡσυχία are most often singled out,\textsuperscript{233} though it is to be noted that the verb ὑποτάσσω (not the adjective) is used in the mulier taceat, and it is likely that στύγω and ἡσυχία are constraining different activities.\textsuperscript{234} It is further argued that the pseudo-Pauline letters contain many restrictions on the activity of women, suggesting a later date of origin for the mulier taceat as well.\textsuperscript{235}

However, the passage has only a prima facie similarity to 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Jervis sees

\textsuperscript{231}The literature is immense, e.g., B. Winter, After Paul Left Corinth. The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

\textsuperscript{232}Fee, First Corinthians, p. 705: “one must assume that the words were first written as a gloss in the margin by someone who, probably in light of 1 Tim. 2:9-15, felt the need to qualify Paul’s instructions even further.” Cf. J. Weiss, p. 342.


\textsuperscript{234}Cf. the dicussion of στύγω above; in 1 Tim 2:2 ἡσυχίος is also used also of men, and may not refer to absolute silence (Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἡσυχία and ἡσυχίος).

some significant differences between the passages. First, because the gloss is positioned in connection with prophecy, the interpolator’s context would have to be identical to the experience of “gifts” and “prophecy” to that of Paul and Corinth. However, “the Pastoral letters give little evidence that they churches to which they were written experienced prophecy in a manner comparable to the Corinthian church.” Second, Paul employs the concept of “shame” in another discussion involving women (1 Cor. 11:6), but this is not found in 1 Tim. 2 and occurs in the pastorals only at Tit. 1:11. Third, επιτρέπω at 1 Tim. 2:12 is in the first person and “should be read as a personal opinion advising a temporary restriction,” while at 1 Cor. 14:34 it is in the third person and “communicates not personal opinion but common custom.”

Moreover, key differences remain between 1 Tim. 2 and 1 Cor. 14:34-35. For example, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 limits “learning” to the home while in 1 Tim. 2 it takes place in the assembly. Second, the concern in 1 Tim. 2 is that of teaching and authority, while the mulier taceat is concerned with asking questions and learning. Witherington is able to conclude that: “the text is not sufficiently close to 1 Tim. 2:11f. to warrant the argument that they were based on a scribe’s editing of that text.”

Furthermore, the proposal of a gloss from the Pastorals added to one of the first copies of the Corpus Paulinum is difficult to account for given what little we know about the early history of the Corpus. For example, Marcion knew only a ten epistle Corpus, one which did not include the Pastorals (or Hebrews). While the precise relationship between the

---


238 Witherington, Conflict and Community in Corinth, p. 288.
Corpus Marcion used and the thirteen (later fourteen) letter corpus is not clear, the fact that Marcion knows 1 Cor. 14:34-35 but not the Pastorals should cause some hesitancy in proposing 1 Tim. 2 as a source for an interpolation into 1 Cor. 14.240

III.F. Motivational Evidence

The motivation for the interpolation is typically described as loss of the egalitarian thinking of Paul in the post-Pauline Christian communities: “After the time of Paul, the status and role of women in the church apparently came to be regarded as something of a problem.” Schrage does not limit the origin of “androcentric-patriarchal” thinking to the post-Pauline church, noting parallels in Greco-Roman and Rabbinic literature. Nevertheless, its evident connection to 1 Tim. 2 marks it as deuto- or even trito-Pauline in origin.242 Munro posits that “an extensive literary stratum” has been interpolated into the Pauline letters and 1 Peter which emphasizes apostolic authority and subjection to it. The Pastoral epistles in their entirety belong to this stratum, and evidence of “subjectionist teaching” regarding to “the subordinate place of women, the vast institution of slavery, and the imperial authority of Rome” is found in numerous places in the Pauline letters, especially 1 Cor. 11:2-16. Munro goes so far as to date this “Pastoral” revision of the Pauline letters to “the period before,


240Allison (“Let Women be Silent in the Churches,” p. 43) notes that the “old thesis” that “the decree in 1 Timothy is based on the Taceat is not so easily discarded, either. . .the texts look like a very typical case of deuto-Pauline extension of Paul’s teaching.”


242Schrage III, pp. 485-86; also Klauck, p. 106, to whom the only other alternative is to posit that the NT does not speak with a unified voice on the role of women in congregational life.
during, and after the second Jewish war of 133-135.” Interaction with this wide-ranging thesis is impossible here. However, the fact that already Clement of Rome and 2 Peter know of collections of Paul’s letters, and that Marcion possessed a ten-letter corpus — which included 1 Cor. 14:34-35 — only a few years later, makes it unlikely that the previous collections would have been so completely supplanted in so short a time so as to result in a manuscript tradition which never lacks the mulier taceat (let alone 1 Cor. 14:32-38, as Munro posits).

The assumption of the abandonment of Pauline egalitarianism in the communities that continued to use his letters is difficult to prove apart from the proposed interpolated and pseudonymous texts. This assumption is by no means universally held. Økland, for example, writes: “I do not share many of the presuppositions concerning the unique early Christian egalitarianism that make the interpolation arguments work.”

III.G. Locational Evidence

This evidence attempts to explain why the interpolation was made at this location. The putative interpolation was placed at the end of 1 Cor. 14 because of a loose connection to “speaking,” “being subject,” and that this is the practice of “all the churches.” However, while there are connections to the surrounding material, those who reject the passage as non-Pauline argue that they are present in 14:34-35 is a way that is completely different from the surrounding context.

The use of internal evidence as applied to 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is indecisive. The

---

243Munro, Authority in Paul and Peter, pp. 148-50.

244Økland, Women in Their Place, p. 151.

arguments against the authenticity of this passage are not as strong as they are in other
interpolations in the NT manuscripts, notably the Pericope de adultera, the ending of Mark,
and the doxology in Romans. Furthermore, all these passages have unambiguous evidence
for their omission in the manuscripts, evidence which does not exist in the case of 1 Cor.
14: 34-35. Finally, it is frequently difficult to disentangle the arguments made for or against
the authenticity of this passage from a given researcher's theological concerns, regardless of
that researcher's theological viewpoint. This warning is well expressed by J. Delobel:

The present concern for the situation of man and woman in the church has greatly
stimulated the proliferation of literature on this passage. In principle, this interest is
positive, so long as it does not become an anachronistic bias hampering objective
exegesis. Contemporary concern should not decide whether or not a statement can be
Pauline.

This does not diminish the role of internal evidence in this discussion, but should remind us
that keeping evidence, meaning, implications, and our own contexts separate is a challenging
task.

IV. The "Marginal Gloss" Theory

As opposed to proposals of massive interpolation or extensive redaction in the Pauline
letters, only the "marginal gloss" theory relies on text-critical evidence and argumentation.
As noted above, the proposed extent of the secondary text, when considered as a problem of
textual criticism, must be limited to the text that is in a different location in D F G and the
Latin tradition. Indeed, the marginal gloss theory requires that the interpolation be so limited,
for if the passage was a marginal gloss, no scribe would presumably insert one part of the

246 See, respectively, Parker, The Living Text of the Gospels, pp. 95-102 and 124-47; J.
K. Elliott, "The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel," Theologische
to the Epistle to the Romans."

marginal note after 14:33 and another after 14:40. The marginal gloss theory also differs from
the interpolation or redaction theories in its reconstruction of the time at which the additions
were made. While the latter posit editing prior to or during the final formation of the letter
collection, the gloss theory places the activity in the scribal process, either during or
immediately after the formation of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

Gordon Fee has mounted the most significant and sustained defense of the secondary
nature of 14:34-35 as a gloss on a text-critical basis. First, using the basic procedure of all
sound textual criticism, he argues that one must accept the reading as original that explains
the rise of the others.\(^{248}\) Using this procedure, he lists three possible explanations for the fact
that the disputed passage is found in the manuscripts located after both 14:33 and 14:40:

Either (1) Paul wrote these words at this place and they were deliberately transposed
to a position after v. 40; or (2) the reverse of this, they were written originally after v.
40 and someone moved them forward to a position after v. 33; or (3) they were not
part of the original text, but were a very early marginal gloss that was subsequently
placed in the text at two different places.\(^{249}\)

Fee concludes that the third scenario best accounts for the textual situation. He finds no
parallel in the manuscript tradition which would explain either the first or second scenario.\(^{250}\)

His argument hinges on this statement:

> Whatever else, scribes were chiefly copyists, trying to reproduce a second — readable
> and useful — copy of a written document. In this case, however, the "scribe" who
> "transposed" Paul’s argument in this fashion can only have done so by deliberately
> rewriting the entire argument; it could not have happened by accident. It is arguable,

\(^{248}\) He labels this “Bengel's first principle” (First Corinthians, p. 699; repeated in
“Excursus on the Text of 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 272), though Epp labels “the harder reading is
to be preferred” as Bengel’s “leading and classic canon” which was formulated in response to
“his own urgent question as to which reading (in a given case) is likely to have arisen out of

\(^{249}\) Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 699.

\(^{250}\) Also J. Weiss, p. 342.
of course, that the scribe left out a considerable portion and then reinserted it at a convenient place. But that is merely a possible solution without an ounce of historical probability. We are talking about dropping several lines of text (seven in \(\text{P}^4\)), which could hardly be counted for as a copying error per se.\(^{251}\)

At 1 Cor. 14:34-35, movement of the passage as the result of repairing an unintentional omission caused by a leap is only a very remote possibility. Both homoioteleuton from the end of v. 33 (\(\Delta \Gamma \Lambda \chi \nu \Theta \) or \(\Delta \Lambda \Delta \chi \kappa \omega \)) to the end of v. 35 (\(\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \chi \varepsilon \chi \Lambda \) or \(\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \chi \chi \Lambda \chi \chi \)) and homoiarcton from the beginning of v. 34 (\(\Delta \Lambda \Gamma \chi \delta \kappa \chi \varepsilon \)) to the beginning of v. 36 (\(\H \Delta \phi \gamma \mu \nu \nu \)) are very unlikely.\(^{252}\) Efforts to explain the displacement (it is always described as displacement from after v. 33 to after v. 40) based on scribal discomfort with the passage have, to this point, been unconvincing.\(^{253}\) However, Fee's assertion that parallels for this type of displacement are found nowhere else in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Paulinum remains to be tested.

Nevertheless, while the uniqueness of this textual displacement has been used as evidence of its secondary nature, that same uniqueness raises the issue of why this marginal gloss was made — and apparently no others. Fee does not cite any evidence of any other gloss or marginal note which has crept into the text from an early edition of the Corpus. The examples he does offer are not found in the Pauline letters and differ significantly from what

\(^{251}\)Fee, "Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35," p. 277.

\(^{252}\)What would be entirely expected is the leap from \(\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \chi \sigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \) (v. 33) to \(\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \chi \sigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \) (v. 34) in 2138. See Text und Textwert II.2, p. 301. I am not aware of anyone suggesting an accidental leap from one paragraph to the next (v. 34 and 36 begin paragraphs in \(\Lambda\), for example), though the possibility exists.

\(^{253}\)D. W. Bryce, "'As in All the Churches of the Saints.' A Text-Critical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:34,35," Lutheran Theological Journal 31 (1987), pp. 31-39 proposes that Marcion omitted the verses because of the Judaic flavor, and the placement of the passage after 1 Cor. 14:40 is the result of its reintroduction in some witnesses. He appears to be unaware, however, that Marcion in fact read the passage (as discussed above under "Patristic Evidence").
he proposes in 1 Corinthians. John 5:3b-4 differs from 1 Cor. 14:34-5 in that it provides further information on the preceding material, not (as Fee proposes for the *mulier taceat*) a corrective to what precedes. 1 John 5:7 is even less comparable, for it is adopted into Latin manuscripts from a fourth century Latin commentary, then very late in the tradition translated from Latin and added to a handful of Greek minuscules — hardly similar circumstance to what Fee proposes for 1 Cor. 14:34-35.

Zuntz, with whom Fee regularly interacts in his commentary but does not cite here, does propose several passages “which must at one time have been written in the margin of the text [of an early copy of the *Corpus Paulinum*] and must have penetrated into it, either when the archetype was edited or even earlier.”

Rom. 7:25b “may be an addition by Paul himself of a summing up by some early reader”; 1 Cor. 1:16 “looks like a marginal addition by Paul himself”; Phlm. 19a is likely added from elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum*; 1 Cor. 10:29b-30 does not conform to “the manner of the diatribe”; and 1 Cor. 14:33b-35 “interrupts the evident connection between vv. 33a and 36. Some scholars regard it as a Pauline addition, but the material contradiction with 11:2ff. lends probability to the view that the passage is not original.” None of these, strictly speaking, involve textual variation in the manuscripts. For example it is 14:34-35, not 14:33b-35, that is in a different location. However, where Zuntz finds interruption and interpolation, recent scholars have found methods of argumentation that conform to Greco-Roman rhetoric. We have already discussed 1 Cor. 14:34-35 above. The other passages cited by Zuntz have also been studied within their context and found to be

---

254 Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 705.

255 Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, pp. 647-49; he notes several other additions to the manuscripts of 1 John.

256 Zuntz, pp. 16-17.
less problematic than Zuntz suggests. For example, on 1 Cor. 1:16 Margaret Mitchell notes 1:14-17 presents a brief narration which serves to refute Paul's own rhetorical question which combats their factionalism directly: μή οίκ το ἑμὸν δνομα ἔβαπτόθητε. He dismisses this possible false impression immediately by a brief narration of his baptismal activities in Corinth in the past (the proper time frame for narration). But this is not a major concern. After this brief treatment, v. 17 provides a smooth transition into the Proof section, and introduces the first two topics, wisdom and the cross. This too conforms to rhetorical practice.257

Similar conclusions have been reached regarding Zuntz's other proposed interpolations.258 1 Cor. 4:6 has also been proposed as a marginal note in pre-Corpus manuscript that was added— in a misread form— into the text. Zuntz does not discuss the passage; for our rejection of this analysis see the discussion ad loc. One cannot disprove, of course, that a single gloss was made at 1 Cor. 14. However, the lack of other examples makes the argument less convincing.

Several other challenges confront the marginal gloss theory. First, it is unlikely that a gloss would be added which contradicts Paul's teaching. For this reason a common alternative proposal is that Paul himself added a marginal comment to the letter as something of an afterthought to the argument.259 Second, one must presume an "anti-feminist" tendency in second century Christianity260 which was pronounced enough to have led to insertions and alterations in the manuscripts— again in order to undermine Paul's instruction. Typically

257Mitchell, Rhetoric of Reconciliation, pp. 201-2.


260Which must be contrasted with a presumed "egalitarian Paul." The difficulties of this reconstruction has already been discussed under "Ideational Evidence."
argued as a feature of the "Western" text of Acts, the alterations that are found result in "some loss of emphasis on women of leadership or prominence in Acts." While the textual alterations that produce this effect are not to be minimized, at the same time it must be noted that none involve a lengthy insertion, as is proposed for the *mulier taceat*. Third, there is no attempt in any manuscript to downplay or excise women "praying or prophesying" in chapter 11. Presumably, it would have been much easier to alter or remove a few words there than to add several lines of text in a place that is typically described as unsuitable for such instructions.

Despite the lack of evidence in the manuscripts of the Corpus Paulinum of an attempt to make alterations in order to counter Paul’s egalitarianism, the gloss theory remains prominent. Fee, in response to specific criticism of his theory, develops an argument that turns less on style and content than on disarming arguments that intentional alteration could have produced "displacement." He argues that neither location can be original because in both places the passage disrupts the flow of the argument, but at the same time the disruption is not so extreme that it would prompt a scribe to move the passage from one location to the other. He then concludes: “one can scarcely find a viable reason for such a total disruption

---


262 Holmes notes a similar flaw in past discussions of the "anti-feminist" tendency in the "Western" text of Acts: "A failure to include in an overall assessment those instances where positive statements have not been altered." (“Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts,” p. 202).

263 Fee’s argument initially sounds tautologous: “Likewise, if [both locations] can be shown to ‘fit’ reasonably well in either place, they can both be shown equally as well not to
of Paul’s argument, if either of the early texts were original; by the same token, one can give perfectly good reasons for the double interpolation, since the argument can be made to work equally well in either location.\textsuperscript{264} The rest of this discussion will demonstrate that displacements similar to that found in 1 Cor. 14 have taken place in the Corpus Paulinum, then seek to identify a motive for the displacement of the verses to the position after v. 40.

\textit{V. Lengthy Insertions in the Corpus Paulinum}

Three insertions in the Corpus Paulinum have been located in witnesses not associated with the bilinguals or the Latin tradition. Two of them are attested only in 075, a tenth century manuscript with commentary that lacks almost all of 1 Corinthians (up to 15:28). At Col 3:17, following δι' αυτου, 075 adds υποτασσομενοι αλληλοις εν φοβω χριστου, a verbatim insertion from Eph. 5:21. At 1 Tim. 3:2, the same manuscript adds, after φιλοξενον, αγριππον διορατικον ζεοντα τω πνευματι (“watchful, clear-sighted, overflowing with the spirit”). The source of this reference has not been identified;\textsuperscript{265} it may have been inserted from the commentary portion of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{266} These examples do not help us untangle the problem at 1 Cor. 14:34-35; they are unique to one late manuscript which has been in contact with numerous other Greek texts.

Because of its antiquity, a third insertion is more relevant to this discussion. A series of revisions at Gal. 4:22-26 has been lost to the manuscripts but preserved in the patristic evidence. Based on Tertullian’s citation in Adversus Marcionem 5,4,28, Harnack proposed

\footnotesize{fit in either place.” Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 275.}

\footnotesize{264}Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 276.

\footnotesize{265}A search of TLG yielded some examples similar to ζεοντα τω πνευματι, though these did not use the other words in the near context.

\footnotesize{266}I do not have access to images of 075.
that Marcion had reworked the passage himself. Both Clabeaux and Schmid point out, however, that the readings are found also in the Armenian translation of Ephraem, thus making it unlikely that Marcion is the source. Rather, a pre-Marcionite form of the text has been edited and used by both. The editing is extensive. At 4:23 there is a substitution/addition: “... one people of the Jews, according to the law begotten unto slavery” in place of “one from Mount Sinai, begetting into slavery” (Ephraem), or, in Marcion’s text, “one from Mount Sinai in the synagogue of the Jews, begetting into slavery.” At 4:26 two additions take place, the first of which is based on Eph. 1:21. After “the Jerusalem from above is free,” Ephraem adds, “just as Sara, and it is above all powers and principalities;” and again after “our mother” he adds, “the holy church, which we confess.” Tertullian’s citation of Marcion reveals a much lengthier insertion from Eph. 1:21. After “the other” (the referent being the “Jerusalem from above”) is found, “begetting above every principality, power, dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the one which is to come;” and following “which is our mother” Marcion reads “in which we have the promise of the holy church.” Schmid’s detailed analysis demonstrates that both writers are working from the same textual basis, with Ephraem incorporating the glosses more carefully into the passage. Schmid’s source-critical analysis is strengthened by his


269 The discussion of this passage is based on Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, p. 128.

270 Schmid (Marcion und sein Apostolos, p. 129 n. 228) points out that Molitor’s reconstruction of Ephraem’s text of Eph. 1:21 also ends, as does his additional text at Gal. 4:26, after the first two elements. This is unlikely to be mere coincidence.
observation that the editing reflects an enhancement of the latent anti-judaic sentiment of the passage, a sentiment which is known to exist in Christian circles of the late-first and early-second centuries (and later). 271

It must be concluded, therefore, that additions and interpolations took place in the *Corpus Paulinum* after the initial formation of the *Apostolos*. Only if Ephesians and Galatians were considered of equal “value” (and likely present in the same codex) would one be used to supply a perceived lack in the other. This extremely early editing – which must have taken place prior to Marcion – has had no impact on the transmission of the Greek text. 272

The only reading that may conceivably be connected is the addition of παντών after μητηρ at 4:26 (\(N^e\) A K L 056 075 cet). This is more likely, however, a typical addition, and not related by either theme or textual consanguinity to Ephraem or Marcion.

While this editing involves the insertion of a passage from one letter of the *Corpus Paulinum* into another, it does not mirror what is frequently proposed for the origin of 1 Cor. 14:34-35: that a marginal gloss, based on 1 Tim. 2:12ff., was written into the margin of an early (indeed, usually the earliest) manuscript of 1 Cor. 14. First, the added text in Galatians matches precisely the wording of the source text in Ephesians. This does not match what the putative interpolator of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 has done with his proposed source, 1 Tim. 2:9ff. Second, the elements that are not adopted from Ephesians are seamlessly incorporated into the structure of the sentences in Gal. 4:22-26, while the material from Ephesians is kept whole. Such is not the case in 1 Cor. 14:34-35, where the proposed gloss itself would be a

---

271 See in particular Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 129 and his conclusion (p. 311) that the Vorlage of Marcion’s *Apostolos* already contained anti-Judaic elements.

272 Aside from the typical addition/omission of articles and prepositions in some minuscules, the only textual problems are examples of parablepsis at v. 25 (αγαρ . . . αγαρ) and v. 26 (εστιν . . . εστιν Ν’).
mixture of themes from 1 Tim. 2 as well as foreign elements, so that the "source" is not immediately obvious apart from one or two vocables.

The comparison of the transmissional histories of these passages does shed light on the problem. While 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is read in every witness, including Marcion and Ephraem, the edited form of Gal. 4:22-26 exists only in those two writers. Yet both readings undeniably existed prior to the middle of the second century. What transmission process can account for this, if the "gloss theory" were accepted? 1 Cor. 14:34-35 must have been written into the margin of a manuscript. Next, a subsequent copy placed the gloss in the text itself. In what is now at least the third generation, a copy of one of these manuscripts underwent extensive revision at Gal. 4:22-26. Then copies of this edited manuscript were disseminated widely enough to be used by Marcion, likely in Rome by 144, and still in existence at the time of Ephraem in the fourth century. This edited version of Eph. 4:22-26 then disappeared from the manuscript tradition, but 1 Cor. 14:34-35 persisted. One must therefore posit at least four generations of manuscripts between the initial Corpus and Marcion, with both glosses taking hold in the tradition virtually immediately, then one of them disappearing. In this reconstruction, it seems that only Zuntz’s or Ellis’ proposals are viable, that the gloss was placed in the margin of the first copy of the Corpus Paulinum. To posit anything other, such as simply a "very early marginal gloss" are likely ruled out by the larger picture of the development of Ephraem’s and Marcion’s text. One must compress the period in which the mulier taceat was added to the Corpus Paulinum and gained a foothold into an extremely

---

273 Harnack, Marcion, pp. 25-26, proposes that Marcion’s produced his New Testament and his Antitheses in Rome between 139 and 144. A native of Pontus on the Black Sea, it is of course possible that Marcion brought an Apostolos text with him. This might account the similarity of Marcion’s text to the early Syriac tradition described by Schmid, in Marcion und sein Apostolos, p. 311 and Ephraem in particular on pp. 278-79.

274 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 699.
brief period. The later one dates the origins of the gloss, the less likely it is that the "gloss theory" can explain the shift of the passage from after 14:33 to after 14:40.

VI. Insertions and Displacements in D F G and the Latin Tradition

The "gloss theory" becomes unnecessary when it is recognized that the editorial activity seen in 1 Cor. 14 in D F G and the Latin tradition takes place elsewhere in the Corpus Paulinum text of those same witnesses. D F G and the Latin tradition attest five other textual additions or displacements in the Corpus Paulinum.275 These indicate intentional textual displacements, similar to what took place at 1 Cor. 14. Furthermore, several of them, combined with other evidence, indicate a particular awareness of the book of Acts and the role of Prisc(ill)a276 with respect to what happens "in all the churches."

Three displacements occur in Romans 16. First, at Rom. 16:3 after ησυχ is read καί την κατ οικιαν αυτων εκκλησιαν, having been moved there from 16:5, where it follows πασαι αι εκκλησιαι των εθνων. The shift is attested by D F G277 and VL 61 75 77 78 86 Γ278 but not 89 (which in Rom. 15-16 derives from a Latin tradition unconnected to the D-

275F G alone shifts clause-length text at Rom. 15:23 and adds text at Gal. 5:10. These are discussed in the chapter on D F G.

276Acts consistently uses πρίσκιλλα; the variation in the manuscripts of the Corpus Paulinum will be discussed at 1 Cor. 16:19 below.

277P omits και την κατ οικιαν αυτων εκκλησιαν from 16:5 but does not add it at 16:3; parablepsis is not an obvious reason for the omission, and may indicate that the alteration influenced Greek manuscripts outside the narrow bilingual tradition, as did the shift of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 in 88* 915.

278Γ is the leading witness of a cluster of Vetus Latina witnesses labeled the Γ group (also Γ and Γ). All the witnesses of this group share the readings discussed here in 1 Corinthians, but only Γ has been checked for its readings in Rom. 16 and Gal. 4.
text\textsuperscript{279}, Ambrosiaster, or Pelagius. Because the passage is moved from the later location to the earlier it cannot have been caused by accidental omission which was later noticed and added in the wrong place. Furthermore, it moves the phrase “the church in their house” closer to the referent of the pronoun, so that it is now clear that the church being greeted is the one at Prisc(ill)a’s and Aquila’s house. In so doing, however, the two relative clauses that modify Prisc(ill)a and Aquila (16:4) are separated from their referent. This myopic shift therefore disrupts the flow of the passage.

A second shift takes place at Rom. 16:16, from which the phrase καὶ αὐτῇ εἰκλησίαν τὸν χριστόν is shifted to a position after μου at 16:21. Virtually the same witnesses attest this alteration: D F G and VL 75 77 78 86. The reading of 61 Γ\textsuperscript{B} shows the process by which most of these displacements were removed by comparison to other witnesses: The phrase is read both at 16:16 and 16:21.\textsuperscript{280} Subsequent manuscripts would likely have removed the repeated text. This is not surprising in these I-text witnesses, which have been influenced by D-text readings. As at 16:3, this shift appears to be the result of intentional editing, for the verb and its object (αὐτῇ εἰκλησίαν ὑμᾶς / salutant vos) are omitted from 16:16 but not added at 16:21, where the noun phrase is incorporated into the syntax. In contrast to 16:3, however, there does not appear to be a significant advantage to the shift. It moves the greeting from “all the churches” away from the command to “greet with a holy kiss” to the position among several personal greetings. It may be that, as at 16:3, the greeting from “all the churches” was


\textsuperscript{280}According to Frede's table in \textit{Neuer Pauluskomentar}, p. 109, Γ\textsuperscript{B} shares the reading of 61 here, though since I do not have access to images of this witness for Romans I cannot verify its text.
felt to be more appropriate in a different location, though again there does not appear to be an obvious benefit to its new position.

A third shift is the removal of the benediction of 16:20 to the end of 16:24. Again, this is attested by D F G P and VL 61 75 77 78 86 ΦB (ο̲m η̲̲sou χρ̲ιςτ̲ω F G 77 78). This also is evidence of editing since it moves the benediction to what in the bilingual and D-text witnesses is the conclusion of the letter. The textual problem of the conclusion of Romans is a complex issue beyond the scope of this project. Nonetheless, as in the other examples of displacement, a perceived problem with the position of an entire sentence led to its shift. This alteration appears to have produced in the Greek tradition a larger echo than the previous two, perhaps because it does serve as an apt conclusion to the letter. Several Greek manuscripts read the benediction at both 16:20 and 16:24 (Ψ 049 056 6 88 69 pc), while others – notably including P, which showed possible influence from the “Western” reading at Rom. 16:5 – reads the benediction both at 16:20 and after the doxology (also 33 pc).

Next, these same witnesses attest two clause-length additions. At 1 Cor. 16:19 the role of Prisc(ill)a is again involved. An explanatory gloss, following the greeting from σο̲ν τ̲η̲ κατ̲' ο̲̲iκον α̲υ̲τ̲ω̲ν έκκλησία, explains that Paul stayed with them: παρ ους και

---


282 The readings of P in these examples (Rom. 16:5, 24) should be compared to that of 88 915 at 1 Cor. 14. In all these cases, manuscripts which are not “Western” nevertheless attest displacements which are otherwise attested only in “Western” witnesses.
550

ζενιζομαι D (ζενιζομαι F G). 283 This insertion draws upon to the account of Acts 18, particularly v. 3, since this is the only passage where Paul is described as staying with the couple. However, direct literary dependence is not likely, since Acts 18:3 uses the verb μένω284 while the insertion uses ξενίζω,285 to describe Paul’s having stayed with Prisc(illa) and Aquila.286 Acquaintance with Acts is further demonstrated by the use of the spelling πρισκιλλά by much of the Latin tradition, C D F G K L Ψ, and the “Byzantine” tradition.287 The insertion is clearly secondary.288 It should not be overlooked, however, that the only detail imported from Acts into the Latin/bilingual manuscripts of Paul is connected to Prisc(illa) and, as in two of the displacements in Rom. 16, the phrase “all the churches.”

The second clause-length addition attested by the Latin tradition and the bilinguals differs from the previous four examples in that it involves the insertion of a sentence from

---

283 apud quos et hospitor 77 78; apud quos etiam hospitor Γ8 Pel8; apud aliter quos etiam hospitor 89.

284 Acts 18:3 reads: καὶ διὰ τὸ ομοτεχνὸν ἔπνευ έμενεν παρ’ αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡγιάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοῖ τῇ τέχνῃ; Codex Bezae reads πρὸς αὐτοὺς for παρ’ αὐτοῖς and omits ἦσαν . . . τέχνη.

285 ξενίζω occurs seven times in Acts, but not in chapter 18.

286 Acts 18 in the “Western” text of Acts has been the subject of study as to whether or not it reflects “anti-feminist” revision. Holmes concludes: “This evidence, though hardly inconsequential, seems hardly sufficient to justify the degree of assurance that has been accorded the hypothesis of deliberate ‘anti-feminist’ alteration to the ‘Western’ text of Acts.” (“Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts,” p. 202). He discusses five variants at Acts 18:2-3, noting that only one (the addition of Aquila without mention of Priscilla) shows any – albeit minimal – potential evidence of concern over the role of women.

287 At both Rom. 16:3 and 2 Tim. 4:19 some two dozen miniscules (also 075 at 2 Tim. 4:19) use πρισκιλλάν. Priscilla is much more common in the Latin witnesses, read at Rom 16:3 by 61 Vgms Amst Pel and at 2 Tim. 4:19 by 61 78 Vgms Amst Pel8.

288 ξενίζω is found nowhere else in the Corpus Paulinum; there is no motive for the deletion of this clause.
one Pauline letter into another. Again, the same witnesses are involved, here joined by 89
and virtually the entire Latin commentary tradition (Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster,
Sedulius Scottus, and the B recension of Pelagius). Indeed, this reading is the only form of
Gal. 4:17 known to either the D-text or the I-text. Its origins are obvious. Paul warns the
Galatians that his opponents want them to “be zealous for them” (i.e., their opponents).
Following this warning, and keying on the imperative ζηλοῦτε / aemulamini, these witnesses
add a positive command: ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ κριττῶ χαρισματα D (F G ζηλοῦται)/
aemulamini autem meliora dona. While the Latin form of the insertion closely parallels 1
Cor. 12:31 (aemulamini autem dona meliora 61 75 77 78 89),290 the Greek text found at Gal.
4:17 is significantly different from the Greek of D F G at 1 Cor. 12:31: ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ
χαρισματα τὰ κρεισσονα. This reading cannot be derived from the Greek of D F G for three
reasons. First, as discussed at 11:17, the archetype of D F G never uses the spelling -ττ-, only
-σσ-. This indicates an insertion that postdates that archetype. Second, the form κριττῶ,
which uses the Attic termination, is found nowhere else either in Paul or the bilinguals. Third,
a different attributive position is used for the adjective at Gal. 4:17 than at 1 Cor. 12:31, one
which is not found at that place in any Greek manuscript. Since the addition at Gal. 4:17
cannot be attributed to an insertion by the creator of the archetype of D F G, it can only
derived from three sources: 1) it was added prior to that archetype in Greek, independent of
the Latin; 2) it was added to a predecessor of that Greek archetype based on the Latin; or 3) it
was added to the Greek text of that archetype as an adaptation to the Latin. The first proposal
is ruled out by the forms found in the insertion, while the third is made more likely by

289 86 is not extant here.

290 The Vulgate of 1 Cor. 12:31 reads aemulamini autem charismata maiora, which
cannot have been the source for the insertion in Galatians.
recalling that the archetype of D F G has made adaptations to the Latin in numerous places, as described in the chapter on D F G.

Before turning to 1 Cor. 14:34-35, it is helpful to make clear that there is a core group of Latin witnesses that share most of these alterations with the bilinguals:

|        | D* | F | G | 88 | 915 | 61 | 75 | 77 | 78 | 86 | 89 | Ε^B | F | R | AMst | CY | MAR | PEL^B | SED-$S$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 14:41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 16:19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least five of these alterations, perhaps excluding Rom. 16:24, must have been the work of a single editor. First, because none of these alterations can be attributed to accidental causes or copyist activity, all must have been intentional. Second, the displacements and additions are all made on the basis of a single key word: At Rom. 16:3 and 1 Cor. 16:19 it is the reference to Prisc(ill)a and Aquila; at Gal. 4:17 it is the word ἐγινότο; at Rom. 16:21, αὐσπιστονταί; 1 Cor. 14:40 ends with κατὰ τάξιν γίνεσθω (the cognate verb ὑποτάσσω occurs at 14:34). Only Rom. 16:24 is not attributable to connection by key word. Third, because the alterations are based on keywords and not the larger context, several alterations disrupt the flow of the argument. This is most obvious at Gal. 4:17, and to a lesser degree Rom. 16:3 and 1 Cor. 14. At Rom. 16:21 the displacement is not obviously superior to the original form of the text. The motivation for the shift made at Rom. 16:24, however, is much more obvious. Fourth, every alteration involves the insertion or displacement of material from texts that were viewed as authoritative, perhaps even canonical. All three in Rom. 16 and that in 1 Cor. 14 simply move text, though in each case by several verses. At Gal. 4 it is the addition of material from 1 Corinthians, and at 1 Cor. 16:19 the addition of material that
is derived from, though not a verbatim citation of, Acts 18. The similar editorial method indicates that the alterations at Rom. 16:3, 21, 24; 1 Cor. 14; and Gal. 4:17 are the work of a single individual.

In addition, the consistently unique witnesses that attest these alterations indicate that they were all produced at the same time. The possibility that all six took place independently before being gathered together in virtually the identical witnesses is so unlikely that it must be ruled out. Furthermore, there is no documentary evidence that any one alteration is chronologically prior to any other. In fact, the addition at Gal. 4:17 is found already in Cyprian and has wider attestation than the shift of 1 Cor. 14:34-35, which is avoided by Pelagius. One question that cannot be definitively answered yet is the question of whether these alterations were made in the Latin text and then brought into the Greek, or the reverse. Because Gal. 4:17 could not have been in the Greek exemplar of the ancestor of D F G (as described above), that alteration is likely to have originated in the Latin tradition. This may indicate that the editor is to be sought in the Latin tradition rather than the Greek. In any case, the alterations do not go back to what Fee describes as a very early copy of the collection, but to a later period.

Nevertheless, the displacement of the *mulier taceat* may now be studied in light of the intentional editing seen elsewhere in these same witnesses. Four alterations cluster around references to women and in particular Prisc(ill)a, what took place in her “house church,” and “all the churches” (Rom. 16:3, 21; 1 Cor. 14:34-35; 16:19). It is clear that the editor was able to compare Paul’s references to Prisc(ill)a and Aquila with those found in Acts, even making reference to the Acts narrative with the insertion at 1 Cor. 16:19. The alterations do not in any way minimize Prisc(ill)a or her role. However, this knowledge of and interest in Prisc(ill)a and her role in “the church in her house” may have raised concerns. Ambrosiaster,
who is among the witnesses to the position of the *mulier taceat* after 1 Cor. 14:40, explains at 1 Cor. 16:19 that Prisc(ill)a could not possibly have had a role equivalent to what he knew as a “presbyter”:

He recalls two churches, the public and the domestic. He calls one public, where they all come together; domestic, the one into which he is gathered through friendship. That alone is called “church,” where the presbyter celebrates the solemn observances.  

Prisc(ill)a’s activity in the “church in their house” is not at all being addressed in 1 Cor. 12-14. However, it may have been of interest to the reviser of the Latin/bilingual text of the *Corpus*. 1 Cor. 14:34-35, where women are commanded to be “silent,” follows the injunction to conform to the practice of what Paul “teaches” in “all the churches.” This would appear to contradict what was taking place in Prisc(ill)a’s “house church.” By shifting 14:34-35 to the position after v. 40, however, the injunction to “silence” is disassociated from the practice of “all the churches” and connected to the command to do things “decently and in order.” In this way, women in general, perhaps with a view toward Prisc(ill)a in particular, are protected from contradicting Paul’s teaching on the universal practice of the church (1 Cor. 14:33), or, stated another way, brought under apostolic authority and “order.”

Any proposed motive for an alteration must, however, remain tentative. Even if a clear motive cannot be identified, however, these six alterations in the bilingual/Latin

---

291 At Rom. 16:3 Ambrosiaster reflects a similar understanding of “house church”: “He [Paul] greets also their household and household servants, which he calls ‘church,’ because they were disciples of holy men in respect to faith.” At Rom. 16:7, where the proper understanding of the phrase ὄτι τινὲς ἐίσουσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἄνωστοις (with reference to Andronicus and Iunia) is in question, Ambrosiaster does not interpret the phrase as implying that Iulia (as he knows her) was an apostle: “These are relatives both according to the flesh and the spirit, in the same way that the angel also spoke to Mary: “And behold! Your relative Elisabeth, etc.” Whom [Andronicus and Iulia] he also declared to be favorable to the earlier apostles with his own testimony, and with them suffered captivity for the cause of the faith; on that account those were fully worthy of honor.”
tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum* provide direct evidence to disprove a key argument for the secondary nature of 1 Cor. 14:34-35: “There is no precedent for their [copyists] becoming redactors of this particular kind, at least not in the Pauline corpus.”

In fact, the very manuscripts that move 1 Cor. 14:34-35 to the position after v. 40 make three other identical displacements as well as two insertions of material based on parallel texts. Furthermore, not only do these witnesses make the very types of displacements that Fee argues never occur, the content of the edited material evidences an awareness of Priscilla’s house church. Previous researchers have tentatively proposed that discomfort over a “command” to “silence women” in the assemblies may have led to their displacement. It may have been that discomfort over what one woman, Priscilla, did in her house church that was the concern. The fact that her activities — well-known to the editor — were problematic compared to what took place “in all the churches of the saints” led to the displacement. By moving the passage, Priscilla’s actions could be distanced from the “all the churches” and brought under the “order” that was desired by Paul in 1 Cor. 14. While a direct connection to the editorial activity seen in the text of Codex Bezae in Acts 18 is not likely, this scenario does match what has been observed in the way that the alterations there affect women’s roles. If there is not an “anti-feminist” tendency, there is a concern that the description of women’s activities be in correspondence with apostolic order, and results in a “loss of emphasis on women of leadership or prominence.”

---

292 Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 278.


performed their exegesis by 'surgical' intervention, which was their privilege, at least for some time."²⁹⁵

As a result, 1) there is no evidence of a text of 1 Corinthians that lacked 1 Cor. 14:34-35; 2) the internal evidence that is used to argue that the passage (and often the surrounding sentences) are secondary is not as decisive as is often portrayed; and 3) the "gloss theory" to explain the displacement is shown to be unnecessary for two reasons: First, the same witnesses that displace 1 Cor. 14:34-35 do the same thing in the same way elsewhere in the Corpus Paulinum; second, a potential motivation for the displacement of the mulier taceat has been identified: a concern over the role of Prisc(ill)a in her house church, which is consistent with scribal activity seen in the "Western" text of Acts. The conclusion that the differing locations of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 requires the conjecture of a post-Pauline insertion is unnecessary. If the passage is to be viewed as post-Pauline, the displacement of the passage in D F G and the Latin tradition cannot be used as part of the argument.

14:37.166 [noted at 7:13.47]

14:37.167 [discussed at 14:9.35]

14:37.168

The shifting location of εντολή / εντολαί bespeaks its secondary nature. It is placed before (N* pc) and after (256 263 pc) κυριοῦ and after εστὶν /εἰσίν (𝔓⁴⁶ Ν² B D² K L Ψ 048 0243 33 263 1241* 1739* pm). The only reading that can account for this is found D* F G, the non-Vulgate Latin tradition, and Origen²⁹⁶ which lacks the noun. Without the noun the

²⁹⁵Delobel, "Textual Criticism and Exegesis," p. 111. He makes this suggestion after his discussion of 1 Cor. 14:34-35, which he considers authentic.

²⁹⁶Fragmenta in evangelium Joannis, fr. 83.
text is clear, the addition simply supplies the predicate. It does so, however, using a non-Pauline word; ἐντολή is found nowhere else in Paul (ἐπιτάγη at 1 Cor. 7:25). It also creates a non-Pauline word order, for the sequence genitive noun-copulative-head noun is unique. The consistent sequence is instead head noun-genitive noun-copulative (Rom. 1:16; 2:2; 1 Cor. 1:18; 6:15; 11:7). In the end, no motive for its omission can be given, but its insertion clarifies the text by supplying the implied noun.

Unconnected to the question of ἐντολή the reading θεοῦ for κυρίου in A 1739 and Origen. The correction in 1739 is adopted from the marginal note, which contains the citation from Origen. The source of the reading in A, however, is unlikely to be Origen, but does reflect its tendency to replace nomen sacrum with a form of θεος (see discussion at 10:9).

14:37.167 [discussed at 14:9.35]

14:38.170

Whether one reads the indicative αγνοεῖται or the imperative αγνοεῖτω, significant exegetical issues remain. Parallels can be given for both; Zuntz cites 7:15 as a parallel for the imperative (εἰ δὲ ὁ ἐπιστος χωρίζεται, χωρίζεσθω), but there is also a parallel also

297 Fee (First Corinthians, p. 700, n. 3) rejects Zuntz’s conclusion, arguing that a scribe would not use a non-Pauline word. This does not make ἐντολή any more Pauline, nor does it account for the word order variation or explain why manuscripts would have omitted the word. Lietzmann (p. 75) rejects the noun, Schrage (III, p. 460 n. 558) accepts it, but Thiselton (p. 1163) does make a decision.


299 See the summary by Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” pp. 62-63 as well as the commentaries (Fee, First Corinthians, p. 712; Schrage III, pp. 460-61; Thiselton (pp. 1162-6) is the most complete, recognizing that the typical distinction between being “ignored” by men or by God is a false one. All these writers adopt αγνοεῖται.

300 Zuntz, p. 107.
for the indicative passive form in the archetypical text of 8:3 (εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ, οὗτος ἔγνωσται). The imperative, easily altered from Δι to Ὡ, may have been influenced by the imperative in the previous sentence. Furthermore, the variation should not be considered in isolation from the addition of εὐτολη at 14:37. The imperative command to “ignore” those who themselves ignore is more suitable when Paul’s instructions are called a “command of the Lord.” D F G and some of the Latin tradition, the same witnesses that avoid the insertion at 14:37, all read the indicative at 14:38.

14:39.171

While the vocative ὁδελφον is frequently a secondary addition in the Corpus Paulinum (see 11:2.3), where ὁδελφον is firm μου is more frequently omitted than added (see 6:12.46). Zuntz also recognizes this fact, yet considers the presence of μου to be secondary at 14:39, this in spite of the tendency of both P^46 and D F G to omit frequently the pronoun in such cases.

14:39.172; 14:39.173

Zuntz correctly points out that the addition/omission of the article before λαλείν is tied to the addition/omission of the preposition, while the displacement of γλώσσαις is a secondary, but related, issue. He fails to note, however, that the article is omitted before προφητεύειν in F G, a significant element which will be discussed later. In one of the lengthiest discussions of any single unit of variation in his study, Zuntz argues that the omission of ἐν is due to the stock phrase, λαλείν γλώσσαις, which would also cause the

301 Zuntz, pp. 29-31.

302 Though it must be pointed out that because the “stock phrase” occurs only in the “Byzantine” text, it is less likely to account for its omission in 1739 than in 5 442.
shift of γλώσσας. This is the most likely explanation for alterations at the end of 14:39. Μὴ κωλυεῖτε ἐν γλώσσας (𝔓⁴⁶ B) was altered to ἐν γλώσσας μὴ κωλυεῖτε (D* F G lat sy⁹).

Subsequently, the ἐν was dropped: by N A P⁴⁰⁸ 048⁴⁰⁸ 0150 0243 1739 pc with the Ψ⁴⁶ B word order, and by “Byzantine” text with the D* F G lat sy⁹ word order.

More difficult however, is the presence or absence of the article. Zuntz argues that “the parallel with the first half of the verse (ζηλοῦτε τῷ προφητεύειν) would cause the article to be added before λαλεῖν,”303 with context requiring the wording of Ψ⁴⁶ B:

Paul could see good reason for not using the article again before λαλεῖν, for its addition, while compulsory after ζηλοῦτε, was at best optional after κωλύετε and its absence before λαλεῖν stresses the accessory character of glossolaly. The spurious additional article has a parallel in ix. 13, where τὰ has been added before ἐκ τοῦ ἑρῶ on the model of the preceding τὰ ἑρῶ. The wording, then, which we commend would convey the meaning: ‘Concentrate upon prophecy, even though (some) glossolaly should not be prevented. The nuancy of the phrase squares with the tendency of the whole chapter and thus vindicates the reading of Ψ⁴⁶ B.

Perhaps Zuntz recognizes the weakness of his arguments here in the statement: “Why should a most outstanding group of manuscripts (𝔓⁴⁶ B 1739) have omitted the article which was protected by a parallel in the same sentence?”304 As we have seen, Zuntz elsewhere denies that arguing on the basis of the “best manuscript(s)” is valid in the NT.

Can other explanations be sought for the addition or omission of the article? The variant cited from 1 Cor. 9:13 is not a true parallel, for it involves adding an article used as a substantive for clarification of the object. Indeed, there are very few examples in the NT that parallel this construction in 14:39, where two clauses, each with imperatives and infinitives, are joined by a conjunction. The closest is 2 Cor. 8:10-11, where the first clause (with an

303 Zuntz, 30.
304 Zuntz, 30.
indicative verb): οὕτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι is connected by νυνὶ δὲ καὶ with τὸ ποιῆσαι ἐπιτελέσατε. The rarity of this construction may have contributed to the attempts to modify in 1 Cor. 14:39.

A helpful line of inquiry is to examine Paul’s use of the infinitive. There are 10 examples of the substantival infinitive in the NT (in NA27) of which 8 occur in the Pauline epistles. In Paul its usage is generally anaphoric, i.e., it refers to something previously mentioned or well known. This is born out by the context of 1 Cor. 14. “Prophets” and “prophecy” have been part of the ongoing discussion in 1 Cor. 11, 12, and 13, and in chapter 14 it is mentioned in vv. 1, 3, 4-6, 22, 24, 29, 31, 32, and 37. “Speaking” and “speaking in tongues” is a topic raised less frequently earlier in the epistle, but is the heart of the matter in chapter 14. It is also clear from 14:2-5 that προφητεύειν and λαλεῖν are distinct activities. Verse 39 serves as a summary to the rest of the chapter, and aptly summarizes the argument, much as Zuntz describes: “Be zealous to prophecy and do not hinder speaking in tongues.”

The relative value that Paul places on these two activities is not defined, as Zuntz implies, by the presence or absence of the article, but by the imperative used to exhort “prophecy,” where “speaking” is merely to be “not prevented.” The use of the article before both verbs is in line with the Paul’s anaphoric usage of it elsewhere.

Furthermore, in the five cases where Paul connects two infinitives with a conjunction, the first is arthrous but the second anarthrous when the two activities are closely identified:

1 Cor. 11:6 εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν γυναικὶ τὸ κείρονται ἢ ξυράσθαι,
κατακαλυπτέσθω.
1 Cor. 11:22 μὴ γὰρ οίκιας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν;

305 According to von Soden, in v. 10 of 216 440 ποιῆσαι is read, without the article.
306 Mκ 10:40; Ac 25:11; 1 Cor. 14:39 (2); 2 Cor. 8:10-11 (3); Phil 2:6, 13(2).
307 BDR §399.
Given these examples, the lack of the article before λαλεῖν would require that προφητεύειν and λαλεῖν be viewed as closely related activities. The article before λαλεῖν, however, would make clear that these are two distinct activities, just as the presence of the article before each of the infinitive at 2 Cor. 8:10-11. At 1 Cor. 14:39, Paul is distinguishing the two activities and encouraged prophesying (cf. also 14:5). Furthermore, there are no omissions or additions of the articles in the examples cited above, which should warn us that the claim of addition by assimilation in 1 Cor. 14:39 is not seen elsewhere in very similar situations. In addition the witnesses that lack the article (οcząc 0243 630 1739 1881) frequently err in omitting it. Royse finds thirty-two cases where οcząc loses the article, and B. Weiss (before the recovery of οcją) cites this passage as one example of B’s characteristic omission of articles.

14:40.174

Güting and Mealand’s explanation for the loss of δε seems reasonable:

On some occasions sentences are severed from their context and are given prominence and particular attention. They become quotable. This development leads into an attitude which drops particles as superfluous, particles with served to mark context. 1 Cor. 14:40 is an instance.

While a few more examples would make the argument more firm, no obvious motivation

308 See also B. Weiss, p. 75.
309 Royse, 258.
310 B. Weiss, p. 75.
311 Güting and Mealand, p. 31.
exists for the creation of asyndeton in witnesses that typically avoid it.
Notes on Chapter 15


Αδελφοι is frequently added (see 11:2.6), including under influence from the lectionary (see 1:10.29). Here its shift to the initial position in some minuscules is likely also due to influence from the lectionary, which typically adds αδελφοι at the beginning of a reading.

In addition, here 1241 makes one of its numerous shifts in the person of the pronoun from ομή to ημή.

15:1.2

Mου is a frequent addition. It is added after ευαγγελιον at 1 Cor. 9:18 (D) and 9:23 (69) and is found in the spurious doxology of Romans (16:25). The addition here is a family 1739 reading, attested by 0243 6 424c 1739 pc.

15:1.6

D* FG read the present στηκετε against the rest of the tradition, including the Latin tradition’s statis, a perfect form. Avoidance of hiatus may have prompted the alteration.

15:2.8; 15:2.11

The syntax of 15:2 presents several difficulties, so much so that some have posited a corruption of the entire tradition.¹ The difficulties can be resolved, however, by regarding τινι λογω ευαγγελισαμην as a parenthetical statement that modifies δι ου και σωζοσθε.

¹The editions preceding BDR (§478¹; also the English translation) argued that both ει and οφειλετε are secondary, with τινι λογω ευαγγελισαμην functioning as object to Κατεχετε. The most recent edition, however, specifically rejects this proposal. See also Fee, pp. 718-19.
The use of a parenthetical statement, however, caused disruption in the manuscripts. Most significantly, D F G and the Latin D-text replace the conditional clause εὐ κατεξετε with an indicative + infinitive, οφειλετε κατεξειν / debetis tenere. This alteration forces τινι λογω / qua ratione to begin a new sentence, as is demonstrated by the lineation of G and VL 89. D* takes the additional step of adding και / et after λογω / ratione, an addition which, as in other places (discussed in the chapter on D F G), disrupts its sense line format by separating the adverb from the verb:

```
ΤΙΝΙΛΟΓΩΔΑΙ
ΕΥΗΝΤΕΧΙΣΤΗΜΗΝΜΕΙΝ
```

```
quarationeet
euangelizavivobis
```

Φ46 also indirectly attests this reading. The line that contains υμειν ends with a gap of about twelve letters. The next line begins with οφειλετε, but points placed over this word mark it for deletion. The standard reading, ει οφειλετε, then follows. Zuntz suggests that οφειλετε κατεξειν was a marginal reading or correction which had been marked out for deletion. It was not clear, however, to the scribe of Φ46 what the correction intended to indicate, which resulted in the unusual formatting and resultant reading. Since οφειλετε is written and then marked out, however, it is also possible that οφειλετε κατεξειν stood in the exemplar of Φ46, with ει οφειλετε written as a correction or marginal note. In either case, Φ46 reflects here a partial conflation. It's scribe has both readings in front of him, and in the act of selecting which reading to reproduce gives evidence of both. This parallels other examples in Φ46 of conflations between readings found in F G and readings found in other witnesses, for example at Rom. 16:19 and Phil. 1:11 (discussed below on pp. 613-14).

The combined attestation of Φ46 D F G and D-text conclusively demonstrate the second century origin of this reading. However, although οφειλω + infinitive is common in

---

2Zuntz, pp. 254-5; surprisingly, Royse does not discuss this correction.
Paul (Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 5:10; 7:36; 11:7, 10; 2 Cor. 12:14), it must be secondary here since it removes the difficulty of the parenthetical statement.

15:3.14; 15:4.21

Harnack attributed three tendentious omissions to Marcion: the loss of ο καὶ παρελαβόν and κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς at both 15:3 and 4.³ The first potential omission, however, is widely attested in the early Latin fathers⁴ and now in VL 89, while the first omission of κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς is nowhere else attested and the same words in v. 4 are missing only in two minuscules (216 440). This makes it unlikely that the readings should be grouped together as a tendentious alteration by Marcion. It is more likely that the omissions of κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς may be Marcionite, but that a text without ο καὶ παρελαβόν preceded Marcion.⁵

15:4.19 [discussed at 7:8.28]

15:4.20

The word order τὴν τρίτην ημέρα (F G K L P Ψ 049 0150 0151 6 424) is likely the result of adaptation to the identical phrase elsewhere in the NT.⁶ The same alteration, which

³Harnack, Marcion, p. 47; he is followed by Zuntz, p. 226.

⁴Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 3,18,3; Ambrose, Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam 10,173; Ambrosiaster; Hilary, De trinitate 10,67; Rufinus, Libri Admantii Origenis adversus haereticos 79,5; Tertullian Adversus Marcionem 3,8.

⁵Clabeaux, pp. 119-120.

moves away from the more Semitic word order, is made elsewhere in the manuscripts:

Luke 18:33 τη ἡμερα τη τριτη Β Δ Λ Ψ φ
John 2:1 τη ἡμερα τη τριτη Ψ66 Ψ75 Κ Λ Δ Ψ φ

This assimilation was made more likely by the context of 1 Cor. 15, which discusses the resurrection of Jesus. Further influence may have come from creedal statements, which likewise use the word order τη τριτη ἡμερα.

D and VL 75 depart from FG and the rest of the Latin tradition by reading τη τριτη / die tertia, most likely an adaptation to a Greek text similar to NA (cf. similar examples in the chapter on DF G).

15:5.22; 15:5.23 15:7.29; 15:7.30 [also discussed at 12:28.118]

At 15:5b, D FG read και μετα ταυτα for ειτα/επειτα. Zuntz attributes this reading to a Latinism based on postea. This, however, does not account for the addition of και/et. Furthermore, at the second occurrence of ειτα/επειτα at 15:7, the Latin witnesses read either postmodum (VL 75 77 89) or postea (Amst), neither of which led to alteration in D FG. A more likely explanation than Latinism is that the alteration to ενδεκα/illis undecim (undecim VL 77 78 V) prompted the alteration to και μετα ταυτα. The interest in the number of disciples present in the post-resurrection narratives of Luke 24 and John 20 led the scribe/editor to distance those events from the previous appearances. As at 14:34-35, this demonstrates intentional editorial revision in D FG and the D-text toward accounts from other canonical writings.

15:6.24 [discussed at 12:28.118]

---

7Cf. also Eph. 4:30 το αγιον πνευμα D FG and 1 Tim. 5:25 τα καλα εργα K L 056 075 0142 0151 pm.
The Atticist Moeris (π 8) rejects πλέονες, the non-contracted comparative form of πολύς, as a Hellenism. He also rejects other non-contracted forms, such as ἐμείνονα, βελτίονες, and ἡσσονα. As Kilpatrick points out, most manuscripts move to the Hellenistic form at John 4:41 (πλειον only Ψ75). The Hellenistic form is otherwise consistent in Paul (1 Cor. 9:19; 10:5; 2 Cor. 2:6; 4:15; Phil. 1:14), the only other place where the Attic spelling replaces it is 2 Cor. 9:2 (πλειονς 919). Pauline usage suggests that πλέονες is archetypical, with πλειονς (K L P Ψ 6 424) an Atticizing replacement.

15:6.28 [discussed at 14:15.68]

15:7.29; 15:7.30 [discussed at 15:5.22 and 12:28.118]

15:9.38 [discussed at 8:9.39]

15:10.39; 15:10.44

The early witnesses frequently omit the article when it is used as resumptive personal pronoun:

Rom. 7:10 η εἰς ζωὴν] εἰς ζωὴν L
Rom. 9:6 το κατα σαρκα] κατα σαρκα F G
Rom. 11:24 οι κατα φυσιν] κατα φυσιν Ψ46
Rom. 12:18 το εξ υμων] εξ υμων 049
Rom. 15:26 των εν ιερουσαλημ] των αγιων εν ιερουσαλημ Ψ46
Rom. 15:31 η εἰς ιερουσαλημ] εἰς ιερουσαλημ L P 049
1 Cor. 11:24 το υπερ υμων] υπερ υμων Ψ46
1 Cor. 13:10 το εκ μερους] εκ μερους 0142
2 Cor. 1:16 ο προς υμας] προς υμας Ψ46 D
2 Cor. 7:14 η επι τιτου] επι τιτου Κ* B
Gal. 2:3 ο συν εμοι] συν εμοι B; omit Ψ46
Gal. 3:7 οι εκ πιστεως] εκ μερους C*vid

In addition, D F G frequently lose the article when it functions as a relative and exhibit a general tendency to lose articles [see chapter on D F G]. As in these other examples, the two omissions at 15:10 may have been prompted by the fact that the Latin witnesses (apart from Jerome) do not render them. There are more examples of this alteration in F G than D; that a predecessor of these manuscripts underwent additional influence from the Latin in similar cases is seen also by the unique addition of the article as relative at Col. 4:15: τὴν κατ οἶκον αὐτῆς εἰκλησιαν τὴν οἶκον αὐτῆς εἰκλησιαν F G = qui in domo eius est ecclesiam (VL 75 77 vgūs Amst).

The core witnesses of family 1739 (0243 6 1739, though not 424°) along with Ν' B 0270 join D' F G in omitting the article before ἑαυτῷ εἰς. While addition by assimilation to η εἰς εἰς is a possibility, it is more likely, given the propensity toward omission in the early manuscripts when dealing with this type of construction, that the article was unintentionally dropped.

6° also omits η before εἰς εἰς. This may reflect another misread correction (see also 4:6) in a predecessor, whereby the first η at 15:10 was initially omitted in error, then replaced and the second η omitted in conformity to its sister witnesses.

15:10.40

9J. Weiss, p. 352 n. 3 also suggests that the omission is caused by conformity to the Latin.
As Zuntz argues, the reading πτωχη (D* F G; paupera VL 75 77 89 Amst), can hardly have derived from κενη,10 whereas κενη as a substitution for πτωχη could have been drawn from the near context (15:14).11

The shift in word order furthermore suggests that the D* F G reading is archetypical, here joined by φ in placing the negative particle between the adjective and verb. In predicate constructions, the negative particle always stands directly before the verb.12 Since the shift of the particle places the emphasis on the adjective, it is unlikely that scribes would shift the particle to the less emphatic position. The shift in tense from εγενηθη to γεγονεν in F G simply reflects a tendency to such alterations (also εγενομην 9:22; κατελαβη 10:13; φαγειν 11:22)

15:10.41

The shift in word order to παντων αυτων (0243 6 206 1739 pc) places the genitive pronoun in the more familiar position. D* L* omit αυτων by accidental leap (ΠΑΝΤΩΝΑΥΣΤΩΝ).

15:10.42

At 15:10, 1739 and its relatives attest three “family” readings. The third of these, the

---

10Latinism is not an issue here, for the D-text consistently translates πτωχος with either pauper (Rom. 15:26; Gal. 2:10) or egenus (2 Cor. 6:10; Gal. 4:9; 1 Cor. 15:10 in Amst(A)) while translating κενη with vacuus (1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 6:1; Gal. 2:2; Eph. 5:6; Phil. 2:16 bis; Col. 2:8; 1 The. 3:5) or inanis (1 Cor. 15:14 bis, 58). Therefore at 1 Cor. 15:10, paupera is rendering πτωχη, not the reverse.

11Zuntz, p. 90.

12Except in direct commands (1 Cor. 14:20) or questions (1 Cor. 3:4; 10:22). Similar word order appears at 2 Cor. 1:18 (δ λογος ήμων δ προς ομας ουκ εστιν) and Gal. 1:10 (Χριστοδ δολος ουκ αν ήμην).
addition of μονος after εγω δε, is found only in 0243 1739. The addition prevents εγω δε from being contrasted with η χαρις του θεου and conforms to the συν εμοι at the end of the sentence. As with other alterations, this minor insertion served to enhance or protect Paul's status and authority (see 9:20-21).

15:11.45 [discussed at 8:4.9]

15:12.50

The reading of Ψ46 D* F G 0270 and Origen,13 which places στι between εκ νεκρων and εγευερτατι, would result in a usage which is nowhere else attested in Paul. In every other case where στι is used as a marker of discourse content, it is placed at the beginning of the discourse. The reading of Ψ46 pc, however, would force εκ νεκρων to modify κηρυσσετατι.14 There is no obvious motivation for the shift. Given the numerous examples of accidental omission of explanatory στι,15 it may have been added in the wrong location after having been unintentionally omitted. It is unlikely that the error would have been repeated independently in these early witnesses. Instead, the impossible reading is further evidence of a shared provenance of Ψ46 D F G 0270 and Origen.

15:12.52 [discussed at 7:8.28]

---

13Commentarii in evangelium Matthei 13,2; Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam i ad Corinthios fr. 84.

14As is the case with the other eleven examples of prepositional phrases following verbs that introduce discourse (Rom. 4:23; 10:9; 14:14; 1 Cor. 15:12b (omit στι Ψ46); 15:15; 2 Cor. 2:3; 11:10; Gal. 1:11 (omit στι 0278); 5:10; Phil, 2:24; 4:10).

15See Ψ46 at 15:12.52 and full discussion at 7:8.28. This accounts for 0142's loss of στι.
D* skips from ΟΥΔΕΞ of v. 13 to Ξ of v. 14, then continues with ΟΥΚΕΙΠΗΓΡΩΠΑ, thereby omitting εγηγερται ει δε χριστος. The resultant text is nonsense, which D's Latin counterpart VL 75 softens by not adding an equivalent non (nec χριστος resurrexit). This reading is repeated in the Vulgate witness S, which may simply share the accidental error or, given the close relationship between the D-text and S, may derive a shared tradition.

15:14.59

Adverbial και following an inferential particle is not uncommon in Paul (διο και Rom. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:20; 4:13; 5:9; Phil. 2:9; οδυν και Rom. 11:5; αφα και 1 Cor. 15:18). It is clearly secondary, however, at 2 Cor. 4:13, where N F G 0186 add και under the influence of διο και later in the sentence. It may also be secondary at Rom. 4:22, where και is lacking after ουν in B D* F G. At 15:14 the addition may have been made in order to balance κενη και in the following clause or the distant influence of αφα και at 15:18. Notably, in each place B preserves the shorter reading, whereas N adds secondary και.

15:14.61; 15:15.63 [discussed at 14:15.68]

15:14.62

Ηωμυ (B D* 049 0243 0270 5 6 33 424 1241 1739) is the result of assimilation to the same word in the previous clause.

15:15.66

---

16B. Weiss, p. 113.
With ἐγίγνεν F G confuse Γ for Ρ. The scribe of G made no attempt to conform the Latin text to this impossible form, retaining suscitaverit.

15:15.67

N* adds αὐτοῦ after χριστοῦ, a phrase found nowhere in Paul but twice each in Acts (3:18; 4:26) and Revelation (11:15; 12:10). Because it is also common in the early fathers, the addition of αὐτοῦ may be an example of a stereotypical phrase rather than assimilation to other NT examples, particularly since those examples are not used in contexts with ἐγείρω.

15:15.68

D VL 64 78 89 sy* and some early Latin fathers (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Ambrosiaster), in addition to thirteen minuscules otherwise unrelated to D and the Latin tradition, lack the clause εἰπέρ αρα νεκροὶ οὐκ εγείρονται. The most obvious explanation for the missing text would be parablepsis εἰπέρ . . . εἰρὰρ. B. Ehrman argues, however, that the clause is an addition made by proto-orthodox scribes in order to counter Gnostic belief that Jesus—not the Christ—was raised from the dead. He supports his argument with internal evidence, arguing that εἰπέρ αρα never occurs together in Paul and further that because the shorter text would say, in effect, that “God did not raise Christ from the dead,” it is the more difficult reading. One must ask, however, how such a text would suit Paul’s argument, or why Paul

---

17E.g., Justin Martyr, Apologia 40,11; Dialogus cum Tryphone 7,3; 28,4; 39,2, 5; Origen, Contra Celsum 4,6, 28; 7, 13; etc.

18TuT lists 43 327 606 886ε 1852 1929 1939 1945 1963 1996 1999 2912 for this reading. Ehrman (see next note) does not note that the same omission occurs in these witnesses.

19Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, pp. 157-58. On p. 178 n. 177 he claims that there is no possibility of accidental loss.
would state that he is a false witness of God if he claims that “he [God] raised Christ, whom he did not raise.” Indeed, as Ehrman notes, the longer reading suits the context perfectly (cf. 15:12-13).

Furthermore, the patristic evidence is not as unambiguous as Ehrman indicates. The use of the passage by Tertullian and Ambrosiaster suggest a secondary adaptation made in order to resolve the nonsensical statement. Both use the future tense in place of the first occurrence of εγέρθη: “For we will be discovered as false teachers of God, who will speak testimony that he will raise ((re)suscitaverit) Christ, whom he did not raise ((re)suscitavit).”

That Tertullian sees the contrast being drawn as between saying that he will be raised and was raised is again made clear at Adversus Marcionem 3,8: “as if Christ will be raised, whom he did not raise.”

This shift in verb tense is unlikely to be derived from Greek, for εγέρεψε(ν) would have to have been corrupted into εγέρεψι, a reading unattested in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. Instead, it is likely that both Tertullian and Ambrosiaster altered the first verb to the present in order to resolve the contextually nonsenical reading. Irenaeus, on the other hand, does preserve εγέρθη . . . εγέρθη and the equivalent suscitavit . . . suscitavit. In the context in which he uses the citation, Irenaeus is combating the very argument which Ehrman claims led to the addition – that this and the others he cites “clearly preaches the resurrection and imperishability of the flesh.” He passes over the difficulty of his shorter text of 15:15, but does comment that “in all these [passages] those men, as I said before, either say that the apostle contradicts himself . . . or again they compel wicked and perverse interpretations to be made of all the passages in order to overturn and change the sense of what was said.”

---

20 Inveniemur etiam falsi testes dei, qui testimonium dixerimus, quod resuscitaverit Christum, quem non resuscitavit (De resurrectione mortuorum 48,4). Ambrosiaster’s text (1 Cor. 15:15 ad loc) is identical apart from the use of ουτεμ ετι in place of etiam.

21 ... quasi resuscitaverit Christum, quem non resuscitavit.
Hence, according to Irenaeus, however one reads 15:15, the two statements "he raised Christ" and "whom he did not raise" cannot contradict each other.

Just as the patristic evidence is indecisive, neither does the internal evidence convincingly demonstrate that the clause is an intentional addition. While the combination of εἰπερ ἀρα never occurs elsewhere in Paul, similar unique usages of particles are found elsewhere in the epistles without any textual uncertainty in the manuscripts (e.g., Rom. 6:16 ἤτοι; 1 Cor. 6:20 δῆ; 10:29 ἵνατι γάρ; 2 Cor. 3:5-6 ἵνα κα; Phil. 3:4 καὶ περ). In addition, the fact that an unrelated group of minuscules omit the clause make parablepsis the only possible explanation for the shorter reading in these witnesses. It should be further noted that D* and much of the Latin tradition omit an entire clause by accidental leap at 15:64 (D* VL 75 89 Vg Amst). It is therefore more likely that an accidental omission (as described above) created the reading than that an addition was made – apparently only here in the entire book – in order to counter a very specific theological emphasis.

15:17.72 [discussed at 15:1.1]

15:17.73 [discussed at 12:6.23]

15:17.75 [discussed at 15:1.1]

15:19.78 [discussed at 6:1.2]

15:20.80 [discussed at 5:11.30]

15:20.83

A form of γίνομαι never follows a predicate position participle in the perfect tense.

The addition of εγενέτο (D² K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 5 88 915 pm) balances
ηλπικότες εσμεν and ἐλεινοτέροι εσμεν at 15:19.

15:22.87 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:23.88

Paul frequently uses ἐκαστὸς to begin a clause in which he makes a conclusion that is applicable to "each." The beginning of this concluding clause is most frequently asyndetic (Rom. 12:3; 14:5; 15:2; 1 Cor. 3:13, 7:20, 24; 2 Cor. 9:7). The only textually firm place that such a clause is marked with δὲ is at 1 Cor. 3:10. Textually variation occurs at 1 Cor. 3:8 (omit δὲ C), 12:7 (omit δὲ L), and 15:23 (omit δὲ Ν). Each of these three cases should receive consideration, 15:23 in particular, since Ν (along with B) are among the least likely witnesses to lose δὲ.²²

15:23.90

F G follow some of the Latin tradition (VL 61 77 78 F R S Pel) in adding a clarifying participle: οἱ εν τῃ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐλπισάντες. This addition is likely adapted from a secondary Latin addition (qui . . . crediderunt). Because the main D-text witnesses (VL 75 89) lack the longer reading, and there is no motive for its omission, the addition is likely a typical addition made to the Latin for clarification, and subsequently brought into F G from either Pelagius or the local St. Gall Vulgate text, here attested by S.

15:24.92 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:25.99 [discussed at 11:26.111]

²²Güting and Mealand, p. 104. Ν never loses δὲ without support, though most would consider insignificant the support at 15:27 (201 915).
Although an allusion to Ps. 109:1 LXX, several adaptations made by Paul make his use of the passage distinctive enough that it is unlikely that the alterations at 1 Cor. 15:25 have been caused by assimilation to the LXX.\(^\text{23}\) First, the verb in the LXX is in the first person (τω), where Paul writes it in the third person (θη). Second, the pronouns are in the second person (σου), not third (αύτου). Finally, the LXX uses ὑποπόδιαν τῶν ποδῶν where Paul uses ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας. None of these were adapted to the LXX in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. Instead, the alterations are typical harmonizations to the near context. The addition of αυτου after εχθρους matches τους ποδας αυτου (found already in Irenaeus and Tertullian\(^\text{24}\)).

The singular reading of F G, which reads αυτου after τους εχθρους but not after τους ποδας, may be the result of a misread marginal correction in a predecessor, which had lost αυτου after ποδας. Instead of placing αυτου in the correct location, it was added after εχθρους. This accounts for the eius of VL 77 above αυτου instead of the suos of VL 78, for all Latin manuscripts apart from the unrelated VL 64 read pedibus eius.

---

\(^{23}\)Contra Zuntz, p. 173. He cites the omission of ποδας as Marcion's reading, but this conclusion is rejected by Schmid (p. 33) as one based on unreliable sources.

\(^{24}\)Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 5,36,2; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,9; *Adversus Praxeans* 4.
Because αὐτῷ ὑποταγῇ (D Ψ Ir) does not conform to the word order found in this context (15:27 ὑποτετακται αὐτῷ F G and ὑποταξαντος αὐτῷ; 15:28 ὑποταξαντι αὐτῷ), it may have been altered to ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ in order to match the other examples. However, the shift of the indirect object to an emphatic position is not uncommon in D (which here departs from its Latin counterpart); see also 3:1 ημῖν λαλήσαι (D L P Ψ 88 1739 pc); 10:33 πασίν πάντα αφεσκῶ (D; πασίν κατὰ πάντα αφεσκῶ F G).

The addition of καὶ intensifies this particular clause,²⁵ an emphasis that scribes are unlikely to remove. The addition is avoided by B D* F G 0243 33 424° 1175 1319 1739 syρ and the Latin tradition (ς⁴⁶ lac).

The word order alteration in D* VL 75 is likely caused by the scribe skipping over the η and then replacing it after the subject (ο θεός).

²⁵Fee p. 746 n. 2.
The substitution of των νεκρων (D2 L 049 056 0142 424 876 pc) for αυτων makes clear the ambiguous referent of the pronoun, which may otherwise be mistakenly construed as the plural οι βαπτιζομενοι. 69 conflates the two readings, perhaps on the basis of a correction in its exemplar, by adding the “Byzantine” reading after the archetypical reading.26

15:30.123 [discussed at 7:8.28]

15:31.128

The function of ομετρον is unusual. Its other uses in the Hauptbriefe are as a possessive adjective, modifying a noun. But here the objective use is required in the context, which is not otherwise seen in the NT but evident in other Greek literature.27 The shift to the first person ομετρον (A 6 876 pc) is an attempt to ameliorate the difficult usage.28

15:31.129 [discussed at 11:2.3]

15:34.137; 15:57.225

0243 1739 frequently have difficulty with word order. At 15:57, the shift of ομων

26J. C. O'Neill (“1 Corinthians 1529,” Expository Times 91 (1979-80), pp. 310-11) argues that ουπερ αυτων των νεκρων is the archetypical reading since the scribe would not have intentionally created such an awkward word order. This reconstruction, however, requires a dubious reconstruction of what is described by “baptism for the dead.” Recognizing that a correction in an exemplar led to the unusual reading is a simpler explanation for the reading of 69.

27BDR §2853; Examples are provided in Kühner-Gerth I, i §454 Anmerk. 11.

28D. R. MacDonald, “A Conjectural Emendation of 1 Cor. 15:31-32 or the Case of the Misplaced Lion Fight,” HTR 93 (1980), pp. 265-76 (esp. 266-67). MacDonald uses this difficult usage to posit the interpolation of 15:31c (η ... ημων). This conjecture is based on a hasty rejection of the use of ομετρον that was described above and a very complex and historically dubious reconstruction of a specific tradition about Paul fighting with lions which led to the interpolation. See Fee, First Corinthians, p. 770 n. 49.
may have been caused by its having been initially overlooked, then added after τινες had
been written. These two witnesses, joined by their sister 0212, also alter τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν
ησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἡσοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν at 15:57. 1739 makes a similar word
order shift at 10:28 (for which 0121 0243 are not extant). At 15:34, the reading τινες θεου
(here 0243 1739 are joined by a handful of other witnesses) may be a pure error, or an
intentional alteration which makes clear that Paul is speaking to Christians (“Some who
belong to God are ignorant”).

15.34.138 [discussed at 6:5.14]

15:36.141

The spelling αφρον is the vocative form, while αφρων uses the nominative case for
the vocative. While potentially merely a phonological variation, the fact that only the
“Byzantine” witnesses read αφρον suggest that an improvement from the “improper” form
has been made. “Αφρον is the only third declension liquid stem to appear in the vocative in
the NT. It occurs elsewhere only at Luke 12:20, where again the “Byzantine” witnesses read
the “proper” form. 0243 6 424 1739 join the Byzantine witnesses here, a further indication
that these manuscripts are the result of correcting away from a Byzantine exemplar toward
manuscripts similar to Ψ46 B [discussed in chapter on “Alexandrian” witnesses].

15:36.142

A, Epiphanius, and Theodoret replace ζωοποιεῖται with ζωογονεῖται. The words


30 Moulton and Howard, Accidence, p. 135.
are similar in both meaning and form, though only the former is Pauline. \(^{31}\) \(\text{ζωογονέω}\) occurs never occurs in the *Corpus Paulinum*, but is found at Luke 17:33 (Ψ \(\text{ζωοποίησει}\)) and Acts 7:19. A makes similar sight/sound confusion of verb forms at 15:22 (see also 14:28.28).

15:36.143

The addition of \(\piρ\omega\tauον\) makes clear the sequence of “dying” and “being made alive,” an addition which may have been suggested by the use of the adjective \(\piρ\omega\tauος\) at 15:45, 47 and the adverb \(\piρ\omega\tauον\) at 15:46. No obvious motive for its omission can be ascertained, apart from the typical clarifying additions frequently found in D F G and the Latin tradition. The reading may not be confined to the Latin tradition, for it is attested in the Latin of Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses* (5,7,1), though the Greek is not extant at this point. It is also found in Rufinus\(^{32}\) and, with the same word order as D\(^{33}\), Basil (*Moralia MPG 31, p. 805*). Other early Latin witnesses lack the adverb, notably Tertullian (*De resurrectione mortuorum 52*) and Cyprian (*Ad Quirinium 3,58*).

15:37.145

A single letter differentiates \(\gamma\varepsilon\nu\nu\eta\sigmaο\mu\varepsilon\nu\nu\) (\(\text{φ\(G\)}\) F G) from the \(\gamma\varepsilon\nu\nu\sigmaο\mu\varepsilon\nu\nu\) attested by the rest of the Greek tradition. The Latin witnesses reflect the Greek variation. The Vulgate and its typical witnesses, along with Tertullian and Ambrosiater, read *futurum est* with the majority of Greek witnesses. *Nascetur* is found in VL 75 77 and *nascitur* in the *Speculum* (27). VL 78\(^{7}\) and 89 each attest a unique conflation: *nasciturum* and *futurum*.

\(^{31}\) Without variation at Rom. 4:17; 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 2 Cor. 3:6; Gal. 3:21; 1 Tim. 3:16 (also Jn. 5:21; 6:63).

\(^{32}\) *Apologeticus Pamphili martyris pro Origene 7*; *Expositio symboli* 40.

\(^{33}\) F G place \(\pi\rho\omega\tauον\) before \(\alpha\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\\nu\eta\), likely in conformity to the Latin’s *prius moriatur*. 
nascetur, respectively. The shared reading of $\Psi^{46}$ F G is not likely to be accidental, since this cluster frequently joins against the rest of the tradition (see chapter on D F G). However, given that Paul uses $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\omega$ to speak only of spiritual or physical birth (Rom. 9:11; 1 Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:23, 24, 29), not eschatological resurrection, $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\nu$ is likely to be an accidental – albeit early – corruption.

15:37.146

$\aleph\ast$ drops the second $\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, an omission which may have been accidental since $\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron$ $\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma \ldots \gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\nu$ would construe as a single clause without altering the sense.

15:38.152

$\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ can be used without the article (1 Cor. 7:7; 9:7; 12:11), though the article is preferred. Its addition by a handful of witnesses here ($\Psi^{46}$ $\eta\nu\nu$ and the "Byzantine" witnesses) may therefore be considered a stylistic improvement.


F G omits the second occurrence of $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ at v. 39 and the second of $\sigma\omega\mu\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ at v. 40. The text construes in both cases, with the absent nouns implied from the respective previous clauses. At v. 40, the omission may have been made to balance the second half of the verse, which does not repeat $\delta\omicron\zeta\alpha$ in the contrasted second clause. F G are joined in the omission by I sy$^p$ at v. 39$^{35}$ and VL 89 Tertullian and Ambrosiaster at v. 40 (for which I is not

$^{34}$BDR §286(2).

$^{35}\Psi^{46}$ is deficient here, though given the available space it must have lacked either $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ (2) or $\alpha$\lambda$\eta$. Zuntz (p. 215 n. 2) posits a potential omission of $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ before $\kappa\tau\eta\nu\omicron\nu$. This is impossible, however, given the fact that $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\; \kappa\tau\eta\nu\omicron\nu$ occurs on a different line than $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\; \alpha$\lambda$\eta$. The omission of $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ (2) is attested by F G I sy$^p$, while the omission of $\alpha$\lambda$\eta$ is
extant), though Tertullian lacks the second σωμα of v. 44 in identical circumstances (joined in the omission by Cyprian and Zeno). This may indicate a general tendency to omit the superfluous noun.

Other witnesses attest harmonizations to the near context, parablepsis, and word order variations which seem to be nearly unavoidable in series such as this. The loss of αλλη δε κτηνους by K and many minuscules is another example of the parablepsis which has beset the “Byzantine” witnesses (see also 9:20). Ψ46 attests one of its typical additions by assimilation to the near context by adding σφξ before πτηνων (it makes similar additions at 12:9 and 15:47). D F G may have avoided assimilation by writing κτηνους rather than the plural κτηνων. In the LXX, the neuter singular is frequently used collectively (e.g., Ex. 9:25; Lev. 27:28; Jer. 28:62) even in, as at 1 Cor. 15:39, a series where other “creatures” are written in the plural (Gen. 6:7; 7:23). In the NT the only other occurrence of the singular cannot be collective (Luke 10:34), in contrast to the two plural forms (Acts. 23:24; Rev. 18:13). The D-text’s pecoris (VL 75 79 Amst Spe) is unlikely to have caused the shift to the singular in D F G, for while pecus in the singular may be used collectively, so also may the plural. Hence there does not appear to be a motivation for the D-text to render a Greek plural form with a singular; rather, pecoris is likely rendering the singular κτηνους. This reconstruction is supported by noting that Tertullian’s iumenti (De resurrectione mortuorum attested by D* and VL 64. All of these witnesses occasionally attest unique agreement with Ψ46.

36Gen. 6:7 and 7:23: ἔως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἑρπετῶν ἔως τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

37Cf. BDAG, s.v. κτήνος: “mostly in pl. as collective.”

38Glare, Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. pecus (1) and (2a).
and the Peshitta also uses the singular form. Therefore, a single alteration in the D-text cannot account for the range of attestation, and the κτηνοὺς of D* F G attests an early Greek reading. Because it avoids harmonization to the plurals ἀνθρωπων, πτηνων, and ιχθυων, it is likely the archetypical reading.


As at 12:10, a series of contrasted clauses led to alteration of the conjunctions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ϒϕ⁴⁶</th>
<th>N* A B L</th>
<th>D*</th>
<th>F G</th>
<th>VL 77</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:39a</td>
<td>lac</td>
<td>ἀλλα</td>
<td>ἀλλα</td>
<td>ἀλλα</td>
<td>ἀλλα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39a</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td>μεν</td>
<td>μεν</td>
<td>μεν</td>
<td>μεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39b</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39c</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39d</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:41a</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>δε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:41b</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>ἀλη δε</td>
<td>ἀλη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:41c</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td>και ἀλη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vulgate, which shows the most significant editing, removes all conjunctions. D* makes two errors: the loss ἀλλα is an example of parablepsis and the omission δε of v. 39c. F G and VL 77 simply read δε for every clause, adding it at v. 41a and replacing και at v. 41b. Given the parallel use of και at v. 40a and b, it appears that the singular reading of ϒϕ⁴⁶, which removes the και at v. 41b, is incorrect. The archetypical reading, which avoids assimilation, is found in the majority of witnesses.

39Though Adversus Marcionem 5,10 reads the plural: alia vero pecudum et volucrum (which omits the final element).
In a rare singular reading of G, the original hand writes καθως after πνευματικον. This is the result of another skip by the scribe, here to the πνευματικον καθως (attested only by F G) at the end of the sentence. The corrector does not omit the additional word, but alters it to ως.

The "Byzantine" witnesses (K L Ψ 049 056 075 01515 424* 876 pm) have substantially revised 15:44. First, the conditional sentence is turned into a statement by removing the particle ετ. Conditional statements are also altered at 1:13; 5:13; 9:8; and 9:13 (though not limited to "Byzantine" witnesses). Next, adverbial κατ is moved to the position prior to the verb, changing its function to that of a conjunction. Finally, σωμα is added prior to πνευματικον, bringing it into parallel with σωμα ψυχικον. Such alterations can only be explained as the result of intentional editing, though perhaps an unintentional omission of ετ (ΕΙΣΙΤΙΝ) has prompted the other alterations.

1 Cor. 15:42-49 received particular attention from Gnostics such as Theodotus and the Valentinian exegetes, and is even alluded to in the Gospel of Philip. For this reason, the apologists Tertullian and Irenaeus made a discussion of this passage central to their
argument. However, the manner of debate over the meaning of this section did not encourage textual alteration. The "Gnostics" and the "Orthodox" differed not on the form of the text but on the meaning of the words in the text, such as ψυχικός and πνευματικός. E. Pagels writes:

The present study of gnostic exegesis lends support to Conzelmann's view. It seems that we can account for allegedly "gnostic terminology" in Paul's letters if we assume that Paul's theological language subsequently is appropriated and developed by the Valentinians (and other gnostics) into a technical theological vocabulary. For this reason Irenaeus made the complaint, noted above (at 15:15) that "they compel wicked and perverse interpretations to be made of all the passages in order to overturn and change the sense of what was said" (Adversus haereses 5,13,5).

Although the "Orthodox" and the "Gnostics" debated the nature of the resurrection of Jesus, the debate has not impacted the textual tradition of this passage. Instead, the alterations in this section are simply mechanical errors. B K 326 385 pc and Irenaeus lose ανθρωπός following πρώτος, most likely by accidental leap. Others make additions by assimilation. At 15:47 C' adds οδαμι after ανθρωπός (1) in conformity to 15:45 and replaces χοικός with ψυχικός from v. 46.

An alteration which may be thought to reflect theological interests is the addition in 1646 of πνευματικός after ανθρωπός (2) at 15:47. This is more likely an addition based on

---

40 Tertullian, De resurrectione 49-54; Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 5,7,1-2. See E. Pagels, The Gnostic Paul. Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 93 n. 190. Irenaeus reads only αδαμι in both the first and second clauses of 15:45. Since he is the only witness to do so, his reading in both places should be attributed to his adaptation rather than an attempt to accurately render an archetype.

41 Pagels, Gnostic Paul, p. 163.

42 B. Weiss, p. 83, who notes similar errors elsewhere in B (omit της δικαιοσύνης after της δωρεάς Rom. 5:17, joined again by Irenaeus; omit αποστολοίς after αγιοις Eph. 3:5).
to πνευματικον at 15:46 than a theologically motivated alteration. Similar theological emphases are not to be found elsewhere in the alterations of ÏP, whereas this witness frequently adds words by assimilation to the surrounding material.\footnote{Royse (p. 264) cites thirty examples of addition by assimilation in ÏP.}

A second alteration has been identified as being motivated by theological interests.\footnote{In particular Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, pp. 47-48. See also Thiselton, p. 1285.} Marcion, according to both Tertullian and Adamantius,\footnote{Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem} 5,10,7 and Adamantius, \textit{Dialogus} 2,19.} replaced αδεμ both at 15:45b and 15:47 with κυριος. Both Schmid and Clabeaux, however, have disputed the Marcionite origin of this reading. Both see the readings as arising early in the tradition as explanatory glosses that clarify who the “second Adam” was.\footnote{Schmid, \textit{Marcion und sein Apostolos}, pp. 108, 210; Clabeaux, \textit{Lost Edition}, pp. 78-79; 112;13. Schmid (p. 108) further debates whether Tertullian has accurately described Marcion’s text here.} The gloss has affected the textual tradition at 15:47 with ο κυριος εξ ουρανου in 630 1912 2200 agreeing with Tertullian’s citation of Marcion (\textit{dominus de caelo}), and the “Byzantine” witnesses reading a conflation, ανθρωπος ο κυριος εξ ουρανου.

\footnote{43 Royse (p. 264) cites thirty examples of addition by assimilation in ÏP.}

15:48.190; 15:48.191

Adverbial κατ following τοιουτοι is in question both in 15:48a (omit F G VL 77 M) and 15:48b (omit ÏP). No witnesses omit both examples, however, and there does not appear to be any reason to unbalance the clauses. Likely both omissions are examples of accidental loss (\textit{TOI OTOL KDEL}), though one may also compare the occasional omission of adverbial κατ (cf. the discussions at 13:12.57; 14:15.68; and 16:6.32).

The adjective ἐπουρανιος occurs only at 1 Cor. 15:40, 49; Eph. 1:3; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12; Phil. 2:10; and 2 Tim. 4:18, and with variation here and at Eph. 1:20 (ουρανοις sic B). Given the use of ἐπουρανιος at 15:40 and 49, that must be the correct form at 15:48. However, ουρανιος, attested only by Ψ46 D* F G, again connects these witnesses as stemming from the same early source.

15:49.194 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:50.199

The shift from δε to γαρ in D* F G the D-text, and Tertullian, is likely the result of intentional alteration (cf. the similar substitution of γαρ for δε at 14:5.18). 15:50 could be interpreted as either a conclusion to 15:44-49 or a part of a unit comprised of 15:50-53.47 The γαρ forces v. 50 to be read with vv. 44-49, though it should more likely be read with vv. 50-53.

15:50.200; 15:50.201

The readings ου κληρονομησουσιν and ου κληρονομησετι, found together only in F G, may seem to be obviously secondary given their “poor” attestation. However, ου κληρονομησουσιν is also read by Marcion48 and κληρονομησετι by Methodius49 (though neither cites both clauses). However, as discussed at 6:9-10, harmonization to the standard phrase βασιλειαν θεον [οδ] κληρονομησουσιν likely accounts for the future tense in both

---

47See Fee, First Corinthians, pp. 795 n. 1 and 797-98 n. 7.

48As cited by Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem 5,10,11; see Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, p. 103.

49Methodius, Symposium 3,7,68.
cases and the shift from κληρονομησάι ou δυναταί, both in F G and in the citation of Methodius. Nevertheless, both readings must have arisen extremely early in the tradition.

15:51.203; 15:51.204

The tradition divides into four main readings and two sub-readings

A. παντες ou κοιμηθησομεθα ou παντες de αλλαγησομεθα Ψ46 Aμ

B. παντες ou κοιμηθησομεθα παντες de αλλαγησομεθα B

B.1. παντες μεν ou κοιμηθησομεθα παντες de αλλαγησομεθα D2 K L P Ψ 049 056 075 0124 0150 0243 5 6 88 424 876 915 1834 1881

C. παντες κοιμηθησομεθα ou παντες de αλλαγησομεθα Ν C 0243* 3352 1241* 1739

D. παντες ανασησομεθα ou παντες de αλλαγησομεθα D* b d

D.1. παντες μεν ouν κοιμηθησομεθα ou παντες de αλλαγησομεθα F G f Vg Tert Amst

Two readings can immediately be explained as subvariants. First, The addition/omission of μεν is the only difference between B (Reading B) and the “Byzantine” text (Reading B.1). This reading is likely secondary, another example of the addition of μεν to balance a subsequent δέ (see discussion at 12:20.82). Second, F G read μεν ouν after παντες (1). This, however, is likely a corruption of μεν ou. We have already seen F G alter Greek particles to match the Latin (discussed at 6:5). Notably, the Vulgate’s quidem, which found its way into the predecessor of VL 77 78, which then led to the addition in F G. These manuscripts add μεν based on the Vulgate’s quidem also at 12:20. The error μεν ouν for μεν ou takes place

50Δύναμαι + inf. occurs some twenty-two times in Paul, nowhere else with variation.

51Α, in one of its characteristic singular readings, adds the article before each παντες: οι παντες ou κοιμηθησομεθα οι παντες de αλλαγησομεθα. The confusion of ou for οι before παντες (2) likely prompted the addition of οι before παντες (1).

52von Soden cites 33 as reading κοιμηθησομεθα ou αλλ ou παντες; cited here from photographs (Tischendorf cites correctly).

53Μεν ouν renders quidem in the Latin witnesses also at 1 Cor. 9:25
in other Greek witnesses. 999 makes the same alteration at 15:51, and 1646 writes μεν ουν ου, showing that scribal corruption is a strong possibility. Whatever the cause, the ουν of FG is a corruption of ου. Therefore, apart from the presence of μεν, FG agree with reading A.

The question of ου before κοιμηθησομεθα is the easiest to resolve. Its omission removes a potential difficulty that later generations of scribes may have had with the text: How can Paul say that “not all will sleep” when clearly (to a later scribe or reader) Paul and all of his contemporaries have died? This rules out Reading C, and, for different reasons (discussed below), Reading D, which removes ου and the replaces of κοιμηθησομεθα with αναστησομεθα.

This passage’s most challenging problem, however, is whether or not to read ου before αλλαγησομεθα. Although this negative particle is read by all witnesses apart from B the “Byzantine” text, and the Vulgate, it is usually given only slight consideration. Schrage, for example, suggests that a negated αλλαγησομεθα cannot suit the argument of 15:52. Fee sees Readings C and D as reflecting later Christian eschatology (“all men must die, but transformation is for believers only”). The reading of ἄπειρον is typically dismissed as a conflation of Readings B and C, though none who make this argument recognize that both Aε and FG would have to result from the same conflation, a highly unlikely situation. For while ἄπειρον conflates readings found in FG and the rest of the tradition, FG only conflates with the Vulgate (which it does not here) and A shows idiosyncratic editing, but not

---


55 Schrage IV, p. 370; Fee, First Corinthians, p. 782 n. 3.

56 Zuntz, Text of the Epistles, p. 254; also Schrage and Fee (see previous note).
conflation. This textual problem must be resolved on the basis of an analysis of the context, not by hazardous conjectures of scribal practice.

In order to determine whether or not the second ou should be read, a decision must be made as to whether each occurrence of πάντες and ἡμεῖς refers to those who, “at the last trumpet,” are still living, to the dead, or to both groups. J. Gillman has analyzed the structure of I Cor. 15:50-53 in detail, which helps to clarify these referents. In 50-53 he finds an A B A’ pattern, with a substructure encompassing 51-52:

50a A Τῷ τὸ δὲ φημι, ἀδελφοί,
50b ὅτι σάρξ καὶ σῶμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται
50c οὔδε ἡ ψυχή τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ.
51a B ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω·
51b a πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα,
51c πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα,
52a b ἐν ὀστομῷ, ἐν ὁπλῇ ὄφθαλμῳ, ἐν τῇ ἕσχατῃ σάλπιγγι·
52b b’ σαλπίσει γὰρ
52c a καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἀφθαρτοὶ
52d καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα.
53a A’ Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν
53b καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἄθανασίαν.

Regarding the πάντες and ἡμεῖς, Gillman concludes:

The living/dead distinction is contained in a (v. 51bc) and a’ (v. 52cd). In element a Paul progresses from the living (v. 51b) to the living and the dead who are both transformed (v. 51c). In element a’, Paul clarifies in a double way what he has said in v. 51c. For the dead, transformation means to be raised incorruptible. The ἡμεῖς of v. 52d by its contrast with οἱ νεκροὶ in v. 52c shows with greater certitude that Paul himself expects to be alive at the Parousia. (p. 322).

Recognizing the obvious distinction in v. 52 between the living (ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα) and the dead (ὁι νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἀφθαρτοὶ) is critical. The living are “changed,” but the dead are not changed because they are “raised imperishable” and therefore do not need to undergo the change that the “living” will. V. 52 is connected to v. 51 by γὰρ, which makes clear that v. 52 is an explanation of the “mystery” stated in the previous sentence. Gillman
and others view the πάντες ἀλλαγησόμεθα of v. 51 as applying to both the living and the dead, but this destroys the parallelism with v. 52 (where a distinction is made between the living and dead) and does not account for the fact that 52 is an explanation of v. 51. Furthermore, because the πάντες at v. 51b does not refer to both the living and the dead (only the living), the πάντες at v. 51c it is not likely to, either. However, the distinction of v. 52 is maintained if one reads οὐ before ἀλλαγησόμεθα in v. 51: “We will (not) all sleep” (v. 51b) refers to the living, who will “be changed” (v. 52d) while “but we will not all be changed” (v. 51c) refers to the dead, who are not changed, but raised imperishable (v. 52c). Reading the negative particle in v. 51c therefore strengthens the parallelism described by Gillman, who, incidentally, does not discuss any textual problems, including the οὐ. The reading οὐ ἀλλαγησόμεθα therefore best suits the structure of 15:51-52.

Reading the οὐ in v. 51c has the additional advantage of making this “mystery” correspond more closely to the parallel description of Paul’s teaching on what happens at the “trumpet” in 1 Thes. 4. 1 Cor. 15:50 uses the term μνημήρων to describe the teaching, at 1 Thess. 4 he “does not want you to be ignorant.” In 1 Thes. 4, Paul argues that both the living and the dead will “be with the Lord” (4:17), but in a distinct sequence. The dead (τοῦς κοιμηθέντας) will “rise first,” and then those still living will be “caught up in the clouds with them.” In 1 Cor. 15 the concern is not the sequence of the resurrection, but what happens to the body. Those who are dead rise αἰθαρτοὶ, while the living must be changed (15:52). Only by reading οὐ at 15:51b is this distinction maintained. As a result, the reading

57 E.g., Fee, pp. 800-801 and 802 n. 27, though without considering alternative explanations nor the role of v. 52.

58 This may further indicate that a reassessment of the parallelism of the entire section is in order. Jeremias, for example, had argued that all of 15:50-53 presents a series of parallel distinctions between the living and the dead. See Gillman, pp. 310-13.
οὐ ἀλλαγησόμεθα suits not only the structure of 15:51-52 but also matches another Pauline description of the eschaton.

Finally, the reading οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα οὐ παντὲς δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα is able to account for the creation of the other readings, for each one assumes that the negative stood before both verbs at 15:51. Reading C removes the first οὐ in order to reflect the situation after Paul’s death, as described above. Reading D, which replaces κοιμηθησόμεθα with αναστησόμεθα, accomplishes the same result as Reading C, though in a different way, by importing the verb ἀνίστηνι, likely from 1 Thess. 4:14, 16. 59 This alteration also requires that the base had read the negative was read before both verbs, for “we all will rise” would easily be substituted for “we will not all sleep” but not its opposite “we will all sleep.” Further, the second οὐ must have been read since only if “not all will be changed” would there be a difficulty with “we will not all sleep” that would prompt such an alteration. As a result, only one alteration took place in the Latin tradition (resurgemus in primarily D-text witnesses, VL 75 89 Amst Spec 60) and D*, the shift of verb, not a complex alteration involving alteration of the verb and addition of the negative. As is the case with Reading C, the only text which could have produced Reading D is Reading A.

This analysis demonstrates that all readings, except for Readings B and B.1, are based on a text which read οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. But is Reading A the corruption, or is B? Setting aside the question of μέν (see below), these readings do preserve the archetypical οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. But is it more likely that B, the “Byzantine” text, and the Vulgate, in

59 In the Corpus Paulinum, only Eph. 5:14 uses the verb in connection with the resurrection.

60 Fee (First Corinthians, p. 796 n. 3) cites Marcion as sharing this reading, though Schmid’s Marcion und sein Apostolos does not locate any evidence for Marcion’s text here.
contrast to the base text for all other witnesses, removed the \textit{ou} before \textit{αλλαγησομεθα}, or preserved it? On transcriptional probabilities the answer is relatively simple: the omission of \textit{ou} results in the reading \textit{παντες δε \αλλαγησομεθα}, which brings v. 51c into harmony with \textit{και ημεις \αλλαγησομεθα} at v. 52d. This harmony, however, is only a surface parallel, for as noted above, the \textit{\alphaλλαγηςομεθα} of v. 52d refers only to the living, while the \textit{\alphaλλαγηςομεθα} of v. 51c refers to the dead – and even according to alternative interpretations, it refers to \textit{both} the living and the dead. So while there is a facile parallel between Reading B (also B.1) and v. 51c, contextually it is not parallel. Readings B and B.1 are therefore the result of a common scribal corruption: assimilation to the near context. Furthermore, this is a typical alteration in these witnesses. One may compare the situation at 1 Cor. 2:4, where only \textit{\textmu\sigma\tau\iota\nu F G} preserve the archetypical text, but all other witnesses, including B and the “Byzantine” text, assimilate the text to 2:13.

As a result, the reading \textit{παντες \textit{ou} κοιμη\thetaηςομε\thetaα \textit{ou} παντες δε \alphaλλαγηςομε\thetaα} (\textit{\textmu\sigma\tau\iota\nu F G}) suits the both the structure and argument of 15:50-53 in ways that the other readings do not. It also suits Pauline theology as expressed at 1 Thess. 4 – without obviously harmonizing to it, as did D*. The only argument against it, that it is the result of conflation, is extremely unlikely, given the known characteristics of witnesses that support it (A F G). Finally, all the other readings can be shown to have derived from this reading.

15:52.205

Zuntz’s argument, that \textit{\epsilon\nu \rhoο\eta \omega\θο\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\omega\upsilon} cannot be understood as “in the blink of an eye,” cannot be assailed.\textsuperscript{61} \textit{\rhoο\eta} and \textit{\deltaι\nu\eta}, because they are similar in meaning, are

occasionally substituted for each other, but \( \epsilon \nu \upsilon \rho \omicron \nu \eta \ \omicron \phi \theta \lambda \alpha \mu \omicron \upsilon \) is senseless in this context.\textsuperscript{62}

Hence \( \upsilon \rho \omicron \nu \eta \) (\( \Psi ^{46} D^* F G \ 0243 \ 6 \ 424^c \ 1739 \)) must be a very early error,\textsuperscript{63} showing that readings in both D F G and the 0243 6 424\textsuperscript{c} 1739 cluster go back into the second century.

15:52.207

\( \Psi \) alone adds an explanatory gloss to \( \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \iota \sigma \varepsilon \iota \ \gamma \alpha \tau : \phi \omicron \beta \varepsilon \rho \alpha \ \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \gamma \iota \ \alpha \pi \omicron \upsilon \alpha \nu \), though an external source for the gloss cannot be identified.

15:52.209

A D F G 056 0142 0150 read \( \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \sigma \omicron \omicron \nu \tau \alpha \iota \) in place of \( \alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omicron \omicron \tau \alpha \iota \). In Paul, \( \alpha \nu \sigma \tau \eta \mu \upsilon \) is used of "resurrection" in the \textit{Corpus Paulinum} only at Eph. 5:14 and 1 Thes. 4:14, 16. However, patristic formulations prefer \( \alpha \nu \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \upsilon \), perhaps based on the use of that term in the gospels, particularly John (John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:23-24; 20:9; cf. Mark 16:9).\textsuperscript{64}

15:53.210 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:53.213 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:54.215; 15:54.216

The range of variation suggests that accidental omission by accidental leap has caused the disruption in the tradition. F G 6 skip from \( \Delta \theta \delta \alpha \nu \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \nu \) (15:53) to \( \Delta \phi \theta \omega \rho \pi \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \nu \) (15:54). D\textsuperscript{*} and much of the Latin tradition (VL 75 89 Vg Amst) skip from \( \Theta \phi \theta \omega \rho \pi \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \nu \) to

\textsuperscript{62}Zuntz denies that any Latin reading goes back to \( \epsilon \nu \upsilon \rho \omicron \nu \eta \ \omicron \phi \theta \lambda \alpha \mu \omicron \upsilon \), but Tertullian's \textit{in momentaneo oculi motu} (\textit{De resurrectione} 42 and \textit{Adversus Marcionem} 5,10) appears to be an attempt to make sense of the difficult reading.

\textsuperscript{63}Compare also \( \pi \epsilon \theta \omicron \omicron \varsigma \) at 2:4; \( \nu \epsilon \iota \kappa \omicron \varsigma \) at 15:54; and \( \epsilon \nu \epsilon \rphi \gamma \eta \varsigma \) at 16:9.

\textsuperscript{64}Cf. Lampe, s.v. \( \alpha \nu \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \upsilon \) (A.2).
TOΦΕΝΤΟΝ, while other early witnesses (𝔓¹⁴⁶ N² C' 088 0121 0243 1175 1739* pc Mcion Ir) skipped from ΑΦΕΝΠΙΔΛΝ to ΑΦΕΝΝΑΠΙΔΛΝ. The reading of the rest of the tradition, including N² B C²vid D K L P pm, may appear to be a conflation of these two readings which was based on the similar wording of 15:53. However, this would not explain why either the D* reading would have intentionally replaced the Ψ⁴⁶ reading, or the reverse. The reading of A, which reverses the two clauses, must be the result of a correction which replaced the missing clause in the wrong location.⁶⁵

15:54.219; 15:55.221

The phrase εἰς νεῖκος (𝔓¹⁴⁶ B D' 088) reflects a Septuagintal rendering of ΠΝΠΠ (or ΠΝΠΠ, “forever”).⁶⁶ The resultant text would translate: “Death is swallowed up forever,” a contextually appropriate meaning that reflects the eschatological fulfillment to which Paul points in this section. This reading is also the basis of Tertullian’s in contentione (De resurrection 51) and Cyprian’s in contentionem (Ad Quirinium 3,58). While attractive, εἰς νεῖκος at 15:54 may simply be an itacistic variation of εἰς νικός,⁶⁷ particularly since the same Greek witnesses read νεῖκος where νικός 15:55 (they read νικός, it should be noted, at 15:57).

15:55.220

This catena of passages is adapted from the LXX of Is. 25:8 and Hos. 13:14, though

⁶⁵ Also attested by a few minuscules and some Vulgate witnesses.


⁶⁷ BDAG, s.v. νεῖκος. Fee (p. 803-804) argues that the νικός in the next clause requires that νικός be read also at 15:54.
no Pauline manuscript matches the texts of the LXX precisely. For example, the only word retained by Paul from Is. 25 is οθαναστος. In addition, δίκη, a key term from Hos. 13:14 (ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε), is absent from all witnesses to 1 Cor. Even more strikingly, the word order of Hosea is rearranged by Paul, so that the vocative stands after the adverb, while the LXX reads the nominative after the adverb. Again, no Pauline manuscript adapts to this sequence. Furthermore, the Textual Commentary argues that the “Byzantine” reading “arose from scribal assimilation to the text of the Septuagint.” This is difficult to sustain in light of the fact that the LXX of Hosea places το κεντρον in the second clause (the reading of 𝔓46 Ν B C 1739), whereas D F G and the Byzantine tradition reads το κεντρον in the first clause. The only adaptation in this unit which may plausibly be attributed to assimilation to the LXX is the substitution of αδη (𝔓² Α² Κ L P Ψ 049 056 075 0142 01516 pm) for the second θανατε. Αδη is found nowhere else in Paul nor in any early translation of this passage. Two citations attributed to Origen, however, read αδη. In Fragmenta in Jeremiam fr. 54 his που σου θανατε το νικος που σου αδη το κεντρον matches 0121 0243 33 1739c. The connection with these witnesses is tantalizing, but catenae manuscripts are notoriously unreliable. At De oratione 25,3, the reading που σου θανατε το κεντρον που σου αδη το νικος matches only D², and likely has no claim to represent manuscripts known to Origen. It may have entered Origen’s manuscript tradition via the “Byzantine” text, into which αδη could have been easily introduced through a marginal gloss or interlinear correction, in this case a minor adaptation to the LXX.

The alternative order, however, is more likely simply scribal error. Irenaeus, for


69Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 570.
example, uses both sequences in the same writing, and Tertullian’s citation varies in different writings. The sequence κεντρον . . . νικος (Δ Φ Γ Κ Λ Ρ Ψ 6 pm) is the most difficult reading for two reasons: it separates νικος of v. 55 from the same word in v. 54, and likewise κεντρον from the same word at v. 56. In addition, as noted above, it avoids the sequence of the LXX.

15:56.222 [discussed at 12:6.23]

15:56.223

0151 alters νομος to θανατος, assimilating the noun to κεντρον του θανατου in the preceding clause.

15:57.224 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:57.225 [discussed at 15:34.137]

15:58.226

ις 46 alone adds a second μου after αγαπητοι, resulting in αδελφοι μου αγαπητοι μου. This may be the result of either harmonization to the near context or adaptation to a stereotypical formula (see discussion at 1:4).

15:58.227

70 Adversus haereses 3,23,7 twice reads ubi est mors victoria tua ubi est mors aculeus tuus, while 5,13,3 twice reads ubi est mors aculeus tuus ubi est mors victoria tua. Tertullian’s De resurrectione 47 and 54 read: ubi est mors aculeus tuus ubi est mors contentio tua (51 replaces contentione with potentia), while Adversus Marcionem 5,10,16 reads ubi est mors contentio tua ubi est mors aculeus tuus.

71 Paedagogus 2,8,74,3: που σου θανατε το κεντρον.

72 Royse, p. 234.
A syn add καὶ or alter other conjunctions to καὶ in three places. At 15:58 (joined by the Vulgate), the addition of καὶ eases the asyndeton created by εἰδωλοθυτόν εἰσιν τί. At 11:5, these two witnesses write καὶ πᾶσα in place of πᾶσα δὲ, and at 11:27 (joined by several minuscules) they write καὶ πινη for η πινη.

15:58.230

FG shift οὐκ εἰσίν to the initial position following ὅτι. Pauline usage demonstrates that this position is secondary, for Paul never places the copulative before both the noun and the predicate and further, as in the majority reading, the subject always follows immediately after εἰδώλως ὅτι (Rom. 5:3; 6:9; 2 Cor. 1:7; 4:14; 5:6). The alteration, found only in FG and VL 77, may have been caused by a skip from ΟΚΟΝΟΣ to ΟΥΚΕΣΤΙΝ, with ΟΚΟΝΟΣΥΜΗΝ re-inserted after the mistake was noticed.

73 The verb stands between the noun and the predicate: Rom. 1:9; 1 Cor. 12:14; Gal. 5:3 or after both: 1 Cor. 7:19; 1 Cor. 10:19 (D* F G εἰδωλοθυτόν εἰσίν τί); Gal. 6:15 (εἰσίν) ισχυει Ψ66 B L Ψ pm).
Notes on Chapter 16

16:2.6

This is the only Pauline occurrence of the phrase μία σαββάτων/σαββάτου. In the gospels, σαββάτον is always in the plural (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7).\(^1\) The plural form has been adapted at 1 Cor. 16:2 to the familiar phrase from the gospels, which were not copied with the gospels in the earliest periods of transmission. For this reason it must be a relatively late reading; indeed, it is only attested by “Byzantine” and related witnesses (N\(^2\) K L 0121 0243 6 1739).

16:2.7; 16:3.18; 16:16.71

Further examples of υμ/-ημ- variation in 1241\(^\circ\).

16:2.10; 16:3.16; 16:6.33

The grammars extensively discuss variation between ἄν and τάν when a particle follows and indefinite pronoun. The consensus is that τάν is the Hellenistic form, with ἄν supplanting it ultimately in Middle Greek.\(^2\) The early manuscripts are not consistent.\(^3\) However, it appears that τάν should be preferred. The only textually firm example of ὅς followed by ἄν is Rom. 9:15 (bis), though this is a citation from the LXX. The manuscripts are otherwise inconsistent:

Rom. 14:23  ο δὲ διακρίμενος εαν cett
            ο δὲ διακρίμενος αν B

\(^1\)Apart from Mark 16:9 πρώτη σαββάτου.

\(^2\)Moulton I, pp. 41-43; BDR §107\(^3\).

\(^3\)See von Soden, I.ii.A, p. 1385, though he discusses only the gospels.
In these eleven examples,\(^4\) it is clear that several witnesses attest to the later shift to &v; D\(^*\) ten times and FG eight; KL \(\Psi\) six each. B\(^*\) makes the shift only three times, but two are singular readings.\(^5\) On the other hand, \(\Phi\) (where extant) does so only twice\(^6\) and A three

\(^4\)2 Cor. 8:12 is not considered since &v (katho \(\alpha\)n D\(^*\) F G L 0150 may be correct here, with \(\epsilon\nu\) influenced by \(\epsilon\) in the previous clause.

\(^5\)Cf. also 1 Cor. 7:8 \(\epsilon\)\nu \(\mu\)\(\epsilon\)\(i\)\(n\)\(w\)\(i\)\(n\) \(c\)\(e\)\(t\) \(\alpha\)n \(\mu\)\(\epsilon\)\(i\)\(n\)\(w\)\(i\)\(n\) B.

\(^6\)This result is all the more significant since \(\Phi\) err\(s\) in writing \(\epsilon\)\nu\ in other situations: \(\omega\)\(\nu\) \(\epsilon\)\nu\ (for \(\alpha\)\nu) at 1 Cor. 11:34 and \(\epsilon\)\nu \(\epsilon\)\(t\)\(e\)\(r\)\(o\)\(g\)\(u\)\(l\)\(o\)\(s\)\(s\)\(a\)\(s\)\(i\)\(s\) (for \(\epsilon\)\nu) at 14:21. The manuscript may be correct, however, at Rom. 9:26, where it reads \(\omega\)\(\nu\) \(\epsilon\)\nu\ \(k\)\(l\)\(h\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\iota\)\(s\)\(\o\)\(n\)\(t\)\(i\)\(a\) (F G \(\alpha\)\nu \(k\)\(l\)\(h\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\iota\)\(s\)\(\o\)\(n\)\(t\)\(i\)\(a\)) against \(\omega\)\(\nu\) \(e\)\(r\)\(p\)\(e\)\(\iota\)/\(e\)\(r\)\(p\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(h\)\(i\)\(n\) in the rest of the tradition.
times.

16:4.21 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

16:5.27; 16:6.30

Φ46 replaces διερχομαι with παρερχομαι, likely a harmonization to παραμενω and παραχαμαισω in the next sentence.7 Harmonization likely also accounts for παραμενω at v. 6 (Φ46 N A C D K L P Ψ 1739†).8 However, the decision between καταμενω and παραπομενω (F G) is more difficult. Both words are non-Pauline, though παραπομενω is a hapax legomenon in the NT and extremely rare in Greek literature.9 Though the shared ancestor of F G is frequently influenced by the Latin, (re)manebo is unlikely to have produced such a rare word. Παραπομενω is the most difficult reading, and would have been easily corrupted to παραμενω. However, since there no discernible cause for καταμενω, final judgment cannot be made.

16:6.29

Simple vowel confusion likely accounts for τυχον (P Ψ 0150 876* 1241†), even though τυχον is a rare use of the accusative absolute.10

16:6.32

D’s awkward singular reading, as Vogels noted, was likely created by a

---

7 Royse, p. 274.
8 Cf. also 7:31, where L writes παραχρωμενοι for καταχρωμενοι under the influence of the next word, παραγει.
9 See Liddell and Scott, s.v. παραπομένω.
10 BDR §424.
This project demonstrates that the source of this correction is a manuscript similar to Ἡ and A. However, instead of placing ταῦτα after παρασχέμασω, it was placed after the similar παρασχέμασσω. The error was easily made because both verbs are at the ends of lines in D. The reading of the shared ancestor of DFG is therefore the same as that found in the D-text: η καὶ παρασχέμασσω εἰ μὴ vel etiam heimabo nisi si.11

This reading is likely another example of minor editing in DFG and their related Latin witnesses to improve the sense of the text. In 16:5a, τυχόν indicates uncertainty as to whether or not Paul will stay in Corinth. This tradition’s revisor took the uncertainty to be not about Paul’s plans, but about whether or not the Corinthians will receive him. The reading likely originates in the Greek, for the D-text’s nisi si is unique in 1 Corinthians, and three times the D-text reads nisi where the Vulgate reads nisi si (1 Cor. 14:5, 6, 9).

Unrelated to DFG’s editing is the question of καὶ. Ἡ καὶ is common in Paul (Rom. 2:15; 4:9; 14:10; 1 Cor. 9:8; 2 Cor. 1:13), with Rom. 2:15 and 2 Cor. 1:13 providing close parallels to 1 Cor. 16:6. Given that adverbial καὶ is frequently lost in the manuscripts (see discussions at 13:12; 14:15; 15:48), and in particular by the witnesses that attest the shorter reading here (NA B C at Rom. 8:34; Ἑ at 1 Cor. 15:48), it is more likely that καὶ was lost either by accident or in yet another attempt to clarify Paul’s description of his future plans.

16:7.35; 16:7.37

Explanatory γάρ is necessary in both places, with 16:7b parallel but also clarifying Paul’s statement of v. 7a. The “Byzantine” text alters the second γάρ to δὲ, making v. 7b contrastive. As is the case with the alterations in 16:6, the alteration attempts to clarify the


12 F G lose η, a common error in these witnesses (see chapter on DFG).
uncertainty which Paul expresses regarding his travel plans.

16:7.38 [discussed at 9:12.40]

16:7.40

Interchange between the present -τρεπ- and aorist -τρεψ- would seem to be common, but this is the only place in the Corpus Paulinum where variation occurs (-τρεψ- Rom. 11:26; 2 Cor. 3:16; -τρεπ- 1 Cor. 4:14; 14:34; 1 Tim. 2:12; also Heb. 12:9). At 1 Cor. 16:7 the present form (D F G K Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 pm) is likely assimilation to ο εαν πορευωμαι at 16:6.

16:9.44

The use of ενεργης, found in every Greek witness, is difficult in this passage, for it cannot directly modify θωρα in the same way that μεγαλη does. Typically, commentators assume that ενεργης must refer to the activity or work that the “open door” presents. However, this would require that μεγαλη and ενεργης function in different ways, whereas their connection by και and identical case should require an identical function. The Latin tradition, however, offers a potential solution. Evidens (VL 77 78 89 VG; videns 75) assumes the Greek εναργης, meaning “clear” or “obvious.” This form of the text is not attested in any Greek manuscripts, but is found in a citation of this passage in a writing wrongly attributed to Chrysostom. Furthermore, the collocation of μεγαλη and εναργη is found elsewhere in

---

11Schrage IV, p. 440; Fee, First Corinthians, p. 820, who gives the sense, “‘a great door’ for effective work has opened to me.”

14De Circo MPG 59, p. 569.
Greek literature, whereas µεγάλη and ενεργή is not. Here, as in the readings ῥωπη at 1 Cor. 15:52 and νείκος at 15:54 the alteration of a single letter has produced a reading which is too difficult for the context. As at 2:4 and 10:20, the Latin tradition alone preserves the archetypical reading.

16:10.49 [discussed at 2:1.1]

16:11.50; 16:11.52

Güting and Mealand suggest that asyndeton in both places is original, with the shorter reading attested at 16:11a by D F G and the D-text and at 16:11b by Ν. However, it is more likely that Ν lost δε by accidental leap (ΠΡΟΠΕΜΠΑΤΕ∆ΕΕ), a common error by the scribe of Ν. Furthermore, while the addition of ουν appears to be a case of avoidance of asyndeton, other factors are more likely. One would not expect the addition in the third position rather than its typical second position in the clause. In addition, D F G and its Latin relatives prefer not to read ουν in the third position:

| Romans 9:19 | ερείς µοι ουν ] ερείς ουν µοι D F G K L Ψ pm |
| Romans 14:16 | µη βλασφημεισθω ουν ] µη βλασφημεισθω F G VL 77 78 |
| 2 Corinthians 11:15 | ου µεγα ουν ] ου µεγα D* VL 61 75 89 Spe Luc |

16:11.54

A case of parablepsis in B: ΔΥΤΙΤΥΜΗΤΑΤΥΝΝΑΔΕΧΦΟΝ.

---

15 Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 10,4,34 μεγάλα καὶ ἐναργὴ δειγματα.

16 Comparison may be made to similar loss of de at 1 Cor. 8:9 (ΒΑΕΠΕΤΕ∆ΕΕ Ψ46 104 1827 24647) and Eph. 4:32 (Γ1ΝΕΞΕ∆ΕΕ Ψ46 B 0278 6 1739 pc); but no loss at 1 Cor. 12:31; 14:1.

17 Cf. Col. 2:16: µη ουν τίς (but 056 0142 0278 µη τις ουν)
The reading δηλω υμιν οτι is typical of the clarifying expansions found in D F G and related Latin witnesses. It helps to make clear that Paul had nothing to do with Apollos’ absence. However, there is no reason for its omission, accidental or intentional. Yet in this reading D F G and the Latin are not alone: Ν* has the identical reading. This reading cannot have originated in the Latin, therefore, and must have existed outside a narrow “Western” text. This should warn us against dismissing all the unique readings in D F G as originating only late in a narrow group of witnesses.

16:13.62 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

16:15.65

Δε is lacking in Ν* D*, the same witnesses which lost conjunctions at 16:11. Güting and Mealand, however, conclude that since these witnesses “rarely omit δε” their reading may be original, and the addition of δε due to the familiar phrase παρακαλω δε. At the same time, however, παρακαλω without δε is found only at Phil. 4:2; there is no reason for not supplying it here.

16:15.66

The addition of και φορτυνατου και αχαιου C* vid F G 1611 pc syb) is made from

---

18 Fee, First Corinthians, p. 823 n. 1.

19 Güting and Mealand, pp. 48 and 101. There is a typographical error on p. 101, where they note that “K and B rarely omit δε.” It is not clear if this error, however, has affected their conclusion, since they claim that B loses δε only once, but D three times.

20 As there is at Phlm. 10, where there is anaphora, as Güting and Mealand (p. 48) note.
16:17; nothing can explain its loss. All witnesses that read this also write εἰσιν for εστίν in order to match the altered number of the subject. However, some witnesses add only καὶ φορτυνάτου without altering the verb (N² 0150 88 104 915 1241). There is no obvious motivation for the addition of only Fortunatus, who is otherwise unknown. It may be that parablepsis accounts for this reading (φορτυνάτος εἰσιν). The same accidental omission must have taken place independently in D and the D-text (VL 75 89 Amst). This reading is based on the FG reading, since it has the plural form of the verb (εἰσιν / sunt), but lacks καὶ σχηκου.

16:15.67; 16:15.68

Ψ⁴⁶ and D⁴ attest independent harmonizations to the parallel in Rom. 16:5. Ψ⁴⁶ reads σταυροῖς for σχηκου, while D⁴ reads απαρχης for απαρχη. The addition of final sigma matches απαρχη at Rom. 16:5, found only in Ψ⁴⁶ and D⁴⁶. The addition of a single letter changes both Epaenetus and Stephanas into a “officials.” Furthermore, Ψ⁴⁶ also read σταυροῖς at Rom. 16:5. This may be, as Royse notes, harmonization to a parallel passage in Ψ⁴⁶, which occurs occasionally in the manuscript, most frequently in Hebrews.21 This indicates not scribal activity, but editorial investigation and alteration.

16:17.75

This is the only interchange of ωτετερος / ωμοι in 1 Corinthians. Given the relative infrequency of the former in the Corpus Paulinum (Rom. 11:31; 15:4; 1 Cor. 15:31; 2 Cor. 8:8; Gal. 6:13; 2 Tim. 4:15) it is likely to have been altered to ωμοι (Ψ⁴⁶ Ρ Α Κ Λ Ψ 049 056)

21Royse, p. 263.
The two occurrences of υμεῖς at 16:15 and 16 may also have played a role.

16:17.76 [discussed at 7:13.46 and 9:12.39]

16:19.84

Assimilation to the near context explains the plural αςπαζονται (B F G L 049 056 075 0121 0243 6 33 88 424 876 915 1739). This form matches both the other occurrences of αςπαζονται at 16:19 and 20 and the grammatical number of the subject, even though Paul's practice is to use a singular verb when two personal names are the subject.²³ Compare also 15:50, where δυνανται replaces δυναται for the same reason.

16:19.86

Πρισκιλλα C D F G L Ψ 075 5 6 88 υμεῖς is most easily explained as a harmonization to the same form in Acts 18. This becomes more certain when one recognizes that D F G, whose text form traces back to the second century, have also added πορ ους και ξενιζομαι in order to bring the mention of Prisc(ill)a and Aquila into harmony with Acts 18 (see further on 14:34-35).²⁴ Priska is otherwise read in the Corpus Paulinum (Rom. 16:3; 2 Tim. 4:19).

Ψ⁴⁶ attests a singular reading, πρεισκός. This is unlikely to be the result of intentional alteration, in spite of the potential of an "anti-feminist" tendency in the

²²B. Weiss (p. 27) sees υμων resulting from simple carelessness.


²⁴This insertion is not recognized by Kurek-Chomycx (pp. 116-17 and 128), who posits that the diminutive "could also be interpreted as a put-down."
manuscripts. Instead, simple doubling of the final sigma satisfactorily explains the reading (\(\text{\textsigma C\textsigma G\textgamma N}\)). Precisely the same error is made by \(\text{\textvarphi}^{46}\) at 1 Cor. 2:4. The manuscript also reads the feminine (\(\text{\textnu\textsigma\textka\textkappa}\)) at Rom. 16:3, confirming that \(\text{\textnu\textsigma\textka\textkappa}\) is a corruption and not intended as a masculine form.

16:19.87 [discussed at 14:34-35]

16:24.98

\(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) is a secondary addition made in virtually all of the Pauline letters, with the same witnesses making the addition: \(\text{\textnu}^2 \ \text{\textkappa} \ \text{\textl} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) at 2 Cor. 13:13; Eph. 6:24; Col. 4:18 (also 0278); 2 Thes. 3:18; 1 Tim. 6:21; 2 Tim. 4:22. Other witnesses also add \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\).

| Phil. 4:23 | + \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) \(\text{\textvarphi}^{46}\) \(\text{\textA} \ \text{\textD} \ \text{\textK} \ \text{\textL} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) pm |
| 1 Thes. 5:28 | + \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) \(\text{\textA} \ \text{\textD}^1 \ \text{\textK} \ \text{\textL} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) pm |
| Titus 3:15 | + \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) \(\text{\textnu}^2 \ \text{\textD}^1 \ \text{\textF} \ \text{\textG} \ \text{\textH} \ \text{\textK} \ \text{\textL} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) 0278 pm |
| Phlm. 25 | + \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) \(\text{\textA} \ \text{\textC} \ \text{\textD}^1 \ \text{\textK} \ \text{\textL} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) 0278 pm |
| Heb. 13:25 | + \(\text{\textalpha\mu\eta\nu}\) \(\text{\textnu}^2 \ \text{\textA} \ \text{\textC} \ \text{\textD} \ \text{\textK} \ \text{\textP} \ \text{\textpsi}\) 0243 pm |

Only Galatians may have ended with \(\text{\textalpha\mu\nu}\) (omitted only by G).

\[\text{25}\] See Kurek-Chomycx (pp. 109-11), who rules out unintentional error: "[W]e cannot be sure that this singular reading should be explained as a mere mechanical error. The outcome at any rate is obvious: the variant under discussion reduces the number of women mentioned in 1 Corinthians. This, however, does not yet facilitate any far-fetched conclusions with respect to the possible animosity toward women in \(\text{\textvarphi}^{46}\)."

\[\text{26}\] Royse (p. 274) suggests that harmonization to the male name \(\text{\textsigma\kappa\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma}\) led to the addition of the sigma.
The Bilingual Manuscript Tradition and its Witness to the Text of 1 Corinthians

The most unique form of the text of 1 Corinthians is found in the Greco-Latin bilinguals D F G. As has been apparent to this point, they frequently differ from all other witnesses. Furthermore, their witness is complicated by the unique relationship between D and FG and between the three together and the Latin tradition. Because each witness has undergone unique alteration, the editorial and copying practices of each must be discussed individually. Ideally, a complete textual commentary on the readings of D F G would be produced; here only representative examples will be provided. An outline is provided to guide the reader through these discussions:

I. 89, AMst(A) and the Old Latin Tradition

II. The Witness of D F G

A. D F G Influenced by the Latin Text
B. Alteration of Word Order
C. Role of Paul in D F G
D. Expansionist and Interpretive Alterations
E. The Influence of the Near Context

III. Secondary Editing in FG

A. Latinisms in FG
B. Latin Influenced Word Divisions
C. Addition and Omission of the Article
D. Other Latinisms in FG
E. Alterations in FG Toward the Vulgate
F. Greek Source of the Vulgate-Influenced Additions in FG
G. Harmonization to Near Context in FG
H. Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text
I. Secondary Spelling in FG

IV. Secondary Editing in D

Since the work of P. Corssen in 1887-9 it has been accepted that, in the late fourth or early fifth century, a Greco-Latin bilingual manuscript was created using existing Greek and Latin witnesses. These were related, but the Latin was not originally a translation of the Greek text which became a part of this manuscript. This bilingual manuscript, which Corssen labelled “Z,” later became the source for two surviving lines of witnesses: D (06) 75 of the fifth century and a predecessor manuscript to the ninth century manuscripts F and G, which Corssen labelled “X.” This basic outline has been widely accepted. Frede made two key additional proposals: First, that Z should be dated to the mid-fourth century; and second, that X was an eighth century edition made by Carolingian scholars in the region of St. Gall, which is able to account for the alterations in the Latin toward a “St. Gall” type of Vulgate now found in 78 and partially in 77.

The Latin text of the bilinguals has undergone detailed analysis. In the early 1960's monographs appeared on 2 Corinthians, 2 Timothy, and 1 Thessalonians, as well as a

---

2P. Corssen, Epistularum Paulinarum codices graece et latine scriptos Augiensem Boernerianum Claromontanum examinavit inter se comparavit ad communem originem revocavit (s.l.: Typis expressit H. Fiencke Kiliensis, 1887-89).

3Corssen’s labels X and Z will be used in this chapter.

4Frede, Neuer Paulustext, p. 78.

5Frede, Neuer Paulustext, pp. 77-78; 78 n. 1.

6H. Zimmermann, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altlateinischen Überlieferung des Zweiten Korintherbriefes, Bonner Biblische Beiträge 16 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1960); F. H.
Festschrift essay on their text of Galatians, which is perhaps the most insightful of these. Only Nellessen attempted at the same time an analysis of the Greek text of the bilinguals; unfortunately his study also has significant shortcomings, primarily due to the limited amount of material discussed.

On the other hand, surprisingly little research has been carried out on the Greek text of D F G. Subsequent to Corssen’s study considerable attention was given to the relationship between F and G, though in the end Corssen’s conclusion that they are independent copies of X has been affirmed. Von Soden’s Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments devoted several pages to the three manuscripts, which in large measure appear to rely on Corssen. Zuntz, as he has for so many areas related to the study of the Pauline epistles, provides what appears to be the current consensus on both the relationship between and the value of D F G.

Zuntz presumed a second century date for the origin of what he, continuing the tradition, labelled the “Western text,” of which the bilinguals as a group represent one among

---


8Note particularly the review of Nellessen by B. Bonsack in Theologische Zeitschrift 23 (1967), p. 221.


10Corssen is not cited, but the discussion of the sense lines in D and in the Gothic manuscripts must have come from his study.
several witnesses. Because this text shows the types of readings one would expect of the “popular text” (as opposed to a controlled copying tradition) of the second century, Zuntz placed it into this earliest period of transmission. Our extant witnesses, however, have by no means preserved this second century text intact. The “leading Western manuscript,” according to Zuntz, is D. F G “more often than not prove themselves its [Z’s] faithful representatives,” but these are also considered to have undergone secondary corruption, apparently from the Byzantine text. The relationship between Z and D is not clearly defined. The latter is derived from the former, but Zuntz never clarifies how D can be the best witness to the Western text, while at the same time acknowledging that F G are often the only manuscripts that have retained readings that D has lost.

Royse has given the argument of a second century origin of the text behind D F G a more solid footing by pointing out two conflations that are unique to Ƥ46 (ca. 200). At Rom. 16:19 this manuscript reads κατ θελω δε, an impossible combination of κατ θελω in D* F G and θελω δε in the rest of the manuscript tradition. In Phil. 1:11 the conflation is even more

11Zuntz, p. 267: “The Western tradition in its three main representatives, namely the Greek originals (a) of Tertullian’s text and (b) of the rest of the Old Latin version, and (c) the common ancestor of D F G, derives largely from this second-century basis.”

12Zuntz, p. 280: “The popular text, on the other hand, which amidst its corruptions preserved original features lost by its rival, lived on in the Latin versions and the few Greek copies (we know only of bilinguals) current in the West.”

13Zuntz, p. 240: “What D FG give us—or Cyprian or Augustine, &c.—is not ‘the text of the second century’: but they preserve features of it.”

14Zuntz, p. 42.

15Zuntz, p. 86.

16Zuntz, pp. 166-67, points out that the “older Western witnesses,” including D, avoid the “interpolation” found in F G at 1 Cor. 7:39 and 11:24 (but see the discussion of 7:39 below).

17Zuntz, p. 85.
striking: FG alone read εἰς δοξάν καὶ εὐαγγελον μοι, with the rest of the tradition reading εἰς δοξάν καὶ εὐαγγελον θεοῦ.\textsuperscript{18} \textsuperscript{D} reads: εἰς δοξάν καὶ εὐαγγελον χριστοῦ.\textsuperscript{18} \textsuperscript{P}\textsuperscript{46} creates from these εἰς δοξάν θεοῦ καὶ εὐαγγελον μοι.\textsuperscript{19} Royse states: "\textsuperscript{P}\textsuperscript{46} thus provides clear evidence that the text now found in FG was already circulating in the second century."\textsuperscript{20} A third conflation has been identified at 1 Corinthians 15:2, where the scribe of \textsuperscript{P}\textsuperscript{46} shows considerable difficulty in dealing with the readings εἰ κατέχετε and ὄφειλετε κατέχειν (see the discussion ad loc.).

In addition, several source-critical features of these manuscripts, particularly FG, suggest that they represent a unique and potentially early form of the text. First, there are two identical lacunae in F’s and G’s Greek texts of 1 Corinthians (3:8-16; 6:7-15). F fills in the Latin column with a Vulgate text but leaves the corresponding Greek column empty. G, being interlinear, simply leaves an appropriate amount of space empty. This indicates damage to an ancestor of these manuscripts, but also signifies that from whatever point that damage took place the subsequent users of that manuscript did not have access to Greek manuscripts to "replace" the missing material. It therefore must hold true that, at least from that point, comparison to another Greek witnesses did not take place, not only in these two places but also throughout the entire manuscript. This is in sharp contrast to D, which underwent quite

\textsuperscript{18}D* reads: εἰς δοξάν καὶ εὐαγγελον χριστοῦ.

The reading of FG has much to commend it, since the shift from praise of Paul to praise of God is quite understandable. Metzger, Textual Commentary 544 calls the reading of FG "very remarkable... which has no parallel in Paul." This is a puzzling statement, given that ἔπαινος does occur with the dative (1 Cor. 4:5), and ἔπαινος is used quite frequently of humans (Rom. 2:9; 13:3; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 8:18; Phil. 4:8). In fact, in the epistles God is never the recipient of ἔπαινος except the three occurrences in Eph. 1; these may have influenced the example in Philippians 1, which stands immediately after Ephesians in virtually all manuscripts Metzger does, however, also see the reading of \textsuperscript{P}\textsuperscript{46} as a conflation.

\textsuperscript{20}Royse, p. 253.
rigorous later correction on the basis of manuscripts of the Byzantine text. Second, F G lack the doxology of Romans 16:25-27. There is little doubt as to the secondary nature of this passage, yet it appears in all the major “Alexandrians.” The passage in D does not derive from Z, as both Corssen and Vogels have pointed out, its text of this passage is not in sense-line format, as is the rest of the manuscript. In addition, its Greek text in this passage is identical to ψ A P 0150 0151 apart from two readings that match its Latin text: the omission of τε in 16:26 and the word order θεός σωφρόνως in 16:26. Its Latin text (75), on the other hand, is unique. It conforms neither to the Vulgate nor to any other known witnesses. This immediately suggests that D represents a secondary stage in the transmission of the bilingual text, one which has been influenced by comparison to Greek manuscripts from outside the bilingual tradition. This will be explored below. One other feature of G in this connection points to an older tradition than that found in D: A space is left after chapter 14, a position in which many witnesses to the Latin tradition have the doxology. However, once again F G do not have alternative Greek witnesses from which to supply the “missing” material. Third, F G

---

21 Frede, Altlateinische Handschriften, p. 95.

22 E.g., J.K. Elliott, “The Language and Style of the Concluding Doxology to the Epistle to the Romans;” K. Aland, “Der Schluß und die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Römerbriefes.” See further the discussion above at 14:34-35 (p. 550)

23 The doxology appears after 16:23 in Μ A B C and after chapter 15 in ψ.


25 In contrast to the rest of its text, 89 presents a Vulgate text in Romans 16:13-27. See Frede, neuer Paulustext I, pp. 91-123.

26 For example, the readings qui autem potest and apocalypsem sacramenti at 16:25 for qui potens est and revelationem mysterii in the rest of the tradition.

do not include Hebrews among the letters of their Apostolos. This is a later addition to Z as well as to the Corpus Paulinum, as evidenced by its shifting location in the manuscript tradition. Furthermore, the Text und Textwert data, which is intended to give a general picture of the relationships among manuscripts, shows that D has a closer relationship to the “Alexandrian” manuscripts in Hebrews than in 1 Corinthians. This again shows that contact and interaction occurred between D and a Greek manuscript (or several) from outside the bilingual tradition. Since Zuntz’s Text of the Epistles focuses on 1 Corinthians and Hebrews, the lack of a text of Hebrews in F G and the close relationship of D with the “Alexandrian” witnesses in that book may have led to his undervaluation of F G. This brief examination of some source-critical features of D F G shows that there are some difficulties with Zuntz’s assessment of the value of F G in relation to D, and his view of the value of the bilinguals as a whole. This will be further assessed below by the examination of different types of readings in detail.

Aside from these larger features, all previous research on the text of the Pauline bilinguals, both the Greek and Latin, has been limited by the difficulty, and in places

28 R. Schlossnikel, Der Brief an die Hebräer und das Corpus Paulinum, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel, 20 (Freiburg: Herder, 1991), p. 131. His thesis is that the Latin text of Hebrews was not produced by the same translator of the other epistles in this manuscript.


30 In Hebrews, among the manuscripts that are extant for most of the Teststellen, D shows the closest relationship to N and C (56%), then A (55%). In 1 Corinthians, after F G, the agreements drops significantly: C and 0243 agree in 40% of the passages, then 33 1739 in 39%. NB agree in 34%. Cited from K. Aland, G. Mink, A. Benduhn-Mertz, und H. Bachmann, hrsg., Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, hrsg., Vol. II: Die Paulinischen Briefe. Band I: Allgemeines, Römerbrief und Ergänzungsliste, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 16 (Berlin ; New York: de Gruyter, 1991).
impossibility, of determining the Z's Latin reading in places where D 75 splits from F 78 G 77. For example, immediately at 1 Cor. 1:1 one finds the omission of κλητος in D 75 (with dp 61vid A D 0151 81 1834 Cyr). Is this the Z reading, with F 78 G 77 moving toward the rest of the tradition? Or in the notoriously difficult set of variations in 2:4, do F G (with only Ψ 46) preserve the Z reading εν πειθοίς σοφιας, partially supported by in persuasione sapientiae 77 78? Or does D, with the reading εν πειθοίς σοφιας λογοις (with Ν B D 33 1175 1739 pc), partially supported by in persuasione sapientiae sermones 75? If one is able to determine the Z reading, then one may determine the scribal habits which produced the alterations in D or F G as well as eliminate that alteration from consideration as the archetypical reading.

Previous researchers have recognized that the Z ancestor of D F G has been adapted to the Latin. What has not always been agreed upon is the method by which it is determined that Latinization has occurred in a given place. Von Soden describes the situation rather simply, that the editor of Z "adapted the Greek text very frequently to Latin," and that determining the original reading of Z when D and F G differ is a matter of deciding which moves toward the Latin, because "the reading adapted to the Latin is secondary." The difficulty with this procedure, however, is that the Greek basis of Latin text of the bilinguals, the D-text, is similar to the text of D F G. Schäfer, at the conclusion of his essay on the bilingual texts of Galatians, recognizes that a different approach is necessary to reconstruct the archetype of D F G:

---

31 In persuasione renders εν πειθοίς, not εν πειθοίς; see the discussion ad loc.

32 Teil 3,b, p. 1939

33 Teil 3,b, p. 1942.

34 A description of the "D-text" and its witnesses is provided in Uwe Fröhlich, Epistula ad Corinthios I, Vetus Latina, die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 22.3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1998), pp. 195-96.
There is no method for it which can be used mechanically; the only useful one is the examination of each individual difference between the three descendants of Z . . . because each of the three texts has its own unique, sometimes difficult to trace, history.35

D and F G must therefore be studied as individual witnesses, which make unique types of alterations for different reasons. It is hoped that by a thorough assessment of the editorial activity in the bilinguals the reading of their shared archetype Z may be accurately reconstructed. Only when Z has been accurately reconstructed in each place may its readings be used to reconstruct the early transmission history of the Corpus Paulinum.

I. 89, AMst(A) and the Old Latin Tradition

The pre-Vulgate Latin text of the Pauline Epistles is remarkably cohesive. The earliest patristic witnesses, such as Tertullian’s citations of Marcion's text, show a text that is not yet settled,36 but even these share readings that are unique to the Latin tradition, most notably the reading portate / tollite (= ἀράτει) in 6:20,37 where the Greek reads a conjunction (δὴ).

However, by the time of Cyprian there is clear evidence that a single Latin version is gaining favor in North Africa (the “K-text”). Lucifer of Calitari shortly thereafter shows the use of a closely related text in Italy (the “D-text”).38 It is the D-text which was adopted for use in the Greco-Latin bilingual Z, and for this reason is critical for understanding the creation and

35Schäfer, p. 70.

36Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos.

37Another example is found at 11:20. While there are some uncertainties regarding the most appropriate way to understand οὐκ ἐστὶ . . . φαγεῖν, the reading οὐκέτι φαγεῖν (D F G and the Latin tradition) is likely a simple scribal error, in which the sigma was dropped (ΟΥΚΕΓΤΙ). Nowhere else in the Corpus Paulinum does οὐκέτι modify an infinitive. The error clearly preceded the direct ancestor manuscript of D F G since it is followed by the entire Latin tradition (iam non [est]).

38Frede, Altlateinischen Handschriften.
development of the Greek text of D, F and G.

The influence of D F G on their corresponding Latin texts has been profound. Although neither a full analysis of the Latin tradition nor a reconstruction of the Latin of the Z archetype is a goal of this study, an example of how the Greek of D F G impacted the D-text may be helpful. At 1 Cor. 9:7, suspicion is cast on the reading of D F G because of the disruption it caused in its Latin counterparts. All four of the key witnesses to the D-text diverge here: ipsius (78); eius (77, also AMst(A)); gregis (89, also Vulgate); and gregis ipsius (75). This diversity can be accounted for by regarding gregis as the archetypical reading of the D-text prior to its adaptation to the Greek text in the bilinguals. This Greek text either inherited or, more likely, created the reading eκ του γαλακτος αυτης as an adaptation to the pronoun in του καρπου αυτου in the preceding sentence. Upon this alteration, the archetype of D F G used ipsius to bring the Latin into concord with the Greek. 78 retains this; 75 has the conflation gregis ipsius. This may be an indication that gregis was retained in the margin of this ancestor manuscript and subsequently reintroduced by 75, a procedure which seems to have occurred in several places in this manuscript (see also 9:20.74). The reading in 77, eius, is local harmonization to the near context, matching the eius following fructum in the preceding sentence.

As a result of these Grecisms in the D-text, the assessment of D F G has been hindered by the lack of a “control” witness, that is, either a similar Greek manuscript that has not been affected by the Latin text or a Latin manuscript that has not been influenced by the Greek.

39A handful of minuscules (including 3 255 323 1241) share this adaptation, as well as 1831 with the reading αυτου, which is so clearly dependent on the earlier sentence that it does not alter the gender of the pronoun.

40Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus,” regards the reading of 75 to be a conflation of the reading of 77 with the Greek text of D. The evidence of 89 now shows this reconstruction to be unnecessary.
While a closely related Greek manuscript has yet to be found, the Latin tradition has been greatly clarified by the recovery of the lemma text of 89. Its text was first published in 1974; the accompanying volume assessing the significance of the manuscript was published one year earlier. Here, Frede evaluated previous work on the Latin text of the bilinguales and compared the results with this newly found manuscript. He concludes:


Frede examined 89's relationship to the D-text only in Ephesians and 1 Thessalonians. His methodology was followed for sections of 1 Corinthians, with similar results attained. The table presents the agreements among the listed witnesses in chapters 1 and 6, with the total number of units of variation for which each witness is available given in the last column:

41 Frede, Neuer Paulustext, Bd. 1, pp. 82-3.
Several items are worthy of note, and will be clarified by attention to individual readings in
the rest of this chapter. First, the highest agreement with 89 is found in Lucifer and 75.
Second, 75 shows significant agreement with the same witnesses. Third, 77 has a relatively
low percentage of agreement with all witnesses. This is due to the singular readings created by
its regular adaptation of the Latin text to the Greek. 77 also shows significant agreement with
the Vulgate, though next is 75. Finally, the lemma of the Amiens manuscript of Ambrosiaster,
when compared with the rest of that tradition, shows movement away from the Vulgate and
toward the D-text.

89 is not a pristine witness to the D-text. In addition to a fair number of singular
readings (seven in the first chapter alone), the manuscript contains numerous "doublets," or
conflated readings. Frede listed the following five examples in 1 Corinthians:

---

Similar examples are found in both 89 and the Vulgate. These may represent early examples of scribes offering alternative readings, a practice which is adopted with frequency and vigor in 77.

In addition, 89 has received some influence from the I-text, both in the “doublets” listed above and, occasionally, in the replacement of D-text readings with those which would eventually be adopted in the Vulgate. This is more pronounced in certain sections than others. In chapter 1 89 agrees with the Vulgate in 65% of the units of variation; in chapter 6 this drops to 53% (also 64 from 49% to 41%; 61 from 56% to 46%). At the same time, the percentage of agreement with D-text witnesses such as 75 and even AMst(A) remains consistent.

An additional non-bilingual witness to the D-text is the lemma text found in the Amiens manuscript of the commentary of Ambrosiaster, designated “AMst(A).” This witness
has been only imperfectly known. Nevertheless, AMst(A) clearly represents a text similar to 75 89, but which has been altered by the adoption of Vulgate readings far more consistently than has 89. Indeed, in chapters 1 and 6 the witnesses with the highest percentage of agreement are Vulgate witnesses. However, this adaptation to the Vulgate does not appear to have been rigorously carried out. For example, in chapter 1 AMst(A) matches the Vulgate in 70% of the units of variation, but in chapter 6 this falls to 58%, while at the same time agreements with 75 rise from 53% to 62%. By chapter 16, however, the manuscript reverts to an almost completely Vulgate text. Various features of the manuscript itself may give clues as to the sections in which the different witnesses were used, such as the presence or absence of the Vulgate capitula, the use of uncial script at the beginning of certain lemmata, and various notations in the margins (which may or may not be original). These, however, remain to be explored fully, and it is clear that the manuscript requires further detailed analysis.

Nevertheless, despite its adaptations to the Vulgate, the manuscript shares several readings with D-text witnesses:

---

43 The edition in the CSEL was beset by the death of two editors during its production. Vogels produced Romans, but his successor's work on 1 Corinthians is less than perfect, with numerous errors in citation. Photographs of Amst(A) were used for this study.
AMst(A) therefore serves as a further aid in the identification of D-text readings where it does not share the Vulgate reading.

Having explained the types of readings we might expect 89 and AMst(A) to alter from the D-text allows us, as Frede noted, to clarify the form of the D-text prior to its adaptations due to contact with the Greek. While this is significant for the history of the Latin Corpus Paulinum, it also provides an additional "control" for the Greek text of the bilinguals. Prior to recognizing the value of 89 and AMst(A), readings in D F G supported only by their Latin counterparts would rightly be looked at with suspicion as unique to the Z revision. However, when these readings are supported also by 89 it becomes clear that the reading predates the Z revision itself. This clarification of the D-text therefore allows one to form a clearer picture of the now-lost Greek witnesses that were similar, though not identical, to the Greek manuscript(s) that served as the basis of Z.
II. The Witness of D F G

The Greek text of the shared archetype of D F G, labelled Z, has undergone alteration which is unique among manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. In places, there is evidence of influence from its Latin counterpart. This is not rigorously carried out, however. The most striking feature of this witness is evidence of editorial activity which attempted to produce a clear, readable text, with occasional theologically motivated alterations.

II.A. D F G Influenced by the Latin Text

The adaptation of the Greek text to the corresponding Latin text of bilingual manuscripts of the NT has been frequently discussed, though most often in the case of Codex Bezae. The current consensus is that the Greek text of Codex Bezae has not undergone extensive Latinization.\(^4\) The Pauline bilinguals have not received the same thorough attention; only suggestions of Latinization in the case of individual readings have been made.\(^4\) Methodologically, it is not always possible to either prove or disprove that a given Greek reading has been altered to match the Latin. For example, if the Greek reading and the Latin reading both construe and are contextually possible, it is not possible to show that the Greek reading has been altered to match the Latin, even if it was actually so altered by a scribe or editor. It is more likely in such cases, however, that the Greek and the Latin texts derive from a shared tradition. In this section, we will examine readings where D F G depart from the rest

\(^4\) A review of the history of the study of Latinism in Codex Bezae is provided in Parker, Codex Bezae, pp. 183-88. Parker concludes: “Present opinion rightly discards the theory that wholesale Latinization of the Greek has occurred. However, the fact remains that in a number of places Latinization remains the best explanation of the text.” (Codex Bezae, p. 256).

\(^4\) For example, Zuntz (pp. 88-89) describes 1:16; 4:8; 7:26, 28; and 15:5 as examples where “the Greek of the bilingual manuscripts reflects particular exigencies of the Latin tradition.” On 7:28 see also Fee, p. 325 n. 10.
of the Greek tradition where 1) the cause for the reading may be an attempt to match a
peculiarity of the Latin or a translational tendency of the Latin tradition found in the bilinguals
and 2) the reading did not arise in the transmission of the Greek text alone.\textsuperscript{46}

An example of the text of D F G being altered to match a translational tendency of the
D-text is found at 14:10. There D* F G (matched by VL 77 89) lack τοσαυτα. The omission
brings 14:10 and 14:11 into visual parallel; D makes this obvious by enlarging and extending
both ετ (14:10) and εαυ (14:11) into the margin.\textsuperscript{47} D is laid out as follows (VL 75 is missing):

\begin{verbatim}
ΕΙΤΥΧΟΙΓΕΝΗΦΩΝΟΝΕΣΤΙΝ
ΕΝΤΩ ΚΟΣΜΩ
ΚΑΙΟΥΔΕΝΑΦΩΝΟΝΕΣΤΙΝ
ΕΔΟΝΟΝΗΑΩ
\end{verbatim}

This alteration, however, is likely to have taken place first in the Latin. The D-text\textsuperscript{48} lacks an
equivalent to τοσαυτα, while the Vulgate supplies tam multa. However, this is the only place
in the Corpus Paulinum where tam multus is used to render τοσουτος. Instead, a form of talis
or eiusmodi / huiusmodi is used.\textsuperscript{49} Its presence in the Vulgate and 78 is therefore unusual and
likely not by the same translator of the rest of the D-text. The lack of τοσαυτα / tam multa is
therefore not an omission by the D-text of an existing tam multa. Instead, it is evidence of text
that did not translate τοσαυτα at all.

\textsuperscript{46}Parker (Codex Bezae, p. 186 and again on p. 257) cites approvingly a principle of H.
Marsh: “There is no reason whatsoever for ascribing any reading of a Greek Ms. to the
influence of the Latin, unless it can be proved that it could not have taken its rise in the
Greek, and that it might have easily originated in the Latin.”

\textsuperscript{47}G capitalizes the initial letter of each word, but since it is not written in sense-line
format it cannot extend them into the margin.

\textsuperscript{48}Represented here by VL 77 89; 75 lacks 14:9-18. Some manuscripts of
Ambrosiaster also lack tam multa; AMst(A) has the unique reading ut puta quanta.

\textsuperscript{49}E.g., talis at 1 Cor. 5:1; 11:16; 15:48; 16:16 D-text; eiusmodi or huiusmodi at 1 Cor.
It is possible that the reading of 

It is possible that the reading of D F G attempts to match an unusual idiom. El τόχοι appears elsewhere in the NT only at 1 Cor. 15:37. Outside the NT it usually has the meaning “perhaps,” but at 14:10, according to BDAG, is “probably meant to limit τοσαύτα . . . there are probably ever so many different languages.” The Latin tradition, however, renders εἰ τόχοι with ut puta, which frequently introduces an example or illustration. This understanding of ut puta suits 1 Cor. 15:37, where it translates εἰ τόχοι: “And what you sow, you do not sow the body which will be, but only a bare seed, for example of wheat or of some other kind” (ut puta tritici aut alicuius ceterorum). Therefore, ut puta genera liguarum . . . at 14:10 could have been understood by a reader as “For example, there are many kinds of languages . . .” 14:11, now visually connected to 14:10 in the predecessor of D F G by the sense-line format, would have served as the conclusion (ἐὰν ὀδυ μὴ εἴδω . . . ) based upon the example given in 14:10. Since there is no obvious motivation for either intentional excision or accidental loss of τοσαύτα, and tam multa never stood in the D-text, the influence of the Latin on the Greek is likely. Furthermore, εστιν is added in D F G also at the end of 14:10, balancing the εστιν of the first clause of 14:10, again on the basis of the Latin, as well as the addition of τῶ before κόσμω, another Latinism (see below). The problem of the unusual usage of εἰ τόχοι to modify τοσαύτα was dealt with by adjusting the Greek to match the Latin.

A second example of the translation peculiarities of the D-text influencing the Greek of the bilinguals is the manner in which it translates the terms ὁμῶν and κόσμος. In three

50BDAG, s.v. τογχάνω 2b.

51Glare, Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. puto 9b.

52VL 64 uses fere in place of puta, while VL 77 uses utpote, both of which correspond to the use of ut puta described here.
passages the Greek uses the demonstrative without variation:

1:20 τού αἰωνὸς τούτου  

3:18 ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ  

5:10 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου  

toū kōsmou tou tou kōsmou D  

The following example should also be included here, since 056 0142 together represent a single witness to their unique error of omission:

3:19 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου  

(τοῦ κόσμου 056 0142)  

Note that at 5:10, D has been influenced by the Latin word order.

7:31 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου  

Apart from the obvious, that where the demonstrative is present in the Greek it is also present in the Latin, it should be noted that with complete consistency 75 89 place the demonstrative before the noun, whereas in the Greek it follows. 77, and in one passage also 78, alter the Latin to match the Greek sequence.

However, with remarkable consistency the D-text uses a demonstrative where none is present in any Greek witnesses:

1:21 ο λ κόσμος  

tοῦ κόσμος 64 77 78 F VG Meion CY AMst  

hic mundus 61 89 Ambr Hil  

mundum 75  

1:28 ΤΟΥ κόσμου  

mundi 77 F VG Spe  

huius mundi 61 752 89 L1 AMst  

huiusmodi d53 HI  

omit 78 TE Spe AU  

3:22 κόσμος  

mundus 75 t z  

vgmass: C H O T Or AMst AMst(A)  

5375 has the error huiusmodi, an obvious corruption of huius mundi. The identical error occurs in Codex Fuldensis at 1 Cor. 4:13.
The consistency of the addition of the demonstrative before *mundus* may be contrasted with the manner in which *saeculus* and *aeternus* are handled. In the two examples where the Greek reads the demonstrative, both at 2:6, the Latin follows. However, at 8:13 and 10:11, *σιωπ* is used without a pronoun; in these places neither does the Latin add one. Recognizing this practice of the D-text allows us to explain the variation within the Latin tradition at 8:4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:6</td>
<td>οἴδαμεν οτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλὸν εν κόσμῳ</td>
<td>munda 77 78 89 VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:33</td>
<td>ῥυ τοῦ κόσμου</td>
<td>mundum 64 77 78 CY HIL AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:34</td>
<td>ῥυ τοῦ κόσμου</td>
<td>mundum 64 77 78 CY HIL AU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Greek text (without variation) reads *οἴδαμεν οτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλὸν εν κόσμῳ*. Immediately we might expect at least the D-text to add the demonstrative, with D F G likely following. However no Latin witness does so, and neither do D F G. This can be explained by the fact that the D-text reading here is preserved only in 75: *scimus quia nihil est idolum in saeculo*. As we have seen, with *saeculum* the demonstrative is not added. 89 has been assimilated to the I-text reading *scimus quia nihil est idolum* (61 Spe AMst AU Pel Sedul).

54 Schmid, p. 68 points out that this is simply a brief form of citation which may have been influenced by 1 Cor. 10:19, is therefore not a true variant reading.
and 78 are assimilated to the Greek (along with the Vulgate) with the reading *scimus quia nihil est in mundo*. We may conclude, therefore, that the editorial habit of adding the demonstrative is limited to the first edition (Z), but was not followed by subsequent editors in the same tradition (77 78).

Having noted the consistency with which the D-text adds the demonstrative with κόσμος, we are now able to examine several passages where this translational habit has prompted alteration in Z:

2:12  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Ψ</th>
<th>0150</th>
<th>0151</th>
<th>sy</th>
<th>Or</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>0150</td>
<td>0151</td>
<td>sy</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>spiritum mundi</em></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of the demonstrative in this passage is not surprising, since the use of πνεῦμα would have prompted a desire for a clear indication of exactly which πνεῦμα has not been received. This accounts for the addition also in Origen, Athanasius, Basil, and Cyril, none of whom are related to the DFG or the Latin tradition.

7:31  

| Text | A | B | C | L | P | Ψ | 056 | 0142 | 0150 | 0151 | 104 | 326 | 917 | 1175 | 1739° | 1834 | 1881 | sy | Or | Ephr | Bas | Chr | Eus | Severian | Thret | Dam |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ | N² | D¹ | K | L | P | Ψ | 056 | 0142 | 0150 | 0151 | 104 | 326 | 917 | 1175 | 1739° | 1834 | 1881 | sy | Or | Ephr | Bas | Chr | Eus | Severian | Thret | Dam |
| *hoc mundo* | 78 |
| *hoc saeculo* | AMst | AU |
| *mundo isto* | TE | HI |
| *de hoc mundo* | 89 |

The use of the accusative with χράομαι, the only example in the NT, prompted the alteration...
to the more commonly used dative. The presence of the demonstrative is not so easily dismissed as a mere Latinism, particularly since the “Byzantine” text is related to D F G. On the Latin side only 75 preserves the original D-text reading (*hunc mundum*); 89 is an alteration of the Vulgate; 78 follows the latter, while 77 attests the D-text reading with its habitual word order alteration to match the Greek (*mundum hunc*). The reading of D F G matches the pattern of other examples of this type of variation, but the addition of the demonstrative (with a shift in case) has apparently been followed by virtually all of the tradition. This adoption of a reading of D F G in the later tradition has not taken place in similar examples. Therefore this may not be a Latinism but a place where the Latin and the bilinguals preserve the archetypical reading.

14:10 ἐν κόσμῳ ὁ Θεός ἦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὁ Θεός

Here the bilinguals do not add a demonstrative but instead the article, which produces the same semantic result. Significantly, the bilinguals rarely add but frequently omit the article, itself a potential sign of Latin interference (see below). 75 is illegible here, but Codex Sangermanensis (76) preserves what had been its reading, which matches the rest of the D-text witnesses. The few other witnesses that independently read the article do not prevent tracing its origin in the bilinguals to influence from the Latin.

This now places us in a position to evaluate the two passages showing disagreement among D F G for this type of variation:

1:20 τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ὁ Θεός τοῦ κόσμου τούτου

55See BDAG, s.v. ἁρώματα; Schrage II, p. 175 n. 698.
This addition of τούτου is caused by the previous example of τού αὐτων τούτου (without variation) in the verse. D could only have avoided the addition by making comparison to other witnesses, as the demonstrative stands in 75 and the entire Latin manuscript tradition, as well as F G. The addition was clearly the Z reading, supported as it is by F G VL 75 77 78 89. The reading in D, no doubt also the original reading in this place (also ℃ 46 Α Β Ζ Μ υ ϵιοντ etc), therefore removes the addition made in Z by means of a comparison to other witnesses (see further below).

11:32 το τοσιω ℃ 46 Α Β Ζ Κ Λ Π Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 Hipp Cl
mundo AU
tο τοσιω τουτω F G 794
mundo hoc 77
hoc mundo 75 89 78 VG

The presence of the demonstrative in F G in 11:32 should be compared to the variants in 14:10, where under the influence of hoc mundo the article was added before κοσμω, but a demonstrative was not introduced. Since το τοσιω already stood in the text, the united D-text reading hoc mundo prompted the addition of τουτω in Z. The original sense-line in Z read:

ινα μη συν το τοσιω τουτω κατακριθωμεν / ut non cum hoc mundo damnemur. D splits this into two lines: | ινα μη συν το τοσιω | κατακριθωμεν |. At the point at which the line break was made, the presence of τουτω would have been apparent to the scribe. Its omission prevents the line ending with το τοσιω from inordinately exceeding those following and preceding, which may have perhaps been an additional consideration leading to the alteration.

The consistent addition of the demonstrative pronoun before mundus in the D-text led to numerous alterations in the Greek of Z (1:20; 2:12; 7:31; 11:32; 14:10). It also prompted an
alteration in the word order of D (5:10). Here D F G show evidence of adaptation to the Latin.

An indirect Latinism may be found at 1:26. There βλέπετε could be either an indicative or imperative form. The indicative is presumed by γαρ and the D-text's videte enim. However, videte must be the imperative form, which then influenced the scribe/editor of the shared ancestor of D F G to alter γαρ to οὖν. Finally, VL 77 78 brings their Latin text into conformity with F G by writing videte ergo.

II.B. Alteration of Word Order

Additional Latinization is seen in adapted word order. Following a comparative adjective Paul frequently, though not consistently, uses the copulative verb (1 Cor. 4:3; 7:9; 7:40; 15:19). This is limited to 1 Corinthians, though the reason that this stylistic peculiarity should be limited to that book is not clear.

The D-text adds the copulative in every passage where it is assumed in the Greek apart from 1 Cor. 13:13, perhaps in recognition of this text’s poetic nature. In addition, it prefers the position immediately following the adjective, a pattern followed also by the I-text (note 64 AU in the first three examples). Both the presence of the verb and its position relative to the adjective have caused variation in the bilinguals:

1:25 σοφώτερον των ανθρώπων εστίν Ν Α Β Κ Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 33 81 88 104 326 1175 syh Or Eus Chr σοφώτερον των ανθρώπων εστι Π 6 424c 1739 σοφώτερον εστιν των ανθρώπων D F G sy9 sapientius est hominibus 75 77 78 89 VG Hil AMst sapientes est quam homines 64 AU sapientibus hominibus Mcion9

56Barrett, p. 56; Fee, p. 79 n. 2.

57Only one comparative adjective is used in Romans; seven in 2 Corinthians, but never with a form of εἰμί.

58The readings attributed to Marcion by Tertullian in 1:25 and that of Irenaeus in 15:19 may be based on any of the Greek readings now in existence, except those of Π 6 424c 1739 and 0150 in the first example.
Both readings may be attributed to the influence of the Latin word order. In one additional
example D shows independent Latin influence:

Why does D alone succumb to the Latin word order here? Because D (or a predecessor) is
written in shorter sense lines than Z, with the result that some lines are awkwardly split. In
15:19, the sense-line in Z was \( \text{ελεεινοτεροι} \ \text{παντων} \ \text{ανθρωπων} \ \text{εσμεν} / \text{miserabiliores} \)
\( \text{sumus omnibus hominibus}. \) Without the alteration, D would have read:

\[
\text{ελεεινοτεροι παντων} \ \text{ανθρωπων} \ \text{εσμεν} \ \text{omnibus hominibus sumus} \]
\[
\text{miserabiliores sumus} \ \text{omnibus hominibus}
\]

This, however, would have separated the Greek noun from its adjective. To maintain the sense
units, \text{εσμεν} was shifted to the previous line so that \( \text{παντων} \ \text{ανθρωπων} \) could stand together:

\[
\text{ελεεινοτεροι εκμεν} \ \text{παντων} \ \text{ανθρωπων}
\]
\[
\text{miserabiliiores sumus} \ \text{omnibus hominibus}
\]

\[\text{As in G 89; F 78 do not make clear the beginning of the line, but it clearly ends as εσμεν / hominibus.}\]
In this way D creates a variant based on the Latin that X, with its longer sense lines, had no reason to alter from Z.

However, alteration in D F G is not clear in other situations where the Latin uses the copulative. There are many places where the Latin reads it without any Greek support (e.g., 12:6.23; 16:4.21). This inconsistency makes it difficult to decide if the addition is attributable to the Latin. For example, at 1 Cor. 7:26, D* F G 629 read καλὸν εστὶν, which Zuntz describes as one of several places where “the Greek of the bilingual manuscripts reflects particular exigencies of the Latin tradition,” matching the common idiom bonum est.

However, neither the D-text nor the Greek of the bilinguals add the verb in similar examples with any consistency:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom. 14:21</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 5:6</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 7:1</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 7:8</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 7:26</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 9:15</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor. 13:7</td>
<td>καλὸν</td>
<td>bonum est (bonum 77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is in contrast to the consistent addition of the verb following comparative adjectives, as discussed above. Although the addition is not consistent in the D-text, the addition of εστὶν in D F G at 7:26 may have been caused by the Latin reading. This may have taken place in other examples where D F G adds the copulative:

14:5 μειζῶν γαρ

14:10 οὐδὲν ἀφινον ropoliston α B P 048 0150 0243 0289 5 6 424 1739

---

60 Cf., with less assurance than Zuntz, Lindemann, p. 177.
Latin influence likely explains what appears to be a conflation in FG at 7:29:

\[
\text{nihil sine voce est 78 89 VG (75 lac)}
\]

\[
\text{nihil eorum sine voce est 61 77 L Sed-S}
\]

The Latin witnesses, however, read:

\[
\text{breve est reliquum est 78 VG HI AU AMst(A)}
\]

\[
\text{breviatum est reliquum est 75 AMstd AMst}
\]

\[
\text{breve est reliquum 89}
\]

\[
\text{breve vel breviatum est reliquum est 77}
\]

FG therefore add the second \text{estin} on the basis of the Latin, not from “Byzantine” witnesses, while D avoids the same addition.

II.C. Role of Paul in D F G

In the Latin tradition in general, but also in D F G, the role, status, or authority of Paul is frequently highlighted. The Latin D-Text\(^{61}\) and FG alter the third clause of 11:2 by removing the reference to the Corinthians (υμιν), adding \text{πανταχου / ubique} (VL 77\(^{e}\) 78 89 AMst), and adding the possessive genitive (μου) after \text{παραδοσις}. This results in an emphasis on the universal acceptance of Paul’s teachings: “Just as everywhere I passed on you hold fast

---

\(^{61}\) The archetype of D F G read καθως πανταχου παρεδωκα τας παραδοσεις μου; D has removed πανταχου and added υμιν, as in other places through adaptation to a Greek witness similar to Β Α, but retained μου. Its Latin counterpart (VL 75) reflects an imperfect adaptation to this alteration in the Greek by reading a conflation, \text{ubique tradidi vobis} (with vobis added to match υμιν) but otherwise retaining the original Latin text of its ancestor, now found only in VL 77 89.
my traditions." The awkward lack of an object for παρεδωκά / tradidi betrays the secondary nature of these alterations. Other examples include 3:5 and 9:1; the most prominent example, however, may be the displacement of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. While not directly highlighting the role of Paul or his authority, that alterations may seek to keep a close associate of Paul from appearing to 'break the rules' that Paul taught "in all the churches."

II.D. Expansionist and Interpretive Alterations

A major interest of the editor of the text behind D F G and the Latin tradition is the transmission of a clear, readable text. Most of these fall into the category of minor additions of words or phrases from the near context. For example, the addition of εις δειπνον (D F G VL 61 75 77 78 89) at 10:27 clarifies the event to which a person might be "called." While this is a correct understanding of the context, there would be little reason for its omission apart from a slight chance of accidental leap (ΔΠΙΣΤΑΤΑΝ ΑΔΕΙΠΝΩΝ). More likely it is a clarifying addition. The substitution of αὐτοῦ (F G VL 61 75 78 89) for αὐλής at 10:29 is a similar clarification. In the latter case D reads αὐλής, which means either that it has been corrected to other Greek witnesses or that F G have been adapted to the Latin. The fact that these readings are limited to the Latin tradition and the bilinguals suggests that they are further examples of the minor glosses common in these witnesses. Nearly identical in procedure is 12:23-24, where D F G add μελή and τιμής both from the near context, and 10:17, where καὶ (εν τοῦ ποτηρίου D*) is added from 10:16.

A striking example is the reading ἐν εἴμι in place of ἔγνων at 13:1 is typical of the

62Lietzmann (p. 53) claims that the addition of πανταχοῦ is the result of "Angleichung" to 1 Cor. 4:17. Assimilation to such a remote passage, which is furthermore only passingly similar to 11:2, is unlikely.

63Schrage, p. 467 n. 517; Fee, p. 475 n. 3.
narrow band of witnesses associated with the Latin D-text. It is found in the Greek witnesses D' F G as well as the *unum sum* of their Latin counterparts VL 7564 77 78.65 It is also found in the cluster of Latin witnesses that frequently match these Greek witnesses: Ambrosiaster, the *Speculum* (7), and Rufinus' translations of Origen (*Origenis in Exodum* 13,2). The reading is extremely difficult in context; εν / *unum* must be construed as the predicate of ειμι / *sum*, with χολκοζ / αεσ / aeramentum becoming the first word of a separate clause. The sense-line divisions found in D and VL 75 89 show this understanding. The reading is not Pauline, for aside from the contextual difficulties εν ειμι occurs nowhere in Paul. γεγονα, however, is used with a predicate nominative (as at 13:1) also at 1 Cor. 9:22; 13:11; and 2 Cor. 12:11.

As Corssen suggests, the most likely cause of corruption is assimilation to the αγαπην δε μη εχω ουθεν ειμι at 13:2.66 This form of the text makes 13:1-3 a series in which lack of love is described in progressively negative terms: εν ειμι (13:1), ουθεν ειμι (13:2), and finally ουθεν οφελομαι. The corruption, as Corssen also points out, took place not in Latin but in Greek. εν ειμι can be derived from ουθεν ειμι, but *unum sum* cannot have arisen from *factus sum*, the reading of the Vulgate witnesses, nor from γεγονα. Here is firm evidence that at least some unique readings shared by D F G and the Latin tradition do not derive from Latin manuscripts which were then adopted into Greek, but originated in Greek and became the basis for the D-text.

These alterations cannot be blamed on the fourth century editor of the bilingual Z

---

64VL 75 reads *in unum sum*. This must have been the result of a misread correction which intended to replace *in* with *unum*. This correction misread the numeral εν as the preposition εν.

65In VL 78, *unum* is written above ειμι in the Greek column. The Vulgate reading *factus sum* is found in the Latin column.

66Corssen II, pp. 15-16.
archetype. Not only are they found in earlier Latin witnesses, but some are found already in \( \text{PG}^{\text{46}} \). Perhaps the most obvious example is 15:2 where D F G smooth the difficult syntax with \( \text{o}\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\gamma\lambda\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu \). The text of \( \text{PG}^{\text{46}} \) is disrupted here, but the confusion in the manuscript is evidence that its scribe knows this reading, otherwise attested in Greek only in D F G (see the discussion \textit{ad loc.}).

\textbf{II.E. The Influence of the Near Context}

One of the most prominent features of D F G is their alteration of the text on the basis of surrounding material. At 9:22, D F G read παντας for παντως τινας. In addition, Didymus (\textit{Commentarii in Zacchariam} 1,26) reads παντας and Clement reads either παντας (\textit{Stromata} 1,1,15,5; 6,15,124,2; 7,9,53,4) or τους παντας (4,15,98,1; 5,2,18.7), the latter found also in 33 915 and Origen (\textit{Commentarii in evangelium Joannis} 20,35,319). Though early, this reading is likely secondary. First, because παντως τινας awkwardly combines the certainty expressed with παντως and the seeming limited response of τινας. Second, because the previous sentences all repeat the phrase of the first clause in the second clause (e.g., τοις ασθενεις ... τους ασθενεις), assimilation to the previous sentences is likely since (τοις) πάντας would match the τοις πᾶσιν of the preceding clause.\(^{67}\)

At 14:5 D F G replace διερμηνευνη with a participle form, διερμηνευων. This substitution was influenced by the participles in the two preceding clauses. Indeed, F G read the article, which D does not, which is present before both preceding participles.\(^{68}\) In addition F G add the subjunctive verb: \( \hat{\eta} \) o διερμηνευων. Frequently the Latin of the D-text is written

\( \text{PG}^{\text{46}} \)

\textit{Textual Commentary}, p. 493.

\( \text{PG}^{\text{46}} \)

\( \textit{qui interpretetur} \) is written above o διερμηνευων, paralleling \textit{qui prophetat} and \textit{qui loquitur}. 
as *qui* + verb when the Greek reads a participle. Here, however, only VL 77 and AMst(A) read *qui*; the rest of the tradition reads *interprettetur* (which properly renders διερμηνευθη). The addition of *ι* is also unusual; D F G occasionally add the copulative, possibly under the influence of the Latin (see 8:4; 14:10), but none exists in Greek here, and the *ι* is left without a Latin equivalent in G. This verb form is omitted by F G at 2:5. It is unlikely that the distant influence of εαν δε μη η o ερμηνευτης at 14:28 played a part, for there the accompanying Latin reads *fuerit* to match *ι* without *qui* to match the article.

These adaptations may not be confined to the archetype Z, for many are attested in non D-text Latin witnesses. The example at 7:14 clearly precedes Z. The archetypical text read:

\[ \eta γιασσαι \varepsilon ρ ο ανηρ ο απιστος \varepsilon ν τι γυναικι \]
\[ και \eta γιασσαι \η γυνη \η απιστος \varepsilon ν τω αδελφω \]

D F G, as well as the Peshitta and the entire Latin tradition, harmonize τη γυναικι to both o ανηρ o απιστος and η γυνη η απιστος with the addition of an adjective: τη γυναικι τη πιστη. This versional evidence points to the harmonization having arisen before translation, since it is attested in both in Tertullian (sanctificatur . . . a fidei uxore et infidelis uxor . . .), the D-text, which reads different nouns: . . . in (omit, + muliere vel 77) uxore fidei et sanctificata est mulier infidelis (75 77 89 AMst; also HI), and the Peshitta. At 16:15 και φορτυνατου και αραίκου is added from 16:17, though C* and the Harklean share this harmonization.

This sampling of unique readings in D F G suggests that its text was not the result of accidental corruption but of intentional revision. Its alterations result in a smooth, readable

---

69 *Ad uxorem* 2.2.

70 The Vulgate, in conformity to the Greek, harmonizes also the nouns: *in muliere fidei et sanctificata est mulier infidelis* . .
text. Nonsense readings are rare. Many of these edited readings exist in the Latin tradition prior to the creation of the shared ancestor of DFG, and are probably based on a Greek text (most obviously at 6:20). While occasional Latinization has occurred, such examples indicate neither a thorough revision to the Latin nor strikingly "ungreek" readings. It appears that the Greek and the Latin texts now found in DFG have a long, intertwined history in the tradition. Readings have been altered from the Greek to the Latin and from the Latin to the Greek. By the time that the archetype of the bilinguals was produced, however, this text was relatively stable, and the only interplay between the texts at that stage seems to be the result of a desire to bring sense lines into harmony.

III. Secondary Editing in F G

These two manuscripts, products of the Carolingian Renaissance, were part of an attempt to introduce Greek to Latin speakers.71 G itself may have served as a study guide to the Greek text. This is most clearly seen in the alternate translations for Greek words that it provides. There are also occasional explanatory notes on Greek words. At 1 Cor. 15:10 two grammatical notes are added: above χαριτι the scribe wrote "ablativus gratia" — indicating the proper case. Above πτωχη is written "pauper id est feminum." Another gloss is interpretive: above both occurrences of πνευμα at 14:15, following spiritus, the glosses read: id est voce ("that is, with the voice").

The lack of thorough acquaintance with Greek, however, is seen in the numerous copying blunders made in the predecessor of FG. Among them are dropped or added

terminations:

2:11 εγνωκεν ] εγνω F G
10:7 ανεστησαν ] ανεστη F G
10:18 θυσιαστηριου ] θυσιαστηρει F G
13:3 παραδω ] παραδωσω F G
15:29 ποιησουσιν ] ποιουσιν F G

Others are simple blunders of sight or sound:

2:4 λογοις ] λογους F G
5:12 τι ] ει F G
11:14 ατιμια ] τιμια F G
11:27 εσθιετε ] αισθειηται F G
11:27 πινητε ] πινηται F G\textsuperscript{72}
12:2 μορφα ] αμορφα F G
12:23 και α ] και o F G
12:23 εχει ] εχειν F G
12:27 υμεις ] υμας F G
14:17 ετερος ] εταιρος F G sy\textsuperscript{p}
15:15 εγειρεν ] εγιγεν F G
15:33 ηθη ] ηθηρ F G* 

Dittography is also common:

2:31 ους ] ουσου F G
7:25 δε διδωμι ] δε δεδιδωμι F G
13:12 εκ μερους ] εκ μερους εκ μερους G* 
14:22 εισιν ] εισιν εις F G

The challenge is that some of these construe in context, and may trace back to early readings. However, as the discussions at the appropriate locations demonstrate, most often these are simple mistakes.

\textbf{III.A. Latinisms in F G}

Several examples where D splits from F G are not corruptions in D. Rather, F G underwent Latinization beyond what took place in the shared ancestor of D F G. The most

\textsuperscript{72}At 11:27, αισθειηται and πινηται are simple vowel confusions, though these same indicative forms at 11:26 have likely influenced these alterations.
striking example of a Latinism in F G is the addition of \( \eta \varepsilon \chi \iota \eta \alpha \lambda \theta \iota \alpha \tau \omega \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \) after \( \varphi \rho \omicron \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \omicron \epsilon \) at Gal. 5:10. This clause is written in the text of F, though preceded by an obelus. Likewise it appears in the margin of G, signaled by a marker in the text following \( \varphi \rho \omicron \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \). Inserted in the midst of v. 10 it is nonsense, \( \eta \nu \) having no referent.\(^73\) The source of the Greek, however, is to be found in the Latin, for \textit{quam habet veritas christi} is lifted verbatim from Pelagius' commentary, immediately following the lemma text's \textit{facietis} (= \( \varphi \rho \omicron \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \)). Initially a comment added in the margin of the shared ancestor of F G, it was left in the margin by the scribe of G but inserted into the text by the scribe of F. Since there is no evidence of a Greek translation of Pelagius' commentaries, the accompanying Greek must be an \textit{ad hoc} translation. This is indisputable evidence of the Greek text being adapted to the Latin in the shared ancestor of F G.

Adaptations to the Latin occur throughout F G's text of 1 Corinthians. At 14:20-22, in a short span of text, F G show several unique readings which all match the Latin:

14:20 \( \iota \alpha \zeta \varphi \rho \omicron \varepsilon \sigma \iota \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omicron \iota \ \sigma \epsilon \iota \omicron \sigma \theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \varepsilon \ \varphi \rho \omicron \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \omicron \epsilon \ F \ G \ ]\)
\[
\text{at sensibus perfecti sitis VL 61 77 78 89 Or AMst AMst(A) AU}
\]
14:21 \( \eta \omicron \delta \epsilon \mu \nu \ F \ G \ ] \sigma \omega \ \varphi \zeta \omicron \nu \ F \ G \text{ Thret } \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \kappa \omicron \omega \sigma \omega \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \mu \omicron \]\n\[
\text{nondum VL 75 77 89 AMst}
\]
14:21 \( \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \kappa \omicron \omega \sigma \epsilon \omicron \tau \alpha \iota \mu \omicron \ F \ G \text{ Thret } \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \kappa \omicron \omega \sigma \omicron \tau \alpha \iota \mu \omicron \]\n\[
\text{exaudiet me VL 77 89 vg}^{\text{ms}}. \ B \ G
\]
\[
\text{me exaudiet AMst}
\]
14:22 \( \tau \omicron \iota \zeta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \ F \ G \ ] \tau \omicron \iota \zeta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \nu \ (2) cett
\]
\[
\text{fidelibus VL 75 78 89 V AMst(A)}
\]
\[
\text{fidelibus vel credentibus VL 77}
\]

At 14:20 F G matches the entire Latin tradition – apart from Tertullian\(^74\) and the

\(^73\)It cannot be the verb \( \eta \nu \), as Swanson's \textit{New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Galatians} indicates by adding breathing and accent marks and inserting a semicolon between \( \eta \nu \) and \( \varepsilon \chi \lambda \iota \omicron \).

\(^74\)Tertullian paraphrases 14:41 at \textit{Adversus Valentinianus} 2: Also the apostle entreats us to become children again (\textit{repuerescere}) according to the will of the Lord, so that being
Vulgate: *Tva taìs pòsìs ðëìeìoi ðëìëìòsì / ut sensìbus perfecti sìtìs.* This again shows the unity of the Latin tradition (cf. also, e.g., 6:20). In the standard Greek text the logic of the argument is not clear. If both ἀλλα and δὲ are adversative, then 20b must be contrasted with both 20a and 20c. But then the argument is not advanced from 14:20a to 20c, for the latter is essentially a repetition of the former. Do the conjunctions then have a different function? Does ἀλλα contrast 20a and 20b, or function as simple connecting particle, without adversative force? If ἀλλα has an adversative function, does δὲ also contrast 20b and 20c? Furthermore, assimilation to the near context is a possibility, with the subjunctive γενησομε misread as an imperative (γενεσομε); this would require, however, a subsequent addition of *Tva.* It is likely that the difficulties of the relationship among the clauses led to the alteration now found in FG and the Latin tradition. Because the passage in these witnesses now flows logically, it is more likely that it is the secondary form. All these readings may have originated either in the Greek or the Latin as assimilations to the near context. However, given that several unique alterations occur in so few lines it is likely that at this point the editor of FG gave even more attention than normal to the relationship between the Greek and the Latin texts.

Many readings in FG can be confirmed as Latinisms, since they adapt the Greek to Latin usage. At 7:16, FG alone alter the cases of the vocatives γυναι . . . ανερ to the like infants in evil by our simplicity, let us be only like (*ita demum*) wise people in our understanding. However, this appears to presuppose the *P⁴⁶ N A B cett* reading.

75 The NASB renders this “yet in evil be infants, but . . .” while the KJV offers “howbeit” for ἀλλα. The RSV and NIV ignore ἀλλα altogether.

76056 0142 may indicate the difficulty by their omission of δὲ.

77 VL B, a Vulgate witness, reads the subjunctive *sitis* without *ut*, but this is likely simply scribal error.
nominate γυνη . . . ανηρ. The alteration must be attributed to Latinization. Both *mulier* and *vir* use the same forms for the vocative and the nominative; the predecessor of FG here altered the Greek to match. Latin case usage also likely affected FG at 1:2; 3:5, 6. In each place ἀπολλω stands in place of ἀπολλως. The Latin nominative form is *apollo*, which is matched phonetically by FG. The Latin case forms for this proper name are phonetically identical for the other cases (e.g. the genitive: *apollo / ἀπολλω* 1:12; 3:4; 16:12), making such alteration elsewhere unnecessary.

Latin idiom has also led to alteration in FG at 1:21. The Latin tradition uses *placeo* to render εὐδοκέω, a verb which typically uses the dative of person. Hence, at 1 Cor. 1:21, the Latin renders εὐδοκησεν ὅ θεος with *placuit deo* (with variation). This then led FG to alter ὅ θεος to τῷ θεῷ = deo. The same alteration did not take place at 10:5, since the D-text renders the Greek with *voluntas fuit dei*. Instead, the editor of the Latin text in FG (VL 77 78) conforms the Latin to the Greek with the less elegant *bene placuit deus*.

Omissions are less common than additions or substitutions. One example is 11:14, where FG lose σωτη. The D FG archetype reading was η φυσις σωτη / *ipsa natura* attested by D and the entire Latin tradition. However, the shared ancestor of FG lost the pronoun when the Greek and Latin were brought together into an interlinear format, which G retains. In that manuscript, *ipsa* was written above the article η and *natura* above φυσις. The lack of anything in the Latin corresponding to σωτη led to its omission.

Several alterations in FG involve verb forms. Because only a present form of the imperative exists in Latin, the distinction between a Greek present and aorist imperative

---

78 Tertulllian lacks the pronoun at *De corona* 6 but reads it at *De oratione* 22,7. His text of 1 Cor. 11:14 cannot be reconstructed with confidence since both examples are paraphrases.
cannot be represented in translation. In these situations the D-text most frequently uses the present imperative form with no impact on the Greek manuscripts.

5:7 εκκαθαρατε expurgate  
5:13 εξαρατε auferte; aut ferte 78;  
εξαιρετε Ψ6 1739 1881  
εξαρειτε Byz  
6:20 δοξασατε glorificate  
clarificate CY  
7:21 χρησαι utere  
10:15 κρινατε indicate  
κρινεται F  
11:13 κρινατε indicate  
15:34 εκνηψατε sobrii estote 61 64 75 77 78 89 Spe AMst  
evigilate 78 VG  
16:1 ποιησατε facte  
poieit CR 330 1108 1611 1890  
16:11 προπεμψατε praemittite 75 77  
deducite 78 89 VG  
16:20 ασπασσαθε salutate  
ασπαξασθε 33 216 440  
16:22 μαραναθα maranatha 75 78 89 VG AMst HI TE  
in adventu domini 77

Similarly, no variation in the Greek takes place where the Latin employs a subjunctive to translate an aorist imperative:

3:18 γενεσω sit 75 77 78 89 VG AMst AMst(A)  
fiat CY  
11:6 κειρασω tondeatur  
κηρασω K L P 0150  
κειρεσω 056 0142 181 206 1758

However, in three places the tense shifts required in Latin caused alteration in F G:

7:11 μενετω αγαμος η τω ανδρι καταλαγητω Ψ6 Ρ Α Β Ζ Κ Λ 056 0142  
0150 0151 1739  
μενειν αγαμον η τω ανδρι καταλαγηναι F G Ψ  
manere innuptam aut viro reconciliari 75 77 78 89 TE CY AMst  
manere innuptam aut reconcilii viro CY  
manere innuptam aut viro suo reconciliari VG

---

manere innuptam a viro suo reconciliari F
manere innuptam aut reconciliari viro Mcion T

At 1 Cor. 7:11 the use of the infinitives *manere* and *reconciliari* stand against the Greek imperatives *μενέω* and *καταλλαγήτω*. While grammatically correct as indirect discourse based on the verb *praecipio* in 7:10 and modelled on the preceding *discedere* (*praecipio* . . . *uxorem a viro non discedere*), the lack of a form equivalent to the aorist passive imperative *καταλλαγήτω* prompted the alteration. Already Marcion (cited by Tertullian) and Cyprian had done the same.80 F G show the alteration of the Greek to match the Latin: *μενειν* αγαμον η τω ανδρι καταλλαγναι. The use of an infinitive rather than an imperative, the only example in the D-text in 1 Cor., prompted the alteration in Z.

7:9 γαμησατωσαν Φ66 Ν A B C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 1739 pm
γαμειτωσαν F G 2 38 81ε 88 623ε 1611 pc
nubant 75 77 78 89 VG
γαμητωσαν 102 462 1927

In 7:9 the Latin is forced to use the present subjunctive *nubant*, which F G follows by substituting γαμειτωσαν (present) for γαμεισατωσαν (aorist). This takes place independently in over a dozen other manuscripts,81 testifying to the tendency toward a shorter form.

In addition, where the Greek uses the complementary infinitive, F G occasionally shifted to the indicative or subjunctive, matching the Latin. However, of nineteen potential examples, in 1 Corinthians, in only two places was alteration made in F G:

7:39 θελει γαμηναι θελει γαμηθη F G = vult nubat
7:40 δοκω εξειν δοκω . . . εχω F G = puto habeo 75 77 89

---

80Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,7,7; Cyprian, *Ad Quirinium* 3, 90.

8138 81ε 88 218 323 378 421 483 491 623ε 919 1610 1611 1838 1912 2125 2298 Epiph Chr; γαμητωσαν 102 462.
III.B. *Latin Influenced Word Divisions*

It is not always obvious that the scribe of G had a clear understanding of the meaning of the Greek which he was copying. Bizarre word divisions abound; ἐν κοπηντὶν αδωμὲν at 9:12 (ἐνκοπὴν τίνα δωμὲν) may be only the most egregious example. However, frequently these mistaken word divisions are adaptations to the Latin. At 4:13 we see a “live” example of the manner in which the Latin influenced the Greek in G:

4:13 ὦς περικαθαρματᾶ ὅ το 66 A B C D E F G L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 pm ὦςπερικαθαρματᾶ D

It appears that when the translation was added in G by the original scribe, the space between ὦς περὶ was bridged with a subscript “ν” (ὡς, περὶ), above which is written tanquam. His Latin text consisted only of tanquam purgamenta (75 77 78 89 VG); not having anything equivalent to περὶ, he created ὦςπερὶ, for which tanquam is an accurate translation.

At 4:21 (further discussed below) the scribe wrote πνεῦματι τεπραζοτητος, with precisely that word division. In itself this is evidence of a lack of understanding his Greek. When the Latin supralinear translation was added, however, this ignorance is shown even more clearly. Above πνεῦματι stand the alternatives spiritus vel [spiritu]. However, qq (= quoque) is placed above the space between the two Greek words, not above its equivalent τε,
which had been incorrectly attached to the subsequent word. *Mansuetudinis* is written above
τεπραστητος, but the semi-colon inserted into the word appears to be secondary word
division. This was likely added concurrently with the Latin since the normal word division is
made either by a space or a point (as in F).

At times this improper word division led to alteration of the prefixes of compound
forms:

7:9 οὐκ εγκρατεύονται Ν Α B C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 614 1739
οὐκ ενκρατεύονται Ψ6 B D
οὐ κρατεύονται F G

non continent se 61 77
non se continent 89 VG AMst(A)
se non continent 78 FL N U AMst Ambr HI AU

8:7 η συνειδησεις D rel
conscientia 61 75 77 78 89 VG AMst AMst(A)
ή ιδησεις G*
ιδησεις F G c

8:8 παριστησιν Ν2 D L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 104 326 1881 Or
παραστησει Ψ6 Ν A B 0150 5 6 33 81 88 181 256 365 467 623 915
917 1175 1241 1319 1739 1836 1875 1912 Cl Ath Cy Or
συνιστησιν F G
commendat 61 75 77 78 89 VG TE AMst AMst(A)

Some of the clearest of these secondary adaptations of the Greek to the Latin are found
in the manner in which compound verbs are handled by X. In 7:9, the prefix εν- is dropped
from the εγκρατεύονται to conform with the Latin, which does not have a similar prefix. The
NT nowhere else attests the verb without the prefix. Similarly, in 8:8 F G alter παριστησιν to
συνιστησιν based on the Latin commendat in an attempt to match the prefixes of the verbs. In
fact, G frequently separates the prefix from the main stem of the verb; in the immediate
context συν ιδησι in 8:7 (discussed below) and συν • ιδησιν in 8:12 are found. The result at
8:8 is nonsense: βρωμα δε ημας ου συνιστησει τω θεω.
A similar confusion over the prefixes of verbs is found in 8:7. There D and all other witnesses read καὶ Ἑὐαγγελίζεις αὐτῶν against καὶ Ἑὐαγγελίζεις (sic = εἰδήςεις) αὐτῶν in F G. The correction in G betrays some of the editing that has occurred, for the original hand has the article η before ιδήσεις. This is marked off with points above and below the letter and is not copied in F, but does show that the article had been present in the exemplar. In addition, the fact that the noun is written as ιδήσεις rather than εἰδῆσις shows that the prefix has been dropped. The noun εἰδῆσις does not occur in the NT except in the compound form with the prefix συν-. This prefix had been present here also in Z, but is removed in X under the influence of the Latin. The Latin equivalent conscientia probably would not have led to the alteration in the Greek except that earlier in the verse a form of συνειδήσις is found in D F G (συνηθεία83 Ν' A B P Ψ 0150 1739 pc). In this earlier example the function of the Greek dative case τη συνειδήσει in rendered with a prepositional phrase: in conscientia. The editor assumed συν- to be a preposition. Since an equivalent was not present in the Latin, εἰδήςεις was written without η συν. Both examples reveal a minimal understanding of the Greek text, and little consideration for the resultant meaning of the text.84

Just as the prefixes of compounds were altered in F G, so were individual prepositions. At 4:6, F G alone read κατά τοῦ ενός (against ὑπέρ τοῦ ενός). In the Latin tradition of the Pauline epistles the participle adversus (from adverto) is used to translate the prepositions

83 The only other Pauline occurrence of συνηθεία is 1 Cor. 11:16 (without variation) where it is matched by consuetudo (also without variation). At 8:7a several Latin manuscripts read something equivalent to συνηθεία: cum scientia 61; consuetudine P; in consuetudine sua Ο.

84 Cf. also 7:29, where F G omit the verb ωσίν, which had no Latin equivalent and likely was confused with ως earlier in the sentence.
κατά (nine times)\(^{85}\) and πρός (six times)\(^{86}\) and, in Rom. 11:18, *adversus ramos* makes clear the function of the genitive τῶν κλάδων. The Latin of 1 Cor. 4:6 has a construction identical to the last of these: *adversus* + accusative, with the sense of “over.” This led to the alteration to κατά in F G, which corresponds to *adversus*. This also brings the phrase into parallel with κατά τὸ ἐπερόν at the end of the clause, even though in Latin the prepositions are not parallel (*adversus alterum infletur pro alio* 75 89 SPE).

A reading that has been substantially altered due to adaption to Latin word divisions is found at 14:19. Regarding the word order variant attested here by F G, Zuntz noted that the reading of ϒ\(^{46}\) is the basis for the reading of F G. This is partially correct, for ΛΛΛΗCAIEN was misread as ΛΛΛΗOMEN and divided in F G into two words. 77 (and the annotator of F) translates this as *loquor quidem*, which ignores the ο attached to μεν and translates only the last word. Λαλη, however, is nonsense in context but supplied with what stood in the Latin text: *loqui*, which is an accurate rendering of Λαλησαί. What Zuntz fails to explain is how the verb in F G came to be placed prior to the prepositional phrase: It is the result of a Latinization in F G. Every Latin witness apart from Ambrose and the Vulgate-influenced manuscripts read *loqui* prior to the prepositional phrase.\(^{87}\) The editor of F G moved what he thought was Λαλη ο μεν to match the Latin, possibly because μεν / *quidem* could not stand at the end of a clause.

The avoidance of crasis in F G may also be a result of adaptation to the Latin (see 2:1.1).

---

\(^{85}\) Rom 8:33; 11:2; 1 Cor. 15:15; 2 Cor. 10:5; 13:8; Gal. 3:21; 5:17; 5:23; 1 Tim. 5:19.

\(^{86}\) 1 Cor. 6:1; Eph. 6:11, 12 (three times); Col. 3:13.

\(^{87}\) VL 75: *loqui per sensum meum*; 77: *loqui sensu meo*; 78: *loqui quidem mente mea*; 89 AMst: *loqui per legem.*
III. C. Addition and Omission of the Article

D F G together infrequently omit the article:

12:11 το ἐν . . . πνεῦμα Ἰν . . . πνεῦμα D' F G 181 arm Chr Ps-Ignatius
15:32 το ὕψος ὕψος D' F G

However, F G add, omit, or alter the article, at times nonsensically, far more frequently than does D, or for that matter, any other Greek witness of 1 Corinthians. They add the article at:

1:16 λοιπὸν λοιπὸν F G
4:1 θεοῦ θεοῦ F G
5:7 χριστοῦ χριστοῦ F G
8:6 ο θεος F G 33
11:7 ανδρὸς ανδρος F G
15:15 νεκροὶ νεκροὶ
15:20 εκ νεκρῶν εκ τῶν νεκρῶν

On the other hand, they more frequently omit the article:

1:24 τοις κλήτοις κλητοῖς F G
2:15 τα πάντα πάντα F G (also B Byz)
3:19 ο δρασασμένος τοὺς σοφοὺς δρασασμένος σοφοὺς F G
7:19 η περίτομη η περιτομή F G
7:28 η παρθένου παρθένος B F G
10:4 η πετρα δε η δε πετρα η πετρα δε F G
10:10 ολέθρευτου ολέθρευ F G
11:23 απο του θεου απο του θεου F G
11:24 εις την εμην αναμνησιν εις εμην αναμνησιν F G
15:8 τω εκτρωματι εκτρωματι F G
16:13 εν τη πιστει εν πιστει F G

The nonsense reading ολέθρευ at 10:10 is particularly striking; it may have been lost purely by accident or, more likely, on the mistaken assumption that it was an article. Finally, F G alter the case or number of the article:

1:25 το αὐθενες το αὐθενες F G

88 This omission may be due to the ending of the preceding word (ΔΗΜΗΤΡΕΝΟΣ); B. Weiss (p. 75) notes also the similar omission of Η after ΥΠΟΜΟΝΕΙ at 1 Cor. 13:8 (B) and Η after ΕΔΟΘΗ at Eph. 4:7 (B D F G L P).
Two other omissions are particularly significant since the article is functioning with an
infinitive. The loss results in nonsense, an indication of the lack of sophisticated
understanding of the Greek text on the part of the scribe/editor:

4:6  το μη ... γεγραπται / μη ... γεγραπται  F G pc
7:26  το ουτως ειναι / ουτως ειναι  F G Meth

This lack of clear comprehension of the Greek is further demonstrated by the omission of
words consisting of a single letter, such relative pronouns and forms of ειμι, apparently
because they are confused with articles:

2:5  η πιστις υμων μη η εν σοφια  Ψ46  Ρ 049 056 0142
      0150 0151 1739
      fides vestra non sit in sapientia  F VG AMst AMst(A)
      esset fides vestra non in sapientia 78
      fides vestra non sit in sapientiam 75 89
      η πιστις υμων μη εν σοφια  F G Ψ pc
      fides vestra non in sapientia 77

The verb is read in the Latin; its omission in F G can be attributed to a confusion with the
article. Similarly, at 16:6 F G lose the particle  η, even though the corresponding vel is read in
75 77 89 VG, and again at 2:13 F G lose the relative pronoun, even though the Latin reads
quaes.

Finally, the loss and alteration of the article is more pronounced in F:

2:6  του αιωνος τουτου (1) / αιωνος τουτου  F
7:39  ο ανηρ (1) / ανηρ  F
8:4  των ειδωλοθυτον / του ειδωλοθυτον  F

D, on the other hand, rarely omits the article without other support. The omission of  τα before
παντα (8:6; 12:6) involves other considerations, as discussed at 12:19.80

III.D. Other Latinisms in F G

One alteration in F G is prompted by the Latin nomina sacra.
At 14:2 F G write πνα written to match ςπς. The spiritus is not nominative here, however, but genitive. A similar use of the genitive where the Greek uses dative is seen at 1 Cor. 4:21.89 Although a corruption, the resultant text in F G actually construes: πνευμα δε λαλει μυστηρια, with the πνευμα now construed as the subject rather than the ο λαλων earlier in the verse. However, the context is discussing human speech, not the Spirit’s speech.

Additional Latinisms in F G include:

4:17 πιστον Ψ46 Ψ68 Ρ A B C D L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 1739 πιστος Ψ F G
fidelis 75 77 78 89 F VG AMst
fidelis minister 61
lac Ψ11

The Latin tradition uses the adjective fidelis in the masculine form because it modifies filius, which translates the neuter τεκνον. F G matches the gender of fidelis with πιστος, even though πιστον should have been protected by the immediately preceding τεκνον μου δαγαπητον. A literal, word-by-word equivalency to the Latin text was apparently desired, though in the resultant text πιστος can no longer modify τεκνον. The result is a nonsense reading, though not a mere “scribal error.”

89 At 4:21, D makes an alteration for the same reason that F G do here; see below.
The D-text frequently uses *qui* + finite verb to render Greek participles. At 4:19, however, the addition of the genitive pronoun *eorum* was necessary in order to convey the possessive force of the participle. The editor of X introduced the "missing" pronoun αὐτῶν into his Greek text, translating *eorum* perfectly but failing to bring the participles into alignment (which was later accomplished by 77 with *inflantium*).

At 6:4 only FG depart from μὲν οὖν to read γαύν (γ' οὖν; γε οὖν), a particle found nowhere else in Paul. The reading is caused by the Latin *igitur*, as can be seen from the way F G and the D-text handle this inferential particle. When οὖν stands in the Greek in 1 Corinthians, 77 78 89 read *itaque* (7:38; 4:16; *itaque vel autem* 78), *autem* (9:25; 15:11; 16:11), or *ergo* (6:15; 8:4; 9:18; 10:19; 10:31; 14:11, 15, 26; 16:18), but never *igitur*. In addition, in several passages where the Vulgate reads *igitur* the D-text either reads different particles: *ergo* (3:4); *quidem* (9:24) or omits it (15:49, discussed below). The only example of *igitur* in the D-text of 1 Corinthians is 6:4, likely accounting for this unusual Greek particle.

Another example of F G altering its text on the basis of the particles found in the Latin is seen at 14:3. There they intentionally replace ο δέ προφητευων with εἰ γαρ ο προφητευων, for no transcriptional error can account for the alteration. In this context, εἰ γαρ would function as a wish: "if only the one prophesying . . ." However, this classical usage is

---

90E.g., 7:30 *qui gaudent* 75 89 78 F VG CY AMst = οἱ χαίροντες.

91Denniston, *Greek Particles*. pp. 91-95.
unknown in the NT. It may have been introduced in FG on the basis of the nam read by most of the Latin tradition.

III.E. Alterations in FG Toward the Vulgate

As noted above, when X was assembled, the Latin text was assimilated to the local "St. Gall" type of Vulgate text. The best extant witness to the text is the Winithar manuscript (S). 77 and 78 each reflect this editorial activity in a different way; 78 has primarily a Vulgate text with a mixture of D-text readings. 77, on the other hand, has as its basis a D-text, though with a significant number of Vulgate readings introduced. In places these readings replace the D-text reading, at others they are added as an alternative in the "double translations." The places where both 77 and 78 adopt the Vulgate reading, however, have not only affected the Latin. In numerous cases, the Greek text now represented in FG was altered to match the both the existing D-text as well as these newly introduced Vulgate readings.

FG and virtually the entire Latin tradition add a disjunctive particle at 13:1 prior to aet / aerumtamen (= λακος). This addition balances the aut prior to cymbalum (= κυμβαλον). In this case, the presence of the particle likely stems from the Latin, not the Greek. A similar adaptation takes place in the Latin tradition at Rom. 9:11, where the Greek

92 Without γάρ, εί functions to introduce strong assertions (but never in Paul); see BDAG, s.v. εί (4).

93 This local text was formed by comparison of several strands of the Vulgate, including a text similar to Codex Fuldensis, manuscripts of the Alcuin and Theodulf recensions, and the edition of Peregrinus. See Frede, Neuer Paulustext, Bd. 1, p. 78 n. 1.


95 velut VL 77 78 VG; vel vgms: A; aut VL 89; ut VL 75 AMst(A) Speculum Rufinus. The remaining witnesses read a comparative particle: sicut vgms: S; quasi Jerome; tamquam Augustine.
reads \( \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \ldots \) \( \eta \) but which is altered in the Latin to \textit{au...au}. Here again \( F \ G \) are unique in reading \( \eta \) in place of \( \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \). Further confirmation that \( \eta \) is a later addition to the immediate predecessor of \( F \ G \) is the use of the lower-case \( H \) in \( G \), which as the initial letter of the line would have been capitalized in its early ancestor. It is unlikely that \( D \) would have omitted \( \eta \), since its adaptations to other Greek witnesses are typically additions, not omission. Furthermore, this would require \( D \) to have omitted the particle based on other Greek manuscripts but without changing \( \epsilon \nu \) \( \epsilon \mu \mu \iota \) to \( \gamma \epsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \alpha \). Latinization is therefore the source of the addition or the particle in \( F \ G \) at both Rom. 9:11 and 1 Cor. 13:1.

\[ \text{12:20 } \mu \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \]  

\( \Psi^{46} \) \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \tau \Gamma \lambda \iota \kappa \pi \lambda \nu \vee \Gamma K L P \Psi 056 0142 0150 0151 33 1739 \)

\( \text{quidem membra 77 78 VG} \)

\( \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \]  

\( \Psi^{46} \) \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \tau \Gamma \lambda \iota \kappa \pi \lambda \nu \vee \Gamma D^* 5 6 102 441 623 1241* 1827 1845 \)

\( \text{membra 61 75 89 AU} \)

This passage has an unusual number of particles, which no doubt contributed to the tendency to add/omit \( \mu \epsilon \nu \): \( \nu \nu \nu \delta \epsilon \) \( \nu \) \( \mu \delta \) \( \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \), \( \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \) \( \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \). An argument could be made for the secondary addition of \( \mu \epsilon \nu \) to balance the second \( \delta \epsilon \); it may also have been omitted because of the proximity of the first \( \delta \epsilon \). In either case, the \( \mu \epsilon \nu \) was not present in \( Z \) since both 75 89 as well as \( D^* \) omit it. The reading \textit{quidem} in 77 78 VG caused the addition in \( F \ G \); these witnesses also add \textit{quidem} in passages where 75 89 do not read it: 7:7; 11:7; 12:8 (75 89 = \textit{enim}); and 12:28, each of which has \( \mu \epsilon \nu \) without variation. In addition, 75 follows 77 78 VG with the reading \textit{quidem} at 3:4 even though it is absent in 61 89. Latin does not normally

96The Latin tradition also reads \textit{au...au} at Eph. 5:4 (supported by \( A \ D^* \ F \ G \Psi \ pc \) where some Greek witnesses read \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ldots \kappa \alpha \iota \).

97In \( \Psi^{46} \), \( \mu \epsilon \nu \) is written above the line in a cursive hand. Kenyon assigns this to "m.2"; NTaP suggests "Benutzer" without specifying a date or correlating to specific corrections elsewhere in the manuscript.
provide an equivalent to μὲν. 98 Here the Vulgate shows its ancestry as a grecized D-text; 77 78 have been affected by it, and as a result so has X=F G. The addition of μὲν at 12:20 is therefore a secondary Latinism in F G, whatever the motives of other scribes for making the same addition.

3:22 παντα ꞌ↛ Ψ 46 Α B C D F G L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 0289 1739
omnia 61 89 75 TE AMst AMst(A) AU Priscill
παντα γαρ 0150 1873
παντα δι [= δη] F G
omnia enim 77 78 VG

The addition of δι = δη 99 before υμων in 3:21 arises from the reading enim, which 77 78 share with the Vulgate. The secondary insertion into the Latin text (it is absent from 64 75 89 AMst(A) etc) created the need for a Greek equivalent, leading to the addition of δη. This particle is found in Paul only in 1 Cor. 6:20 (with variation) and in F G at 1:21, where they divide επειδη into two words (επει δη) based on the D-text’s nam quia.

6:3 μητι γε βιωτικα ꞌ↛ vid Ψ 46 B C D L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 614 1739
neque saecularia 75
nedum saecularia 64 AU
necdum saecularia AMst(A)
μητοιγε βιωτικα 642
ποσω μαλλον βιωτικα F G
quanto magis saecularia 77 78 F VG
omit [parablepsis] A
omit 61 89 AMst Pel

Elsewhere in Paul ποσω μαλλον is found in Rom. 11:12, 24; Phil. 1:23 and Phlm. 16 (without variation), 100 while μητι is likewise infrequent (1 Cor. 7:2; 2 Cor. 1:17; 12:18; 13:5),

99 Gignac I, p. 236 lists examples of ʇ > η substitution of the similar μη in Roman papyri into the late 7th century.
though never elsewhere with γε. Neither reading is likely to have arisen due to harmonization to any of these passages since none of the contexts are similar to 1 Cor. 6. A more likely explanation is that ποσω μᾶλλον is based on the Latin quanto magis (also translating ποσω μᾶλλον at Rom. 11:12, 24 Phil. 1:23; and Phlm. 16). Quanto magis is also used to translate μῆτι γε. The Greek particles are equivalent to each other. Photius' lexicon and the Seguerina provide the gloss πόσω γε μᾶλλον for μῆτι γε. However, finding quanto magis in the Latin, a scribe of an ancestor manuscript to F G substituted the more familiar ποσω μᾶλλον.

The substitution of a particle on the basis of the Vulgate takes place again at 15:49:

καὶ (1) ῥαε A B D K L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243
αρα F Gmg

igitur 77mg 78 VG
itaque AU
sicut 89
igitur sicut AMst(A) SPE
omit G 75 77 Mcion IR OR CY TE

At 15:49, as noted above (see discussion of 6:7), the D-text omits the particle. In fact, the καὶ is not followed by any Latin witnesses, which read sicut (89), itaque (AU), or more often omit the particle. The καὶ may be secondary, for the previous two sentences both begin asyndetically. Regardless, it was absent in the predecessor of F G. In the margin of G, however, ἀρα / igitur is written, the latter of which is taken from the Vulgate. These both stand in the text of F 78 without notation. This particle is unusual in Paul, though not impossible. Its introduction here may arise from previous examples in 15:14, 15, 18. Similar to what took place in 6:4, apparently, the editor/scribe of X considered igitur a strong or unusual particle, and so selected ἀρα as a likely equivalent.

101 Though here 75 uses neque; 64 nedum.
Verb tense was also adapted to the Vulgate:

8:11 καὶ ἀπολείται D² F G L 056 0142 0151 sy Ir Pel

et peribit 77 78 VG AMst AMst(A)

et periet IR

καὶ ἀπολυται Ν² D¹ Ψ 6 81 206 256 263 365 630 1739 1758 1881 2004

2127

et perit 61 75 89 AU

ἀπολυται γαρ Ψ 46 Ν² B 33 917 1175 Cl

ἀπολυται οὖν A P

καὶ ἀπολείται οὖν 326

καὶ ἀπολυται οὖν 0150 181 1875 2110

καὶ ἀπολυται γαρ 104 459

ἀπολυται 1836

The F G reading καὶ ἁπολείται happens to agree with the Byzantine text. However, it is an alteration of the Z reading καὶ ἀπολυται now found in D and supported by et perit in 61 75 89. When the Vulgate reading peribit was adopted in X, the future tense of the verb was altered in the Greek to match.

In some passages, adaptation to the Vulgate was only partial. At 9:15, D matches Ψ 46 Ν² B D with the reading ἡ το καύχημα μου οὐδείς κενωσεί, while F G read τίς for οὐδείς. Their Latin equivalents, however, show no consistency. 75 matches D with nemo, but reads the verb exinaniet (future indicative) which is found in no other Latin witness. 77's quis matches G's τίς, but offers a "Doppelübersetzung" for the verb: evacuat vel exinaniat. The former is the present indicative form, though it may have been unintentionally adapted to the termination of the alternative, 102 exinaniat (the present subjunctive) since 78 matches the Vulgate with evacuet. Further confusing the issue is that F G are inconsistent in the use of ἡ and εἶ, so that one should be hesitant to put significant weight on the form καύχημα (sic) and attempt to decide what the Latin was attempting to match. The most likely reading of the shared ancestor of 75 77 78 is that found in 75: quam gloriam meam nemo exinaniet. This is

102 AMst(A) and the Vulgate manuscripts H N read evacuet.
confirmed by the reading of 89 (gloriam meam nemo evacuavit), which, as we saw above, lost the particle. The Vulgate (also 78) corresponds to what is now in the “Byzantine” witnesses: quam ut gloriam meam quis evacuet. When the ancestor of 77 78 was adapted to a form of the Vulgate, 78 matched it precisely (quam ut gloriam meam quis evacuet, which matches the “Byzantine” witnesses), but 77 retained the D-text verb form as an alternative. At the same time, while ut entered 78’s text, it was not adopted by 77, perhaps because placing the equivalent τια before το καυχημα would have separated it too far from the verb.

Nonetheless, τις replaced ουδεις to match quis. The reading of the Byzantine text therefore had indirect influence on the text of FG through the Vulgate and subsequent alteration to bring the Greek into closer agreement with the Latin.

Similarly, at 13:3 FG alone alter παραδω to its Latin text with the reading παραδωσω, matching the future tense of distribuero. The first verb in 13:2 is also a future in the Latin tradition (distribuero), but the Greek ψωμισω was not altered by the predecessor of FG because the Greek form could be construed either as the present subjunctive or the future indicative, the latter of which was apparently the choice of this scribe/editor.

7:39 δεδεται νομω Ν2 D1 F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 104 326 1175 1241 sy alligata est legi 61 78 vgms; F Θ L N Ο Ρ Ζ AMst(A)
vincta vel alligata est legi 77
vincita est legi Ambr Sedul
vincita est lege AMst

δεδεται γαμω Κ 92 606 858 2659 Epiph co bo
alligata est viro HI

δεδεται Ψ15vid Ψ6 Ν A B D’ 0278 6 33 81 424c 1175 1739 1881 1962
alligata est 75 89 VG HI
vincita est TE CY PEL

The addition of νομω is a secondary harmonization to Rom. 7:2, where the freedom of a married woman from the marriage law in the case of death is used as a metaphor for Paul’s wider discussion of freedom and the law in Romans 7: ἢ γάρ ὑπανδρος γυνη τῷ ζῶντι
Andρι δέδεται νόμῳ. Zuntz hints that this is a place where FG has been influenced by the Byzantine text. However, this is one of only two passages cited by him where FG against D has been influenced by "Byzantine" witnesses; the other is in the eucharistic passage 11:24 (τὸ ὑπὲρ υἱὸν + κλώμενον), which is not an example of FG moving away from D, but D making an addition based on liturgical texts (see discussion ad loc). In the case of 7:34 it is more likely that the harmonization took place in the Latin independent of the Greek (note the presence of the reading in 61 Ambr AMst(A) F R) and from there introduced into FG. At 11:24, contrary to Zuntz's claim that it "is not an Old Western Interpolation," the reading was present in Z as attested by frangitur (75 AMst), frangetur 77 78°, and confirmed now by 89's confringitur. The Byzantine text had no influence on FG, unless indirectly through the Vulgate.

Numerous other examples may be cited, for which the reader is referred to the discussion ad loc:

12:12 τὰ μελῆ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ εὐνοῦ Κ2 Δ Κ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 88 181 326 915 917 1175 1836 1875 1898 1912
ta meli tou soma tos toun evos K2 D K Psi 056 0142 0150 0151 88 181 326 915 917 1175 1836 1875 1898 1912
membra corporis 77 78 VG AMst(A) H I AU
membra de corpore 61
membra de corpore uno 75 89
membra ex uno corpore AMst Hil
lac 0201

14:33 τῶν σαιων ψ46 Α Β Β Δ Κ Λ Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0243 835 876
sancorum 89 75 VG vgms: A G M N
sancorum doceo 61 77 78 vgms: B C F G H O K L N O P R S T U V
W Z AMst AMst(A) Pel

103Zuntz, p. 166, with the remark: "Note that the older Western witnesses are free from the interpolation."
Yet not all of the readings adapted into 77 78 from the Vulgate were also adopted in the Greek of F G. For example:

10:6 ἡμῶν εὐγενῆσαν F G rel  
nostri facta sunt 75 89 AMst AMst(A) Pel  
facta sunt nostri 77 78 VG

12:2 οἶδατε σε Τ F G 0142 0151 pm  
scitis quoniam 61 75 89 vg[mss]: D K* S* AMst(A) AU  
oiδατε σε αν F A B C D L P Ψ pc  
scitis quoniam cum 77 78 VG AMst(A) Pel

The example from 12:2 is particularly interesting, since F G match the D-text reading while D matches the Vulgate reading. This is precisely the opposite of what would be expected if scribal activity were simply mechanical, and they always made the same types of changes. In fact, in this case it is more likely that the Vulgate, which generally agrees with the "Alexandrian" witnesses, and D, which is frequently adapted to "Alexandrian" readings (see below), have independently made the addition, and that F G and D-text preserves the original
Z reading. Again, we are reminded of Schäfer’s caution: “There is no method for [the reconstruction of Z] which can be used mechanically . . . each of the three texts has its own unique, sometimes difficult to trace, history.”

These examples provides us a glimpse, confirmed time and again, of the scribe’s lack of acquaintance with Greek. He is incapable of creating Greek readings “on the fly,” and faithfully presents the lettering, if not always the wording, of his exemplar. The Greek text of G, confirmed by its close agreement with F, therefore represents the exemplar X with remarkable faithfulness. Any search for major alterations in the Greek of F G, particularly the addition of an entire word, must be found in its predecessor X, not these individual manuscripts.

III.F. Greek Source of the Vulgate-Influenced Additions in F G

The adaptation of the Latin text of X to both the D-text and the Vulgate does not yet entirely account for the Greek readings. In some cases the source may appear to be Byzantine manuscripts. Others are singular readings. However, these readings can be accounted for not on the basis of comparison to a continuous text manuscript, as in the case of D, but the use of a Latin-Greek glossary.

The Latin-Greek glossary tradition is long and complex. The most widely used is the so-called Pseudo-Philoxenus, itself a compilation of several earlier lists of works. This specific glossary is known to have been used by Carolingian scholars. At St. Gall, the likely place of origin of Codex Boernarianus, there was a strong interest in bilingual glossaries.

104 Schäfer, p. 70.
105 Wouters, Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499, 101. Wouters supplies a list of other Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin glossaries found in papyrus documents on pp. 102-104.
106 B. Kaczynski, Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts, p. 57.
Though today only Greek-Latin (not Latin-Greek) glossaries have been identified as originating in St. Gall, these exist now only in a single codex and “it is likely that Carolingians possessed far more of them than we have today.”

Many of the above-cited Greek alterations based on the Vulgate adaptations in F G can all be attributed to the Pseudo-Philoxenus glossary. This glossary simply lists a Latin word, followed by one or occasionally two Greek glosses. The passages discussed so far correspond to the Pseudo-Philoxenus glossary as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>77 78 VG</th>
<th>F G</th>
<th>Pseudo-Philoxenus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>+ enim</td>
<td>δι [= δη]</td>
<td>enim γαρ, δη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>quanto magis</td>
<td>ποσον μαλλον</td>
<td>quantum ποσον, πελικαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:39</td>
<td>+ legi</td>
<td>μητι γε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>+ quidem</td>
<td>νομω</td>
<td>lex νομος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:33</td>
<td>+ doceo</td>
<td>μεν</td>
<td>quidem μεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:34</td>
<td>dico</td>
<td>διδασκω</td>
<td>doceo διδασκω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>λεγω</td>
<td>dic ειπατε; dicens λεγον (cf loquitur λαει)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>+ in vobis</td>
<td>εν υμιν</td>
<td>in εις, εν; vobis υμιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all the additions, however, can be attributed to this glossary:

| 4:6   | adversus alterum | κατα του ενος F G |                                  |
|       |                  | υπερ του ενος D cet |                                  |
| 15:49 | igitur           | αρα           | igitur τοινυν, τοιγαρουν         |

However, both the presence and use of such glossaries at St. Gall and the fact that the editor of X did not always clearly understand the Greek strongly suggests that such lexical and

---

107 Kaczynski, p. 59.

grammatical tools would have been used by the editor. Furthermore, a recently edited manuscript Greek-Latin word list for the Pauline epistles, designated Ψ99 (ca. 400), is not a continuous script text but a Greco-Latin glossary of the Pauline epistles. The Latin equivalents most closely identify with D-text readings. Unfortunately, the manuscript contains only portions of Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. There is no clear connection between this manuscript and the Carolingian manuscripts F G; nevertheless, it does indicate that Greco-Latin glossaries of the Pauline epistles had been compiled. The use of similar tools, whether specific to the epistles or of more general content, may explain the way in which single words were adapted from the Latin into the Greek by Carolingian scholars.

Furthermore, several misread corrections in F G correspond to the way that these glossaries would have been used. F G show a unique reading in G at 14:4. Here G* reads ο λαλεί vel λαλων, with qui loquitur written above ο λαλεί but no corresponding Latin above λαλων (the reading of all Greek witnesses apart from F G). This is parallel to the numerous examples of the predecessor of F G providing both the inherited Latin D-text reading and an alternative, separated by a symbol (resembling a Roman lowercase “t”) that stands for vel (the “Doppübersetzungen”). Here G preserves the reading inherited from the Greek portion of its ancestor while also providing an alternative, more literal rendering of the Latin. This was likely a marginal note, one written into the text of G with the λαλων retained, while F properly read the note, writing only λαλεί. It appears, therefore, that adaptations in the Greek have occurred in the same way as the Latin. In the predecessor of F G, alternative renderings were written in the manuscript (either in the margins or interlinear). Some of these alternatives were

---

adopted into the text of G without acknowledgment of the original word, as took place often in
G’s Latin text when the Vulgate reading replaces the D-text reading. On occasion, F similarly
writes the non-Vulgate reading above the corresponding Greek text. At 14:4, the double-
reading in the Greek text of G shows that in the predecessor manuscript the reading inherited
from the shared ancestor of D F G (ο λαλων) is preserved, but in addition a rendering is
provided which matches the Latin indicative form: λαλει. F copied only ο λαλει, but G
copied both the inherited text and the Latinized notation. This is further evidence of Latinism
in the ancestor of F G.

This method of producing the text led to a nonsense reading in G at 10:23. The
predecessor manuscript of F G lost παντα μοι εξεστιν αλλ ου παντα αικοδομει, yet
another example of parablepsis in these witnesses. However, G alone reads μηδεις το
eαυτου in place of the missing text without, however, adding the Latin interlinear translation.
The text is clearly adopted from 10:24, though in that place D F G read μηδεις το εαυτου
ζητειτω all on the same line. There is no obvious similarity in text which would cause a leap
from εξεστειν (sic) to the σωμφερει which immediately precedes the added text, unless the
leap made in the Latin text of the predecessor manuscript from licent to expediunt, with the
text then marked for omission. F correctly interpreted the correction, hence it did not copy the
text; the scribe of G did not, and so copied the nonsense Greek before him.

In another example of a misread correction in the shared exemplar of F G, at 10:32 G*
writes αυτου θεου but marks the initial αυ for omission. F misunderstands the correction by
omitting αυτου altogether, resulting in the singular reading θεου (without the article). There
is a possibility that F G preserve an early reading here, for apart from an absurd blunder no
one would write τη εκκλησια αυτου θεου. However, if the archetypical text read only τη
EKKAJAIA allTou one could easily imagine a scenario where a correction replaced the pronoun with θεου, (modeled on the frequent use of the phrase “church of God” in the epistles) followed by a copyist misreading the correction and copying αυτου θεου, as G* preserves. If τη EKKHΣIA αυτου were the archetypical reading, the αυτου would suit the context because it has a clear antecedent at the end of 10:31 in θεου, which in turn may have led to the substitution. Nevertheless, because the correction may merely indicate a confused scribe, the conjecture is not necessary in this case.

14:25 shows corrections both to the Greek and the Latin. G* has the bizarre reading απαγγελλων, corrected to απαγγελλων by striking through ων. The accompanying Latin has also been adapted: annuntians (adnuntians VL 75 89) has points placed over the an and a ligature for pro written before the verb, indicating correction to pronuntians.110 This corresponds to the alterations of Greek prefixes noted above, but in this case the Latin prefix is altered. The reading of G* is probably a misunderstood correction. The shared archetype of FG read αναγγελλων (as in D), and the correction was intended to replace αν- with αν-. This was correctly interpreted by F (which read αναγγελλων) but misunderstood by G to replace αναγγελλων with απαγγελλων.111 Additional evidence of misread corrections is to be seen at 9:8.25; 15:25.100; and Rom. 14:21 (discussed at 10:7.26).

While corrections and marginal notations, some likely derived from a lexicon, can account for many alterations in the Greek of FG, the Latin texts (77 78) do not appear to have been affected by this process. The use of Greek to Latin glossaries was quite common, and

110 The preceding Latin word, Δm (the Latin reading adorabit deum for προσοκυνησει τω θεω), is written to the left of θεω, as if the scribe realized that space was needed for pro before writing Δm.

111 Scrivener, An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis, p. xxvi, notes nine examples of the confusion of N and Π in F.
known to have existed in St. Gall. However, the most common, the Pseudo-Cyprian lexicon, could not have been used to produce the Vulgate readings. This is seen most clearly in the reading at 6:3. The rest of the Greek tradition reads ητι γε, for which the entries in Pseudo-Cyprian read: ητι nequid num and γε verum, which could not have produced the reading quanto magis of 77 78 VG.

III.G. Harmonization to Near Context in FG

Aside from Latinizations, FG show several other features with relative consistency. These are attributable to the Greek alone, since both D and the D-text retains the Z reading. FG, as are all manuscripts, are prone to assimilation to the near context:

5:8 πνημιας Ψ46 ΑΒΘΔLΠΨ049056014201500151
nequitiae 75 89 78 F VG Spe AMst AMst(A)
malignitatis AU

porneias FG
nequitiae vel fornicationis 77

6:6 επι απιστων
infideles 61 75 89 VG

απιστων και ου επι αγιων F
infideles et non apud sanctos 77
infideles et non inter sanctos 78

απιστων και ου επι αγιων ουκ οιδατε G

10:19 ειδωλοθυτον FGKLO560142015188915pmsygotChrThretDam
ειδωλον ΝιΒC D P Ψ 61739al arm
idolum 61 75 78 89 VG AMst(A)
simulacrum AMst
idolum vel idolothitum 77
omit [parablepsis] Ψ46 Α C 0150 6 33 pc vgms

9:24 ουτως οεττ
sic 75 89 VG AMst AMst(A) IR CY
εγω δε λεγω υμιν ουτως F G
geo autem dico vobis sic 61 77 78

At 5:8, the reading porneias (F G) is adapted to the use at 5:1, and forms of the
similar πόρνος are about to appear in 5:9, 10 and 11. The mistake took place only in the Greek of F and G; 75 89 78 etc. read nequitiae; 77 preserves this reading but adds, in conformity to this newly minted reading, vel fornicationis. Here the Latin has shown itself the faithful transmitter of the second century ancestor since it is not liable to the sight/sound confusion that the Greek is in this case. Another example is the addition of καὶ οὐ επὶ των συγιων after επὶ απιστων at 6:6, which is added from the identical phrase in 6:1. The Latin in 77 78 differ slightly here: 77 reads infideles et non apud sanctos; 77 reads inter in place of apud. The reading in 78 is explained by the double-translation offered in 6:1, where 77 reads apud vel inter sanctos. An identical type of alteration occurs at 10:19. F G assimilate εἰδωλον to the εἰδωλοθυτον earlier in the verse. The D and the Latin preserve the original Z reading. 77 adds an alternative rendering to match the error in the Greek text, though in this case the transliteration idolothitum rather than a translation. Though shared by F G and “Byzantine” witnesses, this type of error is common in those witnesses, and does not indicate shared ancestry.

The addition λεγω δε υμιν at 9:24 is not assimilation to the near context, but an expansion that emphasizes the command of 9:24b. This exact phrase occurs nowhere else in Paul. The source of this addition, attested only by F G 77 78, is, however, not certain.

III. H. Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text

As do all witnesses, F G lose text due to an accidental leap. Its resultant altered text is easily discovered. At 10:2, the scribe leaped from ἐν τῇ to ἐν τῇ, which led to θαλασσῇ

112 For the οὐκ οἰδατε which follows in G, see the next section, “Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text.”

113 Obvious examples of parablepsis are 1:26 omit οὗ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς; 1:27 omit καὶ . . . κατασχυνη, 2:6 omit οὐδέ . . . τοῦτον; etc.
being written first, with εν τῇ νεφηἡ then written after the error was noticed. The corresponding Latin columns of these manuscripts follow the Greek in this error. A shift for similar reasons takes place at 15:58. F G place οὐκ εστὶν before ο ὀκονος υμων. This was likely caused by a leap from ΟΚΟΝΟΣ to ΟΥΚΕΣΣΤΙΝ, with ΟΚΟΝΟΥΜ re-inserted after the mistake was noticed.

A striking attempt at repair is seen at 6:15, where F G add the conjunction ἦ before οὐκ οἰδατε. Since 6:7-14 are missing in these manuscripts, the addition could not have arisen from 6:9, though perhaps it comes from the distant influence of 6:2. However, at the end of 6:6 F G adds καὶ οὐ επί αγίων, which is taken from 6:1, another example of harmonization to the near context in these manuscripts. However, at this point G also adds οὐκ οἰδατε. This cannot have come from 6:1, since at that place F G read η οὐκ οἰδατε. Instead, it is most likely the beginning of 6:15, broken off after these first two words. The lack of a Latin interlinear translation for these two words suggests that the scribe did not realize that a sizeable portion of Greek text was missing until after οὐκ οἰδατε had been written and he had prepared to add the Latin. Once the missing text was noticed, a suitable blank space was left in the manuscript, with the text resuming at 6:15. Here, however is the addition of η before οὐκ οἰδατε. This may be an attempt by the scribe to create a connection with the preceding material, thereby alleviating the loss of 6:7-14. Significantly, 75 89 D do not read the η, indicating an ad hoc creation in X. F G, again without other Greek support and against 75 78 89, add η in the next clause as well (η ὁρα[ς] οὐν . . .) again in an attempt to smooth over a

\[114\]This is the only example of two Greek words in G 77 not being given a Latin equivalent, aside from γενεθητω γενεθητω in the subscription.
now corrupted text.\footnote{G has a unique corruption caused by a leap at 11:3. The scribe skipped from κεφαλή δὲ (1) to κεφαλή δὲ (2), then continued with χριστου. The mistake was noticed immediately, cristou marked for deletion, and the text resumes properly after κεφαλή δὲ (1).} The scribe of G makes a further blunder in the second part of the verse. He skipped from χριστου (1) to χριστου (2), then continued with ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο. The error was then noticed, whereupon he returned to χριστου (1) and continued with the lost η αρα συν τα μελη του χριστου ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο, in the event copying a second time χριστου ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο.

\textit{III.I. Secondary Spelling in F G}

The use of -ττ- and -σσ- by D F G helps to clarify the relationships among these witnesses (see further the discussions \textit{ad loc}). D favors the Attic -ττ- at 1 Cor. 6:9 with the "Alexandrian" witnesses and reads (with 075) κρειττονα at Heb. 6:9 against all other witnesses.\footnote{Hebrews shows the opposite usage of the \textit{Corpus Paulinum} manuscripts: Aside from 6:9, -ττ- is used, without variation, in every example of a comparative adjective or adverb apart (1:4; 7:7bis; 19, 22; 8:6bis; 9:23; 10:34; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24).} On the other hand, apart from clearly secondary adaptations, F G consistently write -σσ-. This suggests that the shared ancestor of D F G used -σσ-, from which it follows that examples of -ττ- in D F G are secondary. For example, ελαττον in F G at 1 Cor. 11:17 (νσσον Κ Α Β Κ Δ; ηπτον \textit{pm}) must be a secondary adaptation. The -ττ- is primary evidence. Latinism may be an issue as well. The lexicon of Ps-Dositheus suggests ελαττον for both \textit{minus} and \textit{parum},\footnote{Ps-Dositheus, \textit{Ars grammatica} 40.} and we find \textit{minus} in the corresponding Latin here.\footnote{As well as 1 Tim. 5:9, where ελαττον is read without variation in the Greek manuscripts} This may help explain ελασσον in F G alone at 2 Cor. 12:15, which, though written with -σσ-, again may be
based on the Latin minus.

F G have therefore undergone editing beyond the Latinisms present in Z. The most significant are the alterations in the Latin text toward the Vulgate, which then led to alterations of the Greek text. This took place, in almost every case, on a word-by-word basis, which is consistent with the use of the lexicon. In addition, X has adapted its text in unique ways, most of which are easily detectable. Such readings may therefore be eliminated as second alterations to the earlier form of the text otherwise witnessed in the these manuscripts. Nevertheless, once these peculiar alterations are identified as later adaptations, an underlying early form of the Pauline Epistles can be recovered.

IV. Secondary Editing in D

Just as a predecessor of F G underwent revision, so also D has undergone its own editing. Some of this editing was in the form of independent Latinization, but others result from harmonizations to other passages within the epistles, editing based on its unique sense-line format, and, most importantly, alteration based on a second Greek exemplar which comes from outside the bilingual tradition.

IVA. Latinization in D

In contrast to the Latinization in F G, which was done on the basis of both the Vulgate and existing D-text reading, the Latinization in D was made only toward the D-text. Just as F G altered the Greek to match the Latin prefixes, so too did D. At 4:8 D* alone reads σὺν υἱὸν σωμάτωσαλευσῶμεν, matching vobiscum regnemus (regnetis 75*) in 75° 89. All other Greek witnesses read υἱὸν σωμάτωσαλευσῶμεν (F G σου-). D*'s σου υἱὸν matches vobiscum without taking into account the compound verb.

Alterations resulting from nomina sacra also occur in D. At 4:21, the genitive spiritus
renders πνευματι (as at 14:12, where it caused problems in F G). Their case matches quoque mansuetudinis, which immediately follows. This is modified slightly in the Ambrosiaster commentary to spiritus et mansuetudinis, but retained in 75 and the Doppelübersetzung in 77: spiritus vel [spirit]u quoque. The alternate reading added in 77 is adopted from the Vulgate and 78. 89, perhaps recognizing the difficulty of the syntax, defected here to the I-text reading spirituque (Spe AM). The use of the genitive in this passage must be intended to give a description of in caritate: “or in love of [characterized by] the Spirit and humility.” The genitive form also occurs in ℃46, although this not an intentional alteration since ℃46 makes the same alteration at 2:14, 15; and 3:1 each time writing πνζ (see discussion at 2:14.61). In this passage D suffers from Latinization, but through misunderstanding. Spiritus could be either the nominative or the genitive form; D writes πνα, selecting the nominative to match ςπς. F G do not use a nomen sacrum abbreviation for πνευματι in this passage, which is similar to its habits in other passages where a form related to πνευμα does not refer to the deity (two examples of πνευματικός in 2:13, which immediately follow an occurrence of πνζ; 2:14, 15 etc). This use of the nomina sacra in these places is further evidence of D moving away from its archetype Z. The Latinization was again facilitated by the shortened sense lines in D, with the resulting πνα τε πραστητης standing on its own line. While certainly nonsense in context, the sense-line format would have allowed this line to be understood independent its surrounding material.

At 11:13, D alone reads ὑμεῖς σαυτοί (against ἐν ὑμίν σαυτοῖς) The use of personal pronouns as the subject of the imperative is rare in the epistles (Rom. 6:11; 1 Cor. 16:1; Phil. 2:18). Therefore, while ἐν ὑμίν σαυτοῖς κρίνοτε does not have a precise parallel elsewhere in Paul, neither is the reading of D clearly Pauline. However, Paul elsewhere uses κρίνω + ἐν,
with the preposition used to introduce the one(s) who are to judge (1 Cor. 6:2). The fact that this usage is not common has likely prompted attempts to render the text more clearly. Most Latin witnesses, including the Vulgate and the D-Text (here attested by VL 75 89), read instead the vocative (vos ipsi). This is matched by ὑμεῖς αὐτοῖ in D. Güting and Mealand note that on occasion “D exhibits stylistic improvements,” of which 11:13 is a “remarkable instance.” This example, however, is attributable to D’s adaptation to the Latin.

IV.B. Harmonizations to Other Writings

At 3:18, D reads ἀπατατω κενοῖς λογοῖς (matched by its Latin counterpart) against εξαπατατω. This matches precisely Eph. 5:6, including the loss of the prefix on the verb. In two places D has readings which are otherwise found only in the Apostolic Constitutions: ζυμωι at 5:6 and, more significantly, θρυπτομενον at 1 Cor. 11:24, which is a liturgical adaptation. No other specific connections between these witnesses has been uncovered in 1 Corinthians, however, and the shared readings probably point to some shared tradition rather than a direct relationship.

---

119Cf. the translations “Urteilt bei euch selbst” (Schrage II, p. 520) and “Come to a decision for yourself” (Thiselton, p. 800). Lindemann (p. 237) notes “Die Addressaten sollen ein eigenes Urteil fällen. Fee (p. 525) deviates from the NIV text upon which he is commenting (“judge among yourselves”) to note that Paul’s request was that the matter be “judged for themselves.”

120The Peshitta’s لکبکي لماح (“Judge among yourselves for yourselves”) shows the difficulty of rendering the Greek.

121Güting and Mealand, p. 50. The reference to D’s text at 1 Cor. 11:13 is made in a discussion of the text of 1 Cor. 12:16, where they conclude that D*K preserve the original asyndeton. No other examples of “stylistic improvements” in D are cited here.

122Here joined by the unrelated 441 463 and a marginal note in 1906.

123Though the Apostolic Constitutions may also be citing Gal. 5:9.
IV.C. Idiosyncratic Editing in D

Many alterations in D are attributable to adaptations that the scribe makes on the basis of D’s unique sense-line format. The exemplar Z used long sense-lines, vestiges of which are still able to be reconstructed from the capitalization of the initial letters of the sense-lines retained in F and G. The scribe of D, however, was forced to shorten the sense-lines in order to suit its format because the manuscript is written with a Greek and Latin column on each leaf. The scribe usually tried to keep subjects and verbs, nouns and adjectives, verbs and adverbs, etc. on the same line. When these sense lines are disrupted, however, it is usually evidence of a secondary adaptation in D away from the archetype Z.

In 6:9b-10, D has a number of singular readings. These readings not only depart from the rest of the Greek tradition but from its own Latin column as well: First, a series of seven consecutive noun phrases beginning with ouδε, followed by two beginning with ουτε (before a final phrase beginning with ουχ as in the rest of the tradition). The Latin column reads neque in every case. After these, the verb phrase Θεοῦ βασιλείαν κληρονομησοῦσιν, again differing (in word order) from the Latin column’s regnum dei possidebunt. This has clearly received editorial attention, most likely influenced by the format in which the text was written:

The assimilation of the last line (6:10) to the second is apparent; the two lines form a frame (both visual and aural) for the list. The list itself is carefully structured; the switch from ουδε
to ουτε makes no difference semantically, and probably little difference in pronunciation, but would signal to the reader that the end of the list is approaching, which then concludes with ουχ at the beginning of the last phrase.

Formatting also influenced the text of D at 10:15-17, which was set apart as a distinct unit through the use of indentation and capitalization. Perhaps because it was an opening sentence, 10:15 was rewritten. The ωμείς is shifted to the first clause and its case changed to dative to match φρονιμοις, while ουν is added after the imperative. The latter addition may have been made to avoid asyndeton, or to parallel βλεπετε ουν (10:18), which in D is set off with the same indentation and capitalization as is 10:15. This must have been an intentional alteration by D, for it is not even supported by its Latin counterpart, 75, which adds vobis to match ωμείς but leaves vos without replacing it with a conjunction.

Harmonization to the near context takes place also in 8:5a, where D alone (followed by 75) adds και κύριοι after the first occurrence of θεοι in the verse, modelled on the θεοι πολλοί και κύριοι πολλοί in 8:5b. Again, the sense-line format led to the addition, which brings the phrases into parallel.

Another example of assimilation is found at 9:19-22. The sense-line format in which the manuscript is written breaks down after 9:20 ως τοοδαιος. The following six lines are far longer than normal and are not divided by sense. This is most obviously shown by the division of the first νομον and the separation of the second υπο from the νομον it governs:124

---

124 The inconsistency of the spelling of VL 75 is shown by its writing sene twice in line four but sine in lines five ad six.
to **οὐτε** makes no difference semantically, and probably little difference in pronunciation, but would signal to the reader that the end of the list is approaching, which then concludes with **οὐχ** at the beginning of the last phrase.

Formatting also influenced the text of D* at 10:15-17, which was set apart as a distinct unit through the use of indentation and capitalization. Perhaps because it was an opening sentence, 10:15 was rewritten. The **ὑμεῖς** is shifted to the first clause and its case changed to dative to match **φρονιμοί**, while **οὖν** is added after the imperative. The latter addition may have been made to avoid asyndeton, or to parallel **βλέπετε ὦν** (10:18), which in D is set off with the same indentation and capitalization as is 10:15. This must have been an intentional alteration by D, for it is not even supported by its Latin counterpart, 75, which adds **vobis** to match **ὑμεῖς** but leaves **vos** without replacing it with a conjunction.

Harmonization to the near context takes place also in 8:5a, where D alone (followed by 75) adds **καὶ κύριοι** after the first occurrence of **θεοί** in the verse, modelled on the **θεοί** πολλοί καὶ κύριοι πολλοί in 8:5b. Again, the sense-line format led to the addition, which brings the phrases into parallel.

Another example of assimilation is found at 9:19-22, The sense-line format in which the manuscript is written breaks down after 9:20 **ὡς ὁ οὐδείς**. The following six lines are far longer than normal and are not divided by sense. This is most obviously shown by the division of the first **νομον** and the separation of the second **υπο** from the νομον it governs.124

124 The inconsistency of the spelling of VL 75 is shown by its writing **sene** twice in line four but **sine** in lines five ad six.
ut iudaeos luceri facerem his qui sub lege sunt
quasi sub lege cum ipse non esse[m] sub
lege ut qui sunt sub lege lucrare[m]
his qui sene lege sunt sicut sene lege
cum sine lege di non sim sed in lege sim 

ut eos qui sine lege erant luceri facerem

The original lineation is preserved, as both Corssen and Vogels note,¹²⁵ in G:

Iva tou8atoug ic, -p8Tlaw
Toug ulTo vopov wq uiTo vopov
Mil wV auTog uTro voliov
Iva TOUq UlTO VOPOV KEP811aW
Toig avogoig wq avopog pil wV avopog
AAA Evvopog Xu
Iva ic, -p5avw Tou; avopoug

Both Corssen and Vogels noticed the similarity to the treatment of the doxology of Romans,
which showed similar disruption of the sense lines. Corssen argued that a copy of the shared
ancestor of D FG omitted the text from Iva iouδaiouς κερδηςω (9:20) to Iva tou
ανομους κερδηςω (9:21). Vogels argued, on the basis of the several unique readings in the
corresponding Latin column, that the scribal leap was from υπο νομον κερδηςω to τους
ανομους κερδηςω. Vogels’ deduction accounts for the Latin text, but not the disrupted
lineation of the first three lines. Corssen’s reconstruction is more plausible. Furthermore, it
may account for the word order Iva tou ανομους κερδηςω now found in D. After a leap
from Iva at 9:20 to Iva at 9:21, the scribe rewrote in the margin the text from Iva iouδaiouς
through εννομος χριστου. In this process the lineation was disrupted at the beginning (as
seen above) and at the end by placing μη ων ανομος θυ on the same line as αλλ εννομος χυ
rather than τοις ανομοις ως ανομος, as it stands in G. Once the scribe reached the Iva touς

¹²⁵Corssen II, p. 26; Vogels, pp. 291-22. Vogels divides Τοις ανομοις ως ανομος
μη ων ανομος θυ into two lines, but there is no indication in G that such a break should be
seen there.
touδαίος κερδησω, ανομοις was written as a correction for τους τουδαίος rather than rewriting the entire line. Thereby this scribe altered both the word order and the verb form found in F G and created a singular reading now found in D.

At 12:13, the lineation of D* has been disrupted by an impossible reading in its Greek column, so that the second and third lines no longer match the Latin column (VL 75):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kαι\,απεργαρτοκυμα} & \quad \text{Sicutenimcorpus} \\
\text{και\,απεργαρτοκυμα} & \quad \text{unumest}
\end{align*}
\]

The original reading of the shared ancestor of D F G is preserved in F G: \ldots εις εν σωμα εβαπτισθημεν (= the Latin of VL 75 77 78). The reading has likely crept in as the result of D's practice of bringing nearby lines into parallel (as at 6:9-10 and 8:5). Eight lines above the text cited above, at 12:12, D is laid out as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kαι\,απεργαρτοκυμα} & \quad \text{Sicutenimcorpus} \\
\text{και\,απεργαρτοκυμα} & \quad \text{unumest}
\end{align*}
\]

This is similar to the layout at 12:13, in that initial κ is enlarged and extended into the left column, γαρ is used in both places, and what is taken to be a numeral followed by a form of ειμι stands on the second line. Apparently, the scribe of D (or his immediate predecessor) departed from the exemplar in order to bring 12:13a into parallel with 12:12a.

At 12:31 F G and the D-text witnesses attest to eti / adhuc as the reading of the shared ancestor of D F G. Once again, D departs from its predecessor, as well as the Peshitta, in reading και. The lineation in D again shows an adaptation away from its archetype. The original lineation is shown by the enlarged size of the initial letters of the lines preserved in F G:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ZHAYOTE} & \quad \text{TA} \quad \text{ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ} \quad \text{TA} \quad \text{ΚΡΕΙΣΩΝΑ} \\
\text{ΕΤΙ} & \quad \text{ΚΑΘ} \quad \text{ΥΠΕΡΒΟΧΙΝ} \quad \text{ΟΔΟΝ} \quad \text{ΥΜΙΝ} \quad \text{ΔΕΙ ΚΝΥΜΙ}
\end{align*}
\]
D, however, has broken the pattern of sense lines in a significant way:

The lines of the exemplar were too long to fit into the two-column format adopted by D, hence τα κρέεισονα is separated from the noun it modifies. But the addition of καί to the Greek would have made the following line too long. This problem was compounded by the presence of a flaw in the vellum in the line with καθ υπερβολήν, which necessitated a gap in the text between υπερ and βολήν. As a result, the scribe added καί ειτί to the line with τα κρέεισονα and destroyed the lineation which should have matched the clause structure. The Latin column was adapted to the Greek, though et was not added to match καί. The additional καί is found in other Greek witnesses, the significance of which will be discussed below.

Recognizing that D brings its sense lines into parallel also helps explain the creation of its reading at 14:5. Here D* reads the simple infinitive προφητευειν in place of ίνα προφητευετε (ut prophetis VG 75 77 89), which anticipates the Vulgate’s prophetare. Both readings are likely independent assimilation to λαλείν / loqui in the preceding clause. It should be noted that the identical phrase at 14:1 (μαλλον δε ίνα προφητευετε) was not altered, since no infinitive form precedes the phrase there. The effect of the assimilation is particularly noticeable with D’s sense-line format, with the infinitives in the initial and final positions of the contrasted phrases:

Other potential examples of sense lines prompting alteration include 12:16.69, where καί is omitted, and 15:2.8, where καί is added.
IV.D. Alterations Toward Alexandrian Witnesses

Several readings in D that move away from its shared ancestor with FG and the Latin text are the result of comparison to one or more Greek witnesses. This has already been suggested by noting the large-scale additions that this manuscript makes at the doxology in Romans and with the entire book of Hebrews. However, the following examples demonstrate that this also took place in some of the most seemingly insignificant readings. Vogels has shown that this is most obvious when, as in the doxology of Romans, the sense-lines have been disrupted in D.126 "Alexandrian" influence on D has also been suggested, though not argued, by Heinrich Zimmerman: "D ist nach einem Text der S [=N] A B C-Gruppe überarbeitet."127 Though he does not develop this statement with examples, his observation will be confirmed here, as well a discussion of other likely cases of secondary influence on D.

At 7:37 it was argued that εδραίος is a secondary intrusion, and that Ἡ F G and the D-text preserve the archetypical form of the text. The bilinguals split here. D follows Ν A B 0278 line of text, whereas 75 77 78 89 all read in corde suo = ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ with F G (and Ἡ). D's reading must therefore result from the introduction of a reading from a second Greek manuscript which comes from outside the bilingual tradition. To match this imported Greek exemplar D has broken the pattern of the sense-lines by placing the adjective at the beginning of a line, separated from the relative pronoun:128

126 Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus."
128 Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 290; Corssen II, p. 22.
ΝΗΠΙΟΤΟΙΔΙΟΥ ΘΕΗΜΑΤΟΣ

Against this FG 77 78 89 stand in agreement, preserving the lineation of Z:

ος δε εστηκεν εν τη καρδια αυτου
μη εχουν αναγκην
εξουσιαν δε εχει περι του ιδιου
θεληματος

qui autem statuit in corde suo.
non habens necessitatem.
potestatem autem habet suae voluntatis

The use of statuit in corde is somewhat unusual here; in fact the apparatus of
Wordsworth and White takes the unusual step of noting that, while statuit is the reading of
every Latin witness, stetit would be a more accurate rendering of ίστημι. It is true that in the
fifteen occurrences of ίστημι in the epistles the D-text uses the near-exact equivalent sto
twelve times. However, two other passages that use statuo have in common with 1 Cor. 7:37 a
focus on the definitiveness of the “standing”130: at Rom. 3:31 it is the verb that follows μη
γενοτο, while at 10:3 it intensifies the defiance of the person who chooses to “stand” in his
own righteousness rather than God’s. This is reflected further in the D-text’s choice of statuit
to translate κεκρικεν later in the verse (the Vulgate uses indicavit). Thus the translator of the
D-text recognized the “firmness” of the stand encouraged by Paul in 7:37 and so chose the
verb statuo over sto. However, it is doubtful that this would have prompted a scribe with δες
δε εστηκεν . . . εδραιος present in his Greek text to omit the adjective.131 Instead, it may

12975 matches D by splitting line three into two units: | potestatem autem habet | suae
voluntatis |. It matches 77 78 89 for the first two lines, not reading anything equivalent to D’s
εδραιος.

130Cf. Lewis and Short, s.v. statuo, (F): “To judge, declare as a judgment, be of
opinion, hold (especially of legal opinions), think, consider (always implying the
establishment of a principle, or a decided conviction. . .).” The first reference listed there,
Cicero’s De provinciis consularibus in senatu oratio 10, is especially relevant to the usage in
1 Cor. 7:37: “He decided (statuit) from the beginning and persevered in it . . .”

131A tempting solution is to posit a Latinism in FG based on a vowel interchange:
εδραιος corrupted to the adverb εδραιως, “firmly.” The translator would have then used
statuo assuming it equivalent to ίστημι εδραιως. This is ruled out, however, by the two
represent an attempt to clarify this unusual use of the verb εςτηκεν, which is not otherwise used of an individual's personal decisions regarding a course of action in the NT.\textsuperscript{132} It may be this unusual use of the verb that has caused the addition of εδροτος in its various positions in the Greek traditions (apart from \textit{P46 FG}). The text of \textit{FG} cannot be attributed to interference from the Latin; the reading of D, which moves away from Z, must have come from an additional Greek manuscript. Given the word order, this manuscript must have been of an "Alexandrian" and not a "Byzantine" type.

Recognizing this pattern of readings in D that vary from both \textit{FG} and the D-text but match the readings of "Alexandrian" witnesses helps to clarify other places where D and \textit{FG} split:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:10 σε τον εχοντα γνωσιν</th>
<th>\textit{N2 A D K L Ψ 1739 1881 sy}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{te qui habet scientiam 75 AMst(A)}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σε τον γνωσιν εχοντα</td>
<td>\textit{K 0150 33 81 104 181 326 467 1836 1875 Or}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{eum qui scientiam habet AU}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τον εχοντα γνωσιν \textit{P46 B FG}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{habentem scientiam 77 78}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{eum qui habet scientiam 89 VG AMst}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A nonsense reading is created in 75's text of 8:10 as a result of an addition in the Greek of D. The D-text reading is found in 89: \textit{eum qui habet scientiam}, another example of this text's use of a relative pronoun + finite verb render the participle. 77 78 show assimilation to the Greek of \textit{FG} with \textit{habentem scientiam}. 75, however, creates a new reading, altering the D-texts \textit{eum} to \textit{te} based on the σε found in D. The insertion is possible grammatically, though it examples of \textit{statuo} in Romans, as well its use again to translate κρινω later in 1 Cor. 7:37.

\textsuperscript{132}Cf. BDAG, s.v. ίστημι (4), where 1 Cor. 7:37 is listed with three other passages under the gloss "stand firm"; however 2 of the examples are not in contexts of a person making a decision on a course of action, but remaining firm in their already held trust and confidence in God (1 Cor. 10:12; 2 Cor. 1:24); the third, 2 Tim. 2:19, discusses an external "foundation of God" that "cannot be shaken."
shifts the object from an unknown person to the hearer. Because *te* is based on *σε*, this shows that both have been added based on comparison to Greek witnesses outside the bilingual tradition. It is the reading of the Byzantine text, but also such key “Alexandrian” witnesses as 23 33 1739.

5:3  \(ως παρον τον ουτω τουτο κατεργασαμενον\) *P* 46 Ν Α Β Ζ Δ Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151

\(\text{ut praeens eum quis sic operatus est}\) \(\text{AMst Hil}\)

\(\text{ut praeens eum qui sic operatus est}\) 75 89 78 F VG Lcf AMst

\(\text{ut praesens eum qui ita operatus est}\) AMst(A)

\(\text{tamquam praesens eum qui sic operatus est}\) 77

\(\text{eum ut praesens qui sic operatus est}\) 61

\text{lac}\ *P* 11 *P* 51 *P* 58

\(κατεργαζομαι\) is used twenty times in the epistles (eighteen times in Rom. 1 2 Cor.)

but never intransitively, even as a participle (Rom. 1:27; 2:9; 7:13; 2 Cor. 5:5; Eph. 6:13). In addition, in two other passages the verb is modified by an adverb yet still takes an object:

Rom. 7:17 (\(\nuνι \delta\varepsilon\ οὐκέτι ἕγω κατεργαζομαι αὐτὸ\)) and 7:20 (\(οὐκέτι ἕγω κατεργαζομαι αὐτὸ\)). At 1 Cor. 5:3 the omission of the object \(τοῦτο\) in virtually the entire Latin tradition can be attributed to the lack of a need for it in translation due to the presence of the adverb *sic*. One may compare “I have already passed judgment on the one who did this” (NIV), which, though not translating the adverb, demonstrates the difficulty of word-for-word rendering of the clause. Its loss in F G and the Latin tradition is likely an example of parablepsis, but, as in other cases, this was the textual basis for virtually the entire Latin tradition. D following the rest of the Greek tradition here adds \(τοῦτο\), which was not present in Z.

3:21  \(\text{ἐν ἀνθρωποις}\) *P* 46 Ν Α Β Ζ Δ Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0289 1739

\(\text{in hominibus}\) VG AMst(A)

\(\text{ἐν ἀνθρωπῳ}\) F G AU Ambr

\(\text{in homine}\) 61 77 78 89 Mcion\(^T\) AMst AU Sedul

\(\text{in homines}\) 75
Zuntz does not cite this on his list of Marcion’s readings (pp. 236-39) in comparison to the “Western” text. The singular \( \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \) (F G and the D-Text) is intriguing because a list of people follows; \( \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma \) appears to be harmonization to what follows or, in the case of those manuscripts that read \( \tau \omega \nu \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \alpha \varsigma \) at 3:20, what precedes. That it is D, rather than F G, that has been affected by other witnesses is shown by the corruption in its Latin counterpart, 75. The reading homines in may be a conflate reading of hominibus (VG AMst(A)) and homine (cett), though perhaps the addition of a final -s was influenced by the ending of the Greek \( \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma \), which is the altered reading in D. This reading, as do the others described here, is found in “Alexandrian” witnesses.

In some examples where D shows influence from another Greek text the correction was incomplete and resulted in a reading unique to D:

\[\text{056 0142 0150 5 33 181 489 614 630 927 1099 1245 1506 1836 1875 bo^ms Mcion^E} \]

Epiph.

\[\text{134 Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus,” p. 278.}\]
2:2 τοῦ εἰδεναι τι εν υμίν L 049 056 0142 0151 104 326 pm
eidevai τι εν υμίν Ρ A F G 048\textsuperscript{vid} 0150 6 88 623 915 al Or
scire aliquid in vobis 77 TE
scire me aliquid in vobis 78
scire aliquid inter vos 75
me scire aliquid in vobis 64
me scire aliquid inter vos 61 89 VG
scire me aliquid inter vos c vg\textsuperscript{mas}. B F G H K O P R V* AMst AMst(A)
ti ειδεναι εν υμίν B C P 048\textsuperscript{vid} 33 81 263 1739 pc Chr Cyr
ti εν υμίν ειδεναι D\textsuperscript{1}
tou εν υμίν ειδεναι τι D\textsuperscript{1}
lac \textsuperscript{46}

The editing of the word order in D matches B C P 048\textsuperscript{vid} 33 1739 pc in reading τι in
the position prior to the infinitive. However the resulting τι εν υμίν ειδεναι is found in no
other witness. This may be a misreading of a correction in a predecessor manuscript that
intended the reading of B, but removed ειδεναι to the end of the line. Again, the text moves
away from Z toward several “Alexandrian” witnesses, but not to the B “Byzantine” text.

2:11 τα του θεου \textsuperscript{46} Ρ Ν Α Β Ζ Κ Δ Φ Λ Γ Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151
quae dei sunt 78 VG
quae dei 75
to του θεου D\textsuperscript{1}
ta εν τω θεω F G
quae in deo sunt 89 Spe Or Hil AMst AMst(A)
in deo 77

The lineation in F 78 G 77 reads as follows:

τις γαρ οιδεν ανθρωπων τα του ανθρωπου
ει μη το πνευμα το εν αυτω
ουτως και τα εν θεω
ουδεις εγνω ει μη το πνευμα του θεου

quis enim scit hominum quae sunt hominis
nisi spiritus qui in ipso est
ita et quae in deo sunt
nemo cognovit nisi spiritus dei

This is nearly identical, both in text and in structure, to that found in 89:

\textit{quis enim scit hominum quae sunt hominis quae in ipso est}
nisi spiritus qui in ipso est
ita et quae in deo sunt
nemo cognovit nisi spiritus dei

The sole difference between 89 and F 78 G 77 is the lengthened initial line. This, however, is
clearly one of the secondary “Dublette” found in 89,115 in this passage comprised of the D-text reading (*quaesunt* *hominis*) and the reading of Ps-Vigilius (*quaes in ipso est*). Here both the text and the layout of the witnesses demonstrate that 89 F 78 G 77 preserve the Z text.

The text of D 75 also shows a similar ancestry, both in text and structure. However the intrusion of readings from a second Greek source has disrupted the layout:

Both the beginning of the initial and the final lines are identical to 89 F G. However, the addition of the second του αὐθρωπου has resulted in “three impossible ‘sense-lines’.”137 This has forced the first two lines to end with the article, which is now separated from its noun. This addition has come from comparison to a second Greek source; 75 attempts to match this addition with *qui in homne* (sic), a reading attested nowhere else in the Latin tradition.138 Likewise the shift from και Τα ευ θεω to και Τα του θεου later in the verse is from a Greek source; the corresponding *et quae dei* is also unique within the Latin tradition.139 Finally, εγνωκεν in place of εγνω = *cognovit* (*75 89 F 78 G 77*) may stem from this set of corrections, or may be a simple copying error in F G (see discussion above).

The readings discussed here have shown that D (or an intermediary between Z and D)

135Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, p. 124. This reading is shared by Hilary, Pelagius, and *Speculum* 3.

136*Contra Varimadum Arianum* 2,5; 2,18.

137Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus, p. 289.

138*hominis* is found in the 64 VG F AMst(A).

139*quaedi sunt* is found in 77 F V; *quae sunt dei* W Vigil
has been corrected to a second Greek exemplar. This has already been suggested by Frede, who noted that this second manuscript was of the “Normaltext” type (= “Alexandrian”). He does not, however, develop this argument. Trobisch also claimed that a predecessor of D has been influenced by another manuscript. He claims, however, that this was a member of the “Koinetext,” and incorporates this into a modified version of Corssen’s simple stemma of the bilinguals. He does not attempt to demonstrate this claim, but does cite Frede in support. In every example discussed here, the alteration from Z has been toward readings found in manuscripts which would fall into the “Alexandrian” category, similar to 𝔓⁴⁶ A B (but not identical with any extant manuscript. Further, there is not a single example of a reading of D that moves away from Z to a uniquely “Byzantine” (Koine) text reading. D only moves toward the “Byzantine” text when that reading is already present in the “Alexandrians.”

In addition to the readings already discussed where D introduces a reading which come either from “Alexandrian” manuscripts exclusively or a reading shared by “Alexandrian” and “Byzantine” witnesses, several others, which are discussed at the appropriate location, are be listed here:

---

¹⁴⁰Bei Differenzen zwischen D und G wird man jeweils die vom Normaltext abweichende, ‘westliche’ Lesart als die Archetyps ansehen müssen; gerade an den späteren Korrekturen in D sehen wir ja die Tendenz, die ‘westlichen’ Lesarten durch den Normaltext und näherhin durch den Koine-Typ zu ersetzen. Daß diese Tendenz schon vor der Niederschrift des Claromontanus in Italien am Werk war, zeigt neben anderen Unternehmungen die Revision, deren Ergebnis die Vulgata ist.” Frede, Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften, 95.

¹⁴¹Trobisch, Entstehung, p. 22.

¹⁴²2:2 τι εν υμιν ειδεναι; 7:29 omit εστιν; 7:37 αυτου + εδραιος.

¹⁴³2:3 εν φοβω και τρομω; 2:11 το του θεου; 3:21 εν ανθρωποις; 4:6 υπερ του ενος; 5:3 τον ουτω τουτο; 8:10 + σε.
688

1:1 *omit* κλητος Ψ\(^{61}\)vid A D 0151 pc VL 75 CY

2:4 εν πειθοις σοφιας λογοις Ψ B D 0150 33 181 1175 1506 1739 1881 εν πειθοις ανθρωπινης σοφιας λογοις Ψ\(^{2}\) A C L P Ψ pm εν πειθοις σοφιας Ψ\(^{46}\) F G

11:22 επαινεσω Ψ\(^{1}\) C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 0199 vid pm επαινο Ψ\(^{46}\) B F G

11:19 ινα και οι δοκιμοι Ψ\(^{46}\) B D* 6 33 69 330 630 1175 1739 1881 1912 ινα οι δοκιμοι Ψ A C D Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151

12:2 οιδατε στι οτε Ψ\(^{46}\) A B C D L P Ψ 056\(^{6}\) 33 1739 sy\(^{b}\) οιδατε στι F G 0142 0151 2 38 88 177 216 629 1875 2298 sy\(^{p}\) οιδατε οτε K 0150 I 69 209 1834 1898 1906 2464 lac Ψ\(^{46}\) 0201

12:10 διερμηνεια A D* ερμηνεια Ψ\(^{46}\) C D\(^{6}\) F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 0201 6 424 915 1241\(^{1}\) 1739 *omit* (parablepsis) B K 0150 pc

12:21 ου δυναται δε Ψ\(^{46}\) Ψ B D K L Ψ 0150 0151 5 6 424 1739 pm ου δυναται A C F G P 056 0142 al

14:11 μη ιδω Ψ\(^{46}\) A D* L 5 33 181 623 μη ειδω Ψ B D\(^{2}\) K P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243 0289 vid 6 88 1739 pm μη γινωσκω F G

15:4 τη ημερα τη τριτη Ψ\(^{46}\) A B D 048 vid 33 pc τη τριτη ημερα F G K L P Ψ 049 0150 0151 5 6 424 pm

16:13 ανδριζεσθε και κραταιουσθε A D 1175 pc sy\(^{p}\) ανδριζεσθε κραταιουσθε Ψ\(^{46}\) Ψ B C F G K L P Ψ 049 056 075 0121 0142 0150 0151 0243 5 6 424 1739 pm

When D departs from F G, its agreement with the "Alexandrian" witnesses is striking. While the passages discussed here are only representative, the agreements with Ψ and A in particular appear to indicate some connection to that line of the Alexandrian tradition, more so than Ψ\(^{46}\) or B.

D therefore departs from the Greek Z toward other Greek witnesses more often than F
and G. It is in fact a “mixed-text,” neither an accurate example of Z nor an “Alexandrian” text, though it clearly has connections to both. It has not yet become a “Byzantine” text either, but is an example of the process by which this form of the text was eventually created.

V. Uncertain Z Readings

Having identified typical characteristics of the D F G and the D-text, several passages nevertheless remain for which the Z reading is uncertain.

7:2 δικ δε τας πορνειας ἢν 64 Ν Α Β Κ Δ Κ Μ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 1739 propter fornicationes autem 64 75 L M R TE CY HI AU
dικ δε την πορνειαν F G sy Or
propter fornicationem autem 78 89 F VG HI AMst(A)
propter autem fornicationem 61 77
sed propter fornicationem TE
tamen propter fornicationem AMst

Several competing factors are at work in this passage. Assimilation to the near context in either F G or the Latin tradition may be at work in this example as well since την πορνειαν occurs a few verses earlier in 6:18. However, the reading may have arisen from a common transcriptional error in the Latin. Only the final -s in fornicationes had to be altered to -m in order to shift from the plural number to singular, possibly also under the influence of 6:18. D, on the other hand, may be an adaptation to the “Alexandrian” reading, particularly since 75 is supported by no other D-text witnesses. Yet it is possible, though remotely so, that 78, 89, and AMst(A) all were independently assimilated to the Vulgate. The reading in F G would therefore be dismissed as adaptation to the Vulgate. A strong argument can be made, however, the F G reading is the archetypical reading since the plural of πορνεια occurs nowhere else in Paul. There does not appear to be any significance in the plural in this context. In addition, the reading is found also in Tertullian, Origen, and the Syriac. These, however, may be independent renderings rather than reflecting a specific Greek vorlage. While I believe
that the balance of probabilities favors the argument that the reading of FG is the Z reading, and D assimilation to the “Alexandrian” text, competing factors preclude a definitive solution.

Another example is the way that D FG, independently, alter τε καὶ to match the Latin. The D-text uses atque (Rom. 1:12), ac (Rom. 1:14), et . . . et (1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 12:12), and et (Rom. 3:9; 1 Cor. 1:24, 30). In four places D or FG was adapted to the Latin. At Rom. 10:12 D reads only καὶ; at 1 Cor. 1:24 FG read only καὶ; and at 1 Cor. 1:30 and 2 Cor. 12:12 FG read καὶ . . . καὶ. However, none of these alterations is likely traceable to Z.

While the archetypical reading at 9:11 is not in question, determining the D-text reading is difficult. The stichometry in D shows that ou is a secondary intrusion since it is separated from its clause:145

Yet this reading is found in two manuscripts which usually have D-text readings (89* AMst (A)), though they may have been influenced by the Vulgate and I-text reading. The original non is 89 is erased; the corrections in this manuscript are usually made not by the scribe when correcting copying errors, but by a diorthotes, usually back to the exemplar but occasionally toward the Vulgate. Furthermore, the vestiges of the lineation of 89 show that non is placed in its proper clause. It must also be noted that this manuscript, alone among all witness to this passage, omits the interrogative particle (si) at the beginning of 9:11. This was left

---

144 At Rom. 1:27 τε καὶ is read as δε καὶ in A D* G P Ψ, which the D-text renders with autem et.


uncorrected, though it is doubtful that this could have led to the independent insertion of non. The commentary provided by this manuscript could result from either the presence or absence of non: “Do not think that it is doing a ‘great thing,’ if they provided anything for the apostles when they themselves learned from them ‘greater things.’” In the end, only three explanations are possible: 1) All three witnesses independently added non, an unlikely explanation given the relationship among these witnesses. 2) Non is the reading of the D-text, but VL 77 78 and subsequently F G were altered to the Vulgate. 3) Non/ou was a correction in the D F G archetype back to the D-text reading which was later adopted by D (albeit written in the wrong line) but rejected later by the shared exemplar of F G. This last scenario seems the most likely of the three, particularly in the light of similar examples (see 9:7, discussed above, and 9:20.74).

VI. Results

Several conclusions may be drawn from this analysis. First, the Greek of the archetype Z and the D-text arise from a similar tradition. This has been frequently recognized by previous researchers. This tradition’s most striking feature is an interest in a smooth, clear text. Second, when Z was created, editorial activity is seen in some limited adaptation of the Greek text to the D-text, while the D-Text was likewise adapted to the Greek; there is also a tendency toward assimilation to the near context, particularly in minor additions. Third, D was revised away from Z in several significant ways. Its unique sense-line format led to numerous harmonizations and alterations of particles. It was also adapted to the Latin, though less so than was F G. More importantly, it was corrected toward manuscripts of the “Alexandrian” text. It was because of this agreement with “Alexandrian” readings that Zuntz saw D as superior to F G; however, it is now clear that when D agrees with “Alexandrian”
witnesses against F G, it does not represent an independent witness. Instead, F G preserve the reading that stood in the archetype Z, and potentially that archetype’s predecessor. Fourth, the archetype of F G (X) adapted its Latin text away from Z and toward a local Vulgate text. This resulted in a fresh set of Latinisms in F G, which account for virtually all of the “Byzantine” readings in F G. Again, this corrects Zuntz, who assumed that the later witnesses (F G) had been affected directly by Byzantine readings. X also suffered from numerous corruptions of word divisions, blunders, and simple adaptations, all of which indicate that the editor of X had only vague comprehension of the Greek, and the copyist of G in particular almost none.

Fifth, even with these conclusions, there are places where the archetype Z cannot yet be accurately reconstructed. Last, and most significantly, with a clearer picture of the origins and types of alterations made in D F G, we are able to strip away the errors and recover what, at its base, is a text than was produced earlier than even \( \Psi^{46} \), and ultimately brings us back into the second century.

From these results, it should not be surprising that D F G do preserve archetypical readings against the rest of Greek tradition, or with only a handful other witnesses:

7:28 \( \lambda \beta \eta s \, \gamma \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha D \, F \, G \, \text{Latt sy}^{p} \)
9:5 \( \gamma \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \zeta s \, F \, G \, \text{Clement} \)
9:9 \( \gamma \varepsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \tau \alpha i \, \gamma \alpha \rho \)
9:9 \( \kappa \mu \omega \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon i s \, B^{*} D^{*} F \, G \, 1739 \)
9:16 \( \chi \alpha \rho i s \, \kappa^{*} D \, F \, G \)
9:20 \( \text{omit } \omega \zeta \, F \, G^{*} \, 6^{*} 326 \, 424^{*} 1739 \)
11:23 \( \text{ev } \eta \, \nu \kappa \tau \tau \eta \, D^{*} F \, G \)
14:37 \( \text{omit } \epsilon \nu \tau \omicron \lambda \eta \)

And from the Latin tradition apart from D F G (though 2:4 and 16:9 involve only orthographical alterations in Greek):

2:4 \( \text{ev } \pi \epsilon \iota \theta o i \, \sigma o \phi i a c s \, / \text{in persuasione sapientiae } 77 \, 78 \, 89 \)
10:20 \(+ \, \kappa a i \, o u \, \theta e w \, (\text{shorter text in SPE AMst PEL}) \)
16:9 \( \text{ev} \alpha r g i c s \, / \text{evidens } 77 \, 78 \, \text{VG AU HI} \)
The "Alexandrian" Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians

There is no question that the "Alexandrian" witnesses preserve a large number of archetypical readings. These are most clearly seen in those readings where either D F G (singly or in common) or the "Byzantine" witnesses — at times both — make their characteristic alterations. Just as D F G preserve very early readings (once their alterations are removed), so do, in particular, Ï46 and A B. Nevertheless, these witnesses, individually and as a group, also show their own unique alterations.

The Witness of Ï46

Ï46 is, of course, the earliest continuous text witness to the text of 1 Corinthians, dated to the early third century. A number of unique agreements with Clement of Alexandria show that it preserves readings from a slightly earlier period. Zuntz and, more rigorously, Mees demonstrated that Ï46 and Clement of Alexandria share a number of readings. This has been confirmed in the present study. For example, in chapter 8 the two witnesses share several singular or sub-singular readings:

8:3 *omit τον θεον Ï46 Cl*

---

1 Other witnesses, such as Ï11 and Ï15, show agreement with the readings of Ï46 and A B but are too fragmentary for full analysis. Unfortunately this is is also the case with the text of 1 Corinthians in H and I, which show agreements both with the "Alexandrians" and with D F G. A study of the texts of those manuscripts in the rest of the epistles is clearly desirable.


3 Text of the Epistles, pp. 242-52.

Furthermore, where the witnesses disagree in chapter 8, it is \( \text{P}^{46} \), with its singular or sub-singular readings, that moves away from Clement (see the discussions at the individual units of variation):

\[
\begin{align*}
8:1 & \quad \eta \ \delta \ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \varsigma \ \text{P}^{46} \\
8:2 & \quad \text{omit ti} \ \text{P}^{46} \\
8:4 & \quad \pi \rho \iota \ \delta \ \tau \epsilon \iota \ \xi \ \varsigma \ \nu \ \sigma \varsigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma \ \sigma \nu \nu \ \text{P}^{46} \ 919 \ 920 \ 999 \ 1149 \ 1245 \ 1872 \\
8:8 & \quad \mu \eta \ \phi \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \ \iota \sigma \tau \rho \omicron \mu \eta \mu \eta \ \sigma \tau \epsilon \omicron \upsilon \omicron \omicron \epsilon \nu \omicron \nu \ \text{P}^{46}
\end{align*}
\]

This close relationship is especially evident in 1 Cor. 8, so that the agreements between Clement and \( \text{P}^{46} \) cited above should be attributed to a shared tradition.\(^5\) These singular readings of \( \text{P}^{46} \) all match this manuscript’s typical corruptions. This at least indicates that the readings known to \( \text{P}^{46} \) existed, in Alexandria, in the late second century.

The unique characteristics of this scribe’s alterations have been made clear by Royse. The scribal habits of this witness include 1) errors in spelling; 2) local errors which create nonsense in the context, indicating that the scribe is not understanding (or paying attention to) what is being copied; 3) a marked tendency to omit a single word, usually through simple carelessness or oversight, or to add single words; 4) rare transpositions of text; 5) and, finally, harmonization to the near context is common.\(^6\) There also seems to be a particular interest in questions (1:13; 5:13; 9:7), though some of these may be the result of the types of errors discussed by Royse. These observations caution one to view the unique readings of \( \text{P}^{46} \) as that scribe’s own creation, rather than readings which reach back to the archetype.

A few other observations are possible. \( \text{P}^{46} \) is frequently the only witness to shift verb

---

\(^{5}\) At 3:5 \( \text{P}^{46} \) B Clement share a corruption: \( \tau \omicron \omicron \eta \) for \( \tau \alpha \).

\(^{6}\) Royse, pp. 282-83.
tenses. Royse finds eight examples in the manuscript, five of which are to the aorist and three of these to the present. Zuntz sees influence from general Septuagintal usage here, but it is more likely simply a scribal trait, as shown by Royse. For example, at 10:27 ὑπερ alone reads φαγετε. Paul uses the present imperative ἐσθιετε also in 10:27, 28, and 31, and while it is possible to argue that φαγετε was altered to match to the later examples, there would be no reason to use the aorist at 10:27.

While, as Royse notes, the manuscript frequently appears to have little awareness of the sense of the text, some alterations show clumsy attempts to make the text readable. The formulaic nature of εὐχαριστοὶ τῷ θεῷ at 14:18 led some scribes to construe παντῶν υμῶν as the ones for whom thanks are given. ὑπερ 1874 add ὑπέρ (cf. 2 Cor. 1:11; Eph. 1:16; 5:20); 5 1311 add περὶ (cf. Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 1:4; Col. 1:3; 1 Thes. 1:2; 2 Thes. 1:3). In this context, however, this is in error, since παντῶν υμῶν is expressed in the genitive here as a comparison (μᾶλλον) to Paul. This indicates a desire for a readable text, but a myopic approach that works at the level of clause rather than sentence. However, the scribe of ὑπερ recognized the problem by the time he reached the end of the sentence, for now μᾶλλον must function absolutely (meaning “more than ever”), with which the first person λοι no longer

---

7 Royse, 270-71. However, he mistakenly identifies φαγετε at 1 Cor. 10:27 as a future indicative; it is in fact an aorist imperative. The counts provided here take this correction into account.

8 Zuntz, p. 19.

9 Some corruptions result in the opposite of Paul’s meaning: at 13:5 it reads ἐσπαχμονεῖ in place of σπαχμονεῖ.

10 Υπὲρ + accusative can be used to express comparison (BDAG, s.v. ὑπέρ (B)), but not ὑπέρ + genitive.

11 BDAG, s.v. μᾶλλον (1).
makes sense. $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ solves the problem by writing the infinitive $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu$ in place of $\lambda \alpha \lambda \omega$, now functioning as object of $\epsilon \upsilon \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omega$, so that the sentence is now rendered: "I give thanks to God for you, that you speak in tongues more than ever." Here, however, the one speaking in tongues is not Paul but the Corinthians. This solution may have been suggested by the $\theta \varepsilon \lambda \omega$ . . . $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \iota$ in the next sentence. Here we find the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ attempting to create a text that construes, even if his improvements require further alterations that alter substantially its sense.

Nevertheless, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ alone preserves the archetypical readings at 12:10: $\epsilon \nu \rho \gamma \iota \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \upsilon \nu \nu \alpha \mu \varepsilon \omega \zeta$.

**Codex Sinaiticus**

Codex Sinaiticus carries many early readings. Most notably, it preserves the archetypical text at 7:38 ($\pi \omicron \iota \epsilon \iota$, joined only by A) and 9:16 ($\chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma$ joined only by D F G latt). On the other hand, it is poorly copied, attesting numerous corruptions, in particular parablepsis. Aside from the characteristics that it shares with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ A B (discussed below), it seems to have been copied from an exemplar that had been corrected. This does not often lead to nonsense readings, as is the case in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and B. But at 7:13 $\aleph^{*}$ reads $\omega \tau \omicron \omicron$ $\alpha \nu \delta \rho \alpha$, a conflation of $\omega \tau \omicron \omicron$ in the "Byzantine" witnesses and $\tau \omicron \alpha \nu \delta \rho \alpha$ in $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$ A B C D F G 6 1739. A similar conflation occurs at 1:29 in $\aleph^{*}$: $\omega \tau \omicron \omicron$ $\theta \varepsilon \omicron \omicron$, a combination of $\omega \tau \omicron \omicron$ ($\aleph^{*}$ $\Psi$) and $\tau \omicron$ $\theta \varepsilon \omicron \omicron$ (rew), though it is not clear that this correction is by the original scribe.

**Codex Alexandrinus**

Codex Alexandrinus seems to have more errors and create more singular readings in the later parts of 1 Corinthians, at least by chap 12. Overall, the manuscript shows the kinds of omissions (3:7), editing of conjunctions (11:5, 13; esp. 12:9-10) and assimilations to the near
context (13:2) that are found in all the early witnesses. One unique feature of A, however, is its interest in verb stems. It writes απεσταλκεν at 1:17, an assimilation to the perfect verb forms in the previous sentence. At 9:18 it reads καταχρασθαι (with 33 and Origen). The infinitive of καταχρασμαι occurs both as a present (καταχρασθαι A 33\textsuperscript{12}) and an aorist (καταχρησθαι rel). However, A appears to have had difficulty with this verb stem. At 1 Cor. 9:12, A alone reads οὐ κεχρημεθα a confusion for οὐκ εχρησμεθα. Furthermore, at 1 Tim. 1:8, AP 1245 read χρησται for χρηται, the former the aorist of the -σω contract stem, perhaps to resolve a perceived difficulty in the use of the -εω contract stem with χραομαι.\textsuperscript{13} At 1 Cor. 9:18, the reading of A 33 may therefore either be accidental or intentional, but should not be considered the archetypical reading.

Another unique feature of A is its harmonization to parallels, both near and distant. At 7:20 εν τουτω is adapted from 7:24, as is ωφελουμαι at 13:2 (from 13:3). From more remote passages, at 7:39 it reads αποθανη (with 0278) from Rom. 7:2 and at 1 Cor. 12:13 reads εν σωμα εσμεν from Rom. 12:5. The harmonizations again point to careful reading and intentional editing on the part of at least one user of the tradition that preceded the copying of A.

Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus is another witness that frequently carries early readings, again in conjunction with Ψ\textsuperscript{46}. Two features of B's text merit discussion. First, B is far from a perfectly

\textsuperscript{12} Origen's citation in Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios (in catenis) 40 is an allusion: Οδ πάντως έάν τινος έχουσίαν έχωμεν, ωφελομεν καταχρασθαι τη έχουσια.

\textsuperscript{13} On the interchange of the -σω and -εω stems, see Moulton and Howard, Accidence, p. 195.
copied manuscript. In chapter 13 several of its typical errors are evident. Some are simple
blunders: καὶ αὐ at 13:3 is likely a simple corruption of καὶ εἰα (see discussion ad loc), the
dittography παντα στεγεὶ παντα στεγεὶ at 13:7, and likely the omission of the article
before αὐσῃ at 13:8.\textsuperscript{14} These errors make it more likely that B’s singular reading at 13:4 is
also accidental (see discussion ad loc). The verb form καταργησεται (13:8; again, B
alone), however, must be the result of intentional alteration, for it conforms the number of the
verb to that of its subject προφητεια. The singular noun, however, is an error since it is not
prophecy as such which is discussed, but individual examples of prophecy, thereby requiring
the plural.\textsuperscript{15} A alone also reads the singular noun, though the verb remains unaltered. Another
intentional alteration by B is found at 13:11. The aorist εγενομην is perhaps the result of
assimilation to the aorist ελθη in the parallel clause at 13:10.\textsuperscript{16} Another possibility is that the
shift to the middle was motivated by Atticism.\textsuperscript{17} B makes the same mood shift at Gal 3:24
(εγενετο Ἡ\textsuperscript{46} B) and 1 Cor. 10:2 ἐβαπτισαντο (Ὡ\textsuperscript{46} B Κ Λ Π 056 0142 0150 1739).\textsuperscript{18}

Second, B is not copied from a single exemplar. Its text has been produced by
comparison of readings among two or more witnesses. This was seen already at 14:34-35,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}B. Weiss, however (p. 75) attributes this omission to post-classical scribal
improvement, comparing the omission of the article at Eph 4:7 and 1 Cor. 7:28.
\item \textsuperscript{15}B. Weiss, pp. 17-18.
\item \textsuperscript{16}B. Weiss, p. 43.
\item \textsuperscript{17}Caragounis, p. 109 (though he provides no NT examples).
\item \textsuperscript{18}The most thorough study of the tendencies of the scribe of B is J. W. Voelz, “The
Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek,” Novum Testamentum
47 (2005), pp. 209-49. Among his conclusions (p. 212-16) are that B prefers καὶ to δὲ (p.
212), simple verbs to compounds, reflexive pronouns to personal pronouns, weak aorist
terminations on strong aorist stems, and ἄν rather than ἡν in general clauses. While this
study examines only Mark, the tendency toward simple verbs and the use of ἄν have been
observed also in 1 Corinthians.
\end{itemize}
where the use of the "umlauts" to indicate places where the scribe of B knows of other readings was discussed. Further evidence for B as an eclectic text are the singular readings that must have been caused by corrections or marginal notes in a predecessor. In a singular reading at 12:24, τι is read after υστερομενόω and τιμην is omitted. B. Weiss puzzles over the reading. He suggests that the exemplar of B read τιμην περισσοτερην, an unattested reading but one created to conform to this wording at 12:23. The scribe of B then wrote the first two letters but failed to copy the rest of the word. A more likely reconstruction is that a predecessor of B had a correction which placed τι (or perhaps ντι) above the ending μεν, so that the reconstructed reading would have been υστερουντι. The scribe of B (or a predecessor) mistook this correction to indicate an addition; τι was taken to be a pronoun and understood as the direct object of υστερομενω. Once this was copied, the τιμην at the end of 12:24 was superfluous, and so deleted.

Another example is 9:18. In the manuscript, following ουν, an abbreviation appears: μυ is written in semi-minuscule style with the legs extending out on the baseline, a small omicron is written above the μυ, and a single line extends from the lower loop of μυ. This is a unique abbreviation in B. Parallel examples in the manuscript show a small omicron written to the right of the preceding letter (as in Heb. 1:3 καθορισμον at the end of the line). Because the line would not be abnormally short without the abbreviation and because the addition brings the text into line with the prevailing "Byzantine" text, it is judged as a secondary addition. Because nothing is visible beyond this abbreviation, the original hand is likely to have read τις ουν εστιν. Corrections in the exemplar of B also explain a conflation unique to

\footnote{B. Weiss, pp. 21-22.}

\footnote{NTaP cites B as reading ουν μου εστιν, against both Tischendorf and von Soden; NA\textsuperscript{27} only notes B as incert.}
B at 2 Thes. 3:4:

καὶ ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε Ν° D° K L Ψ 056 0142 0278
καὶ ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε 075
καὶ ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε 0151
καὶ ποιησετε καὶ ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε B
καὶ εποιησαται καὶ ποιεῖται F G
ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε Ν° A
ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιησετε D°

The “Alexandrian” Witnesses and D F G

Numerous readings are shared only by F G (occasionally also D) with the

“Alexandrian” witnesses, and in particular with ψ46 B:

1:17 ο χριστος ψ46 B F G 43 927 999 Theodoret
1:18 ο λογος γαρ του σταυρου ψ46 B F* G* 21 206* 1758 Cyril
2:4 εν πειθοις σοφιας ψ46 F G
7:29 παρθενοις B F G arm (ψ46 lac)
8:10 omit σε ψ46 B F G vg
8:10 ειδωλειω ψ46 D F G 056 0142 0151
8:11 ο ασθενων εν τη ση γνωσει ο αδελφος ψ46 Ν° A D° F G 6 33 181 1739 1875
9:4 πειν ψ46 Ν B D F G
9:27 υποπιαζω ψ46 F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
10:4 πειν ψ46 Ν B D F G
10:4 η πετρα δε Ν B D*2 (F G)
10:8 εν μια ] μια ψ46 Ν° B D° F G
10:20 θουσαιν τα εθην ] θουσαιν B D F G McionE (correct!)
10:26 του κυριου γαρ Ν B C D F G
10:31 omit ποιετε (2) ψ46 F G f g m Ambr Ambst Hil
11:20 omit σου ψ46 D° F G
11:22 επαινω ψ46 B F G
12:19 παντα B F G 33
12:26 και ει τι B F G Ψ 1175 1739 1845 syh arm (και ετι ψ46)
14:23 λαλωσιν ] λαλησωσιν ψ46 F G

These indicate a closer relationship between ψ46 B F G than with Ν A on the one hand and D on the other. The fact that these shared readings are often archetypical confirms that ψ46 B F

21 Von Soden does not note the original hands of F and G.
G preserve many readings that existed in the second century.

Family 1739 (0121 0243 6 424' 1739)

A key witness for Zuntz is 1739. He argues that it is a “proto-Alexandrian” witness (with \( \Psi^6 \) B). Yet as proof that \( \Psi^6 \) and 1739 share a “special relationship,” he cites only three readings, all of which are of the “agreement in error” type seen as significant by Zuntz:

1 Cor. 15:31 \( \textit{omit } \eta \mu \omega \nu \varphi^6 \text{ 1739} \)
Heb. 5:1 \( \textit{περι } \varphi^6 \text{ 1739} \) \( \textit{υπερ } \textit{cet} \)
Heb. 13:5 \( \textit{αρκουμενος } \varphi^6 \text{ 1739 } \) \( \textit{αρκουμενοι } \textit{cet} \)

However, all three of these variants may simply be a scribal slip shared in common, rather than both manuscripts faithfully copying a corrupt text. Furthermore, subsequent research calls into question the uniqueness of the relationship between \( \Psi^6 \) B 1739. The Text und Textwert series, though in and of itself not sufficient to determine manuscript relationships, gives the following percentages of agreement with 1739 in 1 Corinthians: 0243 – 14/15 = 88%; C – 33/40 = 83%; 33 – 47/59 = 80%; Ν – 46/59 = 78%; B – 45/59 = 76%; \( \Psi^6 \) – 30/54 = 56% (a similar percentage with such witnesses as 122 181 630 1874). Furthermore, while Zuntz (p. 75) argued that 424' and 6 are dependent on 1739, Birdsall notes six places where 424' "descends without error from a source anterior to 1739."23 As Birdsall has demonstrated, in 1 Corinthians "6 and 424 while related to 1739 [are] not descended from it but from a previous stage in its descent. Both manuscripts are contaminated by other readings, but in spite of this both preserve readings of the original lost in 1739."24 This ancestor, which

---

22 Though Zuntz does acknowledge that this type of variation is common, he still includes it in the list.


Birdsall designates "x," is not assigned a precise date, but must postdate the παλαιον copy referenced in the colophon of 1739 and antedate 6 424 1739. Therefore, the ancestor manuscript must have been produced sometime after the third century and prior to the tenth.

Further, through a keen paleographic observation Birdsall further demonstrates that 1739 is not a direct copy of an early manuscript. At 1 Cor. 11:5, 1739 (also 1881) reads ακατάλυφος, a nonsense reading, where all other witnesses read ακαταλυπτω. The corruption was caused by the similarity of the form of the combination πτ in minuscule script to that of the minuscule form of φ. Therefore, 1739 could not have been copied from a manuscript that was earlier than the ninth century. Birdsall has decisively demonstrated that 1739 is not the witness that Zuntz thought it was. What still needs to be determined is what type of witness it is.

A close relationship among Ψ46 B 0121 0243 6 424ε 1739 is undeniable. A large number of shared readings, against all other witnesses, requires that conclusion. A representative list is all that is necessary to confirm that conclusion:

7:37 εν τῇ καρδιᾷ αὐτοῦ D F G K L Ψ 056 0150 0151 pm εν τῇ ἴδιᾳ καρδιᾷ ΝΑ Β Ρ 0278 al (τῇ ἴδιᾳ καρδιᾷ Ψ15) εν τῇ καρδιᾷ 6 424ε 1739
11:19 εν τῷ ιδίῳ δοκιμαὶ 424 pm Ι Ἰ Μ Β 0121 0243 6 424ε 1739 pc
15:10 εὖ γὰρ δὲ ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος 0243 1739 pc
15:10 η σὺν εἷς ΣΥΝ εἷς ΝΒ D F G 0243 0270 6 1739
15:31 Θεοῦ τινές Θεοῦ 0243 1739 pc
15:57 ΤΟῦ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΥΠΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ] 4, 5, 1, 2, 3 0121 0243 1739
16:12 ηλθή πρὸς υμᾶς 0121 0243
16:16 οὕτως καί 0121 0243 1739


26Most readings will come from chapter 15, since that is where 0121 and 0243 are most complete.
In addition, these witnesses frequently carry “Alexandrian” readings:

11:29 εσθιων και πινων Ἡ 46 Ν A B C 33 1739 ] + αναξιως Ν2 C2 D F G K L P Ψ 6 424 pm
14:14 εαν Ἡ 46 B F G 0243 0289 υδ 33 vid 1739 pc ] + γαρ Ν A D Κ L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 6 424
14:26 εκαστος Β 0201 0243 1739 ] + υμων Ν2 D F G K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 668 424
15:4 τη τριτη ημερα ] τη ημερα τη τριτη Ἡ 46 Ν A B D 1739 pc

What neither Zuntz nor Birdsall considered, however, are the numerous places where 6 1739 read with “Byzantine” witnesses against the “Alexandrians”:

1:2 και Ἡ 46 Ν A B D F G ] τε και 6 424 1739 Byz
1:23 εθνεσι Ν A B C D F G L ] ελλησιν 6 1739 Byz
2:2 ειδεναι τι εν υμιν Ἡ 46 D F G ; τι ειδεναι εν υμιν B C 1739 ]
tου ειδεναι τι εν υμιν 6 424 Byz
3:1 λαλησαι υμιν Ἡ 46 A B D F G al ] υμιν λαλησαι L P Ψ 049 6 424 1739 al
7:7 δε Ἡ 46 Ν A C D F G ] γαρ Ν2 B D2 K L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739
11:22 ειπω υμιν ] υμιν ειπω K L Ψ 6 88 424 ; ειπω Ρ

What can account for this situation? In the case of 424 the answer is obvious: It is a “Byzantine” witness which has been corrected with a set of readings that derive from “Alexandrian” readings.27 But is it possible that the “Alexandrian” readings in 6 1729 0121 0243 have resulted from the same process? A few examples are telling. At 7:37, 6 424ε read εδραιος εν τη καρδια, but 1739 places εδραιος in a different location (εν τη καρδια εδραιος); none, however, read the ιδια found in Ἡ 15 Ν A B P 0278. What can account for these readings? Only a correction that was placed in different locations by the different scribes. This reading of 6 424 1739 cannot have been produced by copying a continuous text manuscript that was similar to Ἡ 15 Ν A B P 0278. Another example is 14:5, where 0243 1739

---

27Birdsall describes the process correcting and erasing shown by 424 in “A Study of MS. 1739,” pp. 85-86.
add the implied subject τίς. 28 6, however, reads τι ερμηνευη for τις διερμηνευη. This reading is easily explained as a misreading of a marginal note which was intended to insert τις before διερμηνευη, but instead interpreted as a substitution of τι- for δι-. Another example of 6 producing a singular reading as the result of a misunderstood correction or marginal note was seen at 4:6, where ὑπὲρ ο ἀ is combination of the ὑπὲρ ο of 424 and the ὑπὲρ α of 1739. 29 The insertion of a subject in a note also took place in these witnesses at 14:31, where the implied subject εκαστοι likely stood in the margin. 6 424 interpreted the note as intending to stand for παντες, 30 whereas 0243 1739 read the note as an insertion, producing καθ ενα εκαστοι παντες. 31 In addition, 6 has long stretches of text, for example much of chapter 11, where it agrees with the "Byzantine" readings and does not attest any "Alexandrian" readings.

In the textual discussions we have already seen 1739 produce singular readings as the result of corrections or marginal notes, most notably the reading η και η αδελφη at 7:15 (for which 0243 is not extant). In fact, 1739 has numerous singular readings which can only be accounted for as attempts to incorporate notes or corrections into the text. At 12:24 the original reading of 1739 is not clear. Both von Soden and Lake 32 fail to note any correction. But NA 27 and now Swanson cite the original hand as reading ὡστεροντι and the correction

---

28 Sharing this addition are 1505 1611 1881 2495, which read διερμηνευη for διερμηνευη.


30 Another example of 424 writing a correction in the wrong location may be seen in the reading και το αυτο πνευμα at 12:4 (see discussion ad loc.).

31 This reading is shared by other witnesses, including von Soden's K mss.

reading ουστέρουμενος. An examination of the microfilm allows us to reach the following conclusions. First, -μενω is written with a thicker stroke, and there appear to be marks between μ and ε, though what lettering may have been present cannot be determined. The minuscule ν appears to have been converted to μ (easily done with a single stroke). Also, τι has had a few strokes added to alter it to εν. However the gap that would have been between ν and τ is far larger than anything nearby on the page, making it unlikely that they were part of the same word. In addition, the τ in τι (which are always connected) does not extend above the centerline, which regularly happens in this manuscript (cf. σωματί one line below and ετι two lines below). Furthermore, a space stands between -μενω and the following word, which would again be too large had ουστέρουντι been written originally. A possible reconstruction based on this evidence is that the scribe wrote ουστέρουν (and perhaps the τ of τι), then having noticed a correction in his exemplar altered ν to μ and finished the word, thereupon continuing with περιστέρον. Indeed, this is the exact correction in 424, where μενω is written above the ending τι. This would be further evidence that the exemplar of 1739 is not a direct descendant of an early manuscript. Instead it was copied from a text that was essentially of a “Byzantine” form but which contained corrections toward a text similar to B – a manuscript not unlike 424 itself.

Two readings appear to have been caused by making the correction at the wrong place. 6:9-10 In 1739, a second ou is written supralinear by a corrector following κληρονομησουσιν; the first ou, placed before βασιλειαν θεου, has not been altered. No edition notes this correction, including the collation by Lake and New, but the form of the correction is identical to that made in 6:10. "Η και ἡ αδελφη (with this accenting) at 7:15, another unique reading, again points to the introduction of a marginal note in the wrong place.
Finally, 1739 appears to have had difficulty even with lectionary markings. At 7:20, the correction shows influence from 7:24, though in an indirect manner. The text was partially erased and rewritten, obscuring the original hand. The correction as it now stands reads \( \text{ἐν τῇ κλησεὶ \ ἐν ω \ εὐκληθῇ ταὐτῇ} \). The \( \text{ἐν} \) is written on the main line over an erasure, with \( \text{ω} \) written supralinear. The style and thickness of the script matches the rubrics indicating the lectionary reading, which is also written supra linear, the \( \text{ὁρχη} \) symbol standing above \( \text{εὐκληθῇ} \). This is, however, not the correct location for the beginning of this lectionary reading (\( \text{ἐ τῇ \ ζῆ \ εβδ} \)), which should begin at 7:24 (see discussion at 7:20.77). The similarity of wording between 7:20 and 7:24 led to the accidental insertion of the lectionary note at 7:20, the text of which was then altered to match both 7:24 and the lectionary \textit{titulus}.\(^{33}\)

What results from this? Birdsall had already shown that 1739 does not trace as far back as Zuntz had thought, and that 6 424\(^{c}\) often preserve the readings of their shared archetype better than does 1739. By analyzing the types of alterations – and just as important – the places where these witnesses do not alter their base text, a clearer picture emerges of what kinds of readings we can expect to be unreliable from these witnesses. First, they will be unreliable for word order variation. As three of the agreements with the Byzantine text cited above show (2:2; 3:1; 11:22), making word order changes is difficult in an annotated manuscript. The correction must either delete the entire original text and rewrite the text in a new order, or delete the word to be shifted and rewrite it at the proper location. The latter method accounts for 1739's reading at 7:15, for example. An additional reason that these witnesses are unreliable for word order is the nature of the process of transmission itself. Corrections are frequently simply placed in the wrong location. Second, these witnesses will

\(^{33}\)Lake and New (172) attribute the correction in 1739 solely to the lectionary \textit{titulus}.\)
rarely carry a pure form of any text over any given length of copying. At times they will read with the “Byzantine” witnesses, at times with the “Alexandrian” (though they seem not to carry “Western” readings). Third, their “value” as independent witnesses to the archetypical text is minimal. With readings drawn from more than one source, it is unlikely that they will independently attest to the archetypical reading. Indeed, in this study not a single reading supported only by 0121 0243 6 424* 1739, either as a group or individually, was found to be archetypical.
The “Byzantine” Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians

Zuntz seemed to place the “Byzantine” text in high regard. He argued that “readings which recur in Western witnesses must be ancient. They go back to the time before the Chester Beatty papyrus [𝔓⁴⁶] was written; the time before the emergence of separate Eastern and Western traditions; in short, they reach back deep into the second century.”¹ In spite of this high regard, however, he finds only one place where the Byzantine text, without “Western” or “Alexandrian” support, preserves the archetypical reading (14:19 see below). If read carefully, however, it will be noticed that Zuntz regarded only those Byzantine readings as early that are also found in the “Western” text. This study confirms this assessment.

The unique readings of the “Byzantine” text suggest intentional editing. The result of this editing, almost without fail, is a clearer, more precise text that seems to spare no effort to ensure that the reader will not misunderstand the text. For example, one consistent alteration is the smoothing of transitions between clauses and sentences. Conjunctions are very frequently edited or added for this reason:

3:5 + ἀλλὰ ηԴ² Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0151
5:10 οὐ ] καὶ οὐ Ν² Δ¹ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
7:7 δὲ ] γὰρ Ν² Β Δ² Κ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739 pm
7:38 καὶ οὸ ] ὅ δὲ Ν² Κ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 pm
10:1 γὰρ ] δὲ Ν² Κ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 pm
10:27 εἰ ] + δὲ Κ Δ² Η Κ Λ Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 pm
12:9-10 + δὲ (seven times) A C
11:14 οὐδὲ ] η οὖνδὲ Δ¹ Κ Λ 056 0142 0150 pm
13:9 δὲ ] γὰρ Κ Λ 049 056 0142 0151 88 424* 915 pc
14:15 καὶ Β Φ Γ 0150 0151 ] δὲ καὶ Ν Α Δ¹ Κ Λ Ψ 048 049 056 0142 6 424 1739
14:25 τὰ κρυπτὰ ] καὶ οὕτως τὰ κρυπτὰ Δ² Κ Λ Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151

Additions or alterations are made based on the near context:

¹Zuntz, Text of the Epistles, pp. 150-52; emphasis by Zuntz.
Other additions are made for theological reasons, or assimilate to other writings:

- at least two conflations appear in these witnesses:

These types of alterations appear again and again in the discussion of individual readings. No archetypical readings were found that are attested solely by the "Byzantine" witnesses. Zuntz was able to find one, at 14:19. However, his argument is based on incorrect evidence and fails to take into account the types of changes, described here, that are so typical of these witnesses (see discussion ad loc).

As a result, the "Byzantine" witnesses are never an independent witness. They are at times correct when they read with "Western" witnesses (13:3) and at times correct when they avoid the types of alterations typical of the "Western" witnesses. But they are also at times wrong when they read with the Alexandrian witnesses. Therefore, the "Byzantine" text has been produced from a wide range of witnesses, both "Western" and "Alexandrian," or to say it

\[^2\text{NA}^2\text{ does not cite 048 here, although listed as a "Consistently cited witness of the first order" on p. 60}"; TuT does not note the reading as \text{vid}.\]
more accurately, it contains both "Western" and "Alexandrian" readings as well as its own corruptions.

**Two Significant Byzantine Witnesses: 88 and 915**

88 915 are relatively unknown witnesses. They are discussed here not because they have been found to carry an early form of the text, but because they share with D F G one of the most noted variants in 1 Corinthians: the displacement of 14:34-35. Their witness to that passage has already been discussed; here we will present material that confirms that discussion.

Already von Soden had connected these two manuscripts. He noted the partial use of the Euthalian material, and in particular the matching divisions of the Euthalian sense-line lines by the use of medial points. His analysis is supplemented by two further pieces of data: the identical marginal notations which indicating variant readings and shared unique readings (including 14:34-35).

The shared marginal notations are striking. Some provide information common to other manuscripts, such as identifying the source of an OT citation. Others give explanatory notes on items in the text, for example a list of the "sons of Joseph" at 9:15 (88 915) and a note explaining that Crispus and Gaius "are Corinthians" at 1:14 (915). The most striking marginal notations, however, are indications of the awareness of readings of other manuscripts. These are introduced with the phrase ἐν ἄλλω: "In another [manuscript]." A full

---

3He placed them in next to each other in his F1, his apparatus using the convenient designation "200f" for their shared readings.

4von Soden, p. 677. Payne (p. 152 n. 2) misunderstands these "dots" as "marking punctuation." He finds significance in the fact that the "dot" marking the end of 14:35 is that "largest red spot on the page." Such large points are in evidence, however, elsewhere in the ms., particularly in connection with the beginning and end of lectionary units.
list of these marginal notes, as they stand in 915 is provided here, with manuscript support added for the textual notes.

1:14 κορίνθιοι εἶσιν οὕτω at foot of page, with elongated ω siglum above κρίσσον

5:13 ἐν ἀλλῷ εξαρατε

7:28 ἐν ἀλλῷ | γαμήσῃς (γαμήσῃς in margin of 88)

7:33 ἐν ἀλλῷ | γαμής ??

8:8 ἐν ἀλλῷ οὖ τ | πράστησιν; since τρίστησιν is an impossible form, this is likely a misreading (or unclear photo) for οὖ παριστήσιν.

8:11 ἐν ἀλλῷ ἀπό | λλυται (ἀπολλυται marginal note in 88)

9:5 οἴοι ἰωσήφ | λάκωβος | σίμων | λούδ(ας) (same list in 88)

List of the "sons of Joseph"

10:6-9 αἱρεῖμη | ἐξο | αἱρεῖμη | αἱρεῖμη (88 reverses the first two books)

Indicates OT citation source

10:26 ψα

Indicates OT citation source

10:28 ψα

Indicates OT citation source

14:16 ἐν ἀλλῷ εὐλο | γῆς (88 has same note, with introductory formula)

von Soden does not cite an original hand of 216.
14:19 ἐν ᾀλλῳ· τῷ νο ἵ μου· (88 has same note, with introductory formula)
N A B D' P Ψ 0150 0243 5 38 43 69 81 104 256 263 326 436 467 623 630
915\textsuperscript{uu} 1175 1241\textsuperscript{i} 1319 1739 1834 1837 1881 2127 2464 sy\textsuperscript{p} Mcion Epiph
GrNy Dam

14:25 ἐν ᾀλλῳ· προσ | κυνεί

88, which reads προσκυνεῖ, has a notation in the text pointing to this marginal note:
πρωσωπον προσκ

15:22 ἐν ᾀλλῳ· ἀπὸ | θνῆσκωσιν

915\textsuperscript{uu} reads αποθνησκομεν, a singular reading

88 does not have all the notes. Furthermore, some marginal notations in 88 must have been
adopted from a predecessor. This is demonstrated most clearly by the marginal note at 9:5.
There 88 omits, due to accidental leap, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ. This spot is marked in the text with
the siglum ꞌꞌ. This, however, does not fill in the missing text but points to the marginal note:
ὑιοὶ ῥπηφ | ἱάκωβος· σίμων· λούδαζ]. The identical note is present in 915. Thus the
very text that the note explains is missing from 88, and must have existed in a predecessor
manuscript. 915 reads both καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ (hence the error is unique to 88) and the marginal
note. Again at 14:25 88 has the symbol ꞌꞌ in the text, which points to πρωσωπον προσκ.
The note is obviously incomplete and useless in 88, but the note in 915 supplies what the note
should have been: προσκυνεῖ.

Furthermore, 88 makes corrections using a notation system that is independent of the
notes found in 915. At 11:25 88 places a slash (/) in the left margin. This must indicate the
omission of ος αν πινητε, an omission shared by 915. However, 88 marks the omission,
while 915 does not. The same mark is used at 15:5, which may indicate, in place of ἐπειτα,
either the reading ειτα (Φ\textsuperscript{46} B P L Ψ 6 1739) or καὶ μετα ταυτα (D' F G).

A cross (+) is placed in the margin in five places in 1 Corinthians, with varying
functions. Text lost by parablepsis is replaced at 3:2 (αλλα ουδε ητι νυν δυνασθε). In three places it appears to note alternative readings: at 7:6 the only known Greek variant is γνωμην (823 2815) for συγγνωμην, but the Latin tradition splits: indulgentium VL 89 V Te Ir Cy or veniam 64 Te Cy (= συγγνωμην) for consilium 75 77 vel 78 Cy ( = γνωμην); at 7:10 it may mark χωρισθηναι where other witnesses read χωριζεσθαι (A D F G pc) or χωριζεσθω (ι6 614); and 9:2 it likely marks της εμης αποστολης, for which an alternative is μου της αποστολης (N B P 0150 33 1739 pc). Finally, at 14:16 it apparently marks ευλογησης, for which a note identical to that in 915 is provided at the foot of the page: εν αλλω ευλογης (discussed above).

Apart from the displacement of 14:34-35, these witnesses do not carry early readings. However, the fact that manuscripts are noting alternative readings shows the process by which the text of 1 Corinthians would have been altered even in the later periods of transmission. In at least some cases, scribes did not simply copy what was in front of them, but made comparison to other witnesses and marked differences in the margins. While the relatively few notations in 88 915 do not amount to anything approaching a textual apparatus, they do show that the text was copied, compared, altered, and copied again, one reading at a time. Any attempt to work back through these alterations to earlier forms of the text must therefore proceed in the same way: One reading at a time.
Concluding Observations

The goal of this study has been realized: To apply the principles of thoroughgoing eclecticism to the readings of the Greek manuscripts of 1 Corinthians, in order to determine how and, where possible, why the manuscripts were altered in the earliest period of transmission, that is, up to the fourth century. Witnesses were compared against themselves, with the result that characteristics of the key witnesses have been identified. They were also studied within the context of the linguistic, theological, and ethical developments of the period, and the effects that these developments had on the text has been described. Here, a brief summary describes what has been observed in the process of transmitting the text of 1 Corinthians.

What types of alterations does one find in the witnesses of 1 Corinthians? The vast majority, of course, involve mundane causes. Parablepsis is common; no witness escapes it entirely, though some show it more than others. The addition of words from the near context is very common, and explains numerous alterations (perhaps most significantly at 2:4). Conjunctions are frequently added and changed. No manuscript reliably transmits them (see 14.15, 14:23; 15:6, 14, etc.) The procedure of NA27, to typically follow B in these cases unless obviously incorrect, simply accepts this manuscript's editing rather than another's. It is clear, however, that B and its related witnesses make numerous alterations, though it must be recalled that the Byzantine witnesses alter conjunctions far more frequently than other witnesses.

In addition, however, the relatively recent recognition that readings were prompted by the theological and ethical concerns of the communities that produced and used the manuscripts has helped explain numerous alterations in 1 Corinthians. For example, there is a concern for propriety in marital and sexual discussion (7:5; 7:33-34; 9:5), and Paul and his
authority receive particular attention (1:1; 3:5; 9:1; 11:2).

On the other hand, some types of alterations that might have been expected were not evident in 1 Corinthians. There is a surprising lack of harmonization to liturgical texts at 11:23-25. There is an absence of “anti-feminist” readings, even though some have posited this as a potential motivation at 7:2 and 14:34-35. Furthermore, there is no evidence of such a concern in the readings at 11:2-16. The manuscripts also fail to show any concern for Gnostic theology (15:15; 15:45). Only rarely is an insertion made from another Pauline book, and even less rarely from other writings (including the adaption of LXX citations). The most obvious example of large scale additions and moving text is seen at the end of Romans and 1 Cor. 14 in D F G and the Latin tradition (see 14:34-35).

Whether or not conjecture is a valid procedure in textual criticism was discussed in interaction with the issues at 4:6 and 14:34-35. This study has found no manuscript evidence of lengthy additions or omissions of the type often posited for 11:2-16 and 14:34-35. On the other hand, it was found necessary to conclude that in a surprising number of places the entire tradition is corrupt, or that the archetypical reading is preserved in only a handful of witnesses that would not be accepted by most as “significant.”

1:2 omit τη σωση εν κορινθω
2:4 read πειθοι (61 75 77 89 Ambrose Ambrosiaster)
6:5 καὶ των αδελφων is lost
10:5 omit ὅ θεος or ὅ κυριος (shorter text in 81 257 1610 Cl Mcionb)
10:20 omit καὶ ὃ θεω (shorter text in Speculum Ambrosiaster Pelagius)
14:25 omit ὅ θεος
14:33 omit ὅ θεος
16:9 read εναργης (evidens 77 78 89 VG)

All of these proposed conjectures match the types of alterations seen throughout the manuscript tradition. In most cases the implied subject is added, or the addition clarifies the argument. In two cases, it is proposed that orthographical variation has corrupted the entire
Greek tradition, but since the Latin was not liable to the same type of alteration in those cases, it preserves the archetypical reading. On the other hand, several interpolations proposed by others have been shown to be unnecessary (e.g., 4:6; 15:31).

This results in several implications for the study of the text of the Pauline epistles. First, individual units of variation cannot be discussed without an understanding of how the individual witnesses have produced their texts. Some are comparing readings found in more than one witness. In some cases this happened through incorporating marginal notes or corrections into the text (6 424 1739). In others, it appears that other manuscripts were consulted (D), or even readings found in other languages (F G). Even the manuscript’s format can affect its readings, as scribes altered the text to suit the layout (D). Understanding that different scribes are copying and editing in different ways helps explain how witnesses that generally do not show any unique relationship will, on occasion, share a unique reading.¹

Second, scribes worked locally. The distilling of a complex tradition such as the text of the Corpus Paulinum into “text types,” and then evaluating readings and even manuscripts based on how they perform against the one’s preferred “text type,” is an oversimplification of the process of transmission. Argumentation such as this is frequently encountered in the discussion of the text of 1 Corinthians: “What remains to be considered is the external evidence. Not much needs to be discussed, since it is rather obvious that καυχησώμαι has by far the best attestation, being supported by all the best Greek witnesses (𝔓⁴⁶ Π Α B) as well as the Coptic versions and some Church Fathers. This evidence speaks for itself.”² However,

¹E.g., F G⁶ and 0243 6 424⁶ 1739 (also 5 623 1245) share the reading εαν συνελθη at 14:23.

²Petzer, “Contextual Evidence in Favour of καυχησώμαι in 1 Corinthians 13.3,” p. 251. As discussed at 13:3, Petzer does interact in a significant way with the internal evidence; however, such is not always the practice of those use “external evidence” arguments in this way.
Scribes did not reproduce text types, they produced texts as they copied one letter, word, or phrase at a time. This is precisely the way the early fathers used the text. They generally worked with smaller units and focused on key terms or ideas (e.g., see the discussions at 9:5 and 7:34). Only this process of transmission can account for such a “mixed” tradition, where, for example Ν preserves the archetypical ποιεί at 7:38, joined only by A, yet at 9:16 preserves the archetypical χαριζ, joined only by D F G. Then, a few lines later, is the only witness to add the preposition at 9:18.

This is further seen by the large number of readings that individual manuscripts created on the basis of corrections and notations in their predecessors. Virtually all the manuscripts that carry early readings have been corrupted by their attempts to incorporate these corrections into their texts. Ψ46, the earliest manuscript, already shows conflations and misread corrections. Because the effect of these corrections can only be made obvious when a singular reading is created, many more corrected readings that “improved” the text were simply passed along, unable to be recognized except by conjecture. This confirms that the types of small interpolations described above are plausible.

Third, the contexts of those individual witnesses must be understood. This can be known only in the case of a handful of witnesses (for example F G), and even there only imperfectly. Nevertheless, the theological, ethical, and even linguistic developments that were taking place during the first few centuries of the transmission of the Corpus Paulinum must be understood. For example, only after a highly-developed Trinitarian theology took hold could the addition at 8:6 have been made. The meaning of vocabulary changed (e.g., παρθενος at 7:34; τύπος / τυπικός at 10:11). The use of the nomina sacra expanded to examples that were not referencing sacred things (esp. Ψ46 D at 2:14, 15; 3:1; 4:22). Grammatical preferences shifted, for example in the use of thematic stems (7:3; 9:18; and 13:2 in Ν and A).
The alterations can be explained in a satisfactory manner only when understood within the historical setting of the early period of transmission. This also demonstrates one of the limitations of a study such as this: It will, in a sense, never be complete. The range of early Christian literature is vast, and no individual could possibly master all of it. Alterations that seem to be simple blunders to one individual will be recognized as the result of a profound theological shift by another. A study such as this, therefore, is an invitation to others to apply their unique expertise to the study of the witnesses and their readings.

While the goal of this study has not been a reconstruction of the history of the transmission of I Corinthians, the analysis of thousands of places of variation does allow some features of this history to be known more clearly. For example, it is clear that every witness is corrupt, though in their own ways and for their own reasons. Even though F G are among the most recent witnesses that this study examined in detail, it has been demonstrated that they carry very early readings. F G have also undergone their own corruptions, indeed perhaps more than any other witness. Nevertheless, because the types of corruption and their causes have been described, those corruptions are able to be removed from consideration as potentially early readings. The same can be said for \( \Psi^{46} \), which had already been carefully described by previous researchers. This process continued as manuscripts were copied, compared, and created their own unique readings. In this process, however, the readings of the earlier witnesses were often replaced. Additions once made are simply perpetuated. Smoother and harmonized readings replace the less clear and obtrusive readings. Ultimately, the "Byzantine" text, with access both to "Western" and to "Alexandrian" witnesses, produced the least difficult text of all.

Zuntz had a different picture of the tradition. The purity of \( \Psi^{46} \) B 1739 was initially corrupted by a "wild" second century text (which D F G partially preserve). The influence of
Alexandrian philology, however, led early scholars to seek out and copy uncorrupted manuscripts, of which \( \Psi^46 \) B 1739 are the best witnesses. While these witnesses unquestionably carry early readings, this study has made clear that they are not so pure, nor D F G so corrupt. Indeed, rather than showing corruption being replaced by purity, many early readings now preserved in D F G were replaced by inferior readings by \( \Psi^46 \) B 1739. By repeated copying and comparison they supplanted the older readings. Even the early readings in the Latin tradition were eventually overwhelmed by the Vulgate, which was based on “Alexandrian” witnesses. The “Byzantine” witnesses preserved a few of these “Western” readings, and so they ended up in early printed editions. However, the rediscovery of \( \Psi^46 \) and then \( \Psi^46 \) removed even the few readings that had survived. Beginning with the editions of Tischendorf and then Westcott and Hort, and culminating in our present-day editions, the “Alexandrians” have been so influential that many second century readings have simply been ignored. No witness is perfect. Even if this study has highlighted the early readings found in the bilinguals and the Latin tradition, it has also identified numerous corruptions in the same witnesses. Nevertheless, until witnesses beyond the “Alexandrians” are understood and heard from, we will have only imperfect knowledge of Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians.