

A Textual Commentary on Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians

Volume I

Jeffrey John Kloha

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of PhD

The University of Leeds

Department of Theology and Religious Studies

August, 2006

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgment

Acknowledgments

The two individuals who have most influenced my academic life have been inseparably involved in this project. Prof. J. K. Elliott has provided his meticulous guidance throughout. It has been an honor to work under his direction. I only hope that I can begin to emulate his model of outstanding scholarship and warm collegiality. My family and I also thank him and his wife, Carolyn, for their kind hospitality on numerous occasions, particularly during our time in Harrogate. Moving a family to England and back again would have been far more difficult without their help. Prof. James W. Voelz, who suggested that I study under Prof. Elliott, has been for many years a teacher to me, and now also colleague and friend. I would not have undertaken graduate work without his encouragement, and throughout this project he continued to show interest and serve as an occasional sounding board. Without these two men this project would not have been started, let alone been completed.

Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri (USA), where I teach, made this project possible through financial support and a study leave. I wish to express particular gratitude to Prof. Andrew Bartelt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, who was primarily responsible for overseeing my progress and handling many of the details involved in completing an international degree. Prof. David Berger, the Librarian, was also very helpful in tracking down materials and even acquiring a few microfilms for this project.

I wish to extend thanks also to Prof. Roger Gryson for allowing me to use the *Vetus Latina* facilities in Beuron, and to Herr H. Stanjek and Dr. Walther Thiele for their hospitality during my stay. Prof. Gryson also allowed a large amount of manuscript photographs to be sent to me in anticipation of work on the *Vetus Latina* edition of 1 Corinthians. Without these materials the analysis of the Latin tradition would have been

much impoverished. Prof. Barbara Aland, graciously gave permission to use the collection at the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster, and I thank Dr. Klaus Wachtel for his welcome and assistance.

Much-appreciated reactions to early versions of some of this material were offered by Prof. David Parker and Prof. Michael Holmes. *In memoriam* I would also like to mention Prof. Neville Birdsall, who spent an entire day listening and responding to my work. Would that he were able to see it now complete.

Several institutions and libraries granted me access to items in their collections or provided microfilms: Trinity College, Cambridge; the Hatcher Library at the University of Michigan; the St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek; the Fulda Landesbibliothek; Trinity College Library, Dublin; the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

A section intended for this thesis was previously published as “1 Cor. 6:5: A Proposal,” *Novum Testamentum* 46 (2004), pp. 132-42; it is provided here as an appendix. A portion of the D F G section has been previously published in the 2005 *Bericht* of the Vetus Latina Institut. Other portions of the same chapter were read at the 2003 Colloquium on Textual Criticism at the University of Birmingham. A portion of the discussion of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 has been accepted as a paper to be read at the 2006 Society of Biblical Literature meeting in Washington, D.C.

There would be no reason to thank anyone else without my wife, Susan. Her support, encouragement, sacrifice, and love, far beyond what she will ever receive back from this, made it possible for me to focus on such a painstaking project. To her, and my daughters Taylor and Gabrielle, all of whom are owed much more, I dedicate this project.

Abstract

The textual problems of the Pauline epistles have rarely received systematic study since the work of Günther Zuntz in 1953. This thesis is a study of the text of 1 Corinthians using a different methodology, called “thoroughgoing eclecticism.” The textual data was gathered from collations of manuscripts and critical editions, and is provided as an appendix to the thesis.

The discussion of the textual problems in 1 Corinthians comprises most of the thesis. In them, effort was made to determine whether a given type of variation is typical of any single manuscript or of manuscripts in general. The focus is placed on determining the cause of corruption in each place. This required study of the history of the development of the Greek language and comparison with theological and ethical discussions among early Christians. Detailed discussions are necessary for many problems, including 6:5, where a conjecture is found to be necessary; 7:33-34 and 9:5, where issues of marriage and sexuality led to corruption; 13:3, where transcriptional and structural issues become prominent, and 14:34-35, where a complicated displacement of text involved issues of manuscript attestation, interpolation, and anti-feminism.

The manuscripts that most frequently attest to early readings and unique forms of the text are then assessed. The most unique witnesses to the text of 1 Corinthians are the Greco-Latin bilinguals D F G. Their relationship and unique causes of corruption are described, with the result that F G are shown to frequently preserve the earliest reading. \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B are also discussed. These witnesses attest many excellent readings, but have undergone their own types of corruptions. The “Byzantine” witnesses are summarized, demonstrating that they carry only a late form of the text.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Discussion of 1 Corinthians, Chapters 1-16	28
The Bilingual Manuscript Tradition and its Witness to the Text of 1 Corinthians	609
The “Alexandrian” Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians	693
The “Byzantine” Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians	708
Concluding Observations	714
Appendix: Textual Apparatus of 1 Corinthians	720
Appendix: “1 Cor. 6:5: A Proposal.”	1311
Bibliography	1322

Introduction

The study of the text of the *Corpus Paulinum* as a body of literature with a history and manuscript tradition distinct from that of the Gospels has rarely been undertaken.

Bernhard Weiss,¹ more than a century ago, focused his work on the text of Codex Vaticanus. Hans Lietzmann² provided a few brief yet insightful observations in the introduction to his commentary on Romans. The most significant textual study, however, remains Günther Zuntz's 1953 *The Text of the Epistles*.³ Interaction with his work will be evident throughout this study. Smaller studies have since appeared on individual books, the most important of which is by Michael Holmes.⁴ However, apart from scattered journal articles and particular attention paid to the Latin tradition,⁵ relatively little notice has been paid to the unique challenges and gains that a careful study of the *Corpus Paulinum* would repay.

This thesis investigates the textual problems of this body of literature through a detailed study of one letter: 1 Corinthians. This letter is particularly suited such a study for several reasons. First, its length (16 chapters) yields a sufficient amount a material for analysis. Second, in contrast to writings like Ephesians, there is strong consensus regarding

¹B. Weiss, *Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 14,3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896).

²H. Lietzmann, "Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe," in *An die Römer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933).

³G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1953). Unless otherwise noted, all citations referenced as "Zuntz" will be from this source.

⁴M. Holmes, "Reasoned Eclecticism and the Text of Romans," in *Romans and the People of God*, eds. S. K. Soderlund, and N. T. Wright, pp. 187-202 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

⁵Esp. H. J. Frede, *Allateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1964), pp. 88-101.

its authorship, so that stylistic comparisons can be made to other writings by the same author.

Third, in contrast to other letters, such as 2 Corinthians, there is little dispute regarding the sources and integrity of the letter, again allowing for comparison to other Pauline writings.⁶

Fourth, in contrast to Romans, which fits the previous three criteria, there is no textual uncertainty such as is found at the end of that book (particularly chapters 15-16).⁷ Finally, 1 Corinthians was one of the two letters examined by Zuntz, so assessment of and comparison to his work is possible.

The Corpus Paulinum

The process by which the letters of the *Corpus Paulinum* were collected and preserved is still uncertain.⁸ The collection has likely undergone some enlargement and

⁶Previous commentators had regarded both 1 and 2 Corinthians as composite documents, in particular J. Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, Neudruck der völlig neubearbeiteten Auflage 1910 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), pp. XL-XLIII and, specifically on the most questioned section, 1 Cor. 8-10, pp. 210-213. Instructive, however, is the recent *Festschrift* volume presented to Margaret Thrall (T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott, eds. *Paul and the Corinthians. Studies on A Community in Conflict*, SNT 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003)), in which there was no consensus among the various contributors regarding the integrity of 2 Corinthians, but complete agreement regarding the unity and integrity of 1 Corinthians, including the previously disputed 1 Cor. 8-10. See further on this passage W. Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 1. Teilband 1 Kor 1,1-6,11, Evangelisch-Katholisch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Zürich: Benzinger, 1991) [hereafter Schrage I], pp. 66-68 and A. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 608-609: “The coherence of these chapters and of Paul’s argument may seem vulnerable *only if the passages are removed from their context, or if the varied circumstantial differences between specific cases under review are neglected.*” (emphasis original).

⁷The most thorough study is H. J. Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*, Studies and Documents 42 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977). See also, with slightly different conclusions, P. Lampe, “Zur Textgeschichte des Römerbriefes,” *Novum Testamentum* 27 (1985), pp. 273-7.

⁸The most recent summary of the discussion is S. E. Porter, “When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories,” in *The Pauline Canon*, ed. S. E. Porter, Pauline Studies (Past) 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 95-127.

rearrangement,⁹ and there may have been some earlier “pre-collections.” Pauline manuscripts from prior to the period of the “great uncials” are typically fragmentary; only \mathfrak{P}^{46} is relatively complete, and of the twenty-three surviving papyrus manuscripts containing any of the Pauline writings, only \mathfrak{P}^{13} \mathfrak{P}^{30} \mathfrak{P}^{34} \mathfrak{P}^{61} contain more than one letter.¹⁰ However, the basic content and sequence of the surviving manuscripts – including 1 Corinthians – is traceable to a single collection.¹¹ Furthermore, the shared corruptions – *Leitfehler*, in Zuntz’s terminology – point to a single source for the extant manuscripts. This is most clearly seen in the shared corruption at 1 Cor. 6:5 as well as several others posited, for example, at 1:2; 2:4; 14:25, 33; and 16:9 (see discussions *ad loc.*). Extant evidence furthermore suggests that the letters were not copied in the same manuscript with gospel writings until the 4th century, and right up to the beginning of the age of printing they continued to circulate independent of other NT writings.¹² This has several implications for the manner in which the textual tradition is evaluated. For example, is it possible to reconstruct only the text of that collection, or can one reconstruct the text of the author? Can one discuss and evaluate only

⁹For example, the addition of Hebrews in the east, as seen in its shifting position in \mathfrak{P}^{46} and the *capitula* of B. Furthermore, the sequence of letters is consistent in the manuscripts, apart from Marcion’s shift of Galatians and a minor difference in D and parts of the Latin tradition.

¹⁰For a review of the content of the papyrus manuscripts of the Pauline letters, see D. Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung*, *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus* 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 23-29.

¹¹See H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 58-63; and E. H. Lovering, Jr., “The Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum” (Ph.D. diss, Southern Methodist University, 1988), who argues that a single collection was in existence already in the second half of the first century. D. Trobisch (*Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung*) posits two first-century “pre-collections.” Zuntz (p. 14) claimed that “the ten ‘Pauline’ Epistles, including Ephesians, in manuscripts, versions, and references represent one established entity” and dates this collection to “about 100.”

¹²J. K. Elliott, “Manuscripts, the Codex and the Canon,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 63 (1996), pp. 105-23.

the style of the compiler of the corpus, or can one discuss and evaluate the style of the author, thereby reaching back behind the collection? Zuntz, for example, thought it possible for the usual tools of textual criticism to reach back only to this single collection¹³ and that it is possible to discuss pre-collection readings only as *emendatio*. He concludes: “Thus +/- 100 is a probable date for the collection and publication of the *Corpus Paulinum*; that is, forty or fifty years after the letters were written. Here then, as in the tradition of all ancient authors, ‘archetype’ and ‘original’ are not identical.”¹⁴ However, Zuntz is working with what is essentially a documentary approach (as outlined below), and believes that the only attainable text can be found in the manuscripts.¹⁵ Other methods, such as thoroughgoing eclecticism, and the use of patristic and versional evidence, allows one to reach further back, even in some cases beyond the collection of the *Corpus Paulinum*, wherever and whenever that may have been compiled. As W. Petersen notes, greater use of the patristic evidence creates new possibilities: “The question facing textual critics today is not ‘How far back can we go’ . . . Rather, the question is “How far back do we *wish* to go?”¹⁶

In this study, the term “archetypical” is used to refer to the earliest attainable form of the text, the text from which subsequent copies were made. This would have been the text used by the compiler of the corpus, but alterations may have been made to this text prior to, and in the process of, its adoption in the corpus.

¹³A suggestion made already by Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, pp. 1-4.

¹⁴Zuntz, p. 14. His helpful “stream” analogy of the textual tradition (described below), assumes the transmission of *manuscripts*, not *readings*.

¹⁵This limitation in Zuntz is pointed out by R. V. G Tasker, “The Text of the ‘Corpus Paulinum’,” *New Testament Studies* 1 (1955), pp. 180-91.

¹⁶W. L. Petersen, “What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?” in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), pp. 136-52; quote from p. 151.

The Defining Work on the Text of the Epistles: Günther Zuntz

Trained as a classical philologist, Zuntz adopts Maas'¹⁷ outline of *recensio*, *examinatio*, *emendatio*.¹⁸ He acknowledges that the transmission history of the text of the Epistles is too complex for *recensio* alone:

Faced with a tradition of this kind, the strictly genealogical method of textual criticism becomes inapplicable. It presupposes the existence of a definite archetype recoverable from extant copies through unambiguous lines of descent . . . It cannot do justice to such wider aspects of the tradition as are implied by the terms 'Alexandrian' or 'Caesarean'; for it presupposes a rationality and fixedness contrary to the very character of this tradition.¹⁹

Nevertheless, Zuntz works from within a documentary framework by comparing the earliest extant copy of the *Corpus Paulinum* (P⁴⁶) with other witnesses. He first evaluates individual readings (*examinatio*), from which a clearer picture of the *recensio* emerges, which then further serves to clarify difficult passages.

Zuntz reaches five major conclusions. First, the *Corpus* was compiled right at, or just before A.D. 100. This collection may have been based on earlier, smaller collections (though not a previous full collection) and was most likely produced in Alexandria. Second, a popular or "wild" text prevailed in the second century, apparently derived from a common source or even "early revision."²⁰ No tradition is completely free of the readings (corruptions) created during this period of the lack of a controlled tradition. No suggestions are given as to the

¹⁷Zuntz acknowledges his debt to Maas in the preface, x. He does so similarly in other writings; cf. M. Hengel, "Günther Zuntz." *Lukian Von Antiochien Und Der Text Der Evangelien*, hrsg. B. Aland and K. Wachtel (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1995), p. 65.

¹⁸For the third step, Maas uses the term "*divinatio*" = "conjecture"; Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), §§2, 15.

¹⁹Zuntz, p. 155.

²⁰Zuntz, p. 266.

reasons an interest in philology would have existed only among a small group of those using the epistles, only that contact by Christians with Alexandrian philology led to an attempt to control and preserve the wording of the text *per se*.

The third conclusion is significant because, for Zuntz, it forms the basis for his limited attempt at *recensio* and often impacts his evaluation of individual readings. For Zuntz, the text represented by \mathfrak{P}^{46} B 1739 is representative of the efforts of scholars influenced by Alexandrian philology to purify the text:

The ‘tendency’ which we have noticed over and over again is to substitute the original reading for corruptions of every description which dominated the popular second-century texts. This could be done only by the competent selection of manuscripts with a pure text to serve as a standard for correction. Such manuscripts must have been rare at the time: otherwise we ought to find evidence of their use by the earliest Fathers, who actually without exception all quote from the current, ‘wild’ text. In the decades around A.D. 150 this was the form which manuscripts in all parts of the Christian world propagated, with a wide margin of individual variation yet basically identical. In this *massa confusa* to seek, and to find, manuscripts of a purer quality; to use them for the correction of the current text; and to persist, in spite of the impact of the generally accepted, and corrupt, tradition, in the propagation of improved texts—all this bespeaks something very much like expert philological criticism.²¹

Zuntz does note that this “restoration” was a process, which occurred over a long period of time. There was not a single attempt to restore the text, from which later manuscripts are corruptions; rather, he argues that the text found in the later “Alexandrians” were simply less successful and more prone to interference from the “wild” text.

Two conclusions deal with what has commonly been called “text types” (a term which he finds inappropriate). The “Western Text” is not exclusively “western,” and very rarely is there a reading that is found only in “western” witnesses. Rather, the “Western Text” is a representation of the second century “wild” text.²² Frequently, when it agrees with later

²¹Zuntz, pp. 251-52.

²²This seems to parallel closely the view expressed in K. W. Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis De Zwaan Septuagenarii*, ed. J. N. Sevenster, and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953), pp. 59-64, where

manuscripts of the Alexandrian or even Byzantine text, it witnesses to the original text; when only Western witnesses attest to a reading, according to Zuntz, they are always wrong. The Byzantine text is seen as a later development of the Alexandrian tradition. In places it preserves the original wording which was unavailable to or lost by the Alexandrian editors. Finally, Zuntz concludes that the division of the tradition into “text-types,” as the term had been used in textual criticism, does not explain the evidence. There was never an “Alexandrian” text, as distinct from a “Western” text, and finally a “Byzantine” text, each of which with their own transmission history and set of corruptions. Instead, Zuntz prefers the image of a stream,²³ with one branch, the Western, splitting off early and, on the other side, the Alexandrian and Byzantine branch. Occasionally one branch affected the other, most notably in the case of the Vulgate. However, because the same variants appear in different branches and in different individual witnesses, Zuntz believed that most variation took place early. Even late manuscripts may preserve early and even original readings. This is the result of his basic understanding of the way the text was handled in the second century. He concludes that already by the end of the second century the vast majority of variants had

manuscripts exhibiting a “free text,” a “normal text,” or in the case of the “Western Text” a “periphrastic text” (though apparently only for the Gospels and Acts) existed alongside a “strict text,” which would apparently be equated with the efforts ascribed to philologists influenced by the Alexandrian school. This sounds remarkably similar the categories employed in K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd, rev. and enl. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1989). Later, in Zuntz, *Lukian Von Antiochien Und Der Text Der Evangelien*, hrsg. B. Aland and K. Wachtel, *Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Jahrg. 1995*, 2 Abhandlung (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1995), p. 36 n. 102, Zuntz himself strongly criticized the Alands’ categories, particularly on the circularity of the argument that the current edition of Nestle-Aland is the “original text” and that manuscripts can be judged as to their value on the basis of their level agreement with that edition.

²³A comparable use of imagery is found in Maas, *Textual Criticism*, §21: “The following simile perhaps corresponds more precisely: A river comes from an inaccessible source under the peak of a high mountain. It divides underground, its branches divide further, and some of these branches then come to the surface on the mountain side as springs. . .”

come into being.²⁴ Indeed his table of Byzantine readings supported by \mathfrak{P}^{46} demonstrates that readings previously denigrated as “late” and “Byzantine” are neither.

Reactions to Zuntz

The lengthiest notice of *The Text of the Epistles* was written by R. V. G. Tasker, whose purpose is more informative than evaluative.²⁵ Interspersed in the summary, however, are some pertinent criticisms. For example, while lauding the philological skill which Zuntz demonstrates, Tasker at the same time remarks at the failure to take into consideration a “theological understanding” of the text.²⁶ He also provides helpful discussions of several variants in which he argues for a reading other than that adopted by Zuntz.²⁷

One test of the value of an original work of research is to see if its conclusions are still accepted one or two generations later. On this basis, *The Text of the Epistles* may be one of the more influential text-critical studies of the second half of the twentieth century, particularly as one rarely finds any criticism of his main conclusions. Surveys of the discipline approvingly cite Zuntz’s reconstruction of the rise of the Alexandrian text: “It is widely agreed that the Alexandrian text was prepared by skillful editors, trained in the

²⁴Similar conclusions are reached in H. J. Vogels, *Handbuch Der Textkritik Des Neuen Testaments*, 2. Aufl. (Bonn, P: Hanstein, 1955); G. D. Kilpatrick, “Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament,” in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner, 125-37 (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963); L. Vaganay, C.-B. Amphoux, and J. Heimerdinger, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 2nd ed. rev. and updated (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

²⁵Tasker, pp. 180-91. Other contemporary reviews also tended to summarize, e.g., Dom C. Butler, review of *The Text of the Epistles*, by Günther Zuntz, *The Downside Review* 72 (1954), pp. 108-11; C. S. C. Williams, review of *The Text of the Epistles*, by Günther Zuntz, *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 5 (1954), pp. 89-91.

²⁶Tasker, “The Text of the ‘Corpus Paulinum’,” pp. 180-81.

²⁷E.g., Rom. 7:25 on page 182-83 and 1 Cor. 10:11 on p. 183.

scholarly tradition of Alexandria.”²⁸ Indeed, one surveyor of the state of the study of the text of the New Testament sees this study as the foundation for all subsequent research: “In many respects one may construe the rest of the period under review as efforts to carry out the implications and live up to the model of Zuntz’s work.”²⁹

Zuntz’s conclusion regarding the relative purity of the “Alexandrian” text has received particular attention. For example, J. N. Birdsall writes,

The most striking original hypothesis proposed by Zuntz is his notion of Alexandrian philological ‘know-how’ being appropriated by Christians in their Biblical production so early as the end of the first century of the Christian era. His arguments, though circumstantial, are plausible. They have, however, received little comment or support.³⁰

Elsewhere, Birdsall sees this argument as “cogent”³¹ and further claims that the methodology developed by Zuntz becomes a “pattern” for his own studies.³²

However, not all subsequent researchers have accepted the conclusion that the Alexandrian text is the result of a process of revision. G. Fee argued, on the basis of what he

²⁸B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 215; the footnote reference in Metzger is to *The Text of the Epistles*, pp. 272-76.

²⁹M. Holmes, “Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism.” *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research, Essays on the Status Quaestionis, a Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. B. Ehrman and M. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 339.

³⁰J. N. Birdsall, “The Recent History of New Testament Textual Criticism (From Westcott and Hort, 1881, to the Present),” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, hrsg. W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), p. 169.

³¹J. Neville Birdsall, “The Western Text in the Second Century,” *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. W. Petersen (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), p. 14.

³²J. N. Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism and the Oldest Manuscripts: A Comparative Study of the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospel of Luke,” *Studies in New Testament Language and Text. Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. K. Elliott (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 39, n. 1.

saw as essentially the same methodology as that used by Zuntz, that “the concept of a scholarly recension of the NT text in Alexandria either in the fourth century *or* the second century, either as a created or a carefully edited text, is a myth.”³³ Rather, for Fee, the Alexandrian text is not a recensional text, but a “‘relatively pure’ form of preservation of a ‘relatively pure’ line of descent from the original text.” Also, the conclusion that there is an “early” or “proto” Alexandrian text and a later one, which admitted more corruptions, is argued against by B. Ehrman. Since Didymus and \aleph are contemporaries, one cannot call the former “late Alexandrian” and the latter “early Alexandrian,” even though \aleph seems to be a “purer” witness for the Alexandrian text. Thus, Ehrman concludes, the amount of corruption is probably unrelated to the age of the witness.³⁴ While both Fee’s and Ehrman’s criticisms are based on study of the text of the gospels, Zuntz himself sees the same process of Alexandrian scholarship at work both in the gospels and Pauline epistles (see note 21 above).

Many other surveys and studies which cite Zuntz could be listed; indeed, finding a book on the text of the New Testament without Zuntz’s name at the end of the index or listed in the bibliography is a difficult task. It suffices to note, however, that the most significant aspect singled for discussion and approval is not his painstaking work in evaluating scores of variants but his view of the rise of the Alexandrian text. One may legitimately ask if this conclusion of Zuntz is highlighted because subsequent scholars have traced through his discussion of individual variants, accepted them, and then accepted the conclusion; or if the

³³G. D. Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 272. Zuntz is specifically singled out for criticism on pp. 258-59; Fee cites Zuntz’s method as a model for his own on p. 268.

³⁴B. D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*. The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

conclusion matched what researchers had already concluded to be true: That the “Alexandrian” text is the best witness for the text of the New Testament.³⁵

This conclusion is born out by a survey of subsequent studies on the text of the epistles which interact with Zuntz at individual places of variation. A contrast with Zuntz’s discussion of variants may be found in an article by K. W. Clark, published in the same year as *The Text of the Epistles*. Clark was among the first to make the argument, now well established, that: “The freedom men assumed in altering [the NT] text was inspired by their understanding of Christian doctrine, and by their purpose to make it plain to others.”³⁶ Clark goes on to discuss several places of variation in 1 Corinthians which have been influenced by doctrinal considerations. Of these, Zuntz often handles the issues quite differently. 2:1 and 11:29 are not discussed by Zuntz at all; 10:19 and 15:51 are discussed, but no mention is made of the theological issues involved; 14:38 discusses the context, but the decision is based on other grounds; of these, only at 6:20 and 13:3 does Zuntz see theological motivation as a cause of corruption.

³⁵Consider the comments of Petersen regarding another form of support for the text of Codex Vaticanus: “the papyri are important to some textual critics because they extend the *manuscript* evidence for a particular textual family – the ‘Alexandrian’ or ‘neutral’ family, the family upon which the text of modern editions of the New Testament is built – back from the *fourth* century (the age of the great uncials B and \aleph) to the *third* century (the epoch from which most of the papyri date). This is apparent from Metzger’s breathless (and perhaps too revealing) description of why he thinks \mathfrak{P}^{75} is important: ‘The textual significance of this newly acquired witness is hard to overestimate, presenting, as it does, *a form of text very similar to that of Vaticanus.*’ In short, the reason the papyri are accorded ‘a significance . . . [which] is hard to overestimate’ is because they confirm the *status quo* – in other words, they confirm our biases.” From “What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?” pp. 138-39. Italics by original author. In this quotation, substitute “Zuntz’s conclusions” for “papyri” and “first century” for “third century,” and the same conclusion seems to hold: Zuntz is foundational not because the individual pieces of his work have been tested and verified, but because his conclusion supports the idea that the Alexandrian text is the “best” text.

³⁶Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” p. 55.

The details of Zuntz's arguments have been criticized on a grammatical basis as well. In particular, G. Kilpatrick has pointed out examples of efforts to improve the style of the text of the epistles witnessed by \mathfrak{P}^{46} B, for example:

Rom. 16:17 παρακαλω \mathfrak{P}^{46} *cet*] ερωτω D* *pc*³⁷
 1 Cor. 10:11 κατηντηκεν \mathfrak{P}^{46} B *al*] κατηντησεν \aleph *al*³⁸
 Eph. 3:19 τε \mathfrak{P}^{46}] *omit* D F G³⁹

Finally, the thorough study of the scribal habits of \mathfrak{P}^{46} by Royse shows that Zuntz has, at times, misread or misinterpreted the evidence of \mathfrak{P}^{46} .⁴⁰ Also, while Royse's goal is not a textual commentary *per se*, he does comment that, on the basis of the typical habits of the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{46} , he disagrees with Zuntz's choice of the original reading at 1 Cor. 7:13; 1 Cor. 8:3; and Heb. 2:8.⁴¹

Methodology of This Study

The goal of this study is to describe the types of alterations that were made to the text of 1 Corinthians, with a focus on the earliest periods of transmission. With this information, description of the types and patterns of alterations of individual manuscripts becomes possible. In order to describe the alteration, one must frequently first determine the

³⁷G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Text of the Epistles: The Contribution of the Western Witnesses" in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 96 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), p. 141.

³⁸G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus," *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 96 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), p. 48.

³⁹Kilpatrick, "The Text of the Epistles," p. 149.

⁴⁰J. R. Royse, "Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri," Graduate Theological Union, 1981. Cf. Heb. 10:1 (Zuntz, pp. 22-23, Royse, p. 277); 1 Cor. 15:2 (Zuntz, p. 230; Royse, p. 311).

⁴¹Royse, pp. 254, 312; 316; and 314-15, respectively.

archetypical reading. A thoroughgoing eclectic methodology, as described below, was used to determine the archetypical reading. Therefore, while the production of a nearly complete “original text” of 1 Corinthians would be a possible use of this material, in itself this is not the goal.

Because a thoroughgoing eclectic methodology does not favor one manuscript or groups of manuscripts over others, a comprehensive apparatus of readings was compiled. The Greek manuscript evidence was gathered in several different ways. Primary sources are the manuscripts themselves, as well as various types of photographic reproductions and critical editions.

Collated from manuscript: F 876

Collated from published photographs or facsimile: $\mathfrak{P}^{46\ 42}$ \aleph^{43} A⁴⁴ B⁴⁵ G and VL 77⁴⁶

Questionable or uncertain reading verified by examination of microfilm: Ψ 056

Collated from photographs: D 5 88 614 629 915 AMst(A) VL 75

Collated from microfilm: H K L 088 0289 6 256 263 424 489 1739 VL 78

⁴²F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*, 3 vols. (London: E. Walker, 1933-37).

⁴³K. Lake, and H. C. F. Lake, *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

⁴⁴E. M. Thompson, ed. *The Codex Alexandrinus*, 4 volumes (London: British Museum, 1879-83).

⁴⁵*Exemplum quam simillime phototypice expressum codicis vaticani B (Vat. Gr. 1209) praestantis humanitatis operis rei publicae italicae officina typographica et argentaria sumptibus sui comparavit.* Rome: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1999.

⁴⁶A microfilm of G was acquired, but the manuscript had been heavily damaged subsequent to the photographic edition produced by Alexander Reichardt, hrsg. *Codex Boernerianus. Der Briefe des Apostels Paulus (Msc. Dresd. A 145b)* (Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1909). Therefore, the photographic edition was used.

Collated from published transcriptions: C⁴⁷ I⁴⁸ P⁴⁹ 0201⁵⁰ 0270⁵¹

In addition to the manuscripts, versional, patristic and additional manuscript evidence was included from the standard critical editions of Tischendorf and von Soden,⁵² the Nestle-Aland edition,⁵³ the Pauline epistles volume from the series, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*,⁵⁴ and the 1 Corinthians volume in the *Text und Textwert* series.⁵⁵ The consultation of printed

⁴⁷C. Tischendorf, *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus sive fragmenta Novi Testamenti* (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1843). This was compared with R. W. Lyon, "A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus," *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958-1959), pp. 260-272.

⁴⁸H. A. Sanders, *The New Testament manuscripts in the Freer collection*. Part II: The Washington Manuscript of the Epistles of Paul. University of Michigan Studies, Humanist Series 9 (New York and London: Macmillan, 1918).

⁴⁹C. Tischendorf, *Monumenta sacra inedita*, vols. 5 and 6 (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1865-69).

⁵⁰W. E. Crum, and H. I. Bell, eds., *Wadi Sarga. Coptic and Greek Texts from the Excavations undertaken by the Byzantine Research Account*, Coptica, 3 (Hauniae: Gyldenalske Boghandel-Nordisk, 1922); E. Güting, "Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente London Brit. Libr. Pap. 2240 aus dem Wadi Sarga mit neutestamentlichen Text," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie and Epigraphik* 75 (1988), pp. 97-114.

⁵¹J. Smit Sibinga, "A Fragment of Paul at Amsterdam (0270)," in T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn, and W. C. van Unnik, eds., *Miscellanea Neotestamentica* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), pp. 23-44.

⁵²C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece ad antiquissimos testes*, Editio octava critica maior (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869-1872); Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911-13).

⁵³K. Aland, B. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. Martini, and B. Metzger, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition, 8th corrected printing (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001).

⁵⁴K. Junack, E. Güting, U. Nitz, and K. Witte, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*, Vol. II. Die paulinischen Briefe, Teil 1: Röm., 1. Kor., 2. Kor., Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 12 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989).

⁵⁵K. Aland, G. Mink, A. Benduhn-Mertz, and H. Bachmann, hrsg., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, Vol. II: Die Paulinischen Briefe. Band 2: Der 1. und der 2. Korintherbrief. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 17 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991).

editions made it possible to discover of the errors of each,⁵⁶ as well as to make certain that a complete range of readings and witnesses were available for study.⁵⁷ If my collation differed from a printed edition, the reading was checked again – and, unfortunately it is not possible to report that this collator has been any more free from error than his predecessors. Indeed, such a detailed process gives a new appreciation for the work of Tischendorf,⁵⁸ who worked without the aid of computers, and the editions produced by the *Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung*. The helpful edition of readings produced by R. Swanson was published shortly after the apparatus was complete. Since this should be available to most readers, the incorporation of his data into the apparatus was deemed to be an unnecessary duplication, though his volume was used constantly for reference as the project progressed.⁵⁹ Errors found in the editions are footnoted in the apparatus.

⁵⁶Von Soden's apparatus is notoriously inaccurate. See most recently J. Royse, "Von Soden's Accuracy." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979), pp. 166-71, who notes that many of the "errors" are due to the format and manuscript designation system used in this edition. Nevertheless, numerous errors have been noticed in von Soden's apparatus of 1 Corinthians. These are footnoted in this study's apparatus.

⁵⁷This was suggested by T. Baarda, "What Kind of Critical Apparatus for the New Testament Do We Need? The Case of Luke 23:48," in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, ed. B. Aland, and J. Delobel, pp. 37-97 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994). See also J. K. Elliott, "The Purpose and Construction of a Critical Apparatus to a Greek New Testament," in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments zum 80. Geburtstag Heinrich Greeven*, hrsg. W. Schrage, pp. 125-43 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986).

⁵⁸In his *Editio critica maior* at 7:2, Tischendorf even notes a typographical error in his own edition of C: read δε instead of τε.

⁵⁹R. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: 1 Corinthians* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House and Pasadena, CA: William Carey, 2003).

The patristic evidence⁶⁰ was supplemented by using various electronic resources.⁶¹ Exhaustive searches were not made merely for the sake of adding to the apparatus, but were made in order to verify and extend references when they were deemed to make a contribution to the resolution of a textual problem. In addition, the important evidence of Marcion's citations was added from recent studies.⁶² The evidence of the versions was supplemented significantly. It became apparent in the course of this investigation that the Latin tradition was extremely important for reconstructing the early transmission of the epistles. The evidence from Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate (which also included the known Old Latin witnesses) was included in the apparatus,⁶³ and the evidence of VL 89 and

⁶⁰Patristic evidence is cited using the following reference guides. For the Greek: L. Berkowitz, K. A. Squitier, and W. A. Johnson. *Thesaurus Lingua Graece. Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, Third edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). For the Latin, H. J. Frede, and R. Gryson. *Kirchenschriftsteller Verzeichnis und Sigel. Vetus Latina 1*. Freiburg: Herder, 1999. Unless otherwise noted, editions from these works were used; also, unless otherwise noted, all translations of patristic writings are my own.

⁶¹Computer textual databases consulted include *Thesaurus Lingua Graece*, CD ROM #E (1999); CETEDOC; The primary print index of patristic references to the text is: Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques, *Biblia patristica. Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975-). The card index file of citations collected by the Vetus Latina project, which are housed in Beuron, has, through the kindness of Prof. R. Gryson, been made available to me via CD-ROM images.

⁶²The most significant is U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos. Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 25 (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1995). In numerous places Schmid corrects Harnack's influential reconstruction of Marcion's text – which was used by Zuntz. Also consulted was J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul. A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph series, 21 (Washington, D.C: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989).

⁶³J. Wordsworth, and H. J. White, eds., *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-1949).

the Ambrosiaster tradition was consistently added.⁶⁴ A recent critical edition of the Syriac tradition was also consulted.⁶⁵

The basis for the presentation of readings is 1873 Oxford edition of the *Textus Receptus*. This was chosen because it had been the edition used in the International Greek New Testament Project.⁶⁶ The *Textus Receptus*, of course, has served as a collation base for generations. Because manuscripts are cited when they agree with the *Textus Receptus* as well as when they disagree, the danger of forming an incomplete picture of a witness based only on disagreements with the *TR* is removed.

For the purposes of this study, itacisms, vowel interchanges, and spelling variations were generally ignored, unless the alternate spelling could represent a truly different reading.⁶⁷ In some cases, issues such as crasis, the use of -ττ- for -σσ-, and the δ / θ interchange revealed something of the proclivities of witnesses. Further details are provided in the preface to the apparatus about the selection of which types of spelling variations were cited.

⁶⁴The critical edition of 89 is H. J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, *Vetus latina*, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 7,8 (Freiburg: Herder, 1973-1974). Ambrosiaster's text, which was only imperfectly known in the editions available to Wordsworth and White, was added from H. J. Vogels, *Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster*, *Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 13 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1957). Due to its significance, the evidence of one manuscript of Ambrosiaster, AMst(A), was collated from photographs. These witnesses are discussed in the conclusions with D F G.

⁶⁵B. Aland, and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, Vol. II. Die paulinischen Briefe, Teil I: Römer- und 1.Korintherbrief, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung* 14 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991) [hereafter NTSU]; also, J. Kerschensteiner, *Der altsyrische Paulustext*, CSCO 315, *Subsidia* 37 (Louvain: Corpus Scriptorum Christinorum Orientalium, 1970).

⁶⁶For a defense of its use, see J. K. Elliott, "The International Project to Establish a Critical Apparatus to Luke's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 26 (1983), pp. 225-48.

⁶⁷F G contain, by far, the most inconsistent and inaccurate spelling of any manuscript examined for this study. The significance of this is discussed in the conclusions.

While reading the discussion of textual problems, which forms the bulk of this study, the reader may wish to keep the appendix open to the appropriate place in the apparatus page in order to see the entire range of variation and attestation for each textual problem.

After compiling the apparatus, an initial sorting of the evidence was made by producing several lists of the units of variation (by lexical item, part of speech, and type of variation). This allowed preliminary decisions to be made regarding what types of variations would repay further investigation. At this point, it was decided that some types of variation would not be discussed. For example, if no clear direction of corruption was discernible, variations involving word order were not discussed in detail.⁶⁸ Also, simple orthography was not discussed unless it yielded evidence of manuscript tendencies or linguistic development.⁶⁹ As the analysis progressed, it became apparent that some late witnesses appeared to consistently carry early readings, and so required attention even in their singular readings. Among the latter group are F G (ninth century), 1739 (tenth), 424 (eleventh), 88 (twelfth), 6 and 915 (thirteenth). Other witnesses were examined over several chapters, but rarely or never carried early readings that were not attested elsewhere (e.g., 614 263 1241). Some witnesses proved to carry interesting readings, for example the spelling variations in 1241^s and the Greek text of the bilingual 629, which has been thoroughly adapted to the Vulgate.⁷⁰ However, because these readings said much about their scribes but little about the earliest period of transmission they were not exhaustively analyzed, nor all their readings included in the apparatus.

⁶⁸Though patterns did emerge in some types of word order variation (cf. 3:1.3; 3:11.48; 7:22.82; etc.).

⁶⁹E.g., the discussion of crasis at 2:1.1 and 13:2.7.

⁷⁰This witness, however, is from an completely different line of transmission than D F G.

Once the units of variation were identified, analysis of readings could begin. For much of the 20th century, textual criticism was engaged in discovering “Text-Types”⁷¹ into which individual manuscripts could be placed.⁷² The assumption was that, once the three or four groups could be identified, one could discover the “best” group, and within that “best” group, a “best” manuscript, which would then be given privileged position in evaluating readings. Even Zuntz occasionally falls into this circular argument.⁷³ Little attention was paid to the individual manuscripts themselves, other than to determine which reading a manuscript supported in a given unit of variation. Recent research, however, has shown that when manuscripts are examined for their own tendencies and characteristics, patterns emerge which help to determine not only what scribes “typically” did, but what individual scribes actually did. For example, in the most detailed study of scribal habits to date, Royse has demonstrated that \mathfrak{P}^{46} was written with less than scrupulous care.⁷⁴ This resulted in many examples of parablepsis, omission of individual words (particularly conjunctions), and

⁷¹This thesis will continue to use the traditional terms “Alexandrian,” “Western,” and “Byzantine,” but not with the assumption that they represent discernible “text types.” Instead, these terms refer to small clusters of witnesses that typically share readings. For example, D F G share key readings over against \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B 0201. These traditional terms are therefore readily identifiable shorthand, though it will be evident that they are not used here in the sense of identifiable recensional activity.

⁷²The classic presentation of this methodology is, of course, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1882). It is only slightly modified even in B. Metzger and B. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁷³For example, when dealing with 1 Cor. 7:39 he concludes (p. 30): “Why should a most outstanding group of manuscripts (\mathfrak{P}^{46} B 1739) have omitted the article which was protected by a parallel in the same sentence?”

⁷⁴Royse, esp. pp. 282-83.

confusion over the *nomina sacra*.⁷⁵ One should conclude from this that when \wp ⁴⁶ shows this type of variation, its witness is unreliable. While the purpose of this project is not to carry out on other manuscripts the exhaustive study that Royse and Head did for a handful of papyri, it will attempt to determine whether or not individual manuscripts can be shown to consistently or habitually show certain tendencies.⁷⁶ From this information, it will attempt to explain these alterations on the basis of what factors may have impacted the transmission of the epistles in the pre-fourth century period.

In order to move beyond the limiting nature of a primarily documentary methodology, this project will use “thoroughgoing eclecticism”⁷⁷ to evaluate the text of 1 Corinthians. G. D. Kilpatrick summarizes the methodology in a few sentences:

No readings can be condemned categorically because they are characteristic of certain manuscripts or groups of manuscripts. We have to pursue a consistent eclecticism. Readings must be considered severally on their intrinsic character. Further, contrary to what Hort maintained, decisions about readings must precede decisions about the value or weight of manuscripts. By the time that we can appreciate the manuscripts all or nearly all our decisions about the readings will have to be made.⁷⁸

⁷⁵See also P. Head, “Observations on the Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits’,” *Biblica* 71 (1990), pp. 240-47.

⁷⁶A thoroughgoing eclectic methodology does take into account the types of errors and alterations that are typical of individual witnesses. If a pattern of alteration is typically seen in a given witness, that witness will be considered unreliable for that type of variant. For example, Elliott, in a study of the *nomina sacra* in 1 Corinthians, concludes that, in cases where these are in questions, certain manuscripts are “unreliable” (F G), or that there should be some “reluctance” to follow 056 0142 because they are “often indiscriminate in their treatment of the *nomina sacra*.” Elliott, “The Divine Names in the Corinthian Letters,” in Trevor J. Burke and J. K. Elliott, eds. *Paul and the Corinthians. Studies on A Community in Conflict*, SNT 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 3-15 (quoted from pp. 11-12).

⁷⁷For a definition and summary of the procedure, see J. K. Elliott, “Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research, Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. B. Ehrman, and M. Holmes, Studies and Documents 46, pp. 321-35 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995).

⁷⁸“The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus,” in *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), p. 50. A. E. Housman provides a more scurrilous argument: “It is desired to know which MS., if either,

A documentary method, such as Zuntz used, relies on the comparison of manuscripts to each other. For this reason Zuntz compares all other witnesses to \mathfrak{P}^{46} , the earliest Greek manuscript of the *Corpus Paulinum*. Once similar manuscripts are grouped together, a loose stemma of groups can be created, which then allow the judgment of readings. Zuntz, of course, does not simply declare one group of witnesses the “best,” and accept its readings without question. But he does permit his conclusions regarding which witnesses are “better” to determine at least some readings, and reconstructs his history of the manuscript tradition on that basis. As a result, \mathfrak{P}^{46} B 1739 are generally given what we might call “the benefit of the doubt” when evaluating difficult textual problems.

A thoroughgoing eclectic methodology forces one to evaluate every reading, regardless of its source. “External evidence” plays no role in the determination of the archetypal reading.⁷⁹ It precludes any prejudgement regarding which witnesses are “best.”

is better than the other, or whether both are equal. One scholar tries to determine this question by the collection and comparison of examples. But another thinks that he knows a shorter way than that; and it consists in saying ‘the more sincere MS. is and must be for any critic who understands his business the better MS.’ I ask this scholar, this critic who knows his business, and who says that the more sincere of two MSS. is and must be the better—I ask him to tell me which weighs most, a tall man or a fat man. He cannot answer; nobody can; everybody sees in a moment that the question is absurd. Tall and fat are adjectives which transport even a textual critic from the world of humbug into the world of reality, a world inhabited by comparatively thoughtful people, such as butchers and grocers, who depend on their brains for their bread. There he begins to understand that to such general questions any answer must be false; that judgment can only be pronounced on individual specimens; that everything depends on the degree of tallness and the degree of fatness. It may well be that an inch of girth adds more weight than an inch of height, or vice versa, but that altitude is incomparably more ponderous than obesity, or obesity than altitude, and that an inch of one depresses the scale more than a yard of the other, has never been maintained. The way to find out whether this tall man weighs more or less than that fat man is to weigh them; and the way to find out whether this corrupt MS. is better or worse than that interpolated MS. is to collect and compare their readings. “The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism,” *Selected Prose*, ed. J. Carter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), pp. 139-40)

⁷⁹A classic definition of “external evidence” is given in B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Second Edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), pp. 11*-12*: First, the “Date and Character of the Witness,” including the assumption that “earlier manuscripts are more likely to be from those errors

Moreover, in evaluating every reading, one is able to compile lists of similar examples of a given type of alteration. In this way, it can be determined if a given witness is prone to making such alterations, and is therefore not to be relied on for that particular type of variation. In other words, rather than comparing manuscripts to each other, thoroughgoing eclecticism allows a manuscript to be compared to itself.

Furthermore, the types of changes made in the witnesses should be compared to their contexts. While we know the provenance of only a handful witnesses,⁸⁰ we do know a great deal about the linguistic, theological, and ethical concerns of those who produced the earliest extant copies of the *Corpus*. As Ehrman has argued, at least some passages of the NT manuscripts have been altered in light of the christological controversies with which the scribes, presumably, would have been familiar.⁸¹

Only after every meaningful place of variation has been analyzed may we develop a picture of the development of the text of 1 Corinthians in its earliest period of transmission. At that point, an assessment of the witnesses is possible. One conclusion of this study is that the witness of D F G and the Latin tradition has been misunderstood. Because these witnesses

that arise from repeated copying,” as well as the “character of the text that it embodies” and “the degree of care taken by the copyist.” Second, the “geographical distribution” of witnesses. Third, the “genealogical relationship of texts and families.” And fourth, that witnesses are “weighed and not counted.” The subjective nature of such criteria as “character” and “weight” calls into question how this evidence can actually be “external.” Unless otherwise noted, citations from B. Metzger, *Textual Commentary* will be from the second edition (1994), not the first edition (1971).

⁸⁰Though those for which we have knowledge, for example F G, aid greatly in understanding the types of alterations that are made in these witnesses. See the concluding section on D F G for a discussion.

⁸¹B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture : The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. See also P. Head, “Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels.” *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993), pp. 105-29; D. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

carry a unique form of the text, and many of their alterations fall into similar patterns, a lengthy concluding chapter on these witnesses is provided rather than repeating the arguments at each individual place of variation.

It is only on the basis of these hundreds of places of variation that a coherent understanding of transmission of the text can be developed. As Zuntz says:

Every variant whose quality and origin has in this way been established must serve as a stone in the mosaic picture of the history of the tradition, for there is next to no other material from which it could be built up. At the same time the evaluation of individual readings depends to a large extent upon their place within this picture. This is another instance of that circle which is typical of the critical process; it is a fruitful and not a vicious circle. The critic may, indeed he must, aim at a comprehensive picture of the whole tradition: he reaches this goal by an untiring attention to detail.

However, once individual pieces of the mosaic are demonstrated to have been put in the wrong place, the picture begins to lose its focus. Some pieces may need to be removed and others added. The text of the epistles must be examined in its individual witnesses and their many places of variation. Only then may we create a sharper, or perhaps entirely new, mosaic.

Notes on Chapter 1

1:1.1

Assimilation to other greetings is unlikely to have caused either the addition of κλητος (Rom. 1:1) or its omission (2 Cor. 1:1). Instead, the omission (P^{61vid} A D 0151 pc VL 75) was most likely prompted by a concern for Pauline authority, particularly in a letter full of descriptions of conflict.¹ A similar concern over the apostle's status also leads to alteration at 1:1; 3:5; 9:1; and 11:2.

1:2.4

One of the most challenging textual problems in the letter is found at its beginning, involving its addressees. The reading that places τη ουση εν κορινθω before ηγιασμενοις εν χριστω ιησου is unproblematic, and for that reason could not explain the alternative word order. However, reading ηγιασμενοις εν χριστω ιησου before τη ουση εν κορινθω is quite difficult, indeed likely impossible,² yet how does one account for its creation? And in so “weighty” a group of witnesses? For, as this study will demonstrate, readings shared by P⁴⁶ and D* F G along with the Latin D-text³ (here joined by B) trace back to the earliest layers of the manuscript tradition.⁴ The most likely way to account for the word order variation is to posit a secondary insertion of one of the phrases, since neither intentional

¹Schrage I, p. 100 n. 20; A. Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9/1 (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2000), p. 25; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 30.

²Esp. B. Weiss, p. 130; Zuntz, pp. 92-93.

³The D-text is the Latin text found in the shared exemplar of D F G. 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. This text is extensively discussed in the chapter on D F G.

⁴As noted also by Zuntz, p. 93.

nor accidental alteration could explain how *τη ουση εν κορινθω οσ ηγιασμενοις εν χριστω ιησου* would have been altered to the other word order.⁵

Comparison of this problem to the greetings of the other letters in the *Corpus Paulinum*, in particular as they are attested in \mathfrak{P}^{46} B D* F G, shows that interpolation is likely. In the case of Romans, *ἐν ῥώμη* is lacking in G at Rom. 1:7 and 1:15.⁶ Yet the attestation is not as weak as it appears.⁷ A correction in D at Rom. 1:7 may indicate that *εν ρωμη* should be deleted. While the text is present (also in its Latin counterpart), the present study demonstrates that D (or a predecessor) has been corrected away from the manuscript that served also as original basis for the texts of D F G toward a text similar to \mathfrak{N} and A.⁸ Additional Greek evidence for the omission is found in Origen's text, attested in a marginal note in 1739.⁹ This confirms that Rufinus' translation of Origen's commentary on Romans had accurately rendered Origen's text. While the lemma has the reading, his comments make clear that Origen does not have *εν ρωμη* before him as he writes.¹⁰ Additional Latin

⁵Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, p. 543) argues that "accidental omission of one or more phrases and their subsequent reintroduction at the wrong position" explains the \mathfrak{P}^{46} B D* F G reading. See, however G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 27-28 n. 4; also Thiselton, p. 72.

⁶F is not extant for this section, but, given the close relationship between these witnesses, must have shared the readings with G.

⁷W. B. Smith ("Address and Destination of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 20 (1901), pp. 1-21 and H. J. Gamble (*Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*, pp. 30-33) summarizes the attestation of the shorter text in the various witnesses.

⁸Note that also at 1 Cor. 1:1.1 A D VL 75 share, virtually alone, a unique reading.

⁹E. von der Goltz, *Eine Text-kritische Arbeit des zehnten bzw. sechsten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), p. 53.

¹⁰Origen does cite Rom. 1:17 with *εν ρωμη* at *Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis* 19,5,31.

evidence is found in the commentaries of Ambrosiaster and Pelagius, both of which presume the absence of *εν ρωμη*. The evidence therefore goes beyond a narrow or late “Western” tradition.¹¹ At 1:15 G does stand alone, but *τοις εν ρωμη* seems superfluous here, since *εν υμιν* alone would supply the needed referent.

H. Gamble makes perhaps the strongest argument for a motive for the omission: That it is connected to the 14-chapter form of Romans and is the result of a generalizing tendency.¹² He makes this connection through the Latin tradition, to which the bilingual G is related. This connection is clear from the fourth century, when the shared archetype of D F G was created (see chapter on D F G), but is not certain in the second century. Furthermore, this does not account for the absence of *εν ρωμη* in Origen’s commentary as attested in 1739, which is unconnected to the Latin tradition. Finally, P. Lampe has argued that F G preserve the archetypal form of the final chapters of Romans,¹³ not a late derivative. This present study also concludes that F G carries what is, at its root, a very early form of 1 Corinthians. If it cannot be decisively demonstrated that a generalizing tendency accounts for the lack of (*τοις*) *εν ρωμη* at Rom. 1:7,15, alternative solutions should be considered.

The second letter that shows variation involving the addressees is Ephesians. Here, as at 1 Cor. 1:2, \mathfrak{P}^{46} B* and Origen, joined by \aleph^* 424^c 1739 lack the specific addressee: *εν*

¹¹This rules out a solution proposed by D. Trobisch (*Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung*, pp. 66-67), that an anti-Rome tendency is present in G, as evidenced by a poem in the margin of folio 23 that mocks the city. This solution would limit the alteration to a single ninth century scribe, and does not account for its absence in the commentaries of Origen, Ambrosiaster, or Pelagius.

¹²H. J. Gamble, pp. 115-26.

¹³P. Lampe, “Zur Textgeschichte des Römerbriefes.” He does not discuss Rom. 1:7 or 1:15.

εφεσω. This shorter reading, unlike those at Rom. 1:7, 15 and 1 Cor. 1:2, is frequently considered archetypal, usually for reasons associated with the origins of the letter itself.¹⁴

These three readings should be considered together, for several reasons. First, the form of the addressee is identical: ἐν + the city name in the dative. This form is used at 2 Cor. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; and Col. 1:1, but not Gal. 1:2 (simple dative) or 1 and 2 Thes. (τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ θεσσαλονικέων). Second, a similar group of witnesses attest the variation: G in Rom. and 1 Cor; P⁴⁶ and B* at 1 Cor. and Eph.; and Origen at Rom. 1:7 and Eph.¹⁵ This places all of the shorter readings in the second century. Third, given the first two reasons, it seems likely that a similar motive should account for all three.

What might this motive have been? Because parablepsis is not likely to have occurred here, intentional alteration is likely. A generalizing tendency might therefore be posited, as Gamble did for Romans. However, it would be difficult to explain why only these three letters would have been “generalized” in the second century, in particular 1 Corinthians with its obvious site-specific contents. Most commentators seem content to settle on the longer readings in each place without satisfactorily resolving the problem of the creation of the shorter reading in each place.

However, while it is difficult to explain the creation of the shorter readings, one can explain the longer readings relatively easily, assuming that the shorter reading is archetypal. This is not the place to review the arguments on Rom. 1:7,15 and Eph. 1:1.¹⁶ In

¹⁴Zuntz, p. 228 n. 1; H. J. Gamble, p. 119. Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, p. 601) also expresses hesitancy regarding ἐν εφεσω.

¹⁵The 1 Corinthians commentary by Origen collected from catena does not mention τῆ οὐσῆ ἐν κορινθῶ, but neither is it clear that he lacked the words.

¹⁶For the former passage see especially Smith, “Address and Destination of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans,” and, citing approvingly Smith’s argument, A. Harnack, “Zu Rom. 1,7,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 3 (1902), pp. 83-86.

the case of 1 Cor. 1:2, as Zuntz pointed out, either *ηγιασμενοις εν χριστω ιησου* or *τη ουση εν κορινθω* is a secondary intrusion into the text, for this alone can account for present forms of the text. Zuntz proposes that *ηγιασμενοις εν χριστω ιησου* is secondary, since *οι ηγιασμενοι* does not occur elsewhere in Paul but is found in Acts and Jude.¹⁷ This is too narrow a way to settle the question, however, since *αγιαζω* is a Pauline verb (1 Cor. 6:11; 7:14). A more likely explanation is that the specific addressee (*τη ουση εν κορινθω*) was lacking in 1 Corinthians, as it possibly was in Romans and Ephesians. The shorter reading may therefore reflect a pre-*Corpus* form of the letter. The location of the addressees would have been obvious; it is not provided in other near-contemporary writings with epistolary frameworks (e.g., James, 2 and 3 John, Epistle of Barnabas). However, when collected together into the *Corpus*, the recipients of each letter must be specified. This was done, as in the case of the four gospel codex, by giving each letter a title with the identical format (*προς* + addressee). However, an additional step may have been to add the location in the text of those letters that lacked them. Indeed, the uniform style of the proposed additions in Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians provides evidence for a secondary addition, just as it does for the titles. In the case of 1 Corinthians the addition is even more obviously borrowed from 2 Corinthians, which at 1:1 uses the precise phrase proposed as an interpolation at 1 Cor. 1:2: *τη εκκλησια του θεου τη ουση εν κορινθω*. Either the compiler of the *Corpus* or an early editor would have noticed the similar *τη εκκλησια του θεου* in both letters, and supplied the missing *τη ουση εν κορινθω* in 1 Corinthians. Finally, the syntax of 1 Cor. 1:2 shows no difficulties if the phrase is not present.

¹⁷Zuntz, p. 92.

1:4.10; 1:14.46; 14:18.80

Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου is common in the thanksgivings of Pauline letters. It is firm followed by μου at Rom. 1:8; Phil. 1:3; and Phlm. 1:4. The only firm examples that do not read a genitive pronoun have the plural form of the verb (Col. 1:3; 1 Thes. 1:2). Assimilation to the examples of τῷ θεῷ μου which occur outside the thanksgivings is a possibility.¹⁸ Furthermore, there is a tendency toward addition the of μου after τῷ θεῷ, seen also at 1:14 (A 33 *sy pc*, likely by assimilation to 1:4) and 14:18 (K L 056 0142 88 614 876 915 *pm*).¹⁹ Yet due to the “external evidence” most commentators are reluctant to adopt the shorter text.²⁰ Accidental omission is not likely, for it does not take place in the other examples of τῷ θεῷ μου. Although B occasionally shows a tendency toward the omission of μου or possessive pronouns (see 7:5.19), it is more likely that here assimilation to a formulaic thanksgiving has resulted in the addition.²¹ Comparison may also be made to Phil. 1:3, where most witnesses read the common εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου, but D* F G and related Latin witnesses²² read εὐχαριστῶ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

A similar problem occurs at 1:14, where a narrow band of closely related witnesses (N* B 6 424^c 1739) lack τῷ θεῷ μου. Here Pauline usage is helpful. Outside the thanksgivings, εὐχαριστέω (first person) is firm without θεῷ as the object only at Rom.

¹⁸Schrage I, p. 111, n. 82.

¹⁹Perhaps also D* χαριν εχω τῷ θεῷ μου at 2 Tim. 1:3.

²⁰Lindemann, p. 29; Fee, p. 35 n. 1, though Fee adds: “the wording does not naturally lend itself to the addition of ‘my,’” an argument that seems improbable, given the likelihood of assimilation to the other examples in Paul.

²¹B. Weiss, p. 99, who mentions specifically assimilation to Rom. 1:8.

²²VL 75 77 89 read *domino nostro*; Amst *domino*. The Vulgate reads *deo meo*, 76 78 *deo nostro* (a misreading of *dnō*?), and 64 *domino meo*.

16:4, where Prisca and Aquila are the objects, and the terse question at 1 Cor. 10:30 τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ, where τῷ θεῷ is implied but its expression would unbalance the clauses. Aside from 1 Cor. 1:14, the first person with τῷ θεῷ is firm in the witnesses (1 Cor. 14:18; 1 Thes. 2:13). Furthermore, τῷ θεῷ is easily lost after εὐχαριστῶ due to accidental leap,²³ particularly since there is no difference in meaning between εὐχαριστῶ and εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ. This is seen by Chrysostom's use of the passage in his homilies. His first citation of 1 Cor. 1:14 reads εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, but a few lines later, when discussing v. 17, he notes, "to those who were puffed up over having baptized, he says, "I give thanks that I baptized no one."²⁴ The τῷ θεῷ is not necessary, for to whom else would thanksgiving be given?²⁵ Accidental loss is therefore the most likely cause of corruption.

1:6.14 [discussed at 2:1.6]

1:8.21; 1:8.23

D F G attest two unique readings here: ἀχρι τελους and εν τη παρουσια. Rarely is there variation between ἀχρι, μεχρι, and εως.²⁶ However, D F G are not to be trusted in this

²³J. K. Elliott, "The Divine Names in the Corinthian Letters," in *Paul and the Corinthians. Studies on A Community in Conflict*, ed. T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 12.

²⁴Chrysostom, *Homiliae in i Corinthios* MPG 61, first citation p. 25, second citation p. 26.

²⁵Also at 1:4, the omission of the του θεου following χαριτι is prompted by the presence of τῷ θεῷ. The του θεου is redundant, for is it necessary to "thank God" for the "grace of God"? Several witnesses remove the apparently superfluous του θεου (A* 056 0142 142 326 547 Amst^{mss}).

²⁶Only 1 Cor. 4:11 ἀχρι της αρτι ωρας] εως αρτι ωρας F G; 2 Cor. 10:13 ἀχρι] μεχρι 0150.

place, since παρουσία is likely a secondary adaptation to other Pauline references to Jesus' "coming" (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thes. 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thes. 2:1, 8, 9). D F G show frequent assimilation to other Pauline passages (see 14:34-35 and 16:15, 19).

℘⁴⁶ preserves a singular reading, τελειους. As Zuntz points out, the reading suits the context and perhaps even Pauline theology. He ultimately rejects the reading, however, since τελειος is never used in an eschatological context. Instead, the form may be the result of a misread gloss, τελειως, an apt substitution for εως τελους.²⁷ Another possibility is that τελους was taken as modifying ανεγκλητους.

1:9.26

Υπό + genitive is the preferred way to express agency with a passive verb. Διά + genitive may be used, though rarely.²⁸ D F G write the proper υφ' here, a stylistic improvement

1:10.29

The shift of αδελφοι to the beginning of the sentence is likely influenced by the lectionary unit, which is typically introduced with αδελφοι. In L, for example, the symbol marking the beginning of the reading is placed after the αδελφοι (L reads παρακαλω δε υμας αδελφοι), while the note (clearly a different hand) at the top margin reads: αδελφοι παρακαλω υμας, now the reading of C^c 206 1311 1758.

²⁷Zuntz, p. 20. Another misread gloss is found at 1 Cor. 15:2.

²⁸F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, bearbeitet von F. Rehkopf, 18. Aufl. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001) §232(3)⁷ [hereafter BDR]; A. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (New York: Macmillan, 1897), §1464.

1:10.32 [discussed at 12:9.32]

1:11.38

As noted at 6:12.46 and 14:39.171, μου is frequently omitted after αδελφοι, while it rarely is added. P⁴⁶, for example, loses it four times. Here the omission is attested by the Latin D-text, but these witnesses also lose the pronoun at Rom. 15:14 (with P⁴⁶ D F G) and 1 Cor. 8:13 (with D* F G). B shows another example of attraction, writing μοι under the influence of the μοι a few words previous.

1:13.42; 1:13.43

P⁴⁶ adds μη to μεμερισται ο χριστος and alters μη in the next sentence to η, thus conjoining the questions and making certain that the first is read as a question for which a negative answer is required.²⁹ This is one of several places where P⁴⁶ alters questions for the sake of clarification (also 5:12.38; 6:2.7; 9:7.21), which indicates that the scribe is attempting to produce a clear, readable text.

1:13.44

P⁴⁶ B D* replace υπερ with περι. Variation between these similar prepositions is common.³⁰ Pauline usage is consistent: υπερ is used in the expression “Christ died for . . .” when the object of the preposition is a pronoun or a person.³¹ This would rule out περι both here and at 1 Thes. 5:10, where περι is again read by B (joined by N* pc). The alteration may have been caused by similarity of meaning or even similarity of form, with ΠΕΡ glanced by

²⁹Barrett, p. 46; Fee, p. 51 n. 17.

³⁰See BDR §231(1), Lindemann, p. 41, and the lists given by B Weiss, p. 58 and Zuntz, p. 87.

³¹Cf. Zuntz, p. 87.

the scribe and written as ΠΕΡΙ rather than ΥΠΕΡ. Zuntz goes to great pains to argue that the agreement of D* with ϑ⁴⁶ B does not indicate a special relationship, an argument necessary for his thesis that the “Western” text is completely independent of the (as he describes it) relatively pure “Alexandrian” text. A concluding chapter on D F G demonstrates, however, that readings where D departs from F G to agree with “Alexandrian” witnesses are usually the result of corrections to a manuscript of that type.

1:14.46 [discussed at 1:4.10]

1:14.48

ℵ* writes πρισκον for κρισπον, a simple error of sight/sound in this poorly copied manuscript. The name πρισκον appears in Gregorius of Nyssa’s *Contra Eunomium* (1,134), who is described as διώνυμον but who merits no other description save that he is the grandfather of Eunomius. Given that the Arian bishop Eunomius, a native of Cappadocia, was active in the mid-fourth century, the chronology would fit with the copying of ℵ, but no obvious connection to the manuscript’s likely place of production in Caesarea³² can be made.

1:15.50; 1:16.51 [discussed at 11:22.85]

1:16.52 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:17.55 [discussed in chapter on “Alexandrian” witnesses]

1:17.57

³²T. C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and the Emperor Constantine” *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999), pp. 583-625.

B writes the aorist εὐαγγελισασθαι, attracted by the tense of ἀπεστείλεν in the previous clause.

1:18.59

℘⁴⁶ B occasionally omit the article when used as a relative. B does so at three other places (Gal. 2:3; Phil. 1:11 and with ⑈* at 2 Cor. 7:14),³³ while ℘⁴⁶ does the same at 1 Cor. 11:24 and 2 Cor. 8:19. At 1:18 this may either be the result of a shared tradition³⁴ or simply another example of a tendency to lose the article when used in this way.³⁵

1:18.60 [see also 12:20.82]

℘⁴⁶ alone omits μὲν, which it does also at 2 Cor. 10:10.³⁶ Zuntz is right to note that this witness frequently loses particles, and so is unreliable for this type of variation.³⁷

1:18.62

Ἡμῖν forces the contrast to be drawn between the general “those who are perishing” and the specific “us who are being saved.” This, as Zuntz points out, incorrectly removes the focus from the universality of 1:18-21. The shorter text is attested only in F G 6 2147 and the D-text,³⁸ yet, as this study demonstrates, this is only one of numerous places where the

³³B. Weiss, pp. 78-79.

³⁴So Zuntz, p. 67.

³⁵For example, F* also shares this omission, though not through any transmissional relationship with ℘⁴⁶ B. The shared tradition of D F G frequently show the same omission (see the chapter on D F G), and F frequently makes unique errors.

³⁶Royse, p. 258.

³⁷Zuntz, p. 198.

³⁸Fee (p. 67 n. 2), without referencing Zuntz, argues that “the Latin omits ἡμῖν, probably a translational variant” – though not noting F G 6 2147.

tradition behind F G and the Latin D-text reaches back beyond most witnesses (see the chapter on D F G).

1:19.65

F G write *ασυνετων*, a mindless adaptation to the immediately following *αθετησω*. It is not supported by any of the Latin tradition, and so must be an error unique to the shared ancestor of F G.

1:20.66 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:21.67 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:21.68

Ɀ⁴⁶ *pc* writes *σοφια του κοσμου* in place of *σοφια του θεου*, assimilating the phrase to *σοφιαν του κοσμου* in the previous clause.

1:21.69 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:22.72; 14:16.75

In the *Corpus Paulinum*, the manuscripts divide between *επει* and *επειδη* at only 1 Cor. 1:22 (F G) and 14:16 (B 0243 6 630 1739 1881). Both examples show the close relationship among their respective witnesses. At 14:16, assimilation to *επει* at 14:12 is the likely cause of corruption,³⁹ while at 1:22 F G alone avoid assimilation to *επειδη* in the previous sentence.

³⁹B. Weiss, p. 69.

Only \mathfrak{P}^{46} F G⁴⁰ avoid the addition of δε (0150) or και (*cett*) after επει. At 1:22 the replacement of επει with the “stronger” conjunction επειδη⁴¹ forced the clause to be read as stating a cause. The insertion of the και results in a “both . . . and” emphasis, matching the stronger force of επειδη. This results in a non-Pauline coordination of “Jew and Greek” (see 10:32.123).

1:22.73; 1:23.75

The singular σημειον (L 049 056 0142 0151 6 *pm*) matches the number of σοφιαν in the next clause. Virtually the same witnesses (C³ D² 049 056 0142 0151 6 173 *pm*) assimilate εθνεισιν to ελλησιν at 1:22, 24. There is no motive for a change in the opposite direction. The terms are virtually interchangeable in the *Corpus Paulinum*.⁴²

1:22.74

\mathfrak{P}^{11vid} A write αιτουσιν for ζητουσιν, an assimilation to the same form in the previous clause.

1:24.77; 1:30.97 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:24.78

\mathfrak{P}^{46} reads the nominative χριστος . . . σοφια in place of the accusative. This makes the nouns the subjects of independent clauses, rather than the objects of the relatively distant

⁴⁰F G write επει δη as two words under the influence of *nam quia*.

⁴¹Jannaris §1738; cf. BDAG, s.v. ἐπεὶ (2) and ἐπειδή (2). Cf. also BDR 456(3); E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1923-24), II,3, p. 82, notes that ἐπειδή gradually retreats in the Ptolemaic papyri in favor of ἐπεὶ.

⁴²Fee, p. 67 n. 5, though Lindemann (p. 47) sees a distinction even here in 1 Cor. 1.

verb κηρυσσομεν (1:23). This distance likely accounts for the alteration, which is shared with Clement (*Stromata* 1,18,88), a relationship explored further in the concluding chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses.

1:25.79; 1:25.82

P 6 424^c 1739 replace εστιν with the future εσται in the first clause of 1:25. This is likely accidental (ECTΔI misread as ECTI) since the second clause does not make the same change and the future makes little sense here. Nonetheless, it does connect these witnesses to a shared tradition. The position shift of εστιν in D F G is discussed in the concluding chapter on D F G.

1:26.83 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

1:28.89

ℵ* shows another example of assimilation to the near context, writing αθενη under the influence of the same word in the previous sentence.

1:28.91

The insertion of και (ℵ² B C³ D² L P Ψ 6 88 1739 *pm*) removes the difficulty of the parentheses;⁴³ alteration for the same reason is seen at 12:18.77.

1:28.92

This transposition in ℘⁴⁶ was likely caused by an initial leap (INΔTΔONTΔKΔTΔPΓHCH), one of many similar examples in the manuscript.⁴⁴

⁴³Thiselton, p. 83.

⁴⁴Royse, p. 261.

1:30.97 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

Notes on Chapter 2

2:1.1; 2:3.9; 3:1.1; 7:8.31; 10:6.20; 15:8.34; 16:10.49 [see also *καὶ εἰς* at 13:2.7]

Καὶ ἐγώ is firm at 1 Cor. 7:40; 11:1; 2 Cor. 6:17; 11:16 (only *καὶ Ϝ⁴⁶*), 18, 21, 22; Gal.

4:12; 6:14; Eph. 1:15; Phil. 2:19 (only *ἐγώ Ψ*), 28; and 1 Thes. 3:5. *καὶ ἐγώ* only occurs

with variation:

1 Cor. 2:1	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	1827
1 Cor. 2:3	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	D F G L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 614
1 Cor. 3:1	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	L 049 0151 614
1 Cor. 7:8	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	<i>Ϝ⁴⁶</i> D F G 1758
1 Cor. 16:10	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	<i>Ϝ³⁴</i> D F G Ψ 049 075 104 326
2 Cor. 2:10	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	<i>Ϟ² C*</i> F G K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151
2 Cor. 12:20	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	F G
Gal. 4:12	<i>καὶ ἐγώ</i>	Ψ

This seems to confirm that *καὶ ἐγώ* is to be preferred.¹ D F G, and in particular F G are the witnesses that most frequently write *καὶ ἐγώ*.² This may be due to the influence of the Latin.

Since it has no comparable contraction, two Greek words were written to match.³

2:1.4

Λόγος may refer to individual vocables or to “an individual declaration or remark.”⁴

Ϝ⁴⁶ assumes the former, and so writes the plural.

2:1.6 [also 1:6.14]

The similarity in spelling/sound may have given rise to the variant, although clearly this is not inevitable as attested by the dozens of places where the identical variation does not

¹NA²⁷ prints only *καὶ ἐγώ* in the *Corpus Paulinum*.

²Cf. also 1 Cor. 2:26 *οὐδε εἰς* D*; 15:8 *καὶ ἐμοί* F G 0243 1739.

³Cf. 1 Cor. 1:21 F G *ἐπεὶ δὴ* = *nam quia* and further examples in the chapter on D F G.

⁴BDAG, s.v. *λόγος* 1(αγ); Cf. 1 Thes. 4:15.

occur. In fact, surprisingly little variation takes place between the terms μαρτύριον (twenty-eight times) and μυστήριον (twenty times) in the NT witnesses⁵:

1 Cor. 1:6 μαρτυρια *rel.*] κηρυγμα 6 82 424^{c mg}

1 Tim. 2:6: το μαρτυριον] *omit* A

A frequently cited possible cause of corruption in this passage is the influence of the distant context (μαρτύριον at 1:6 and μυστήριον at 2:7). While only Zuntz bases his argument on the influence of 1:6,⁶ other commentators see these passages as too remote to have influenced the text of 2:1.⁷ Rather than mechanical alteration, the motive for the change is more likely a development in the meaning of these terms.

Since Paul changes vocabulary between μαρτύριον at 1:6⁸ and μυστήριον at 2:7, one must determine whether the shift should take place at 2:1 or 2:7 (where there is no variation). In the first chapter, μαρτύριον is used of the initial proclamation of the Gospel, while in 2:6-16 the discussion focuses on the manner of revealing, which takes place specifically ἐν τοῖς τελείοις. Schrage argues that this provides a motivation for scribes to have altered the original μυστηριον to μαρτυριον.⁹ However, in the second century there are numerous examples of using μυστήριον to describe kerygmatic preaching. In *Protrepticus*

⁵Noted also by Schrage I, p. 226 n. 18.

⁶Zuntz, p. 101.

⁷Fee, p. 88 n. 1.

⁸Only 6 82 424^{c mg} read κηρυγμα at 1:6. 6 and 424^c are sister witnesses, and the format of the correction in 424 suggests that a marginal note has been incorporated in the text of 6. This note may have been influenced κηρυγμα ιησου χριστου at Rom 16:25 – possibly still fresh in the editor’s mind?

⁹“Zwar kann man fragen, ob μαρτύριον den reifen Christen vorbehalten wird (2,6f), Aber genau diese Überlegung könnte die Vertauschung bei den Abschreibern mitbewirkt haben.” Schrage I, p. 226.

12, Clement of Alexandria, having cited the *Odyssey*, issues his “exhortation” specifically to non-initiates by calling Christianity itself a “sacred mystery”:

Sail past the song; it works death. If only you will it you have overcome ruin, and bound to the wood of the cross you will be set free from destruction. The word of God will guide you, and the Holy Spirit will bring you to anchor in the harbor of heaven. Then you will see my God, be initiated into the sacred mysteries, and you may have enjoyment of the things which have been hidden, reserved for me, which “ear has not heard, nor has it entered into the heart of any.”¹⁰

Far from having difficulty with μυστήριον, early Christian writers have adopted the term, and even transformed it in this example, equating “initiation into the mysteries” with “initiation into the Christian message.”

Little support can be found, therefore, for the following line of argumentation: “As the influence of mystery religions spread, this phenomenon provides an explanation for the very point which Fee considers inexplicable, namely, a good reason for Christian scribes ‘to avoid misunderstanding’ about preaching by changing Paul’s μυστήριον to μαρτύριον.”¹¹ Indeed second century Christianity attests quite the opposite: the content of the Christian teaching is

¹⁰*Protrepticus* 12,118,4: Παράπλει τὴν ωφδὴν, θάνατον ἐργάζεται· ἐὰν ἐθέλης μόνον, νενίκηκας τὴν ἀπώλειαν καὶ τῷ ξύλῳ προσδεδεμένος ἀπάσης ἔση τῆς φθορᾶς λελυμένος, κυβερνήσει σε ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῖς λιμέσι καθορμίσει τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· τότε μου κατοπτεύσεις τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐκείνοις τελεσθήσῃ μυστηρίοις καὶ τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπολαύσεις ἀποκεκρυμμένων, τῶν ἐμοὶ τετηρημένων, ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη τινός. (cf. also 12.119.1 and 12.120.1). *Sromateis* 5.10 shows numerous other uses of the term. Justin Martyr also uses the term in an apologetic context: ὁ γὰρ Χριστός, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὢν, καὶ ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονε, τοῦ ἀναγεννηθέντος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δι’ ὕδατος καὶ πίστεως καὶ ξύλου, τοῦ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἔχοντος, ὃν τρόπον καὶ ὁ Νῶε ἐν ξύλῳ διεσώθη ἐποχούμενος τοῖς ὕδασι μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων. (*Dialogus cum Trypho* 138.2). It must be noted, however, that Justin’s *Apologia* compares mystery religions and Christianity without calling the latter a μυστήριον.

¹¹Thiselton, pp. 207-8.

frequently described as a “mystery,” even in direct comparison to mystery religions. This, in the Pauline epistles, is often described as μαρτύριον.¹²

This helps explain the other, poorly-attested readings at both 1:6, where three manuscripts replace μαρτυριον with κηρυγμα, and 2:1, where five late manuscripts replace μαρτυριον with ευαγγελιον and one with σωτηριον. Since at 2:1 Paul is referencing his proclamation of the Gospel, these semantically similar vocables could stand in place of μαρτυριον.

At 2:1, then these two factors combined to create the corruption: later use of μυστήριον in a way similar to that which Paul used μαρτύριον, and, perhaps in some manuscripts, an intentional attempt to link 2:1ff. with 2:6-16. Such scribal activity is, certainly, more than mere copying. However, similar efforts to bring similar passages into congruence can be found in the same manuscripts in other places, most obviously at 2:4 (see below).

2:2.7

The shift of the indefinite pronoun to the position preceding the infinitive (B C P 048^{vid} 33 *pc*) resolves the awkward negation, so that the οὐ cannot be misread with ἔκριναι rather than τι. The addition of του clarifies the function of the infinitive. Similar witness add the article before the infinitive at 9:6.

2:3.10; 2:3.11

Is the instrumental dative to be read (as in D F G), or the preposition? The former usage is certainly Pauline (e.g., 1 Cor. 10:30; 11:5), and at 2 Cor. 7:4 B adds the

¹²See also Fee, p. 88 n. 1; Barrett, pp. 62-3.

preposition.¹³ However, τρόμῳ without ἐν is used instrumentally at 2 Cor. 7:1 and Eph. 5:21, both without variation. It is likely that the preposition was added under the influence of ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ earlier in the sentence.¹⁴ The identical addition takes place at 1 Cor. 14:6, where ἐν is added to διδασχῆ under the influence of the preceding series of three uses of ἐν + dative (see discussion *ad loc.*). Latinism is not likely to be an issue here, since the Latin tradition reads *in timore* to match ἐν φόβῳ at 2 Cor. 7:1 and Eph. 5:21. Instead, F G preserve the reading upon which the Latin tradition is based. D departs from the shared exemplar of D F G by adding ἐν only before φόβῳ.

2:4.12

This unit of variation has generated discussion far outweighing its exegetical significance. Nevertheless, it is an intriguing problem, not least because of the complexity of the evidence and the obvious difficulty that scribes, translators, and church fathers had with this prepositional phrase. How much difficulty? The entry in *Text und Textwert* lists no less than 30 different readings in the Greek tradition alone. Most of these can be dispensed with as obvious spelling variations and even nonsense readings. Metzger claims eleven different readings,¹⁵ a number which is repeated often in the commentaries, while Lietzmann, who appears to be the first to try to understand the readings in relation to each other, divides them into seven readings.¹⁶ Perhaps the clearest manner of laying out the data is in table form,

¹³Probably under the influence of ἐν φόβῳ at Eph. 1:1.

¹⁴As does ℘⁴⁶ here, which cannot resist adding a fourth, nonsensical ἐν before πολλῶ.

¹⁵B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 546.

¹⁶H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933), p. 11; his description and solution is followed by H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. J. W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 55.

ignoring the variations in case endings and number which are secondary to the addition or omission of the words themselves:

πειθ-	ανθρωπιν-	σοφ-	λογ-	Apparatus	Witnesses
πειθοις	+	+	+	a b c d e	Gk: \aleph^2 A C L P Ψ (+431) Lt: vg ^{mss} AM; sy ^h
πειθοι	+	+	+	l m n o p q	Gk: 205 216* (+77)
πιθανοις / διδακτ. πειθ.	+	+	+	s	522 2652 ^c
πειθοις		+	+	g	Gk: \aleph^{*1} B D 0150 (+24) Lt: 64 Ambr Hier
πειθοι		+	+	i	Lt: 75 AM; sy ^p
πειθης	+	+		f	Gk: 1922
πειθοι	+	+		k	Lt: 61 AMst SED
πειθοις		+		h	Gk: \wp^{46} F G
πειθοι		+		i	Lt: 77 78 89

Every possible combination, addition, and omission of words is represented, save that every witness includes a form of πειθ- and of σοφ-. These, therefore, provide an appropriate place to begin.

The immediate difficulty is the variation between πειθοῖς and πειθοῖ. The former, an adjective form, is unattested apart from this passage and citations of it in patristic material. This could be interpreted in two ways: either the adjective was unknown and later altered to πειθοί; or, the term is impossible, and πειθοί has been corrupted into a simpler adjective form. Virtually every commentator takes the former view, primarily on the weight of the external evidence, since πειθοῖς is attested in the major *Greek* witnesses (i.e., \wp^{46} \aleph A B C

D F G).¹⁷ This would require, then, that Paul had coined a new term. No commentator ventures an opinion as to whether or not Paul is capable of this or has done this elsewhere, but we have seen that it does occur elsewhere in 1 Corinthians, and in each of those places, similar to here, the “new” term is based on familiar forms.

The form $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\iota$, on the other hand, is also absent from the LXX and the other NT authors, though very common elsewhere. The stem is unusual in the NT, and in fact it would be the only occurrence of a $-\acute{\omega}$ stem in the NT. This, however, should not have been overly difficult for scribes as the stem itself was common, particularly in names.¹⁸

The versions are split as well. Assuming $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ is the Harklean and the Latin *in suasoriis* (VL 64 Ambr Or Hier Vigil) and *in persuasibilibus* (Vg Hier). On the other hand, the Peshitta and *in persuasione* (VL 75 77 78 89 Ambr Amst Sedul) assumes the noun. The versional evidence is significant because it provides evidence for Zuntz’s argument that the final ς is an early corruption of $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\iota$, which otherwise is not found in the Greek manuscripts until later in the tradition. Zuntz notes the Latin support in a footnote; no other commentator, however, appears to notice the support this lends his argument.

A simple error may account for $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$. The addition of final sigma is common in the papyri,¹⁹ and occurs also in the NT witnesses. D, for example, writes $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ for $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ at 1 Cor. 16:15. More significantly, Φ ⁴⁶ makes precisely this error at 16:19, writing

¹⁷Westcott and Hort claim that $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ is a corruption of $\pi\iota\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$.

¹⁸See Jannaris, §§410-11; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), §279. The standard NT grammars relate no difficulty with this stem; see BDR §47(4) and §112.

¹⁹F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1, Phonology (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpin-La Goliardica, 1981), pp. 125-6.

ΠΡΕΙΚΚΔCCYN for ΠΡΕΙΚΚΔCYN. The Latin, of course, could not make a similar error of transcription.

Moving to the question of the presence or absence of a form of λόγος, those who find authority in “good manuscripts” include the word (with the support of \aleph^{20} A B C D 33 1175 1739 etc.).²¹ Transcriptional probabilities, which would argued that the word was accidentally omitted as the result of parablepsis, weigh more heavily for others.²² Yet this should not be treated as a question to be decided in isolation from the πειθοῖς / πείθοι problem. The presence of λόγοις in fact argues against the adjective πειθοῖς. Its presence is inexplicable if πείθοι had been in the text, for only the bare adjective requires a noun. The need to supply the implied noun is seen, for example, in the anonymous commentary contained in VL 89. The lemma texts reads (with VL 77 78) *in persuasione sapientiae*. Yet the comments demonstrate how almost inevitable was need to supply the noun “words”: “I have not been “persuaded” by rhetorical arts and arrangements of words but by powerful “proofs,” so that not my eloquence but the work of God was praised.” The comments appear in the manuscript immediately between *persuasione* and *sapientiae*, so it is clear that this is the very portion of the text to which he refers.

The need for a noun was easily filled with the λόγος of 2:1 and 2:4a, as well as the clear parallel in 2:13: ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις. The only variants in this later passage are the shifting of the cases of ἀνθρωπίνης and σοφίας, which is similar to

²⁰ \aleph^* reads λογος, a copying mistake which is grammatically impossible in this context.

²¹Most decisively Lietzmann, p. 11 and Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 481.

²²Especially Zuntz, 24, followed by Fee, p. 88 n. 2.

what occurs at 2:4.²³ Given the confusion over the text of 2:4, it is likely that, at some point early in the tradition, 2:13 suggested itself as a solution to the problems at 2:4.²⁴ This also accounts for the addition of *ανθρωπινης*, not merely an “explanatory gloss”²⁵ but an intentional addition from 2:13. It also lends an additional count against the adjective *πειθοις*, which conforms to the parallel adjective *διδασκτικοις*.

Additional strength for the argument that *πειθοι σοφιας* has given rise to the mass of other readings is found in syntactic parallels elsewhere in the epistles. First, *ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λογοῖς* splits the adjective and the noun it modifies with a genitive noun. This does not occur anywhere else in the epistles.²⁶ Second, Paul appears to favor balanced prepositional phrases when coordinated using *ἀλλά*:

2:5 ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾗ ἐν σοφία ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ’ ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ.
 5:8 ὥστε ἐορτάζωμεν μὴ ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας.

The structure of these two examples is identical to that of 2:4: two prepositional phrases with a noun and modifying genitive noun coordinated by *ἀλλά*. Many additional examples could be cited where other types of balanced clauses are coordinated:

2:12 ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,

²³As well as a the reading *σοφιας λογους* in F G, clearly nonsense in context and probably a sight confusion of *ΛΟΓΟΥΣ* for *ΛΟΓΟΙΣ*. Similar examples are noted in the chapter on D F G.

²⁴A later example, but betraying the same attempt at a solution, is seen now in 2652^c which added *διδασκτοις* before *πειθοις* at 2:4, resulting in *εν διδασκτοις πειθοις ανθρωπινης σοφιας. λογοις.*

²⁵So Metzger, p. 481.

²⁶The closest example is, perhaps not surprisingly, 1 Cor. 2:13: *διδασκτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις*, where the adjective and noun are separated by an additional adjective and noun in the genitive.

9:21 τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος, μὴ ὢν ἄνομος θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ,
 ἵνα κερδάνω τοὺς ἀνόμους·

10:23 Πάντα ἔξεστιν ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει· πάντα ἔξεστιν ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα
 οἰκοδομεῖ

11:8 οὐ γάρ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρός

Of course exceptions may be found;²⁷ Paul's style is not put on like a straightjacket. These arguments are not decisive in and of themselves. However, the fact that parallels can be adduced for πειθοῖ σοφίας but not for πειθοῖς σοφίας or πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας apart from their source (2:13) is telling, and supports the case made above on the basis of the likely direction of corruption outlined above. While unattested in the Greek, πειθοῖ σοφίας is assumed by VL 77 78 89,²⁸ and is the reading from which the mass of alternatives have been created.

2:5.16 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

2:7.23

The shift from θεου σοφίαν to σοφίαν θεου (L Ψ 056 0142 *pc*) places the genitive in its preferred position. Cf. also βασιλεαν θεου at 6:9 (L 056 6 88 424 1739 *pm*).²⁹

2:8.27; 2:11.4 [discussed at 8:2.4]

2:8.28

℘⁴⁶ alone reads δοξης αυτων, the addition of αυτων balancing δοξαν υμων at 2:7.³⁰

²⁷E.g., 4:19, 20; 6:12, 13; 7:4; it bears repeating, however, that ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λογοῖς and ἐν πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις σοφίας λογοῖς have no parallels, save 2:13.

²⁸VL 75 AMst(A) and Ambrose also read the equivalent of the noun πειθοι, though with other additions.

²⁹Also Rom. 3:5 δικαιοσυνην θεου G.

³⁰Royse, p. 264.

2:9.30 [discussed at 13:2.9]

2:9.31 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

2:9.32

The syntax of this passage is difficult. The first ἄ functions as the subject of εἶδεν and ἤκουσεν but as the object of ἀνέβη. Additional difficulties arise in the final clause. If οσα ητοιμασεν is read, οσα must be understood as “how much.” If α ητοιμασεν is read, an ellipsis in the final clause must be assumed, with something like “we know” supplied. Neither solution is without difficulties.³¹ However, it seems more likely that scribes would assimilate a difficult form to one that occurs earlier in the passage (α ητοιμασεν) than that a word not found (οσα) in the context would be substituted.³² While οσα ητοιμασεν is attested in relatively few manuscripts (ϕ^{11vid} A B C^{vid}), it is found already in Clement of Rome (*ad Corinthios* 34,8).³³

2:10.34

Δε best suits the context, since Paul draws a contrast between the “rulers” (v. 8) and those who have the Spirit (v. 10).³⁴ The γαρ is easily explained as a correction based on the previous clause, particularly since οσα is to be read, which makes the clause stand alone. “Whatever God has prepared” is evident because (γαρ) “God has made it know to us.” This

³¹Thiselton, pp. 248-50; Conzelmann, p. 56 notes 4-5.

³²B. Weiss, p. 27.

³³See Conzelmann, p. 63 n. 70, for a discussion of Origen’s attribution of the passage to the Apocalypse of Elijah.

³⁴Barrett, p. 74; Lietzmann, p. 13; Schrage I, p. 256 n. 204.

adapts 2:10a to the very near context (2:9d) without recognizing that 2:10 contrasts with 2:8.³⁵

2:10.35 [discussed at 12:18.76]

2:10.36; 2:13.55

In two places, πνεύμα receives an addition for the sake of clarification. The additions of αὐτοῦ at 2:10 (N^{c2} D F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 *pm*) and of αγιου at 2:13 (D¹ L P 049 056 *al*) distinguishes God's spirit from the use of πνευμα at 2:10-12 to refer to other types of "spirits."³⁶

2:11.38 [discussed at 13:2.9]

2:11.39; 2:11.40; 2:11.44; 2:11.45

Several alterations bring the parallel sentences at 2:11 into harmony. First, A 33 and some fathers drop ἀνθρώπων, which may have been viewed as redundant³⁷ but also makes bare τις parallel to οὐδεις at 2:11c. Second, while it may be assumed that τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was omitted to avoid the third example of the noun, it is more likely that it was added, under the influence of το πνευμα του θεου (2:11d), to clarify that God's spirit is not in view here. The addition was avoided by F G and most of the non-Vulgate Latin tradition. On the other hand, these same witnesses write εν τω θεω – a non-Pauline use of ἐν + θεός – in

³⁵Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 481 notes simply that γάρ "has the appearance of being an improvement introduced by the copyists." Fee (p. 97 n. 1) argues that "a copyist would scarcely have deliberately created a text with three γάρ's (*sic*) in a row," but the logical relationship between 2:9 and 2:10 is likely a great factor in the alteration than the clauses which follow. Conzelmann (p. 65 n. 84) simply defers to ℘⁴⁶.

³⁶Metzger, *Textual Commentary*; Lindemann, pp. 68, 70; Fee, p. 97 n. 2.

³⁷Compare also the omission in A of αὐτω at 2:14.

conformity to the immediately preceding $\tau\omicron \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$. Fourth, $\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\nu$ (L 056 *pm* matches the same form in the first clause). The aorist $\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega$ in F G is likely a simple error for $\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$,³⁸ since the perfect seems to be necessary for the argument. Finally P *pc* adds $\tau\omicron \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ after $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, matching $\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ (2:11b).

2:12.46 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

2:12.50 [discussed at 13:2.9]

2:13.52 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

2:13.54 [discussed at 2:4.12]

2:13.55 [discussed at 2:10.36]

2:13.56

B 33 read $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$, an impossible form in this context. It is probably the result of a misreading of $-\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$ as $-\kappa\omega\varsigma$,³⁹ or, less likely, assimilation to the same form at 2:14.⁴⁰

2:14.60 [discussed at 2:11.39]

2:14.61; 2:15.64; 3:1.4; 4:21.70

\wp^{46} frequently errs when writing *nomina sacra*, with three examples in 2:14-3:1 and one at 4:21. For each of these \wp^{46} writes $\overline{\Pi\text{NC}}$, at 2:14, 15 and 3:21 for $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$ and at

³⁸Similar examples of dropped terminations in F G are cited in the chapter on D F G.

³⁹Barrett, p. 67.

⁴⁰Conzelmann, p. 67 n. 112; Thiselton, p. 264.

4:21 for πνευματι. Royse labels these a “confusion” of *nomina sacra*,⁴¹ but it is more likely that \mathfrak{P}^{46} is creating its own abbreviation based on πνευματικοις and πνευματι written *plene*. These words are not abbreviated B F G (they are in D), manuscripts which are closely related to – and in these cases carry a less corrupted form of – the text found in \mathfrak{P}^{46} . Note that in each case D also departs from the *plene* spelling, using ΠΝΙΚΩC at 2:14, 15, ΠΝΙΚΟΙC at 3:1, all of which match exactly the *nomina sacra* at those place in A. Further examples of D altering its text to match readings found in \aleph A are discussed in the chapter on D F G.

2:15.65 [discussed at 12:20.82]

2:15.66 [discussed at 12:19.80]

⁴¹Royse, p. 248, with further examples.

Notes on Chapter 3

3:1.1 [discussed at 2:1.1]

3:1.2; 3:2.9

The variation between the syllabic augment η- and temporal augment ε- for δύναμαι, βουλομαι, θέλω, and μέλλω may be simply orthographical, or may have been caused by stylistic interests. BDR claims that, in the NT, η- is always found with θέλω and ε- with βουλομαι, which is due to the word having been “borrowed from literary language,” but that the examples of δύναμαι and μέλλω show inconsistency. It is often noted that ε- is Attic, and η- a later development.¹ However, Moeris rejects ε- as Hellenistic,² and there appears to be a movement toward the temporal augment after the period of the Greco-Roman papyri, so that it comes to dominate by the Byzantine period. It has, however, again fallen away in favor of the syllabic augment in Modern Greek.³ This makes it difficult to decide what Pauline usage should be; all the more so since examples of the augmented forms of these verbs are rare in Paul.

Augmented forms of θέλω appear six times in the Pauline epistles all with the syllabic augment and without variation.⁴ βουλομαι occurs once with variation (see below) and once

¹So BDR §66(3); Moulton, *Accidence*, p. 189, which dates η- to “since 300 B.C.”

²Moeris, *Lexicon Atticum*, p. 198 ἤμελλον ἠβουλόμην ἠδυνάμην ἠὺξάμην διὰ τοῦ η· διὰ δὲ τοῦ ε Ἑλληνες.

³See Jannaris, §722; B. Mandilaris, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973) §§ 245-9.

⁴1 Cor. 12:18; 15:38; Col. 1:27; 1 Thes. 2:18; Phlm. 14 (all aorist); Gal. 4:20 (imperfect).

without,⁵ while μέλλω does not occur with an augment. In both examples of augmented δύναμαι, however, there is variation:

1 Cor. 3:1 εδυνηθην C Ψ // ηδυνηθην *rel.*
 1 Cor. 3:2 εδυνασθε Ϝ⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C F G P 048 056 0142 0150 0185 0289 // ηδυνασθε *rel.*
 Phlm. 13 εβουλομην *rel.* // ηβουλομην ⋈ 547 1245

One is tempted to opt for the temporal augment in all three places, but the limited number of examples precludes final judgment.

3:1.3

The position of the indirect object in relation to the verb is frequently in question:

3:1 λαλησαι υμιν Ϝ⁴⁶ ⋈ A B D* F G] υμιν λαλησαι L P Y 049 6 88 424 1739
 9:3 εστιν αυτη ⋈ A B P 33 1739] αυτη εστιν D F G K L Y 88 424
 10:28 ειπη υμιν 630 1311 1739 1881] ειπη F G; υμιν ειπη *cett*
 11:13 προσευχεσθαι τω θεω D F G] τω θεω προσευχεσθαι *cett*
 11:22 ειπω υμιν] υμιν ειπω K L Y 6 88 424; ειπω P
 12:31 δεικνυμι υμιν] υμιν δεικνυμι F G
 15:38 διδωσιν αυτω Ϝ⁴⁶ ⋈ A B P *pc*] αυτω διδωσιν D F G I K L Y 049 056 075
 0142 0151 0243 5 6 1739

In these examples, the “Byzantine” witnesses favor the placement of the pronoun before the noun.

Turning to 3:1, Pauline examples of λαλέω + dative of indirect object (in this sequence) without variation are found only at 1 Cor. 14:11 and Eph. 5:19, both of which have the participle form. The reverse sequence is more common: 1 Cor. 14:3, 6; 15:34; 1 Thes. 2:16, all of which are textually firm.⁶ In addition to 1 Cor. 3:1, similar alteration is made at 2 Cor. 7:14:

παντα εν αληθεια ελαλησαμεν υμιν *rel*

⁵2 Cor. 1:15 (imperfect).

⁶There are two example of the verb standing between two coordinated datives: 1 Cor. 14:2, 28.

παντα υμιν εν αληθεια ελαλησαμεν C D P 326 VL 78 89 Vg
 υμιν παντα εν αληθεια ελαλησαμεν VL 64

In both places, notice that D⁷ P Vg reflect the tendency of the later witnesses to place the dative pronoun prior to the verb. Furthermore, the reading λαλησαι υμιν at 1 Cor. 3:1 may be an attempt at clarification, so that the dative is not read with the preceding verb (ἡ/ἐ)δυνήθην.

3:1.4 [discussed at 2:14.61]

3:1.5; 3:3.12; 3:4.23

In 3:1-4 Paul expresses his disappointment in the lack of spiritual progress (and indeed regression) among the Corinthians.⁸ They should be πνευματικός, but three times Paul describes them as the opposite: σάρκινος or σαρκικός. The manuscript tradition is divided in each example:

σαρκιν- (v.1) . . . σαρκικ- (v. 3a) . . . σαρκικ- (v. 3b) ⋈ A B C* 0289 6 33 81 181
 424** 917 945 999 1175 1739 1836 1852 1875 1912
 σαρκιν- (v.1) . . . σαρκικ- (v. 3a) . . . σαρκιν- (v. 3b) Ϝ⁴⁶
 σαρκιν- (v.1) . . . σαρκιν- (v. 3a) . . . σαρκιν- (v. 3b) D*
 σαρκικ- (v.1) . . . σαρκικ- (v. 3a) . . . σαρκικ- (v. 3b) D¹ L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
 104 326 1881 π
 σαρκικ- (v.1) . . . σαρκιν- (v. 3a) . . . σαρκιν- (v. 3b) F G

The correct reading in each place is typically chosen on the basis of the meaning of the individual words. Fee, for example, sees major emphasis being made in what he sees as the shift in vocable:

⁷Both times against VL 75 and other old Latin witnesses.

⁸Schrage I, p. 282.

The word used here [v. 1], *sarkinoi*, emphasizes especially their humanness and the physical side of their existence as over against the spiritual. The change to *sarkikoi* in v. 3 only adds to the blow. They were not only ‘of the flesh’ when Paul first was among them, but even now their behavior is ‘fleshy,’ a word with clear ethical overtones of living from the perspective of the present age, therefore out of one’s sinfulness.⁹

However, Thiselton points out, perhaps a bit strongly, “the distinction remains one of morphology rather than semantics.”¹⁰ BDAG lists the two forms in different entries, noting little to distinguish between the two: “σαρκικός means ‘belonging to the σάρξ’ [opp. πνευματικός], ‘fleshy’; on the other hand, σάρκινος is ‘consisting/composed of flesh’, ‘fleshy,’” though noting also that “our literature, or at least its copyists, for the most part did not observe this contrast.”¹¹ Zuntz sees a similar shade of distinction: “the rule with Paul is to use the form on -κος throughout except where the adjective refers to human beings. This leads, as he indicates, to reading -νος in both Rom. 7:14 and both examples 1 Cor. 3:3.¹² His

⁹Fee, p. 124 (adopting the reading of NA and Ɱ B C etc.).

¹⁰Thiselton, p. 288. Those who see no semantic discussion include Barrett, p. 79 n. 1; Wolff, p. 64 n. 228; H. Merklein, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Bd. 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992), p. 251; H.-J. Klauck, *1. Korintherbrief*, Neue Echter Bibel, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit Einheitsübersetzung 7 (Würzburg:Echter Verlag, 1992), p. 32; Schrage I, pp. 281-2; M. Parsons, “ΣΑΡΚΙΝΟΣ, ΣΑΡΚΙΚΟΣ in Codices F and G: A Text-Critical Note,” *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988), pp. 151-55. The versions are of no help; the Latin tradition uniformly uses a form *carnalis*.

¹¹BDAG, s.v. σαρκινός. Parsons, “ΣΑΡΚΙΝΟΣ, ΣΑΡΚΙΚΟΣ” attempts to argue against this statement by claiming that F G are examples of an attempt to “preserve, or perhaps create, a distinction between the meanings of closely related words, [which] led some scribes intentionally to change, more or less consistently, certain words so that their meanings would conform both to their narrative or epistolary contexts and to the definition which the scribe held.” One would expect, however, additional examples of this interest in precision of use of vocabulary to be in evidence elsewhere in these manuscripts, which Parsons does not note. In addition, he fails to consider that F G may in fact have the original reading in some of the places (he does not take into account Zuntz’s arguments at all), nor does he recognize the likelihood of the shift to or preservation of -κος in these manuscripts due to the near context.

¹²Zuntz, p. 99.

observation is confirmed by an examination of the places where variation occurs. At Rom. 7:14 and 1 Cor. 3:1 -voς was adapted to -κος due to the influence of the immediately preceding πνευματικός and πνευματικοῖς. At Rom. 15:27 likewise πνευματικοῖς precedes σαρκικοῖς, but here Zuntz's observation holds true: he is not speaking of humans but of "fleshy things," so the σαρκικοῖς is correct and, as no passage where -κος is original is there a manuscript that reads -voς, so no variant is found here.

Overall, the direction in the textual tradition is clearly from -voς to -κος; the "Byzantine" witnesses uniformly read -κος in all 10 NT occurrences apart from 2 Cor. 3:3, where Zuntz notes that -voς "was protected by the prototype Ez. xi.19 and the rhyme with λιθαναις preceding"¹³ All the corrections in the extant manuscripts themselves move in the same direction.¹⁴

The textual problems in 3:1-4 are best resolved, therefore, not by an appeal to semantics but to transcription. In v. 1, as described above, attraction to πνευματικοῖς has caused the corruption σαρκικοῖς. The expectation of the author to be consistent in his terminology from v. 1 to v. 3 is signaled by his use of ἔτι at the beginning of v. 3.¹⁵ However, the corruption in v. 1, as well as the tendency toward -κος evident throughout the tradition, gave rise to the reading σαρκικοῖ in both occurrences at 3:3. \mathfrak{P}^{46} F G, as in many other cases, alone witness to the archetypal readings.¹⁶

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Rom. 7:14: \aleph^2 ; 1 Cor. 3:1: C³ D²; 3:3: D¹; Heb. 7:16 C³ D².

¹⁵Schraeg I, p. 282; cf. also Zuntz, p. 99.

¹⁶ \mathfrak{P}^{46} , as Zuntz (p. 100) points out, "derives from a text which had the original form (-voι) in both places. F G, as is often true of this pair, also here suffered assimilation to the immediately preceding πνευματικοῖς at 3:1, but avoided the assimilation at 3:3."

3:2.6

When ποτίζω is used in contexts of someone giving another something to drink, the double accusative construction is used.¹⁷ However, L and some Latin witnesses read the dative υμιν,¹⁸ with the word order γαλα υμιν εποτισα. This is likely the result of influence from the υμιν λαλησαι in these witnesses at 3:1.

3:2.7

Paul's use of the conjunction between contrasting pairs is inconsistent. BDF notes: "Asyndeton is regularly avoided in the case of only two words or ideas (as in classical) except in contrasting pairs . . . If the opposite term is added with a negative (οὐ), καί may or may not be used."¹⁹ Indeed examples may be found of both,²⁰ and the only case in which a choice between reading or omitting the καί is found is the passage at hand. Since there does not appear to be obvious motivation for the omission, the addition (D F G L 049 056 *pm*) is likely secondary for the sake of clarity.

3:2.9 [discussed at 3:1.2]

3:2.11

¹⁷BDAG, s.v. ποτίζω and the references there; note esp. Rom. 12:20.

¹⁸The Latin's dative *vobis* may also be explained by the use of *potum dedi* to translate the verb. This significantly did not affect VL 75 77 78.

¹⁹BDF §460(1).

²⁰Noted there are 1 Cor. 10:20 (with καί), to which could be added Rom. 7:6 and Col. 2:8; their example without καί is 1 Cor. 7:12, to which could be added 1 Cor. 7:6. None of these have any variation involving the conjunction.

Whether or not ἔτι is to be read turns on a stylistic issue. As Zuntz notes, “The omission . . . of ἔτι after οὐδέ so greatly improves the style as to make the assumption of a mere scribal error difficult.”²¹ No examples of οὐδέ ἔτι νῦν have been located, apart from citations of this passage in patristic writers.²² This stylistic improvement has led Metzger to conclude that the omission is an “Alexandrian improvement of style,”²³ as it is read by only \mathfrak{P}^{46} B 0185.

3:3.12 [discussed at 3:1.5]

3:3.14

F G attest what is likely a phonological variation (ἡμιν for υμιν). The first person is not matched in the Latin, and is in fact impossible in this context.

3:3.15

As the commentaries suggest, the closest parallel to this passage is Gal. 5:20, where διχοστασιαι is also found (also Rom. 16:17). The term is clearly Pauline; the question is whether or not it has been interpolated here on the basis of the other passages. This would assume a major editorial revision, which has added small units from other Pauline texts.²⁴

²¹Zuntz, p. 40.

²²οὐδέ νῦν ἔτι is found Nicolaus, *Fragmenta* 1 l.23 [iv BC]; Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes* 13.20 [AD i-ii]; Gregory of Nazianzus, *In laudem Athanasii*, in MPG 35, p. 1112; Joannes Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3,14,7 [AD v]. Also, in a quotation of 1 Cor. 3:2, in Cyril, *Commentarii in Lucam*, MPG 72, p. 748.

²³Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 482. He does not cite any additional examples.

²⁴Zuntz (p. 170) describes it this way: “Here, then, the papyrus [\mathfrak{P}^{46}] has been infected by, or has retained, one of those interpolations which we assume to have been floating about in great numbers at the time.” Here he does not provide any additional examples, though on pp. 16-17 he lists a few larger units which he suspects to have been interpolated.

This is likely, however, for two reasons. First, there is no obvious reason for the omission.²⁵ Second, D F G show these assimilations elsewhere (cf. the examples in the discussion at 14:34) as does \mathfrak{P}^{46} (16:15), indicating that such additions are not unusual in these early witnesses.

3:3.17 [discussed at 3:1.5]

3:3.19

The genitive $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$ is grammatically possible, but does not fit in this context. L earlier (3:2.6) was guilty of a grammatically possible but contextually incorrect reading. This may, however, simply be an error of sound.

3:4.21 [discussed at 7:18.69]

3:4.22

These “slogans”²⁶ resemble those of 1:12, both in content and in structure. There the slogans are spoken by more than one individual ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \upsilon\mu\hat{\omega}\nu \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$), the first introduced with a $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and each successive clause marked with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$.²⁷ Here at 3:4 the structure is more difficult. Only one person speaks ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta \tau\iota\varsigma$) but more than one is condemned ($\omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$), though Paul is describing a recurring ($\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha\nu$) situation.²⁸ This tension was apparently felt in the manuscript tradition. One reading results in a single slogan: $\epsilon\gamma\omega \mu\epsilon\nu$

²⁵Metzger, *Textual Commentary* p. 482; Fee, p. 121 n. 4.

²⁶See M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. (Tübingen: Mohr and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), pp. 84-86; Thiselton, p. 120.

²⁷The clarity of the structure has resulted in a lack of variation: only the omission of the third $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (of four!) in 056 0142.

²⁸Thiselton, p. 295.

ειμι παυλου ετερος δε απολλω (“I belong to Paul’s group, but another is for Apollos”; \mathfrak{P}^{46} 69). Another reading is identical to the structure of 1:12: εγω μεν ειμι παυλου δε εγω απολλω (A alone), which at first may appear to be too harsh for this context. On the other hand, nowhere else does Paul use τὶς . . . ἕτερος together.²⁹ These two difficult readings have given rise to the rest of the tradition: εγω μεν ειμι παυλου ετερος δε εγω απολλω (\aleph B C D F G L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0289 1739 \mathfrak{N}^{P^t}) results in two statements, but in contrast to the μέν in the first slogan and the usage at 1:12, the δέ now is part of Paul’s comments rather than the slogan.³⁰ This problem is resolved in the readings εγω μεν ειμι παυλου ετερος εγω δε απολλω (1518) and εγω μεν ειμι παυλου ετερος δε εγω δε απολλω (216 257 440 1149 *pm*).³¹ A decision between ετερος δε and εγω δε (A) is not so easy, though the former may be an attempt to resolve the difficulty of the perceived lack of distinction between the speakers in εγω μεν ειμι παυλου δε εγω απολλω. Since A, however, frequently drops words that are unnecessary in the context (see also 2:11.39; 2:14.60), it has likely done the same here.

3:4.23 [discussed at 3.1.5]

3:4.24

P adds και κατα ανθρωπον περιπατειτε from 3:3.

²⁹ὅς . . . ἕτερος is found at 1 Cor. 12:8

³⁰Cf. the punctuation in NA²⁷.

³¹One may be able to see ετερος δε as a simplification to ετερος δε εγω, but εγω δε cannot be derived from that; it may be a conjecture or an assimilation to 1:12, but the manuscript must be tested for these kinds of obvious adaptations (it does not, for example, read καὶ διχοστασίαι at 3:3) before dismissing the reading.

3:5.25

Zuntz explains the shift from $\tau\iota$ ($\aleph^* A B 048 0150 0289 1739 pc$) to the masculine $\tau\iota\varsigma$ as the result of the influence of the personal names as well as the following $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\alpha\nu\omicron\iota$.³² In addition, the shift to the sequence $\text{Παυλῶς} . . . \text{.Απολλῶς}$ is, as in other places (1:1; 9:1; 11:2), an elevation of the role or status of Paul.³³ Whether or not $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ should be read is a more difficult issue. Zuntz cites eight passages where Paul has parallel or contrasting clauses with $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ present in both;³⁴ in none of these places is the $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ omitted,³⁵ making Paul's usage clear.

3:5.27

The presence of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\ \eta$ ($D^2 L P \Psi 049 056 0142 0151 pm$) as Fee notes, appears to be an attempt to clear up the awkwardness of the sentence, "so that the answer becomes part of the question."³⁶ More precisely, the interest may have been in preventing the text following the insertion to have been read as a separate question, with an implied answer that would have been uncomfortable: "Who is Paul? Who Apollos? Servants through whom you believed . . . ?"³⁷ Note that this again indicates intentional and considered editorial activity.

³²Zuntz, p. 132. He is followed by Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 483; Thiselton, p. 299; cf. also Lindemann, p. 80 and Fee, p. 129 n. 1.

³³Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 483; Thiselton, p. 299.

³⁴1:18; 7:14, 19, 22; 10:16, 19; 12:12, 15f.; to these may be added 11:14f.

³⁵At 7:14 Tischendorf cites A with a "?" as omitting $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; the corner of the leaf is torn away, but there does appear to be sufficient space for the $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, particularly if it has been written in smaller letters. No other edition cites the omission here, but the reading $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ should be noted with a *videtur*.

³⁶Fee, p. 129 n. 3.

³⁷Note that most manuscripts which read the $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \ \eta$ also read $\tau\iota\varsigma$ and omit $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ ($D^{2,3} L \Psi 049 056 0142 0151$ etc.).

3:7.35

A loses ουτε, the result of parablepsis: ΩCΤΕΟΥΤΕ.

3:10.42

Most commentators lean toward reading την χάριν την δοθεισαν without του θεου (added in \mathfrak{P}^{46} 056 0142 81 1505 1611 VL 78 89 vg^{mss}). Schrage claims that there are no examples of similar omissions while there are of additions, which merely begs the question.³⁸ Zuntz argues, on the basis of semantics, that here χάρις specifies “a particular charisma with which that ‘grace of God’ endows an individual,” citing Rom. 12:3 and Gal. 2:9 as parallels without τοῦ θεοῦ. The meaning of χάρις at 1 Cor. 3:10 is not in question.³⁹ However, Zuntz’s conclusion that the presence of τοῦ θεοῦ “obscures a characteristic finesse of the Pauline terminology” and that, where Paul is using the word in this way, “χάρις—quite properly—is not followed by a genitive” is not sustainable. In several places Paul uses χάρις in exactly this sense but does qualify it with τοῦ θεοῦ: 15:10 (2x)⁴⁰; 2 Cor. 9:14; and 2 Cor. 8:1.⁴¹ Therefore, no decisive rule governs the presence of τοῦ θεοῦ.

The reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} may be accounted for in a different way. The manuscript appears to have been copied from an exemplar which had been corrected.⁴² The scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{46} has

³⁸He cites 1 Cor. 1:4; 2 Cor. 8:1; Eph. 3:2 as examples without omission; Rom. 12:3 as an addition.

³⁹See especially BDAG, s.v. χάρις (4).

⁴⁰αυτοῦ is read for τοῦ θεοῦ in 255 1738 2143; it is omitted in 0270* 1611.

⁴¹This last passage does not fit Zuntz’s narrow definition above as a χάρις given to an individual, but is placed into the same entry as the others by BDAG.

⁴²Zuntz, p. 254-6; Royse, p. 253.

apparently misinterpreted the correction in a few places.⁴³ In addition, the scribe had particular difficulty with *nomina sacra* (see 2:14. 61). One possibility is that the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{46} at times misread the bar over the *nomen sacrum* as an omission, and so did not copy it. There are several examples of omissions of *nomina sacra* that are found in no other or few other witnesses: 1 Cor. 8:3 του θεου⁴⁴; 2 Cor. 12:19 εν χριστω⁴⁵; Gal. 4:6 του υιου.⁴⁶ At 1 Cor. 3:10, \mathfrak{P}^{46} does have more support for the omission than these other passages; however, it does fit the pattern, and the omissions certainly could have risen independently. Verification of this conjecture is, of course, impossible without the exemplar of \mathfrak{P}^{46} . However, one should be cautious in trusting \mathfrak{P}^{46} 's handling of these readings. Royse concludes:

The scribe makes a number of errors which result in nonsense, despite frequent correction by him of his text. Many of these seem to arise from his faulty understanding of what he is copying, resulting in a high density of nonsense in context readings. In particular, he rather often errs when he encounters abbreviations of nomina sacra.⁴⁷

The remaining witnesses have little connection with \mathfrak{P}^{46} or early forms of the text. 056 0142, for example, are a pair which frequently attest unique readings, the Latin witnesses can all be traced to one strain of the Vulgate, and 1611 typically matches “Western” readings.

3:10.44

⁴³Zuntz cites 1 Cor. 7:17; 15:2, 51 as examples; Royse cites Rom. 16:19; 2 Cor. 10:8; Phlp. 1:11.

⁴⁴With Clement; see chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses.

⁴⁵This, interestingly, supported as at 1 Cor. 3:10 by VL 75, along with VL 89 Ambrosiaster.

⁴⁶Possibly supported by Marcion, as cited by Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,4,4.

⁴⁷Royse, p. 282.

Δε after αλλος is likely secondary, particularly given the general tendency to add particles as well as a specific tendency to add them in “contrasted elements.”⁴⁸ Zuntz also sees a difficulty with αλλος δε followed by εκαστος δε in the next clause,⁴⁹ though if this caused scribes difficulty it would seem more likely that the second δε would be omitted or replaced. Αλλος without a conjunction is not common, but does occur in Paul (1 Cor. 12:10; 15:41).

3:11.48

The reading δυναται παρα τον κειμενον θειναι (0150 33 81) can be ruled out on the basis of Paul’s usual word order when using the complementary infinitive:⁵⁰ The finite verb is followed immediately by the infinitive⁵¹ unless a different subject is used for the infinitive (which then stands between the finite verb and the infinitive)⁵² or a postpositive conjunction is used.⁵³ In cases where a prepositional phrase modifies the infinitive, the prepositional phrase does not stand between the finite verb the infinitive⁵⁴ unless an adverb or, again, a conjunction is present.⁵⁵

⁴⁸E. W. Güting and D. L. Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, Studies in the Bible and early Christianity 39 (Lewiston: Mellen Press, 1998), p. 64-65. However, they simply cite Zuntz’s conclusion for this reading.

⁴⁹Zuntz, p. 189.

⁵⁰For the construction, see BDR §366 (δύναμαι specifically in §366(2)).

⁵¹1 Cor. 2:14; 6:5; 7:36, 39; 10:13, 27; 11:7; 12:3; etc.

⁵²This is expressed in the accusative, e.g. 1 Cor. 7:7, 32; 10:1, 20, 21; 16:7; etc.

⁵³Gal. 4:20.

⁵⁴See Rom. 8:18, 39; 16:19; 1 Cor. 6:5; 11:10; Gal. 2:17; 32; 4:20; 6:12; etc.

⁵⁵As in Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 5:10; 14:31; 16:7; 2 Cor. 1:15. The sole exception may be 2 Cor. 12:11, but the lack of ὑφ’ before ὑμῶν should be given consideration (as in B* D* etc).

3:12.50

Τουτον is typically dismissed as a clarification.⁵⁶ However, this seems unlikely in view of the statement in v. 10 that there is “no other foundation.” Its omission is more likely due to accidental leap (ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΝΤΟΥΤΟΝ), perhaps even overlooked because it was not deemed necessary. The omission is limited to witnesses that typically agree with each other \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* A B C* 0289, and could have easily occurred in a single early manuscript.

3:12.51

The addition of και (\mathfrak{P}^{46} B 0289) or η (6 pc) separates χρυσον and αργυρον. Since it is unlikely that a scribe would remove the conjunction, it must be secondary.⁵⁷ B, joined by \aleph C^{vid} 0150 1739 pc, read the diminutive forms χρυσιον and αργυριον⁵⁸ Zuntz claims that diminutives increase in the later periods. However, the increase begins already in the “common speech” of the classical period.⁵⁹ Thus Paul himself might have used the diminutives, and been lost in certain manuscripts due to an archaizing influence. The only other example of a shift to the diminutive form found in 1 Corinthians is ποιμνιον at 9:7 in 1241. Contextually, there is nothing to suggest the need for the diminutive forms, so it is more likely that their presence is the result of a common expression. Examples of χρυσι- και

⁵⁶Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 483; Fee, p. 135 n. 5, who dismisses this as a “versional” addition even though attested in the “Byzantine” witnesses.

⁵⁷B. Weiss, p. 115; Zuntz, pp. 40 and 133, who shows the same witnesses adding και at Heb. 8:9 and 9:5. He is followed by Güting and Mealand, p. 61 and Fee, p. 135 n. 6.

⁵⁸Though diminutive in form, the meaning would be “a piece of gold” or “anything made from gold.” See Liddell and Scott, s.v. χρυσίον. It is also possible that χρυσιον is an itacistic corruption of the adjective χρύσεος, “golden.”

⁵⁹Jannaris, §1039.

αργυρι- abound in Greek literature of all periods, including the LXX and early Christian writers.⁶⁰

3:13.53

D* (F G are not extant here) and the D-text offer a substantially different initial clause at 3:13: ο ποιησας τουτο το εργον φανερος γενηται / *qui fecit (fecerit 61 89; facit AMst) hoc opus manifestus erit VL 75*. While the initial impulse would be to simply dismiss the reading as a simplification, the alternative form of the text (εκαστου το εργον φανερον γενησεται) is parallel to 3:13c (εκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ [αὐτὸ] δοκιμάσει) and may have been harmonized to this clause. Furthermore, the D and D-text reading has a parallel at Gal. 3:12 (ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς), so it cannot be dismissed as non-Pauline. However, because this reading resolves the difficulty of the unstated subject (to be inferred from τις at 3:12), it is likely to be a secondary adaptation of the text, one characteristic of this group of witnesses. Whether the alteration originated in the Latin or the Greek, however, cannot be determined, though the fact that no Greek fathers or other versions show any influence from it suggests a Latin origin.

3:13.54

The grip that “external evidence” has on many text-critical discussions is evident in this problem. Those who argue against τουτον at 3:10 – which involves virtually identical issues – see αὐτο at 3:13 as authentic because of the “external evidence.”⁶¹ It should be noted, however, that the strong “external evidence” is only A B C P 6 424^c 1739 *al*; the

⁶⁰E.g., Ex. 31:4; 35:5, 32; Ps. 118:72, etc.; Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 2,12,129,2 and *Stromata* 1,4,25,5 without reference to 1 Cor. 3:12, but also *Stromata* 5,4,26,4 in a citation.

⁶¹Especially Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 483 (enclosed in brackets).

pronoun is absent in \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph D L Ψ 0289 *pm*, Clement of Alexandria, and the Latin tradition. Its function in the sentence is unclear. Αὐτό at 3:13 is often understood as a personal intensive pronoun modifying $\tauὸ \piῦρ$;⁶² however the only other example of this pronoun modifying an immediately preceding noun in Paul is 1 Cor. 11:14 ($\eta \phiύσις αὐτῆ$), where there is context makes clear the emphasis on the noun. Therefore, it would be best understood as a resumptive pronoun, referring back to $\acute{\epsilon}κάστου τὸ \acute{\epsilon}ργον$.⁶³ Zuntz argues that the $\alphaυτο$ was “easily dropped,” but *parablepsis* is not an issue here.⁶⁴ It is more likely that the addition was made to resolve a slight *anacoluthon*: “. . . and of what sort the work of each is, the fire will demonstrate.” The addition of $\alphaυτο$ connects the final clause to the previous by providing the object of the verb $\deltaοκιμασει$.

3:14.56

The use of the temporal augment led to the alteration from $\epsilonπικοδομησεν$ to $\epsilonπωκοδομησεν$ (B² C 049 0142 6 424 1739) Comparison to other examples involving this stem cannot be made, since this is the only Pauline instance where $(\epsilonπ)οικοδομέω$ could have been so altered, but this is likely a secondary adaptation.⁶⁵

3:17.61

⁶²So Conzelmann, p. 71 n. 19; Fee, p. 135 n. 6.

⁶³Zuntz, p. 132; hesitatingly Lindemann, p. 86.

⁶⁴Zuntz, p. 132. He also argues that the absence of $\alphaυτο$ “renders the preceding $\acute{\omicron}ποῖον \acute{\epsilon}στιν$ superfluous,” though, as discussed above, the sentence reads clearly without it.

⁶⁵Moulton and Howard, pp. 191-92, where examples of the exchange in gospels are listed.

An obvious case of attraction, by which φθερει was altered to φθειρει (D F G L P 049* 0150 0151 6) under the influence of the immediately preceding word.⁶⁶

3:17.62

The desire for clarification seems to have led to the substitution of τούτων for αὐτὸν (Ϟ⁴⁶ ⚭ B C L P 1739 1834 *pm*⁶⁷). In Paul the demonstrative is used to refer back to τις only in Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 8:2-3; 2 Cor. 10:7; 2 Thes. 3:14; and Eph. 6:8. Yet in all but the last of these the demonstrative is used only because a form of αὐτός is used nearby.⁶⁸ On the other hand, τις with the personal pronoun αὐτός is quite common in Paul.⁶⁹ Resisting the clarification are A D F G 205 326 2138* *sy*^{p,hmg}.⁷⁰

3:18.63 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

3:19.70 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

3:20.72

Strong arguments can be made on either side: σοφῶν may be a harmonization to the preceding σοφία and σοφους (3:19) as well as σοφός (2x in 3:18), but ἀνθρώπων (056 0142

⁶⁶Zuntz, p. 112; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 484; Fee, p. 454 n. 1.

⁶⁷Note also the number of versions which, perhaps independantly, translate with the demonstrative: VL 75 77 78 Spe Vg *sy*^h; D F G depart from the their corresponding Latin text here.

⁶⁸Rom. 8:9: οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ where αὐτοῦ refers to, apparently θεοῦ; 1 Cor. 8:2-3: οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, where αὐτοῦ refers to θεόν; At 1 Thes. 3:14: τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε μὴ συναμιγνυσθαι αὐτῷ and 2 Cor. 10:7: τοῦτο λογιζέσθω πάλιν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι καθὼς αὐτὸς Χριστοῦ . . . the pronouns refer to the same individual, most likely the shift from the demonstrative to the personal to avoid repetition.

⁶⁹E.g. Rom. 3:3; 1 Cor. 3:15; 8:7, 10; 2 Cor. 10:12, all without variation.

⁷⁰Zuntz, p. 112, does not explain either reading, but rejects αὐτόν.

33 Mcion^E *pc*) is the reading of LXX Ps 93:11. We have already seen Paul, on several occasions, differ slightly from the LXX text, which then was adapted by scribes toward the LXX.⁷¹

3:21.73

Zuntz does not cite this on his list of Marcion's readings (pp. 236-9), which he then compares to the "Western" text. The singular *εν ανθρωπω* (F G Mcion^T Aug Ambr) is intriguing because a list of people follows; *εν ανθρωποις* appears to be harmonization to what follows or, in the case of those manuscripts that read *των ανθρωπων* at 3:20, what precedes.⁷²

3:22.75 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

3:22.76; 3:23.77

In two consecutive places B writes the first person (*ημων, ημεις*) for the second. This is likely a simple sound confusion.

⁷¹E.g., 1 Cor. 1:19 where *αθετήσω* stands, without variation, in place of the *κρύψω* of Is. 29:14; 3:20, where *σοφῶν* is used in place of Ps. 93:11's *ανθρώπων*; and 15:55, where *τὸ νῆκος* replaces the *ἡ δίκη* found in Hos. 13:14.

⁷²H. J. Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus der Paulinischen Briefe," in H. G. Wood, ed. *Amicitiae Corolla* (London, 1933), pp. 274-99. On p. 278 he notes that VL 75 reads *homines* as the result of conflation. It may, however, have been influenced by D's *ανθρωποις*.

Notes on Chapter 4

4:3.8

εἰς ελαχιστον εστιν is difficult. The exact phrase occurs elsewhere only in citations of this text. Two explanations for the creation of the construction are commonly repeated. The first, originating apparently with Lietzmann, is that it “konfundiert aus ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν und εἰς ἐλάχιστον γίγνεται.”¹ He cites Schmid as providing examples of the latter phrase in the Atticizing authors, such as Lucian, Aristides, Aelian, and Philostratus.² These are all examples, however, of εἰς + adj. used adverbially, which is found occasionally in Paul³ but is not the use at 1 Cor. 4:3. A more likely explanation is that it is an “amalgamation” between ελαχιστον εστιν and the LXX’s λογίζεσθαι εἰς,⁴ Numerous examples of adj. + ἔστιν are found in Paul (1 Cor. 3:17; 7:14, 19, 38; 10:28; etc.). However, his examples of εἰς + predicate accusative are found primarily in citations from the LXX.⁵ While this phrase is present in literary texts, particularly in writers acquainted with the LXX and NT, this remained, according to Jannaris, “alien to popular speech” and is never found in the Neo-Hellenic period.⁶ This helps clarify the omission of εἰς (P⁴⁶ 177): it was dropped due to its non-literary nature.

¹Lietzmann, p. 18.

²W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1887-96), I, p. 398; II, p. 237; III, p. 281; IV, p. 455.

³Gal. 2:2; Phil. 2:16 (2x); 1 Thes. 3:5.

⁴BDR §145(2). This is followed by BDAG, s.v., εἰμί 2β.

⁵In an example similar to 1 Cor, 4:3, εἰς + predicate accusative is used with εἰμί in the adaptation of 2 Sam. 7:14 in Rom. 6:18. See also Rom. 5:18 εἰς κατάκριμα with an assumed ἔγενετο and Eph. 5:31 (LXX Gen. 2:24). See Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, pp. 462-63; Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 71.

⁶Jannaris, §1552.

4:5.17

The presence of a relative pronoun immediately following its referent is quite unexceptional in Paul.⁷ The lack of ὅς may be due to several factors, including accidental omission due to the preceding κύριος or an attempt at syntactical improvement.⁸ However, the fact that the reading is found only in D F G with their Latin counterparts VL 75 77 78 suggests a source for the omission in their unique transmission history. The predecessor manuscript to D F G was written in sense lines, as is D.⁹ The predecessor ms. may have been a single column, Greek only manuscript written in sense lines (as is, e.g., also H). More likely, however, given the interaction between the Greek and Latin in evidence in this tradition, it was written with Greek and Latin on facing pages, each in a single column, as is found, for example, in Codex Bezae. When the format was altered slightly to that found in Claromontanus, where two columns, one each of Greek and Latin, are written on the same page, the lines had to be shortened with the result that some single lines spilled over onto a new line. F and G do not retain the sense line format, though it is able to be discerned by the

⁷Examples followed immediately by καί include Rom. 8:34; 16:7; 1 Cor. 1:7-8; 2 Cor. 1:6; 3:5-6; 1 Th 2:13.

⁸Both noted by Lietzmann, 19. The latter is also at work in the omission, in 489 927 1518 and some Latin fathers, of the immediately following καί. P. Corssen (*Epistularum Paulinarum codices graece et latine scriptos Augiensem Boernerianum Claromontanum examinavit inter se comparavit ad communem originem revocavit* (S.l.: H. Fiencke Kiliensis, 1887-89), II, 7) also believes the omission to have taken place in the Greek, then followed by the Latin translator of the bilingual edition. However he also notes that this may not be decisive; in Col 1:23 D F G alone among Greek witnesses reads the relative pronoun ὅς which immediately follows διάκονος; *qui* is read by VL 75 77 VG.

⁹Corssen, I,17.

occasional use¹⁰ of slightly larger letters at the beginning of what had been, in a predecessor, the sense-lines. In D, 1 Cor. 4:5 is laid out in this way:

ΩΣΤΕ ΜΗ ΠΡΟΚΕΡΟΥΤΙ ΚΡΙΝΕΤΕ ΕΩΔΝΕΛΘΗΟ Κ̄C
 ΚΑΙ ΦΩΤΙΣΕΙΤΑ ΚΡΥΠΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΣΚΟΤΟΥC
 ΚΑΙ ΦΑΝΕΡΩΣΕΙΤΑC ΒΟΥΛΑC
 ΤΩΝ ΚΑΡΔΙΩΝ
 ΚΑΙ ΤΟΤΕ Ο ΕΠΑΙΝΟC ΓΕΝΗΣΕΤΑΙ
 ΕΚ ΑCΤΩ ΔΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ¹¹

It is apparent that in this format that the two clauses modifying κυριος are parallel to each other. This also obviates the need for the ὅς, since the subject is now clear from the parallel verbs. Rather than grammatical interest alone leading to the omission, the visual format on the page contributed to the loss of the ος. It is significant that the *Speculum*, which is an excellent witness to the Latin tradition behind D F G,¹² is not written in sense lines, and so does read the *qui*.

4:6.27; 4:6.28; 4:6.29

Prior to the recent debate over 14:34-35, this was widely considered the most likely example of interpolation in 1 Corinthians. Recent literature has summarized and repeated the positions so often that a full review is not necessary here.¹³ The most influential recent version of the interpolation theory is that of J. Strugnell, who argues that the original wording was: ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε, ἵνα εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.

¹⁰This is not consistent, though is clearer in G than in F; it is clear, for example, at 1 Cor. 4:10-11 with its unusually short lines. See Corssen I, p. 20.

¹¹Throughout this study, when the lineation of manuscript is provided, its text is faithfully reproduced, including spelling and the use of *nomina sacra*.

¹²Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, pp. 80-82.

¹³Of particular value are James C. Hanges, "1 Corinthians 4:6 and the Possibility of Written Bylaws in the Corinthian Church," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998), pp. 275-98, esp. pp. 275-81, and Thiselton, pp. 351-56.

According to this argument, an early scribe was uncomfortable with the possibility of reading the second $\iota\nu\alpha$ clause as positive statement, and so added $\mu\eta$ following $\iota\nu\alpha$.¹⁴ The scribe, however, scrupulously noted his addition in the margin: $\tau\omicron \mu\eta \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron \gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$.¹⁵ The $\mu\eta$ then stands for the scribal correction and $\omicron \gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ for the text of the exemplar. A subsequent copyist then incorporated mistakenly incorporated the note into the text itself. However, no recent commentator sees the command to “not go beyond what is written” as so difficult as to require the acceptance of this conjecture,¹⁶ even if there is debate about precisely what writing it is that Paul here invokes.

On this passage Kilpatrick remarks, “We do not seem to have any variants which indicate that the scribes found the text difficult.”¹⁷ Indeed, the variations can be explained as arising within the normal course of transmission. The initial $\tau\omicron$ gave rise to two readings: it may have been dropped (F G 2 330 823) due to not recognizing that it introduces a quotation, or, in the case of F G because of the influence of the Latin, which reads *ne supra quam scriptum* (VL 75 77 78 Spe). In G, *ne* is written above $\mu\eta$ so that the article becomes superfluous. The variation between $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron$ and $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \alpha$ most likely reflects the difficulty

¹⁴D, apparently following the Vulgate, is the only witness to the omission of this $\mu\eta$, but these also read $\tau\omicron \mu\eta \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron \gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ without any indication of textual difficulty.

¹⁵John Strugnell, “A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, with a Coda on 1 Cor. 4:6,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974), pp. 543-48. This is followed by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Interpolations in 1 Corinthians,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986), pp. 81-94 (p. 85). Strugnell’s argument receives specific response in G. D. Kilpatrick, “Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 349-60.

¹⁶Zuntz, who suspects many small interpolations (see pp. 16-17 and 162-71) and resorts to the conjecture of a misreading of marginal notations to explain some corruptions (e.g. 229-30), takes no notice of this passage.

¹⁷Kilpatrick, “Conjectural Emendation,” p. 352.

which modern commentators still have in determining whether the reference is to something stated earlier in the same letter (υπερ ο/*supra quod*: D F G L 048 049 056 0142 0150 *pm* VL 61 75 77 78 *sy*^p)¹⁸ or something outside the letter, such as an OT citation or set of church rules (υπερ α: ϙ⁴⁶ ⑈ A B C P Ψ 0289 33 81 104 234 365 630 1175 1739 1881 *sy*^h). It may have also been influenced by the parallel in Rom. 12:3: Λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν. The addition of φρονεῖν (⑈² C^{vid} D² L P 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0285^{vid} 33 104 326 *pm sy*) or υπερφρονεῖν (1834) was suggested by the το and likewise imported from Romans 12. Kilpatrick's observation is thus confirmed.

4:8.36

ὄφελόν has become a particle in Hellenistic Greek.¹⁹ It has been misunderstood, however, as an augmented form of the verb ὀφείλω at 1 Cor. 4:8 (D² L 0151 5 181 203 226 319 506 623 665 915 1912 2004) and 2 Cor. 11:1 (D² F G H^c K L Ψ 075 0150 0151 etc.). This is not to be dismissed as merely an orthographic variation since no similar interchange of ο to ω takes place in any other occurrence of the verb in the Pauline epistles.²⁰ This is so because all other forms are either augmented already in the aorist or have primary endings; the particle οφελον, however, would have appeared to be an improperly written form of the

¹⁸See W. F. Howard, "1 Cor. iv.6 (Exegesis or Emendation?)" *Expository Times* 33 (1922), pp. 479-80.

¹⁹BDR §359(1). ϙ⁴⁶ shows that it recognizes its function by substituting it with another particle, ἄρα, in Gal. 5:12.

²⁰Rom. 13:8; 15:1, 27; 1 Cor. 5:10; 7:36; 9:10; 11:7, 10; 2 Cor. 12:14; Eph. 5:28; 2 Thes. 1:3; 2:13; Phlm. 18.

imperfect. Therefore the shift to *ωφελον* shows interest in morphological correctness, but a misunderstanding of the form.

4:13.51

While *βλασφημέω* is used in the NT and the LXX far more frequently than *δυσφημέω*, we have already seen that the “rarity” of a word is not the sole, if indeed any, factor in textual variation.²¹ Claims regarding the “rarity” of *δυσφημέω* should be tempered by reference to the citations provided in both LSJ and Lampe. Similarly, the even less common *λοιδορέω* is used in the first clause of this unit (4:12), yet no manuscript alters this word. A more likely explanation is that the use of these words in the context of describing persecution has given rise to the alteration. Paul, as BDAG notes, uses *βλασφημέω* both in relation to humans (Rom. 3:8; 1 Cor. 10:30) and in relation to transcendent beings (Rom. 2:24), apparently with little semantic distinction.²² However, by the end of the second century there appears to have been a distinction drawn between *βλασφημέω* and *δυσφημέω*, so that the former becomes used only of transcendent beings,²³ the latter used occasionally in these contexts but more often, probably influenced by the noun *δυσφημία*, of slanderous statements.

An example of this careful use of *βλασφημέω* is found in Origen’s *Contra Celsum*.

Origen uses *δυσφημέω* to refer to “slanders” made by Celsus against Jesus, such as that he

²¹Fee (p. 165 n. 1), for example, claims the opposite, that many manuscripts “read the more common *βλασφημούμενοι* for the much rarer *δυσφημούμενοι*” and that the latter, as the “more difficult reading is to be preferred.” Presumably this reasoning, combined with the “external evidence,” led the editors of the standard text to print *δυσφημούμενοι*.

²²E.g., Schrage I, p. 348.

²³Cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) [hereafter Lampe], where no entry is given for the verb used with respect to people.

was born in a non-Greek village, the son of a poor servant girl (1,29) or treating him as if he were a sorcerer (1,71). βλασφημέω however, is used with reference to humans only in the direct citations from Celsus. When Origen moves from the citation of Celsus to his response, his use of βλασφημέω is different: he uses it only to refer to “blaspheming” transcendent beings. This is most striking in *Contra Celsum* 8,41-44, where Celsus is cited twice in section 41 and twice again in 43 using βλασφημέω in reference to people. At the end of 8,43, however, Origen uses the verb in reference to the “blaspheming” of demons by Christians. Then in 8,44 Celsus is again cited using βλασφημέω with respect to people. Another example is 5,63, where Celsus uses βλασφημέω to describe what Christians do to each other:

“Moreover,” he continues, “these persons speak blasphemies against one another, saying all manner of things shameful to be spoken; nor will they yield in the slightest point for the sake of harmony, hating each other with a perfect hatred.” (5.63)

In his response, however, Origen gives a verbatim citation of 1 Cor. 4:12b-13a, using δυσφημούμενοι.²⁴

Similar examples of this careful use of βλασφημέω can be found in already in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, where the verb βλασφημέω is used to describe blaspheming against God (62.4; 72.4; 74.2; 96.3). However, when describing humans being defamed the verb καταλαλέω (100.2) or the noun κατάλαλος (73,2) are used, both within close proximity to the use of βλασφημέω. Justin Martyr also evidences this careful distinction, using the noun forms. In *Apologia* 26.6 βλασφήμιας describes what the nations do against God because of Marcion, but δύσφημα is used immediately following in 26.7 to describe the slanderous accusations made against Christians.

²⁴In two places Origen cites 1 Cor. 4:13 using βλαφημουμέμοι: *De oratione* 29.4; *Homiliae in Iob*, MPG 12, p. 1032. Here and in *Homiliae in Iob*, MPG 17, p. 69 δυσφημουμέμοι is used.

This emerging narrower use of βλασφημέω was not yet present in Paul. However, as very early βλασφημέω became used almost exclusively of God, the text was altered to δυσφημεω²⁵ (P⁴⁶ N* A C P 0150 33 181 917 1175 1506 1834 1836 1875 /249 /846²⁶). This alteration having taken place in a passage about how one should respond to persecution is also noteworthy. Many of the manuscripts that have the more developed terminology at 1 Cor. 4:13 also show interest in retaining a high view of martyrdom at 13:3, among them P⁴⁶ N* A 0150 33.

4:14.55

Both νοουθετω (P^{46c} B D F G L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 6 81 326 1881 it vg) and νοουθετων (P^{11vid} N A C P 3 6 33 88 104 256 263 322 337 365 467 630 919 945 1175 1245 1319 1739 2127 2004 /52 /249) could have been influenced by the preceding context.²⁷ Fee's argument, based on Pauline style, is no doubt correct, that "the οὐ/ἀλλά formula ordinarily contrasts coordinates in Paul,"²⁸ here a pair of participial phrases with causative force. The

²⁵A similar alteration did not take place in Rom. 3:8 or 1 Cor. 10:30. In both of these passages, however, in contrast the 1 Cor. 4:13, Paul is the one being "blasphemed." Though later (4th cen.), *Acta Xanthippae et Polyxena* 40 also uses βλασφημέω of Paul, who has by now become somewhat of a transcendent figure himself: he is ὁ μέγας Παῦλος (9) and is described as having Christ-like abilities, as people seek "to touch the hem of his garments" for healing (7).

²⁶The Latin tradition is unanimous in supporting βλασφημουμενοι, using a form of the adopted verb *blasfemo*. In 2 Cor. 6:8 where the noun δυσφημια is used, the Latin uniformly translates with *infamia*.

²⁷In D F G this is even more probable due to the position of γραφω at the end of the previous clause.

²⁸Fee, p. 182 n. 81.

reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46*} (νουθετη²⁹) is nonsense in context, though a possible form (pres act subj 3S).

The correction was apparently influenced by the γράφω.

4:15.58

B 1506 omit the Ιησου from εν γαρ χριστω ιησου under the influence of the immediately preceding εν γαρ χριστω.

4:16.61

Καθως καγω χριστου (104 441 463 367 614 VG^{mss}) is added from 1 Cor. 11:1.

4:17.62

At least twenty other occurrences of διὰ τοῦτο occur in the Pauline epistles.³⁰ In fact, the phrase is so stereotypical that postpositive conjunctions are placed after the τοῦτο rather than the διὰ (Rom. 5:12; 13:6). Zuntz conjectures that the αυτο arose from an early accidental omission of the το in τουτο, resulting in δια αυτο. This was then conflated with δια τουτο to create δια τουτο αυτο.³¹ There is, however, no attestation for this initial corruption. A less complex explanation is that the αυτο was modeled on the common (seventeen occurrences) τὸ αὐτό³², even though διὰ τὸ αὐτό never occurs in Paul. The αυτο

²⁹ \mathfrak{P}^{46} does not write in the iota subscripts; cf. ἔλθη and ἐκάστῳ at 4:5.

³⁰Also in one citation from the LXX (Rom. 15:9) and one plural, διὰ ταῦτα, in Eph. 5:6.

³¹Zuntz, p. 63.

³²This range of variation is found paralleled in 2 Cor. 2:3 (without a preposition): τουτο αυτο \mathfrak{P}^{46} & B D F G P K L Ψ 049 056 075^s etc; αυτο τουτο C 0285 33 1175; τουτο A 81; το αυτο 38.

is present in $\mathfrak{P}^{11vid} \aleph^* A P 33 81 181 326 330 436 462 917 919 1108 1175 1505 1610 1611^*$
1739 1834 1852 sy^h .

4:17.63

In the Pauline epistles, a noun followed by an adjective modified by a genitive pronoun always has the word order: NPA³³, here $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\nu\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ ($\mathfrak{P}^{46} D F G L pm$). In spite of this Zuntz calls this word order at 1 Cor. 4:17 “hackneyed,” and dismisses it as secondary.³⁴ However, the inversion of the noun and pronoun ($\mathfrak{P}^{11vid} \mathfrak{P}^{68} \aleph A B C P \Psi 0150 6 33 69 81 104 181 256 263 462 467 917 1108 1175 1319 1611 1739 1834 1836 1875 2127$) may be due to the influence of the following $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, so the that noun stands immediately before the coordinated adjectives. There is an exact parallel to $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\nu\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, however, in Phil. 4:1 ($\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\pi\omicron\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota$).³⁵

4:19.74

$D^* VL 75^*$ omit the negative particle; see also 4:6.29, though there with more Latin support.

4:20.78

$\mathfrak{P}^{11} 177$ are influenced by the thirty-two examples of this phrase in Matthew, the only NT writing to use $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \tau\omega\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omega\nu$.

4:21.70 [discussed at 2:14.61; the reading of D^* is also discussed in the chapter on D F G]

³³Rom. 6:19; 1 Cor. 4:14; 7:14; 8:7; 10:1; 14:14; 15:58; 2 Cor. 1:7; Phil. 1:13; 4:1; 1 Thes. 3:6.

³⁴Zuntz, p. 161.

³⁵Instead of seeing this a support for $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\nu\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ at 1 Cor. 4:17, Zuntz (p. 181) argues that it caused the corruption. This possibility seems remote.

Notes on Chapter 5

5:1.1

Elsewhere Paul uses the first person of ακούω to report a known problem (1 Cor. 11:18), while 1 Cor. 5:1 is the only place that Paul uses the passive voice (ακούεται) of this verb. However, the reading ακουω (P⁴⁶) appears to be assimilated to ἔλθω in 4:21. Similar examples of a shift in the person of a verb caused by attraction to near context in this manuscript are found in 2 Cor. 8:5 (εδωκαμεν) and 13:4 (ζωμεν).¹ The “report” referenced at 5:1 is first mentioned at 1:11, also with a passive verb (ἐδηλώθη).² The remoteness of this last previous reference may have contributed to this assimilation to near context.

5:1.2

The selection of ὀνομάζω to supply the implied verb at 5:1 (P⁶⁸ N² L P Ψ pm) is not appropriate to the context. The *catena* attributed to Origen fills in the blank properly, using the verb supplied at the beginning of v. 1: “This sort of marriage the Apostle calls *porneia*, and this of such a sort as is not even possible to hear (ἀκουεῖν) among the Gentiles.”³ The addition of ὀνομάζω in the manuscript tradition is not, however, a random choice but adopted from another passage in the *Corpus Paulinum* which discusses πορνεία, Eph. 5:3: Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις. This is the only other passage in the epistles where ὀνομάζω refers a mentioning of vices rather as opposed to the naming (praising, preaching) of God or to those

¹Royse, p. 267.

²Thiselton, p. 385.

³Origen, *Fragmenta* ad 4:21-5:2. The *lemma*, based on the a text similar to the “Byzantine” reading, adds ὀνομάζεται, but the commentary supplies a different, more appropriate verb.

who have received God's name. Harmonization, prompted by the lack of a verb in 5:1, gave rise to this assimilation to Eph. 5:3.

5:2.4

The prefix on the verb ἐξ- was attached to ἀρθῆ (L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151) under the influence of the same verb stem at 5:13, which is based on similar passages in Deuteronomy. This may be due to the familiarity of this passage in ecclesiastical usage⁴ rather than added directly from 5:13.

5:2.5

There is little to distinguish πράσσω and ποιέω semantically. Zuntz see the former as slightly "more forceful," which led to its introduction here (P^{1vid} N A C 6 33) in the context of an injunction to remove an individual from the community.⁵

5:3.7

The loss of particles is common in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. However, in some cases there may have been specific motivations for their omission. μὲν γάρ potentially occurs at 1 Cor. 5:3; 11:7 (μὲν 489); 11:18 (μὲν 2815); 12:8; and 14:17.⁶ These omissions of γάρ may have been occasioned by Paul's non-classical use of this combination.

⁴E.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *In Ecclesiasticen* 5,408; Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* (19,4), which is citing a letter sent by a Synod gathered in Alexandria; Basil, *Regulae brevis tractatae* (MPG 31, pp. 1037, 1144, 1184); etc. All of these examples cite "the Apostle" or "Paul" as the source, not Deuteronomy.

⁵Zuntz, p. 131.

⁶Outside 1 Corinthians in the Pauline epistles at Rom. 2:25 (μὲν 69 642 1319); Rom. 5:16 (μὲν F G 1610); 2 Cor. 9:1 (μὲν C 2 383 491 1099 1836 1874); 2 Cor. 11:4 (no v.l.). Notice in this list the presence of G 2, which omit γάρ in similar examples in 1 Corinthians as well.

The only example without variation is 12:8, which is the only one of these that conforms to an uncommon combination found in classical Greek, where γάρ (following μέν or ἤ) is used appositionally, and “ceases to be used as a conjunction, though the meaning is still explanatory, ‘that is to say’, ‘to wit.’”⁷

Two passages in 1 Corinthians may show an attempt to use the μέν in another classical usage not otherwise found in Paul. Μέν, when used in non-contrastive situations, may be placed into a position that “follows a pronoun at the beginning of a sentence which is not introduced by a connecting particle proper,” in which it “seems to acquire a quasi-connective, progressive force.”⁸ Paul’s usage always places a conjunction after μέν in these situations,⁹ e.g. Rom. 11:13: ἐφ’ ὅσον μέν οὖν¹⁰; Phil 2:23: τοῦτον μέν οὖν¹¹. A similar pattern is found also in Epictetus.¹² At 1 Cor. 5:3, however, ἐγὼ μέν without γάρ is found in 241 263 440 927 1311 2004; 440 again, this time joined by 1610, does the same at 14:17 (σὺ μέν γάρ). To a style-conscious scribe confronted with μέν γάρ in these passages, γάρ would have been viewed with suspicion.

⁷J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), p. 67. Schrage II, p. 135 reflects this by translating with *nämlich*, though without discussion.

⁸Denniston, p. 360.

⁹The most likely candidate for this classical usage in Paul is 1 Thes. 2:18 (ἐγὼ μέν Παῦλος); however the introduction of Paul as subject (using μέν) contrasts with the plural subject of ἠθελήσαμεν earlier in the verse and ὑμεῖς in v. 17.

¹⁰The diversity of the readings here evidence the difficulty with this construction: μέν οὖν is the reading of only ℘⁴⁶ Ɀ A B C P 81 104 1506; μέν is found in L Ψ 049 0156 0142 0151 33 1739 1881 *pm*; μέν οὖν is not read in D F G 69 206* 256 326 337 365 436 547 623 1319 1738 1837 1875 2127 2298.

¹¹μέν without οὖν in 206 1758.

¹²*Dissertationes* 1,27,15 (ἐγὼ μέν γάρ); 3,5,7 (Ἐμοὶ μέν γάρ).

The loss of γάρ at 1 Cor. 11:7 (489) and 11:18 (2815)¹³ appears to reflect a tendency to lose particles rather than any grammatical difficulty.

5:3.8

Should the participle ἀπὼν should be taken as concessive, “although absent,”¹⁴ (Ⓜ¹¹ vid Ⓜ⁴⁶ Ⓜ⁶⁸ Ⓝ A B C D* P 0151 6 33 69 81 326 424 630 1175 1739) or, reading ὡς before απων (D¹ F G L Ψ 88 1875 VL 75 77 78), making a comparison to the actual situation (“as if I were absent”)?¹⁵ The longer text fits awkwardly into the context, either forcing the predicate παρών to be read as a substantive or understanding ὡς as the equivalent of ὡσεὶ or εἰ καί (compare the KJV’s “For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present”). While consideration must be given to the possibility that the ὡς was omitted in order to remove this difficulty, a more likely explanation is that it has been added under the influence of the ὡς παρών in 5:3b as well as the ὡς ἐρχομένου a few verses earlier in 4:18.¹⁶

5:3.9

¹³Rom. 3:2 is very similar: πρῶτον μὲν with γάρ present in most witnesses (not B D* G Ψ).

¹⁴A semantically similar construction, likewise common in Paul, is εἰ καί + indicative verb; an example remarkably similar in meaning (but not form) to 1 Cor. 5:3a is Col. 2:5: εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἶμι.

¹⁵Similar examples of ὡς + participle used in this way are Rom. 15:15; 1 Cor. 5:3b; 1 Cor. 7:30-31. The concessive participle also is found at e.g., Rom. 1:21; 2 Cor. 10:3; 12:1.

¹⁶Though this is a different use of ὡς + participle: focus on an imagined conclusion; see BDAG, s.v. ὡς (3b); N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 4: Style (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976), p. 158. Other examples are found at Rom. 4:17 (εἰς for ὡς in 256); 1 Cor. 4:7, 18; 2 Cor. 6:9, 10; 10:14; Col. 2:20.

κατεργάζομαι is used 20 times in the epistles (eighteen times in Romans, 1 2 Corinthians) 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 (νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ) and 7:20 (οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ). The omission the object τοῦτο at 5:3 in virtually the entire Latin tradition and F G is likely the result of parablepsis: TONOYTOTOTOYTO.¹⁷

5:6.15

NA²⁷ cites as a variant reading the omission of οὐ before καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν. This occurs only in two Latin fathers, Ambrosiaster¹⁸ and Lucifer, though Augustine refers to the variant as well. As the text is presented in our modern printed edition it appears that parablepsis may have prompted the omission (due to the preceding κυρίου, Ἰησοῦ, or χριστοῦ,¹⁹ depending on which reading was present in the manuscript), though as this would have had to have taken place before the use of *nomina sacra* it is an unlikely explanation. Neither could it have occurred in Latin (*domini, iesu, or christi . . . non*). Augustine attempts to explain both readings without deciding which is “original”:

The apostle says . . . *non bona gloriatio vestra*, or, in a reproaching manner, *bona gloriatio vestra*. For thus several and important Latin manuscripts read, although the same thing may be understood in both sentences. No one should fear nor take it has his meaning that it was to praise him that he said: *bona gloriatio vestra*, when also earlier he said: “You are puffed up and did not instead mourn,” (1 Cor. 5:2) and

¹⁷F reads οὐτο, G οὐτω.

¹⁸A handful of manuscripts of Ambrosiaster resolve the difficulty by adding *non*; for *bona* one early printed edition of his commentary added *non bona est*, another *bona est*, both of which make this into a question, for which then a negative answer could be expected. See Vogels, *Ambrosiaster*, ad loc.

¹⁹Wolff, p. 105 n. 52; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC (New York: Scribner, 1911), p. 101.

continuing he adds this: “do you not know that a little leaven corrupts the whole dough?” (5:6)²⁰

The two commentators see little difficulty here as well. Lucifer passes over this individual sentence, discussing 5:3-7 as a unit. Ambrosiaster simply assumes irony: “*Bona gloriatio vestra*. This is evil. For they were joyful when instead they ought to have been saddened in the case of the brother sinning so severely, just as Samuel was saddened in the case of Saul sinning.”²¹

However, could this extremely harsh irony have been written by Paul? Lietzmann believes so.²² Other examples of irony can be found in 4:8: “You already have enough, you are already wealthy, you reign without us. Indeed, I would that you did reign . . .” and 2 Cor. 11:19: “Gladly you endure the foolish, being wise.”²³ though admittedly not in the abrupt fashion that it is here.

If only καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν were before a scribe, are there any other examples of this kind of variation in 1 Corinthians? Editing a series of questions by the addition or omission of a negative particle can be seen at 1:13 and 5:12-13 evidenced in \mathfrak{P}^{46} (see below). Elsewhere, the Latin tradition edits questions in order to remove uncertainty as the implied answer. At 1 Cor. 6:3, μήτι γε βιωτικά anticipates a negative answer to the question “do

²⁰*Contra epistulam Parmeniani* 3,5.

²¹*Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas*, ad 5:6; the reference to Saul’s sin comes from 1 Sam 15, specifically Samuel’s grief in 15:35. There is variation in the manuscripts of this commentary. The later recension identified by Vogels (his γ) replaces the lemma reading *bona* with *non bona*, and in the commentary itself replaces *mala* (“evil”) with *non bona*. The comments themselves indicate, however, that the original recension had *bona* in the lemma. A discussion of the recensions and relative value of the witnesses to Ambrosiaster is given in CSEL 81.1, *Prolegomena* III.B.

²²p. 24: “Sowohl das Fehlen von οὐ wie δολοῖ könnte Urtext sein und die Lesart des ägypt. Textes Eintragung des Normalen.”

²³Both examples cited from Turner, *Style*, p. 83.

you not know that you will judge angels, let alone everyday things?” Virtually the entire Latin tradition, however, translates with *magis saecularia*²⁴, which also assumes a negative answer but does not use the negative particle. It seems likely that the reading of Ambrosiaster and Lucifer are the result of an interest in clarity, and not an archetypical reading which has been lost to the rest of the tradition.

5:6.16

Using the standard “rules” there appears to be little difficulty in deciding the direction in which corruption would have taken place. In the sentence, μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα δολοῖ, the last word, given its proximity to ζύμη can quite easily have been corrupted into ζυμοῖ. This would have been given additional impetus from the parallels in Matt 13:33 and Luke 13:21, which both use forms of ζυμώω with ὅλον in the immediate context, just as at 1 Cor. 5:6. Additionally, whereas apart from a variant reading at Gal. 5:9 (discussed below) no other example of this verb is found in Paul, Paul uses δολόω with the same meaning and in a similar context of whether or not a community is being corrupted in 2 Cor. 4:2. It is not surprising, therefore, that even Lietzmann, who regularly finds textual issues settled by the authority of the “Egyptians,” here notes that δολοῖ “may be original.” It matches the context better, particularly when viewed against the use of the image of leaven as a corrupting influence both in Greek and Jewish sources.²⁵ Zuntz’s argumentation is quite similar, noting also that ζυμώω fits well in the parallels in Matt and Luke, but not 1 Cor. 5.²⁶

²⁴VL 75 reads *neque saecularia*; 64 Aug *nedum saecularia*.

²⁵Lietzmann, pp. 23-4, 174.

²⁶Zuntz, pp. 114-5.

Δολοι has been otherwise universally rejected, however, because of its “weak” attestation: Aside from D*, Basil, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*²⁷ (both of which may be citations of either 1 Cor. 5:6 or Gal. 5:9), the only support comes from the Vulgate, a few old Latin witnesses (c d f*), and the near-unanimous support of the Latin fathers.²⁸ Many commentators therefore dismiss δολοῖ, assuming that the reading “arises through the Latin.”²⁹ However, the range of variation demonstrates that in fact the Latin is translating a different Greek text. Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 13,18) uses *desipiat* here, “renders insipid,”³⁰ while the bulk of the Latin tradition uses a form of *conrumperere*, “to destroy, waste, ruin, despoil.” While both of these might be dismissed as “improvements” in translation, it is significant that it this requires that the improvement took place in at least two separate translations. Furthermore, when translating the verb ζυμώω in both Matt 13:33 and Luke 13:21 the entire Latin tradition uses a form of *fermentare* (cf. also the unanimous use of *fermentum* to translate ζύμη at Matt 16:6). On the other hand, in 2 Cor. 4:2 *adulterantes* is used, without variation, to translate the participle δολοῦντες. Finally, the assumption of Latin influence on the Greek fails to take into account the Greek patristic evidence. Basil cites this passage on four occasions, each time using δολοῖ,³¹ as does *Apostolic Constitutions*

²⁷Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 485 also cites Marcion for this reading, but it is clear from location the citations in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,3 and 42,12,3 that the passage in Galatians is under discussion. Epiphanius discusses Marcion’s text of 1 Cor. 5:5 and 5:7, but not 5:6.

²⁸Only Pacianus (*Paraenesis ad paenitentium* 8,1) reads *fermentat*.

²⁹Thiselton, p. 400; cf. Fee, p. 214 n. 1.

³⁰Lewis and Short cites this occurrence in Tertullian as the only example the verb used with this meaning.

³¹Basil, *Regulae brevius tractatae*, MPG 31, p. 1141 and 1144; *De Baptismo*, MPG 31, p. 1617.

2,17.³² Unless these can be shown to have been influenced by the Latin as well, $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ must be a genuine Greek variant. The parallel at Gal. 5:9 gives additional support to the Greek basis for this reading. There the support is similar: D^* , Latin manuscripts (though here the Old Latin unanimously reads *corrumpit*) and fathers, but the crucial additional witness of Marcion, as cited in Epiphanius *Panarion* 42,11,3 and 42,12,3. Therefore $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ is the earliest verifiable reading here.³³ Jerome's comments on Gal. 5:9 also indicate further Greek manuscript support than is now extant:

Incorrectly in our manuscripts is found: *modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit*. A translator himself conveyed a better meaning than the words of the apostle. However Paul uses this exact sentence [that is, with *corrumpit*] also to the Corinthians . . . he says: *nescitis quia modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit?* or, as we now emend (*emendavimus*), *totam conspersionem fermentat*.³⁴

Jerome's complaint is that the Latin manuscripts before him have improved the Greek $\zeta\upsilon\mu\omicron\iota$ by using *corrumpit*, but that in 1 Corinthians there was not a similar corruption. This implies that Jerome knew of manuscripts that read $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ at 1 Cor. 5:6, although today none of our witnesses have a different reading in the two passages. In any case, the argument that $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ is simply a Latin corruption or improvement cannot be sustained; it must be assessed as a genuine Greek variant, and on that basis it stands as the only not to have undergone corruption. The disagreement between D and F G is due to the habitual influence of the near

³²There does appear to be a unique connection between D and the *Apostolic Constitutions*. In addition to this reading, at 1 Cor. 11:24 D^* alone reads $\theta\rho\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$, again with the support of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8,12.

³³Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 187.

³⁴*Commentarii in epistulam ad Galatas* 3 (Gal. 5:9). *conspersionem* (= $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\mu\alpha$) is also found elsewhere only in Tertullian's citation of the verse.

context in the latter two witnesses, a type of corruption that D often avoids when F G do not.³⁵

5:7.18

This unique reading helps clarify the relationship between 056 and 0142. The τὸ γὰρ τό of 056 perhaps arose from copying by phrase (the τὸ repeated accidentally), so that the three elements καὶ γὰρ τό were written mistakenly as τὸ γὰρ τό. This impossible collocation was altered to the more sensible γὰρ το of 0142.

5:7.19

There is clear theological significance to the phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν in connection with language about the sacrificial death of Jesus. Such language is Pauline (Rom. 5:8; 8:32; Gal. 3:13; etc.), though it does not occur elsewhere in 1 Corinthians. Neither is the use of a prepositional phrase immediately after a pronoun in the genitive uncommon (Rom. 1:24, 27; 2 Cor. 10:15; 12:21; Gal. 1:16). Most significantly, the omission may be accounted for quite readily on transcriptional grounds as haplograph: ΗΜΩΝΥΠΕΡΗΜΩΝ.³⁶ Nevertheless, accidental omission is less likely than that this is another example of expansionistic, clarifying readings found in numerous places in the “Byzantine” witnesses (see conclusions on the “Byzantine” text).

5:7.20

³⁵E.g., 1 Cor. 2:11 τα εν τω θεω F G for τα του θεου caused by preceding τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ.

³⁶Schrage I, p. 383 denies the possibility of accidental omission by claiming that there is no tendency to omit the phrase in its other occurrences in the epistles. However, none of these other examples has ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν following ἡμῶν.

When confronted with the choice of whether or not to read the article before *χριστός*, Zuntz tentatively offers this suggestion: “I suspect that the omissions are genuine and the additions spurious.”³⁷ He notes that D F G omit the article in Rom. 15:3 (with 1739) and 1 Cor. 11:3 (with B* *al*), while F G alone add it in Rom. 15:18 and this passage, 1 Cor. 5:7. Typically F G omit the article, probably under the influence of the Latin’s lack of an equivalent (see the D F G chapter). However, the article may have been added in these manuscripts due to the presence of the *nomen sacrum*. A similar examples is found at 4:1 (τοῦ before θεοῦ; F G alone).

5:8.22; 5:11.32

Two variants in this chapter involve the use of negative particles in a series. At 5:8 two prepositional phrases stand in parallel, modifying the same verb: *ἐορτάζωμεν μὴ ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας*. This conforms to normal Greek and Pauline usage (Rom. 6:12-13; 14:21; 2 Cor. 4:2). However B 056*^{vid} read *μή* twice, resulting in an otherwise non-Pauline construction.³⁸ A second variation here reads *μή . . . ἢ* (630 1739 1881), again a coordination not otherwise attested in Paul.

Again at 5:11 a similar variation takes place, and in manuscripts that are generally regarded as related to those involved in the alterations in 5:8. One alteration here can be dismissed easily, since the variation between *μήτε* (F G) and *μηδέ* (*rel.*) is simply another example of the confusion of the dentals *δ* and *τ* in these manuscripts. Of more significance, however, is the reading *μή*, found only in A, which may be the result of more than an accidental simplification. In the *Hauptbriefe*, aside from this passage, *μηδέ* only occurs in

³⁷Zuntz, p. 103 n. 2.

³⁸*μή . . . μή* only stand in series when modifying different verbs, e.g., Rom. 11:8; 14:3; 1 Cor. 7:29-30; 2 Cor. 4:18).

series with a preceding negation (Rom. 5:13; 9:11; 14:21; 1 Cor. 5:8; 10:7-10; 2 Cor. 4:2).

Although Eph. 5:3 is the only other passage in the *Corpus Paulinum* where μηδέ has the intensive idea implied in the translation “not even,”³⁹ οὐδέ frequently is used this way (1 Cor. 3:2; 4:3; 5:1; 14:21; 15:13, 16; etc.), with μηδέ used instead in 5:11 due to its association with the infinitive συνεσθίειν. Despite this normal usage of μηδέ, A replaces it with μή. This assumes a full stop after ἄρπαξ, with the clause τῷ τοιούτῳ μὴ συνεσθίειν standing independent of the list of vices. Verse 11b then becomes a separate instruction, standing in parallel, rather than an intensive relationship, to 11a. This may be due at least in part to the question of whether a reader would have understood συνεσθίειν as less problematic than συναναμίγνυσθαι.⁴⁰ This difficulty would be resolved if the relationship between μή . . . μηδέ were understood as it commonly is elsewhere: as a series rather than intensively: “Do not associate with . . . nor eat with such a one.” The μή . . . μή in A accomplishes the same thing, though again, as with μή and ἢ at 5:8, creating a non-Pauline coordination.

³⁹So BDAG, s.v. μηδέ (2); Schrage, p. 386; Thiselton, p. 415; etc.

⁴⁰See Thiselton, p. 415; Schrage I, pp. 393-4.

5.8.23 [discussed in the chapter on D F G]

5:10.26 [discussed in the chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses]

5:11.30

The *-í demonstrativum* was commonly attached to pronouns and adverbs in Attic Greek for emphasis.⁴¹ However, by the Ptolemaic period there is little evidence of any distinction in meaning between $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$.⁴² Neither do the standard NT lexica and grammars find any significant semantic difference between the two. Rather, a distinction is drawn in the contexts in which they are used, so that $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ may be used with the article as a demonstrative, but $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ may be used to introduce “the real situation after an unreal conditional clause or sentence.”⁴³ However, this conclusion may be flawed due to the reliance on the standard text. What is not noted in BDAG is that while there are no examples of article + $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$, there is variation between $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ in every example given of $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ used after an “unreal condition.” In order to test whether any distinction exists between $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ in Paul,⁴⁴ an examination was made of every example of in Romans, 1 2 Corinthians, and Galatians to see if the either Paul or the manuscripts show any consistency in their use of $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$.

⁴¹Kühner-Blass, I.1, p. 620; BDF §64(2).

⁴²Mayser I,3, p. 110.

⁴³BDAG, s.v., $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ (2b) and $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ (2b).

⁴⁴Where $\nu\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ is used almost exclusively; elsewhere in the NT only Acts 22:1; Heb. 8:6; 9:26; 11:16, each time with variation.

Whether intentionally or not, the standard text prints the reading of ϖ⁴⁶ C in every place. Particularly in the case of ϖ⁴⁶ is there considerable doubt as to its care in copying.⁴⁵ In addition, there appears to be little reason to read vuví at 1 Cor. 12:18 but vûv at 12:20 when both passages appear in identical contexts, make the same contrasts, and are used with the same conjunctions.

Of the examples of vûv/vuví from the *Hauptbriefe* that occur without variation, the following observations may be made. First, when used adjectivally with the article, vûv is used without exception: Rom. 3:26; 8:18, 22; 11:5; 2 Cor. 5:16; 8:14 (*omit F G*); Gal. 4:25. Second, when the conjunction δέ is not present, vûv is always used: Rom. 5:9; 5:11; 6:19; 6:21; 8:1; 11:31; 13:11; 1 Cor. 3:2; 16:12; 2 Cor. 6:2; 7:9 (*omit D 547; add δέ 917*); 8:14 (*omit F G*); 13:2; Gal. 1:23; 3:3; 4:29. Both of these conclusions are hinted at in the respective entries in BDAG.

A third observation is that when used before δὲ οὐκέτι or δὲ μηκέτι, vuví is always used (Rom. 7:17; 15:23). The two passages show a difference in the precise *meaning* of vuví. BDAG lists 7:17 of an example of a “temporal marker with focus on a prevailing situation, with the idea of time weakened or entirely absent,” while 15:23 is a “temporal marker with focus on the moment as such.” However, it appears that semantics may not be an issue at all, but the phonological similarity of vuví to the following οὐκέτι/μηκέτι. This may also be a factor (though see below) in the use of vuví at 1 Cor. 13:13, where it appears again without variation⁴⁶ immediately following several examples of the semantically and grammatically

⁴⁵Royse, p. 282; Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, p. 99 describes it as a “Free text,” i.e., “characterized by a greater degree of variation than the “normal” text,” in contrast to a “strict text . . . which reproduced the text of its exemplar with greater fidelity” (p. 93).

⁴⁶F G omit vuví, reading μένει δέ under the influence of the Latin *manet autem*.

similar ἄρτι in the preceding verse, as well as its connection with a similar sounding verb:

νοῦνί δὲ μένει.

Of the all the examples, Gal. 2:20 stands out as unique in that δέ precedes νοῦν: ὁ δὲ νοῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί. Here the position of the relative pronoun before νοῦν, similar to the use with the article described above, forces the νοῦν to follow the postpositive δέ.⁴⁷

It is with the remaining examples, where νοῦν/νοῦνί precedes δέ, that the most variation occurs:. Only 2 Cor. 8:11 has no variation whatsoever. There νοῦνί is read, and there is a clear time element involved in the preceding clause: προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρουσι. In several other passages where there is a clear time element, the most appropriate conclusion is that νοῦνί δέ should be read:

	<i>Time reference from context</i>	<i>Mss. reading νοῦν</i>
Rom. 3:21		489 2138
Rom. 6:22	6:20 ὅτε	323 1890
Rom. 7:6	7:5 ὅτε	F G
Rom. 15:25	15:24 ὡς ἂν	F G
1 Cor. 15:20	5:17 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται	F G
2 Cor. 8:22	8:21 ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον ὄντα	1890

It will be readily observed that F G 1890 prefer νοῦν in these examples. In the case of the Greco-Latin bilinguals, this may be due to the influence of the Latin *nunc*,⁴⁸ which, like νοῦν, lacks a final vowel. Regardless of the cause, however, whether influence from the Latin or

⁴⁷One additional example is the spurious Rom. 16:26: φανερωθέντος δὲ νοῦν. Elsewhere Paul's word order is νοῦν - δέ - participle (Gal. 5:9).

⁴⁸These manuscripts always use *nunc* to translate both νοῦν and νοῦνι in the *Hauptbriefe*.

mere carelessness, where these manuscripts read $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ without other evidence their value should be questioned.

This leaves six examples of $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu/\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$ to be discussed. In each of these, a distinction can be seen between the temporal and the inferential or logical use. Fee uses this semantic distinction to argue for reading $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$ at 1 Cor. 12:18, where a logical use is demanded, and for $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ at 5:11 where he sees a temporal sense.⁴⁹ BDAG sees $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$ as able to be used in both senses; however, once again all the examples cited from Paul for “logical” $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ involve textual variation. The manuscript evidence is inconsistent in these remaining cases:

⁴⁹Fee, p. 608 n. 1 and p. 220 n. 4. This distinction is also made at 13:13 (pp. 649-50) and 14:6 (p. 661 n. 5). Most commentators on 1 Corinthians do not note the variation between $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$, nor seem to take significant notice of whether or not one or the other is read in the text. Conzelmann, for example, translates the examples in both 12:18 and 20 with “as it is,” though not noting any variation. Thiselton (pp. 1103-4) gives the same translations, likewise without noting any difference in the Greek. Schrage III, p. 223, glosses 12:18 with “Wie die Dinge wirklich liegen” but does not comment on the example at 12:20.

	Rom. 11:30	1 Cor. 5:11	1 Cor. 7:14	1 Cor. 12:18	1 Cor. 12:20	1 Cor. 14:6
	temporal	??	temporal	logical	logical	logical
ϑ ⁴⁶	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν
κ	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν
A	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν
B	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν
C	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν
D	νὺν	νυνί	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν
F G	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν
L	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί
P	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν
Ψ	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νὺν
056/0142	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί	νὺν	νυνί
1739	νὺν	νὺν	νὺν	νυνί	νυνί	νυνί

The use of νὺν/νυνί at 5:11 is exegetically debatable. The ἔγραψα 5:9 most likely refers to a previous letter (ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ) rather than the letter at hand (an “epistolary aorist”).⁵⁰

The reading νυνί at 5:11, however, would suggested logical connection to the preceding ἔγραψα (5:9), assuming then also an epistolary aorist at 5:9. At issue is whether or not Paul wrote a (now lost) letter to the Corinth prior to 1 Corinthians.

Two immediate observations may be made on the basis of the table. First, the lack of consistency of the individual manuscripts. The manuscript tradition does not evidence a systematic attempt to make a consistent distinction between νὺν and νυνί. A is the only manuscript to show any kind of pattern by simply defaulting to νὺν in each of these cases. F G, in contrast to its alterations to νὺν does appear to maintain some kind of distinction, by

⁵⁰Fee, pp. 220-24; Thiselton, pp. 408-9, 413; Schrage I, pp. 385-6, but without extended discussion.

the two uses $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$, though the differences between 12:18 and 20 may reveal a rather haphazard attempt rather than a formal, careful editing process. Second, the homogeneity of the traditional manuscript “families” fail completely. \aleph B agree in only half of these; B 1739 agree only twice; \mathfrak{P}^{46} 1739 fare somewhat better at 4 agreements; Only D F G appears to show the kind of relationships amongst themselves that are found elsewhere, agreeing 5 times. It appears that an appeal to “Text families” or “Best manuscripts” will solve little in these cases.

However, Fee’s distinction between $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ as “temporal” and $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$ as “logical” can be useful in making textual decisions. This would result in only slight alteration to the standard text: 1 Cor. 12:20 and 14:6 would read $\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$ in place of $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$.⁵¹ One must be cautious, however, to note that the author’s own usage may not have been entirely consistent. Some of these examples may in fact be corrections of the author. For our purposes, however, we do see a lack of rigorous care in the manuscript tradition. B, for example would have the “correct” reading only twice; 1739, on the other hand, has either inherited or created a consistent and perhaps correct pattern of the use of $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu/\nu\nu\acute{\iota}$.

5:11.33

The word order variation in C is the result of the scribe catching a potential parablepsis. The eye skipped from ΗΠΟΡΝΟC to the next occurrence of $-\text{OC}$, ΗΛΟΙΔΟΡΟC . The copying then continued with $\eta\ \acute{\mu}\epsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, but at this point the scribe realized the error and filled in the missing text: $\eta\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma\ \eta\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho\eta\varsigma\ \eta\ \lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$. 69 shows *homoioarcton* instead, skipping from $\eta\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\nu\omicron\varsigma$ over $\eta\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ to $\eta\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$.

⁵¹Fee notes the difficulty of reading $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ at 14:6, but deviates from his practice elsewhere by accepting a logical use of $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ here.

The mistake was realized immediately, however, and ἡ πλεονέκτης written after ἡ εἰδωλόατρης.

5:12.36

The presence of καὶ after μοι in 5:12 may be the result of an attempt to highlight Paul's authority to judge those "on the inside," which was already stated in 5:3-5, but now contrasted with his authority over against those "on the outside," whom he does not have authority to judge "as well."⁵² An additional possibility is that scribes added καὶ to make the construction similar to the formulaic construction τί - dative pronoun - καί - dative. This construction, common in Attic,⁵³ does not occur elsewhere in Paul but is found in the Synoptic Gospels and John⁵⁴ as well as the LXX.⁵⁵ This is most likely in the case of 0151, which reads the dative τοῖς in place of τοῦς.

5:12.35 [discussed in the D F G chapter]

5:12.38 [see also 6.2.7]

Ⲫ⁴⁶ shows an interest in clarity in several passages where a question is asked. The ambiguity of the question at 1:13⁵⁶ is removed by the addition, in several late manuscripts (326 441 467 1912) of μὴ before μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός. This balances the question with

⁵²Fee, p. 220 n. 5. Cf. the KJV: "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without?"

⁵³Kühner-Gerth II,1, p. 417; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2. Abt. 1. T. (Munich: Beck, 1939-53), II, 143.

⁵⁴Matt 8:29//Mark 5:7//Luke 8:28; Mark 1:24//Luke 4:34; John 2:4.

⁵⁵2 Reg. 16:10; 19:23; 3 Reg. 17:18; 4 Reg. 3:13; 2 Chr. 35:21; 1 Esd. 1:24.

⁵⁶BDR §400.

the one that follows immediately: *μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη*, so that the first question, which unlike the second had not been introduced by a negative particle, is not misunderstood to expect a positive answer. But \mathfrak{P}^{46} undertakes further revision, not only adding the *μὴ* but also altering the *μὴ* before *Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη* to *ἤ*. The result is one question, separated into three clauses by *μή . . . ἤ . . . ἤ*. Here there is no possibility that the question can be misunderstood.

Again at 5:12-13, \mathfrak{P}^{46} alone gives editorial attention to an interrogative clause in order to ensure a proper understanding on the part of the reader. In place of a question that anticipates a negative answer: “Do you not judge⁵⁷ those inside?” \mathfrak{P}^{46} has a command: “You yourselves judge those inside!” (*τοὺς ἔσωθεν ὑμεῖς κρίνατε*). The editing continues in the use of *ἔσωθεν* in place of *ἔσω*, which is matched in the next verse with *ἔξωθεν* in place of *ἔξω*. \mathfrak{P}^{46} is the only manuscript to make these alterations as well. They are recognized as secondary because, aside from any semantic difference,⁵⁸ Paul always uses, without variation in the manuscripts, *ἔξω* and *ἔσω* with the article (Rom. 7:22; 1 Cor. 5:12a; 2 Cor. 4:16), but *ἔξωθεν* and *ἔσωθεν* without the article (2 Cor. 4:16). This alteration has taken place in spite of the *ἔσω* at the beginning of 5:12, which \mathfrak{P}^{46} does not alter. The fact that the *ἔσω* in 5:12a does not preserve the *ἔσω* in 5b may indicate a pause in the copying as the text was altered, but the fact that *ἔσωθεν* leads to *ἔξωθεν* indicates that 5:12b and 5:13a were copied in view of each other.

5:13.42

⁵⁷The mood of *κρίνετε* could be either imperative, or, more likely in this context (because *οὐχί* is used) an indicative.

⁵⁸The *-θεν* suffix indicates “*from* some place”; see Jannaris, §434.

The abruptness of the direct command led to the insertion of the *καί* (D² L 88 915 1912 *pm*). The interchange of vowels led to the various spellings *ἐξαίρετε* (P⁴⁶ 6 1739 1881), *ἐξάρατε* (N A B C D* F G P Ψ 33 1175 *pc*), and *ἐξαρεῖτε* (D² L 88 218 330 915 1912 *pm*). In the case of the future tense *ἐξαρεῖτε* this was helped by the various similar statements which use the future (though the singular form: *ἐξαρεῖς*) in the LXX of Deuteronomy (13:6; 17:12; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21; 24:27).⁵⁹

5:13.43

Augustine describes the consequences of reading the neuter article (*τὸ πονηρόν* in 42 1906) in place of the masculine (*τὸν πονηρόν*):

Now the Greek has *τὸν πονηρόν*, which also is written here. This however is usually to be understood better as *malignum* than *malum*. He does not say: *τὸν πονηρόν*, that is, “this evil thing” but *τὸν πονηρόν*, which is “this evil one.”⁶⁰

The Latin *malum* could be understood as either the neuter noun or the masculine adjective, whereas *malignum* ensures that the masculine is understood (though no Latin manuscripts read it). Augustine does not note any Greek manuscripts with this reading since his discussion focuses on the ambiguity in the Latin. The neuter *τὸ πονηρόν* focuses on the action rather than the individual, whereas in this context it is clear that the individual is being judged, not merely the action.

⁵⁹Fee, p. 220 n. 8, attributes both the addition of *καί* and the future tense to harmonization to Deut. 17:7.

⁶⁰Augustine, *Quaestionum in Deuteronomio* 39.

Notes on Chapter 6

6:1.1

The partitive genitive in Paul can appear with the preposition ἐκ (e.g. ἐκ τοῦ σώματος four times in 1 Cor. 12:15-16). However, when following pronouns NT usage in general (apart from John) and particularly Paul favors the genitive without the preposition:¹ With τις: 1 Cor. 10:7, 8, 9, 10; 1 Thes. 2:9, 19; 2 Thes. 3:8; with ἕκαστος: Rom. 15:2; 1 Cor. 1:12 (ὁμιν 1875); 16:2, 14, 24; with οὐδείς: 1 Cor. 1:14 (ἐξ ὑμῶν 1875). The only example in the *Hauptbriefe* with ἐκ is Rom. 11:14.² At 1 Cor. 6:1 a large number of manuscripts (A P 33 69 104 177 206* 256 263 326 365 642 1881* 1912 2127 2138 etc.) have added the preposition under the influence of ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, which immediately precedes in 5:13.

6:1.2

Although the word order πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον πρᾶγμα ἔχων κρινεσθαι, which places the prepositional phrase prior to the participle which it modifies, is found primarily in Latin and Latin-influenced witnesses (D F G; Latin fathers), it cannot be attributed solely to a Latin word order variation due to the witness of Ψ 547 1926. Zuntz claims that this is one among several examples of word order variation where the “context and emphasis, rhythm and sound alike are all impaired” and that “the origin of each and all is easily accounted for.”³ He does not, however, give an explanation for the specific cause of variation.

¹BDR §164.

²Also Col. 4:9, 12.

³Zuntz, p. 160-61.

That *πραγμα εχων προς τον ετερον κρινεσθαι* is the original form can be shown by the fact that Paul typically places the prepositional phrase after the anarthrous participle (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:2, 10; 2:1; 8:12; 14:25; 15:58), in addition to a few examples of the position of the prepositional phrase between the participle and another element, typically a finite verb or another participle.⁴ The two exceptions either have a clear emphasis which places them at the beginning of their clause (1 Cor. 16:6 *προς υμας δε τυχον*), or must find a different position due to the surrounding elements (1 Cor. 15:19: *ει εν τη ζωη ταυτη εν Χριστω ηλπικότες εσμεν μονον*).⁵ Close parallels can be found for *πραγμα εχων προς τον ετερον κρινεσθαι* at 1 Cor. 7:25 (*ως ηλεημενος υπο κυριου πιστος ειναι*) and 2 Cor. 10:15 (*ελπιδα δε εχοντες αυξανομενης της πιστεως υμων εν υμιν μεγαλυνθηναι*).

B. Weiss claims that the loss of the article in *προς τον ετερον* is a simple error, noting also other omissions of article in 2 Cor. 12:2 (*εκτος του σωματος* B 642); Rom. 13:1 (*κ* A B D P 0151* – ℘⁴⁶ lac*); Col. 1:20 *επι της γης* (*℘⁴⁶ B 056 0142 919 1831*).⁶ Little consistency, and certainly no pattern is discernible here. Indeed, in the last example the article is not omitted from the following prepositional phrase: *εν τοις ουρανοις*.

⁴1 Cor. 8:10: *εαν γαρ τις ιδη σε τον εχοντα γνωσιν εν ειδωλειω κατακειμενον*; 11:4: *προφητευων κατα κεφαλης εχων*; 12:3 *ουδεις εν πνευματι θεου λαλων*; 14:9: *εσεσθε γαρ εις αερα λαλουντες*

⁵The word order *ει εν τη ζωη ταυτη ηλπικότες εσμεν εν χριστω μονον* is found in D¹ K L P ℣ etc., perhaps to avoid the awkwardness of two prepositional phrases standing next to each other. The result, however, is nonsensical in context.; cf. the ASV: “If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable” – as if Paul was urging hope in Christ also in the next life.

⁶B. Weiss, p. 77.

6:2.5; 6:15.50; 6:16.58

Paul uses the phrase οὐκ οἶδατε ten times in 1 Corinthians and twice in Romans. Each time it introduces a statement that should be self-evident to his audience, whether due to a general knowledge of the world or to a particular teaching.⁷ Zuntz has suggested that when preceded by ἢ these statements substantiate a preceding statement, but when appearing asyndetically they introduce a new point.⁸ Furthermore, in the seven examples of οὐκ οἶδατε which occur without variation there is also a strong verbal link between the statement and what either precedes (in the examples of ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε) or what follows (οὐκ οἶδατε). With ἢ it occurs in Rom. 11:2⁹; 1 Cor. 6:9 (ἄδικοι; ἀδικεῖτε 6:8); and 6:19 (τὸ σῶμα; τοῦ σώματός 6:18). Without ἢ: 1 Cor. 5:6 (ζύμη; ζύμην 5:7); 6:3 (βιωτικά; βιωτικά 6:4); 9:13 (ἐσθίουσιν . . . συμμερίζονται; οὕτως καί . . . ζῆν 9:14); 9:24 (τρέχουσιν; οὕτως τρέχετε). To this should be added 1 Cor. 3:16, where και is added before οὐκ οἶδατε only in 1319 2127 (ναὸς θεοῦ; τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ 3:17).

Using this observation, the unit of variation at 6:15 may be explained. Οὐκ οἶδατε introduces a question which includes the noun phrase μέλη Χριστοῦ. This is then repeated in the second half of the verse (τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Η is added before οὐκ οἶδατε in 6 296 823 under the influence of ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε at 6:9. The same addition in F G is not from

⁷J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 85; Thiselton, p. 316; Schrage I, p. 409.

⁸Zuntz, p. 195.

⁹There is no precise verbal correlation between 11:2bff. (ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε . . .) and 11:2a. However, in contrast to the other examples, ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε introduces several sentences (11:2b-4) rather than a single clause. In these a comparison is drawn between the remnant preserved by God in Elijah's day and the non-rejection by God of Israel described in 11:2a.

the same source, but the result of adaption to lost text (see the discussion in the chapter on D F G).

Two examples, however, substantiate Paul's previous argument but at the same time introduce a new direction in the argument. 1 Cor. 6:2a follows the introduction of the issue of lawsuits among believers, repeating much of the same language from 6:1 (κρίνεσθαι . . . τὸν κόσμον κρινοῦσιν; ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων . . . οἱ ἅγιοι). Yet these are also repeated in 6:2b (κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος; ἐν ὑμῖν) as the discussion moves to Paul's instructions on the topic; indeed, 6:2b is virtually a restatement of what precedes.¹⁰ Similarly, 1 Cor. 6:16a has links with 6:15, not only lexically (τὰ σώματα 6:15. . . ἐν σώμα; πόρνῃς 6:15 . . . τῇ πόρνῃ) but also structurally, with οὐκ οἴδατε introducing parallel statements in both. Both 6:15 and 16 are part of Paul's discussion of the use of the body, but 6:16 shifts slightly from its improper use to an argument for its proper use. This "hinge" function of οὐκ οἴδατε, where the statement introduced by it relates to that which both precedes and follows, has no doubt played its part in producing the wide attestation of textual difficulty in both 1 Cor. 6:2 (omit η: D² L 056 0151 6 88 623 629 1241 *pm*) and 6:16 (omit η: ℘⁴⁶ D K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 *pm*).

Is there a tendency that can be detected in the manuscripts? Zuntz notes that "removal, rather than the creation, of asyndeton is the characteristic trend of the tradition."¹¹

¹⁰Zuntz (p. 195) argues that 6:2 "seems to introduce the elaboration of the reproach contained in the preceding questions." This is identical to the way it is used in Rom. 6:16, where Zuntz argues for οὐκ οἴδατε without ἦ (added in D* F G). It seems that Zuntz's "better manuscripts" are allowed to hold sway here, despite his argumentation.

¹¹Zuntz, p. 195. This is listed as one of three reasons for his hesitation in accepting the reading οὐκ οἴδατε at 1 Cor. 6:16. The other two, however, are virtually indistinguishable: that Paul should have conformed in this passage to Rom. 6:16 (where he accepts οὐκ οἴδατε) and that "it seems natural" after μὴ γένοιτο, which is in fact identical to the situation in Rom. 6:16.

However this is a questionable conclusion for this specific variation, particularly at 1 Cor. 6 where the same formula occurs six times. Instead, assimilation to the near context is a more likely explanation in every case of variation: At 6:2 the omission of η brings the text into agreement with the preceding example of $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \text{o}\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ at 5:6 and that immediately following at 6:3. It is also added at 6:15 under the influence of 6:9 (see above), and in F G at 6:15b. In manuscripts which avoid this addition of η at 6:15, it is dropped at 6:16 (\mathfrak{P}^{46} D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm*), also due to assimilation.

6:2.7

In several places \mathfrak{P}^{46} edits an interrogative clause (see the discussions at 1:13 and 5.12), here joined by D* VL 64 Hilary Pelagius. The removal of $\epsilon\iota$ has the effect of splitting the question in 6:2b into two sentences: the first, $\text{kai } \epsilon\nu \text{u}\mu\text{i}\nu \text{k}\rho\text{i}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\text{i } \omicron \text{k}\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, becomes an answer to the question in 6:2a: $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \text{o}\text{i}\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon \text{o}\tau\text{i } \omicron\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{i}\omicron\text{i } \tau\omicron\nu \text{k}\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\nu \text{k}\rho\text{i}\nu\omicron\upsilon\text{s}\text{i}$; The last clause of 6:2 then stand as a separate question: $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\xi\text{i}\omicron\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon \text{k}\rho\text{i}\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\nu$;

The alteration of $\epsilon\iota$ to $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ in F G is another example of these manuscripts, when reading alone, falling under the influence of the Latin. A Greek ancestor to these manuscripts apparently lacked the interrogative, as in D, which was filled in with $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ in F G under the influence of the corresponding Latin *si*.

6:3.11 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

6:4.11; 6:7.24 [reading of F G discussed in chapter on D F G]

At 6:4, the position of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ follows typical Pauline usage: standing in the second position in a sentence which follows a question expecting a negative answer, it gives answer

to a speaker's own question. From there the argument then proceeds.¹² Its other use is to correct a preceding statement.¹³ Neither of these are taking place at 6:7, where οὖν follows μὲν in \aleph^2 A B C D¹ L P Ψ 0156 0142 0150 0151 *pm* sy^p sy^{h mg}. The addition at 6:7 is an assimilation to the (proper) example at 6:4.

6:5.14 [also 15:34.138]

The shift from the dative ὑμῖν to the genitive ὑμῶν (056 0142 257 326 440 489 823 927 999 1831 1873) in the clause πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λέγω results in a text which is more directly applicable to later readers: he speaks *about* the Corinthians in order to shame them rather than speaking *to* them. The dative is always used in the NT with λέγω (in Paul at Rom. 9:12, 19, 26; 11:4; 1 Cor. 11:22; etc.). The identical variation takes place in the same circumstance at 15:34, with many of the same manuscripts again making the alteration (056 0142 0243 5 181 203 216 429 436 440 489 506 1245 1611 1739 2143).¹⁴

6:5.15

Both λέγω (twenty times in 1 Cor. without variation) and λαλέω (thirty-one times, but twenty-one of these in chapter 14) are common in 1 Corinthians.¹⁵ Apart from chapter 14,

¹²Denniston, pp. 478-79, with examples.

¹³Zuntz, p. 193.

¹⁴Two other examples of case shift of a pronoun used with λαλέω or λέγω are found at 1:12, where 1875 substitutes ὑμῖν for ὑμῶν, making the partitive genitive (ἕκαστος ὑμῶν) into the object of the verb λέγει (although this strains the context). The substitution of πρὸς ὑμῖν for πρὸς ὑμᾶς by P at 14:6 is nonsense, probably influenced by the surrounding datives.

¹⁵This is in contrast to Romans, for example, where λαλέω is used only at 7:1, 15:18, and 3:19, when the use of λέγει with νόμος as the subject (see below) forces the use of λαλέω later in the sentence.

where λαλέω seems to entail inspired speech,¹⁶ there is little semantic distinction between the two.¹⁷ In three places this similarity caused corruption, each of them involving the 1st person singular present indicative form:

6:5 λαλω B
λεγω *rel*
9:8 λαλω ϩ⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C K L P Ψ *pm*
λεγω D F G 42 234 328 464 483 *pm*
15:34 λαλω ϩ⁴⁶ ⋈ B D P Ψ 049 0243 88 1241 1739 etc
λεγω A F G K L 056 075 0142 0150 0151 104 181 326 1881 *pm*

Seven textually firm examples of λέγω are found at 1 Cor. (7:6, 8, 12, 35; 10:15, 29; 15:51), but only two firm examples of the form λαλω: In both 13:1 and 14:18 it is connected with “tongues,” which always stands with a form of λαλέω. All three examples of variation in 1 Corinthians can be explained as harmonizations: 9:8 to the following λέγει¹⁸; 15:34 to bring προς εντροπην υμιν λαλω into harmony with προς εντροπην υμιν λεγω at 6:5; and B alone reverses the direction of harmonization, from 15:34 to 6:5. Both harmonizations would require a sophisticated effort to bring the texts into parallel.

¹⁶Thiselton, p. 1157; Barrett, p. 332. Against this Fee (p. 704), though without discussion.

¹⁷Zuntz, p. 97 claims: “Paul . . . as a rule, refers to definite statements by λέγω, while λάλω with him usually denotes a vocal utterance in general . . . Even he, though, occasionally uses the two verbs alternately for the sake of mere stylistic variation.”

¹⁸λέγει is always used in 1 Corinthians of the “speaking” of “Scripture,” “The Lord,” and “God,” e.g., 12:3; 14:21; 14:34. Significantly each of these are in contexts where λαλέω is used almost exclusively otherwise. The use of λαλέω prior to λέγω in the same sentence, as at 9:18, can be seen also at Rom. 3:19.

6:5.16

ἔνι (= ἔνεστι) in the NT appears with the meaning “is present” in all of its four occurrences in the manuscript tradition, always with the negative οὐκ ἔνι: 1 Cor. 6:5; Gal. 3:28 (οὐκετι ἦ⁴⁶; Col. 3:11 (no variation); James 1:17.¹⁹ ἔνι = ἔστι when οὐκ is not present is not found in the NT period. According to both Schwyzer and BDR, this meaning is not attested until a sixth century inscription.²⁰ However, Mandilaris notes that in the papyri “οὐκ ἔνι is equivalent to οὐκ ἔστι,” which is parallel to the examples in 1 Corinthians and James.²¹ There is no consistency among the manuscripts in this variation. At James 1:17 ενι is replaced with εστιν in P 206 218 241 242 429 522 614 630 808 876 1505 1525 1799 1873 2147 2412; At 1 Cor. 6:5 the same substitution is made in ᾠ^{11vid} D F G 6 69 104 365 462 630 1739 1881 1926. This would tend to favor the reading ενι at both places, with ουκ εστιν the result of familiarity with this more common Pauline formula.

6:5.17

In the Pauline letters, when οὐδείς / οὐθείς is the subject in a clause with an equative verb (whether present or assumed) it always precedes the noun or adjective that is the predicate (Rom. 14:14; 1 Cor. 8:4 *bis*; 14:10; each without variation). The order is never reversed. At 1 Cor. 6:5, the word order was altered to σοφος ουδε εις in D² L 056 0142 0151 81 177 263 429 462 1108 1505 1611 1834 *pm*, perhaps to avoid the repetition -ος ος in σοφός ὅς.

¹⁹At Luke 11:41 a participle form of ἔνειμι appears, meaning “is inside,” a usage comparable to that of this verb in the LXX.

²⁰Schwyzer I, p. 678 and more extended discussion on II, p. 423; BDR §98.

²¹Mandilaris, §106.

6:5.18

The addition of the negative particle *οὐ* in L alone is another example of a manuscript showing difficulties with questions (see also 1:13 and 5:12). The insertion of the negative assumes two separate questions in the verse: “Is there no one wise among you? Who will not be able to judge between his brother?”

6:5.19

This passage has been discussed in the article, “1 Cor. 6:5: A Proposal,” *Novum Testamentum* 46 (2004), pp. 132-42, provided as an appendix. The only addition to be made is a comment on the problem in the recently published *Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament*: “Echte Vergleichbeispiele und somit Deutungsmöglichkeiten bieten die dokumentarischen Papyri hier also nicht.”²² This confirms one of the conclusions of the article.

6:6.23

D* reads *μετα* in place of *επι*, which has been caused by the immediately preceding *μετα αδελφου*.

6:6.24 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

6:7.29; 6:19.63 [see also 12:9.32]

²²P. Arzt-Grabner, R. E. Kritzer, A. Papatomas, und F. Winter. *1. Korinther*. *Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament* 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), p. 227.

κριματα has been shortened to κριμα in \aleph 441 460 629 1241^s 1881,²³ which may have been dropped by accident (see also 12:9.32), with the final -τα perhaps simply lost by a leap (ΚΡΙΜΔΤΔ).²⁴ Another possibility is that the singular was intentionally written because the context seems to be discussing only one lawsuit. But should the same be said in the case of σωμα at 6:19 (\mathfrak{P} ⁴⁶ \aleph A* B C D F G K P 0150 0151 1739 630 1241^s 1739)? In the latter case, however, the plural form may have been prompted by attraction to the following plural ὑμῶν. Given similar difficulties elsewhere, accidental loss seems most likely.

6:8.32

103 1926 add αυτοι before υμεις, adding emphasis.

6:9.36 [also 15:50.200; 15:50.201]

The loss of ου before κληρονομησουσιν in B* 88 440* is apparently accidental,²⁵ due to haplograpy caused by the *nomen sacrum* ΘΥ. The original scribe of B was confronted with ΟΥΘΥ, likely the original reading in an ancestor of 1739²⁶; 88 440 had before them ΘΥΟΥ. The common Pauline phrase βασιλείαν θεοῦ [οῦ] κληρονομήσουσιν, found also at 1 Cor. 6:10 (see discussion of D* in the chapter on D F G), 15:50, and Gal. 5:21, is responsible for

²³Also the reading of sy^p.

²⁴Fee, p. 239 n. 2.

²⁵Though “gedankenlos,” it conforms to the reading of 1 Cor. 6:10, according to B. Weiss, p. 103.

²⁶In 1739, a second οῦ is written supralinear by a corrector following κληρονομήσουσιν; the first οῦ (before βασιλείαν θεοῦ) has not been altered. The correction, likely influenced by the familiarity of this phrase, suggests that the word order βασιλείαν θεοῦ is likewise due to the stock phrase. No edition notes this correction, including the collation of Lake and New (K. Lake and S. New, eds, *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, Harvard Theological Studies XVII (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932) but the form of the correction is identical to that made at 6:10.

the reading βασιλειαν θεου (L 056 0142 0150 0151 6 81 104 915 1912 *pm*) in place of θεου βασιλειαν. Were βασιλειαν θεου to be considered original, there would not be any reason to explain the alteration in sequence, particularly as the identical phrase (with οὐ) is found in Gal. 5:21, with no manuscripts finding a need for the same alteration. Additionally, the manuscripts that read βασιλειαν θεου have a tendency to harmonize distant passages (see 5:2.3). Harmonization to this standard phrase also explains two other readings: βασιλειαν θεου ου κληρονομησουσιν (F G 1907 Marcion) for βασιλειαν θεου κληρονομησαι ου δυναται at 1 Cor. 15:50²⁷; and the addition of ου before κληρονομησουσιν (L P 056* 0142 0150 0151 81 104 326 915 917 1175 1311 1739c 1881 1912) at 6:10, which in fact results in nonsense in this context.

6:9.36; 6:10.38; 6:10.39; 6:10.40 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

6:12.46

Schrage claims that the omission of μοι in from the slogan παντα μοι εξεστιν, only in C*, has been attributed to a “generalizing” tendency in the manuscript tradition.²⁸ This, however, appears to be the only example of this tendency in C. Further examples may be the omission in 8:10 of σε from εαν γαρ τις ιδη σε (P⁴⁶ B F G) and two occurrences of μου after τον αδελφον at 8:13 (F G *bis*; D* second example). At 8:10, however, the omission may have been instead prompted by the removal of an explicit subject already which was

²⁷F G are missing 6:7-14, but one suspects, given their proclivities, that they would have read βασιλείαν θεοῦ at 6:9 to match the *regnum dei* of VL 75 77 VG, as G does against the rest of the Greek tradition at Rom. 3:5.

²⁸W. Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen in der Textüberlieferung des Neuen Testaments,” in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments zum 80. Geburtstag Heinrich Greeven* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1986), p. 381.

implicit in the verb. In the second example, it must be noted that μου is frequently omitted after αδελφος: Rom. 9:3 (P⁴⁶); 15:14 (P⁴⁶ D F G I 1739); 1 Cor. 1:11 (P⁴⁶ C*); 8:13 (D* F G); 11:33 (Ψ) Phil. 3:1 (P⁴⁶); 4:1 (B), so a “generalizing” tendency may not be the issue involved. Indeed, the opposite effect takes place in the change from τον αδελφον ημων to τον αδελφον υμων (F 0142) at 2 Cor. 8:22.

6:14.49

A variant unique to a small segment of the “Alexandrian” tradition (P^{46c2} B 424^c 1739) reads the aorist εξηγειρεν—“and he raised us by his power” in place of the future εξεγειρει (or εξεγειρει)—“and he will raise us . . .”²⁹ While it has been suggested that this may have been due to an interest in baptism, with the aorist pointing to a prior event,³⁰ it is more likely simply assimilation to the aorist verb which immediately precedes: “God raised (ἤγειρεν) the Lord from the dead.”³¹ Indeed, one commentary claimed, “no intelligent copyist would alter ἐξεγέρει into ἐξηγείρεν, but an unintelligent one might assimilate the second verb to the first.”³² This commentary was written prior to the discovery of P⁴⁶, which makes this very alteration. In fact, P⁴⁶ shows a remarkable sequence of variation that is easier to picture than to explain: εξεγειρει was copied first; a corrector struck out the first ι, producing εξεγερει; the final corrector added η above the second ε without striking it out, wrote ι above the previously marked out ι, and added a slanted line to the final ι to create ν,

²⁹P^{46c1} corrects to ἐξηγείρει from ἐξεγέρει.

³⁰Conzelmann p. 108 n. 1.

³¹B. Weiss pp. 40-41; Zuntz, p. 256-7.

³²Robertson and Plummer, p. 125.

resulting in ἐξηγείρεν.³³ Whether this correction happened in the scriptorium (assuming that scenario) before the manuscript was “released” (Zuntz) or simply by subsequent users of the manuscript is difficult to determine due to the nature of these corrections; NTaP does not assign either correction to a specific, identifiable corrector. The manuscript does, however, show the ease with which assimilation to the preceding context could find its way into the tradition.

6:15.50 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

6:15.51; 6:15.56

Two possible additional examples of “generalizing” (6:12.44): “your bodies” to “our bodies” by \aleph^* A and the shift from singular to plural verb by 330 1875.

6:15.53

Final -ς is both lost and added frequently in documents of the Roman period.³⁴ In this passage, both the verbal participle ἀρας and ἀρα³⁵ have Pauline parallels. ἄρα οὖν is used seven times in Romans (5:18; 7:3, 25; 8:12; 9:16, 18; 14:19), though nowhere else in 1 Corinthians (apart from this contested example). The verb αἴρω has already been used at 1 Cor. 5:2, though elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum* only at Eph. 4:31 and Col. 2:14 (and never as a participle). The position of the participle in the sentence, however, is unusual for Paul, standing in the first position only in Rom. 1:22; 5:1; 12:6, 9; 1 Cor. 7:18; 11:20; 2 Cor.

³³Cf. the description of these corrections in NTaP, p. 203.

³⁴Gignac, p. 120; cf. 1 Cor. 2:4.

³⁵Scribes may have understood it as the interrogative particle ἄρα, though this occurs elsewhere in Paul only in the Gal. 2:17 (where it may also be inferential).

2:12; 3:12; 4:13; 5:6, 11; 6:1; 11:23, and never at the beginning of a question. The available evidence does not allow a final resolution of the problem.

6:15.54

Σωμα for μελη in 33 is an adaptation to the near context.

6:16.59

The omission of φησιν from the LXX citation (Gen. 2:24) is not surprising in the patristic witnesses, but is in A, which does not, however, omit the γάρ, which is also absent from the Genesis passage.

6:19.63 [discussed at 6:7.29]

6:19.64

In the *Hauptbriefe*, the sequence πνεῦμα ἅγιον occurs exclusively in prepositional phrases: with ἐν in Rom. 9:1; 14:17; 15:16; 1 Cor. 12:3; 2 Cor. 6:6; cf. 1 Thes. 1:5; with διὰ in Rom. 5:5; cf. 2 Tim 1:14; and in the genitive, modifying a noun in a prepositional phrase: Rom. 15:13 (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου); cf. 1 Thes. 1:6 (μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου). The sequence ἅγιον πνεῦμα occurs only in one other passage in Paul, 2 Cor. 13:13, which follows the practice of the rest of the NT in placing an article before ἅγιον. The reading πνεύματος ἁγίου at 1 Cor. 6:19 (B 97 241 255 1831) is assimilation to the more common sequence, perhaps because ἐν ὑμῖν is placed between τοῦ and ἁγίου πνεύματος.

6:20.68 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

6:20.69

The addition of **και εν τω πνευματι υμων ατινα εστιν του θεου** (C³ D² K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 69 88) is typical of the expansionist “Byzantine” readings. The manner in which the addition is based on the preceding clause is reminiscent of the type of expansion seen also at 8:5.

Notes on Chapter 7

7:1.2

Paul's use of the dative pronoun with the verb γράφω is consistent: it is always present unless the immediate context has already clearly indicated the addressees. The pronoun ὑμῖν is found without variation in passages where the verb occurs in the 1st person singular (Rom. 15:15; 1 Cor. 5:9; 5:11; 14:37; 2 Cor. 2:4; 7:12; Gal. 1:20; 6:11) and the 1st person plural verb (2 Cor. 1:13). In three passages the dative pronoun is absent (also without variation). The immediate context, however, makes clear the addressee, so that the use of the pronoun would be redundant. At 1 Cor. 4:14 ὑμᾶς immediately precedes; at 9:15 the 3rd person singular verb γενηται makes clear that a general audience is being addressed, not the recipients of the letter specifically; and at 2 Cor. 13:10 a 2nd person verb (ἦτε) as well as a possessive pronoun (ὑμῶν) stand in the preceding sentence.

In two passages a similar group of witnesses, however, add the dative pronoun in contexts where it is unnecessary. At 2 Cor. 2:3, the preceding sentence already clarifies the addressees: εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς . . . the pronoun is added, however, by D F G, most of the Latin tradition, and the "Byzantine" witnesses. A few verses later, at 2:9, F G retain the original reading of the archetype of the bilinguals in the addition of the pronoun ὑμῖν/*vobis*.¹ Here again the addressees are clear from the following clause (ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν), making the pronoun unnecessary. The bilinguals alter Gal. 6:11 in the same way. While the rest of the manuscript tradition reads the word order ἰδετε πηλικοις ὑμῖν

¹*vobis* is read by 77 78 89, matching the ὑμῶν (error for ὑμῖν) of F G. D 75 has removed the pronoun under the influence of other Greek witnesses.

γραμμασιν εγραψα τη εμη χειρι, D F G place the pronoun in the position immediately preceding the verb (γραμμασιν υμιν εγραψα).²

This immediately casts suspicion on the reading εγραψατε μοι at 1 Cor. 7:1 in D F G and the “Byzantine” witnesses. While this is the only example of γράφω used in the 2nd person in the *Corpus Paulinum*, the witnesses that add the pronoun to the 1st person forms of the verb do the same here. While this addition is clearly a case of addition for clarification,³ it also falls within the pattern of alteration unique to these witnesses, particularly the bilinguals.

7:2.4

In the NT, the plural of πορνεία is found only in lists (Mark 7:21; Matt. 15:19). This is the only example of the plural in Paul. It is difficult to find an explanation for the unique use of the plural in this context; most likely the plural “should refer to sexual immoralities that are occurring, not that are anticipated,” with the singular referring to “anticipated” immorality.⁴

The singular την πορνειαν is attested in the Greek only by F G. It is difficult to draw significant conclusions from the versional evidence. *Fornicationem*, found in 61 77 78 89 Vg Te Amst could easily be explained as a corruption of *fornicationes* (64 75 Te Cy). The fact that Tertullian attests both readings⁵ shows the ease with which the singular could arise. In

²The D-text was altered to match the Greek word order: *litteris vobis scripsi* = 75 78; 78 89 follow the Vulgate word order *litteris scripsi vobis*.

³So Fee, p. 271 n. 11.

⁴Fee, pp. 277-78. Similarly Thiselton, p. 501. Alternatively, Barrett (p. 155) sees the plural as referring to the widespread examples of the practices of Corinth which have entered into the congregation.

⁵*Fornicationem* in *De pudicitia* 16; *fornicationes* in *De monogomia* 11,10.

addition, only the Latin translation of Origen's commentary on Matthew (14,23) reads the singular, with the Greek reading the plural. The Syriac is also potentially ambiguous; the difference between the singular ܩܘܠܐ , and the plural ܩܘܠܐܝܢ , is indicated only by the presence or absence of the *Syame* dots. Given the editing of F G toward the Latin, it is likely that this accounts for the reading in these manuscripts.⁶ The fact that the versions use the singular is not surprising given the normal usage in Paul, the previous examples of the singular at 6:13, and particularly the command at 6:18: *fugite fornicationem*.

7:2.5

την ιδιαν γυναικα (181 1836 1875) is likely assimilation to the τον ιδιον ανδρα which follows. Although additional examples from the *Hauptbriefe* are not common, throughout the *Corpus Paulinum* the adjective ιδιος is always used with ανηρ (1 Cor. 7:2; 14:35; Eph. 5:22; Tit. 2:5), while εαυτος is always used with γυνη (Eph. 5:28, 33).

7:2.6

Some have suggested that the omission of the clause $\text{και εκαστη τον ιδιον ανδρα εχετω}$ may be related to an “antifeminist” tendency in the manuscript tradition.⁷ However, it is more likely simple parablepsis: $\text{ΕΧΕΤΩΚΑΙ ΕΚΑΚΤΗΤΟΝΙΔΙΟΝΑΝΔΡΑΕΧΕΤΩ}$. The fact that several otherwise unrelated witnesses share the omission (F G 42* 69 102 1944) points to an accidental loss. In addition, F G are particularly susceptible to this copying error (1:26; 2:6; 7:19, 38; see further the chapter on D F G). In this case, the loss may be attributed to the use of sense lines in an ancestor manuscript.

⁶The original Z reading is difficult to assess here, as discussed in chapter on D F G.

⁷Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen,” p. 387.

7:3.8

Ευνοϊαν follows οφειλομενην in K L 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm sy*. The only other NT example of εϋνοια is Eph. 6:7, there used in a prepositional phrase. Parablepsis may have taken place. Far more likely, however, is that the addition serves to euphemize το οφειλην, either for reading in worship or for the ascetic concerns so evident throughout the alterations in this chapter, in particular 7:32ff.⁸

7:3.9

Αποδιδετω in A is an intrusion of the thematic form;⁹ other examples of the manuscript introducing the thematic stem are discussed at 13:2.14.

7:3.10 [discussed at 7:22.80]

7:4.11

F alone omits αλλ' ο.¹⁰ There is no possibility of parablepsis nor other transcriptional error. This is one of the few differences between F and G. Perhaps the scribe of F mistook αλλ' ο for αλλο, then dropped the word due to the lack of a Latin equivalent.

7:4.12 [discussed at 7:22.80]

⁸Lietzmann, p. 29; Robertson and Plummer, p. 133.

⁹See Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 202; Mayser I,2, pp. 123-4 lists examples of this taking place with διδωμι in the papyri.

¹⁰As it is read in D G; other witnesses read αλλα ο.

7:5.14

Only \mathfrak{P}^{46} B 321 read $\epsilon\iota$ $\mu\eta\tau\iota$, omitting the $\alpha\nu$. Both Clement and Origen likewise omit while altering $\mu\eta\tau\iota$ to $\mu\eta$.¹¹ These likely indicate independent attempts to deal with an unliterary phrase.¹² The exact phrase $\epsilon\iota$ $\mu\eta\tau\iota$ $\alpha\nu$ is not attested outside of Christian writings, of which the earliest example (outside of direct citations) is in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (16:4).¹³ Here the omission is the result of an interest in a more literary text.¹⁴

7:5.15

The variation between $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\alpha\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon$ and $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\alpha\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$ reflects a common interchange of the sibilants σ and ζ when it occurs between vowels.¹⁵ In this context, it is likely that $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\alpha\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon$, the present form, is assimilated to the present tense forms of the verbs that precede and follow in the verse.

7:5.16

The longer reading may have been shortened due to an accidental leap:

$\tau\eta\eta\chi\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$.¹⁶ However, elsewhere in Paul the noun¹⁷ occurs only in

¹¹Clement, *Stromata* 1,107,5. M. Mees (*Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien. Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum" 2* (Bari: Instituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1970, p. 135) sees the agreement among \mathfrak{P}^{46} B Clement as independent alteration of "the more difficult reading" rather than sharing a unique relationship. Origen *De oratione* 2,2 reads $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ $\mu\eta$.

¹²Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 169.

¹³ $\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\nu$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\tau\iota$ $\alpha\nu$ $\omicron\tau\iota$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$.

¹⁴Zuntz, p. 61 n. 2.

¹⁵Gignac I, p. 123.

¹⁶Kilpatrick, "The Greek New Testament and the Textus Receptus," p. 40.

¹⁷The verb $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ is completely absent from Paul.

contexts describing physical hardship (2 Cor. 6:5; 11:27), never ritual observance. This suggests a secondary insertion into the text. When described as an addition its source is generally ascribed either to “asceticism”¹⁸ or harmonization to Mark 9:29.¹⁹ The difficulty with the latter argument is that the reading *τη νηστεια και τη προσευχη* cannot be attributed directly to Mark 9, which reads (in all witnesses except \aleph^* B 0274 2427 VL 1) *εν προσευχη και νηστεια*. In addition, the same word order appears at Matt. 17:21, which is generally regarded as a secondary harmonization to Mark 9. Harmonization to this passage in 1 Cor. 7 can therefore be attributed to the reading *τη προσευχη και (τη) νηστεια* in 330 459 2400 2523 (2289), which assumes that the reading *τη προσευχη* stood in their text prior to the assimilation. This argument cannot, however, explain the reading *τη νηστεια και τη προσευχη*.

That reading can be accounted for by noting that the phrase (by, with) “prayer and fasting” appears to have been something of a stock phrase in patristic literature. Origen appears to be the first to attest it, in a discussion of the casting out of demons in his own day. Some people, he notes, have limited success in casting out of demons, “but sometimes with fastings and prayers and more efforts they succeed.”²⁰ In the fourth century, with far more extant literature, there is a sharp difference in the frequency of use attested between “prayer and fasting” and “fasting and prayer.” The former occurs only 10 times (apart from citations

¹⁸Metzger, *Textual Commentary* p. 488; Fee, p. 272 n. 17; though not Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen,” pp. 384-86.

¹⁹Thiselton, p. 506; Lindemann combines these by explaining it as “eine ritualisierte Frömmigkeit anzeigende Lesart” adopted from Mark 9:29. Zuntz, p. 165 explains the reading simply as a “gloss.”

²⁰Origenes, *Commentarii in evangelium Matthei*, 13.6.

of Mark 9:29 and Matt. 17:21).²¹ “Fasting and prayer,” however, occurs 35 times (apart from citations of 1 Cor. 7:5).²² This tendency toward the latter sequence has also affected citations of Matt. 17:21 in Ps-Athanasius and Hesychius:

Ps-Athanasius, *De virginitate* 7: τὸ γένος ἐν οὐκ εκβάλλεται, εἰ μὴ ἐν νηστείαις καὶ προσευχαῖς.

Hesychius, *In sancto martyres* 1: τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται οὐκ ἐξέρχεται εἰ μὴ ἐν νηστεία καὶ προσευχῇ.

No extant manuscripts of Matthew attest this word order. However, these examples do show that the phrase “fasting and prayer” was common enough to have been written into these paraphrases of the passage. In addition, Basil uses the phrase specifically in a monastic context, in Letter 284 “To the Magistrate concerning Monks.” Here Basil is seeking relief for monks from tax payments. Their practice of “fasting and prayer” is especially highlighted:

I submit men such as these to your perfect judgment, those who have long ago renounced life, having already mortified their bodies, so that neither from their wealth nor from their bodies are they able to supply any useful service to the state, so that they be exempt from their tax burden. For if they are indeed living in accordance with their profession, they have neither wealth nor bodies; the one is given up in sharing with the needy, the other has been worn out by fasting and prayer (ἐν νηστείαις καὶ προσευχαῖς). I know that you will consider worthy those who live in this way and that you will wish acquire for yourself their aid, since by their life in accordance with the Gospel they are able to appeal to the Lord.²³

²¹*Martyrium Ignatii* 1,1; Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula magna* 283; Theodoretus, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, MPG 83, 540; Ephraem, *Sermo compunctorius* 113; *Sermo de communi resurrectione*, 58; *Institutio ad monachos* 360; Ps-Athanasius, *Quaestiones in Evangelia* MPG 28, 701; Basilus, *Asceticon magnum*, MPG 31, 949; Ps-Chrysostom, *De jejuniis* MPG 60, 717; 62, 757.

²²Gregorius Nyssenus (3); Gregorius Nazienzanus (1); Ps-Athanasius (3); Basilus (1); Ps-Basilus (1); Cyrillus Alexandrinus (1); Ps-Macarius (4); Socrates (1); Chrysostomus (5); Ps-Chrysostomus (5); Didymus Caecus (1); *Apostolic Constitutions* (1); Epiphanius (3); Cyrillus (3); Palladius (2).

²³Basilus, *Epistulae* 284.

Significantly, the addition has impacted only the Greek tradition. The Latin equivalent of νηστεία, *ieiunium*, was not added in any Latin witnesses, whether manuscript or patristic.²⁴

This indicates that the addition took place after the Greek ceased to have any influence on the Latin tradition (apart from the isolated bilingual line). The familiarity of this phrase to Greek readers, particularly in a monastic context, has led to its late introduction in 1 Cor. 7.

7:5.17

The variation between the verbs συνερχησθε (or -εσθε) and ητε²⁵ can only have arisen from intentional editorial revision, regardless of which reading was in the archetype. The differences among modern-day commentators as to which reading would have caused the other are due to a lack of clarity regarding the meaning of the verb συνερχομαι. Fee, for example, argues that “‘being together’ as the norm is stronger than ‘coming back together,’” the latter (συνερχησθε) therefore possibly arising from ascetic motivations.²⁶ However, συνερχομαι has a much wider semantic range, for example with reference to sexual

²⁴It is found in two Latin sources that are translations of the Greek: “*jejunio et orationi*” is found in an anonymous commentary on Matthew which is likely based on Origen’s commentary. Also, “*orationibus et jejuniis*” is found in the Latin translation of the *Concilii Laodicensi*. It is also found in the 8th century Irish collection of council material, the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*, though the source for this text is not clear.

²⁵Zuntz (p. 50 n. 3) suggests that “The absence of any verb in Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and d may be original.” The source of his information is unclear, but all of these attest the same reading (though with different word order and/or prepositions) as the Vulgate: *revertimini*.

²⁶Fee p. 272 n. 18.

relations.²⁷ In the second century this is seen in Clement²⁸ and Origen, who uses the verb with this meaning in comments on this passage,²⁹ with later writings such as the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies³⁰ and Chrysostom showing similar usage. The context of 1 Cor. 7:1-7 does not shy from such terminology. The verbs ἄπτω (7:1) and ἀποστερέω (7:5) and all of 7:3-4 make clear references to physical relations between wife and husband. In addition, the vocabulary is found in the LXX, Josephus, and elsewhere in the NT.³¹ An additional possible use for the verb συνέρχομαι, though not in the NT period, is to refer to a relationship between someone who had taken a vow as a virgin and a “brother,” a relationship which may have at least appeared suspicious.³² The Council of Ancyra (314) states in its Canon 19:

Anyone who, after professing virginity, renounces their profession should complete the time [of suspension from fellowship] of the remarried. Furthermore, we prohibit virgins from living with any men (συνερχομένας παρθένους τισίν) as sisters.³³

²⁷Liddell and Scott, s.v. συνέρχομαι II.b. It is understood this way by W. Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 2. Teilband 1 Kor 6,11-11,16, Evangelisch-Katholisch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Zürich: Benziger, 1995) [hereafter Schrage II], p. 69 n. 101; Thiselton, p. 506; Lindemann, p. 160; also, apparently, Metzger, *Textual Commentary* p. 588, who describes ητε as “colorless.”

²⁸*Stromata* 1,5,31,4; 2,18,88,4.

²⁹*Philocalia* 23,13, used in a discussion of the procreation of children; *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios* (in catenis) 34; Origen’s text appears to have read ητε, as it is found both in the lemma of the commentary and in *De oratione* (2,2). See D. Hannah, *The Text of 1 Corinthians in Origen*, The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 78-9. However, in the comments on the verse Origen uses only the verb συνερχομαι (3 times), including a discussion of other occasions when sexual abstinence is necessary, such as the ritual regulations of Lev. 15:19.

³⁰*Homiliae* 5,13, used interchangeably with μείγνυμι.

³¹ἄπτω in Gen. 20:6; Prov. 6:29; Josephus, *Antiquities* 1,163; see BDAG s.v. ἄπτω 4. συνέρχομαι in Matt. 1:18; Josephus, *Antiquities* 7,168; see BDAG s.v. συνέρχομαι 3.

³²Cf. the discussion of a related term in Lampe, s.v. συνείσακτος 4.

³³MPG 137, p. 1180.

The verb can also be used quite innocently, such as Chrysostom's uses of the verb when describing the "virgins" who "came together" to mourn the death of Jephthah's daughter.³⁴

This wide range of possible meaning provides several possible contexts for the alteration.³⁵ If *συνερχομαι* was understood to have a sexual reference, the colorless *ητε* would have appealed to ascetically-minded readers, as is the case with the addition of *ευνοϊαν* at 7:3. This may be reflected, albeit in a slightly different way, by the *revertimini* of 75 78 Vulgate with Cyprian and Ambrosiaster, which elsewhere in the epistles translates only *ὑποστρέφω* (Gal. 1:17). It is difficult to see how this could accurately render *συνερχησθε* except to soften a perceived difficulty ("return to each other"); nevertheless it clearly cannot be based on *ητε*. On the other hand, if *συνέρχομαι* was understood positively as describing an asexual relationship, as it clearly was at some point,³⁶ it might have suggested itself to resolve the ambiguity of *ητε*. Most likely however, *ητε* replaced *συνερχεσθε* in order to be less likely to offend.

7:5.18

The singular reading in Ψ: *ινα μη επιχαρη υμιν ο εχθρος* appears to be modeled on Ps. 40:12: *ἐν τούτῳ ἔγνων ὅτι τεθέληκάς με ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἐπιχαρῆ ὁ ἐχθρός μου ἐπ' ἐμέ*. The adaptation shows intentional alteration: the personal pronoun is not present in Ps. 40, but it has been properly adapted here to the dative case. The reading *ινα μη επιχαιρει*

³⁴*Ad populum Antiochenum*, MPG 49, p. 170.

³⁵The argument that *συνερχησθε* is an assimilation to 1 Cor. 11:20 and 14:23 is extremely unlikely given the completely different contexts, meaning of *συνερχομαι* in those passages, verb forms, and word order. So also Zuntz, p. 50 and Schrage II, p. 69 n. 101.

³⁶The warning of the Council of Ancyra points to a previously encouraged practice that had been, apparently, abused.

πειραζει υμας in 0150 is puzzling; this may be derived from the partial adoption of a marginal reading also based on Ps. 40:12.

7:5.19

B. Weiss has noted several places where B, with the support of very few other witnesses, omits the possessive pronoun:³⁷

Rom. 16:21	B 0150 <i>omit</i> μου
1 Cor. 1:4	ℵ* B <i>omit</i> μου
1 Cor. 7:5	B <i>omit</i> υμων
1 Cor. 9:18	B <i>pc</i> <i>omit</i> μου
2 Cor. 4:17	℘ ⁴⁶ B <i>omit</i> ημων
2 Cor. 11:30	℘ ⁴⁶ B H ^{vid} <i>omit</i> μου
2 Cor. 12:5	℘ ⁴⁶ B 0243 <i>omit</i> μου
Eph. 1:18	℘ ⁴⁶ B <i>omit</i> υμων
Phil. 4:1	B* <i>omit</i> μου

The appearance of ℘⁴⁶ in this list is not surprising, given the fact that this manuscript alone frequently omits the possessive pronoun against all other witnesses:³⁸

Rom. 9:1	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> μου
Rom. 9:3	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> μου
Rom. 10:8	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> σου
Rom. 15:31	℘ ^{46*} <i>omit</i> μου
1 Cor. 8:9	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> υμων
2 Cor. 1:5	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> ημων
2 Cor. 11:1	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> μου
Eph. 1:9	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> αυτου
Gal. 5:14	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> σου
Phil. 1:8	℘ ⁴⁶ VL61 <i>omit</i> μου/μοι
Phil. 3:1	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> μου
Heb. 12:16	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> (ε)αυτου
Heb. 13:7	℘ ⁴⁶ <i>omit</i> υμων

³⁷B. Weiss, p. 99-100; Weiss argues, however, that B is correct at 1 Cor. 1:4; 2 Cor. 4:17; 12:5.

³⁸Cited from Royse, p. 258-9.

These omissions are all the more striking given the fact that the addition of a pronoun takes place only seven times in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , each of which can be attributed to harmonization, usually to the near context.³⁹ The convergence of \mathfrak{P}^{46} B in the four omissions cited above may reflect a shared ancestry, with B having been adapted to the rest of the tradition in the majority of examples. Alternatively, this may reflect shared editorial practices, which simply chanced to correspond in a handful of passages.

7:6.20

The reading the $\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta\nu$ (823 2815) in place of $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta\nu$ initially appears to have little to commend it. However, the reading is also attested, independently, by the D-text *consilium* (75 77; cf. *conscientiam vel consilium* 78). This form of the text consistently renders $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$ with *consilium* (1 Cor. 7:25, 40; 2 Cor. 8:10; Phlm. 1:14), apart from 1 Cor. 1:10 where *scientiam* is used.⁴⁰ In that passage most of the Latin tradition uses *sententia*. Furthermore, $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$ appears nowhere else in the NT. The resulting clause, “I say this as an opinion” can be construed grammatically and fits with the context. In the end, however, the frequent loss of compounds in the manuscripts (see 7:13.47 and 7:31.110) suggests that $\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta\nu$ is a simple error. *Consilium*, therefore, may simply translate the rare $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\nu\omega\mu\eta\nu$.

7:7.21

$\Gamma\alpha\rho$ (\aleph^2 B D² K L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739) resolves two difficulties. First, since $\delta\epsilon$ is found in the previous clause, $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega \delta\epsilon$ in the next would be awkward. Second, $\gamma\alpha\rho$ would serve to make more clear than the colorless $\delta\epsilon$ at 7:7 concludes the unit 7:1-7. This indicates careful editing in the interest of clarifying the structure and argument. The

³⁹Royse, p. 252.

⁴⁰*Scientiam* may render $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$, though this is found only in 2815.

alteration may have arisen independently in B and the “Byzantine” witnesses, both of which show intentional editing for clarity.

7:7.23

An obvious gloss, *εν εγκρατεια* was added in the predecessor manuscript of 1611 and the sy^h.⁴¹ Elsewhere in Paul the word is found only in the list of “fruits of the Spirit” at Gal. 5:23.

7:7.25

The use of the article as a pronoun in the phrase “the one . . . the other” (ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ) is rare in the NT, which prefers to use the relative pronoun (ὃς μὲν . . . ὃς δέ). This is in contrast to Attic Greek, which rarely attests this use of the relative.⁴² Ο μὲν . . . ὁ δέ (N^a A B C D F G 6 424^c 1739 *pc*) is found nowhere else in the *Hauptbriefe*, and in the *Corpus Paulinum* only at Eph. 4:11 and Phil. 1:16-17,⁴³ with Hebrews showing four examples (7:5-6, 20-21, 23-24; 12:10; but never ὃς μὲν . . . ὃς δέ). The relative pronoun is used in this way at Rom. 9:21 and 1 Cor. 11:21, with a further example in 2 Tim 2:20. Given the tendency of the tradition as a whole, it is more likely that Paul’s style has been improved than that it has

⁴¹The Greek basis of the Harklean revision was based on manuscripts that are related to the minuscules 1505 1611 2495; see NTSU, pp. 22-27.

⁴²BDR §293(11); R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. 2 aufl. in zwei Banden, hrsg. B. Gerth (Hannover: Hahnsche, 1898-1894, p. 228 [hereafter Kühner-Gerth], who notes that the use of the relative pronoun in this way is very common in later writers.

⁴³The example of ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ in Gal. 4:23 is not the same, since the articles are standing for the noun υἱος (from 4:22); cf. the citation of this passage in BDR §250(3) as an example only with a “?”

undergone vulgarization.⁴⁴ The archetypical reading is preserved by \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^2 and the “Byzantine” witnesses (K L Y 056 0142 0150 0151 88 *pm*).

7:8.27

Τοις χηραις (206 2815 *pc*) is an assimilation of the article to the immediately preceding τοις αγαμοις.⁴⁵

7:8.28

The addition / omission of ὅτι is a common variation in the manuscripts. The examples of each in 1 Corinthians are 1) add οτι:

- 4:9 Maj sy (ⲁⲓ sy^p; ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲁ sy^h) (discourse)
- 6:19 0142 (discourse, influenced by near context)
- 7:8 A sy (discourse)
- 7:29 D F G Ψ sy (explanatory)
- 10:19 489 1827
- 12:3 1836
- 12:16 \mathfrak{P}^{46} (discourse, influenced by near context)
- 14:18 F G latt sy cop (discourse)
- 15:17 69 327 1831 1845 b d Ir Te (explanatory)
- 15:30 1831 replaces τι
- 16:12 \aleph^* D* F G latt exc. vg (discourse, with addition of 2 words which precedes)

2) omit οτι:

- 6:3 999 (discourse)
- 6:9 replaced by οι A*
- 8:4 L 1739 (discourse)

⁴⁴Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, p. 52; Fee, p. 272 n. 22 also notes the difficulty of reading the articles, but argues that ὃ . . . ὃ should be understood not as articles but as neuter relative pronouns in the accusative case, with χάρισμα as their antecedent. This is extremely difficult, given that there would no longer be subjects for the clauses (though Fee supplies one in his translation: “one has this gift, another has that”).

⁴⁵NA²⁷ notes here conjectures by Bois: τοις χηροις; and by Holsten, *omit και ταις χηραις*. These are drawn from P. W. Schmiedel, *Die Brief an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther*, Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 2.1 (Freiburg, 1892), p. 127. Conjecture here seems unnecessary.

9:24 88 (discourse)
 10:19 255 (discourse)
 10:20 D F G (discourse)
 12:15 Ψ (discourse)
 12:16 P Ψ 38 102 1845 (discourse)
 15:4 Ψ (discourse)
 15:12 (1) 0142 (discourse)
 15:12 (2) ℘⁴⁶ (discourse)
 15:27 (1) ℘⁴⁶ B 33 630 1505 d vg Hipp Did Ir Chr Hil Ambst (discourse)
 15:30 0142

Notably, examples of explanatory ὅτι are never omitted. This is likely because its loss would significantly affect the meaning of the text. By contrast, ὅτι used to introduce discourse could be added or removed without significant impact on meaning. This accounts for its seemingly random omission in single witnesses, though Ψ appears particularly prone to its omission.

7:8.29

The use of an adjective in predicate nominative constructions is quite common in Paul, both with and without the equative verb (usually εἰμί). However, while καλός is used in predicate nominative constructions elsewhere in 1 Cor. without the verb (5:6; 7:1; 9:15), καλός never occurs in this letter except as a variant here and at 7:26 (D F G).

7:8.30

The addition of the adverb οὕτως in the reading εἰν οὕτως μείνωσιν ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ (C 1611 latt) clarifies that the desired action is specifically the unmarried state, not simply imitation of Paul. This is perhaps modelled on 7:40: μακαριωτέρα δὲ ἐστὶν εἰν οὕτως μείνη, and suggested by 7:7: ὅς μὲν οὕτως, ὅς δὲ οὕτως. The addition of οὕτως following the verb in 69 104 330 441 2004 is either an additional attempt at clarification or the misreading of a corrector's notation.

7:8.31 [discussed at 3:1.1]

7:9.33; 7:9.34 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:9.37

There has been some debate as to whether a difference in meaning exists between $\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$ (\aleph^* A C* 0150 *etc*) and $\gamma\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ (\wp^{46} \aleph^2 B C² D F G K L P Ψ 6 1739). The present tense is given the meaning “to be in married state;” the aorist, “to marry.”⁴⁶ However, “to be in a married state” is better understood as the meaning of the middle/passive form $\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (203 255 506 1311 1827), which is clearly an assimilation of $\gamma\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ to the $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ which follows. Either form could have been assimilated to the near context: $\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$ to the present tense $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; $\gamma\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ to the preceding $\gamma\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$. A final decision is therefore not yet possible.

7:10.38

Already in the second century three readings were circulating: $\chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ is attested by Clement (*Stromata* 3,18,108,1), $\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ by Marcion (as cited by Tertullian),⁴⁷ and $\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$ in \wp^{46} . The reading of \wp^{46} , however, is an assimilation to the imperatives which follow in this unit: $\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omega$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\tau\omega$ (7:11); $\alpha\phi\iota\epsilon\tau\omega$ (7:12, 13), and most significantly, $\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$ (7:15). The infinitive is demanded by 7:10b, which, like $\chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ / $\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is also governed by $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\text{\AA}\nu\delta\rho\alpha$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$. This

⁴⁶Barrett, p. 161. He is followed by Fee, p. 286 n. 2; and Lindemann, p. 163.

⁴⁷Schmid, 323 cites Marcion’s text for this reading as uncertain (printing $\chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$). Marcion’s text does read the present *discedere*, while the perfect stem *discesserit* is used to translate the aorist $\chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ which immediately follows. See the discussion of the Latin tradition below.

assimilation, however, is a corruption of χωριζεσθαι, not χωρισθηναι, since the present stem is used to form the imperative, not the aorist passive (which would have resulted in χωρισθητω). This same assimilation apparently took place independently also in 614. The Latin tradition without exception uses the present tense *discedere*, which most likely assumes χωριζεσθαι. Passive forms of χωρίζω in the NT are always translated with *discedo*, which has only the active form (1 Cor. 7:15 *bis*; Phlm. 1:15; cf. Acts 1:4; 18:2). In addition, the aorist stem is elsewhere matched by the perfect: *discesserit* = χωρισθη (1 Cor. 7:11); *discessit* = ἐχωρίσθη (Phlm. 1:15). The combination of the source of the reading of Φ ⁴⁶ and the uniformity of the Latin tradition combines to preclude the possibility of a Latinism in D F G. The reading χωριζεσθαι therefore predates the creation of the bilingual tradition.

7:11.40 [also discussed in the chapter on D F G]

The addition of ιδιω (P 214 547) is a clear example of clarification, so that ανδρι will be understood as “husband,” not an indefinite “man.”

7:13.43

ητις / ει τις reflects a common vowel interchange. While ει τις may be an assimilation to 7:12,⁴⁸ 7:12-13 may in fact be another example of the parallelism which is typical of Paul. In addition, ητις never occurs elsewhere in Paul in hypotaxis,⁴⁹ whereas ει

⁴⁸Conzelmann, p. 119 n. 7; B. Weiss, p. 65.

⁴⁹Rom. 1:25; 32; 2:15; 6:2; 9:4; 11:4; 16:4,6, 7, 12; 1 Cor. 3:17; 5:1; 2 Cor. 8:10; 9:11; Gal. 2:4; 4:24, 26; 5:4, 10, 19; Eph. 1:23; 3:13; 4:19; 6:2; Phil. 1:28; 2:20; 3:7; 4:3; Col. 2:23; 3:5; 4:11; 2 The. 1:9; 1 Tim. 1:4; 3:15; 6:9; 2 Tim 1:5; 2:2, 18; Tit 1:11

τις in such clauses is quite common.⁵⁰ The reading ητις (A B C K L Ψ 33 1739 *etc*) is therefore the “smoother, secondary reading.”⁵¹

7:13.46

Rarely does αυτος and ουτος interchange. At 7:13, αυτος replaces ουτος (P¹¹ P⁴⁶ N A B C D* F G P 6 1739 *al*) under the influence of several other examples of αυτος in the near context. On the other hand, unless αυτοι at 16:17 (A D F G 0121 0243 6 1739 sy^P) is a simple blunder, it is more likely to have been altered to ουτοι than the reverse.

7:13.47

The verb συνευδοκει in 7:12 may have led to the addition of the prefix to the verb ευδοκει (P⁴⁶ B 81 1881* 2464) at 7:13.⁵² Zuntz argues for the same reading on internal grounds:

It is possible to find in the differentiation a purpose which would tell in favour of P⁴⁶ B. Their reading may be held to reflect that preponderance of the male which Paul stresses elsewhere: he εὐδοκεῖ, while the woman συνευδοκεῖ. Assimilation would naturally ensue.⁵³

Zuntz does not cite any other examples of the “preponderance of the male.” Whatever may take place elsewhere, however, at 1 Cor. 7:10-16 the statements concerning men and women show none of this differentiation. Instead, what is said about the husband is repeated often verbatim for the wife:

⁵⁰Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im neuen Testament*, citing also 1 Cor. 3:12, 14; 15:17, 18; 7:36; 8:2-3; 10:27; 11:16, 34; 14:35, 37, 38; 16:22, all with ει τις; with εαν τις: 8:10; 10:28; with οταν τις: 3:4.

⁵¹Barrett, p. 159 n. 2.

⁵²Barrett, p. 159 n. 3.

⁵³Zuntz, p. 40.

γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι / χωριζέσθαι (10)
καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι⁵⁴ (11)

εἴ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἔχει ἄπιστον καὶ αὕτη συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετ'
αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀφιέτω αὐτή (12)
καὶ γυνὴ εἴ τις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον καὶ οὗτος [συν]ευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετ'
αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφιέτω τὸν ἄνδρα (13)

ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικι (14)
καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ (14)

οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ ἀδελφὴ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις (15)

τί γὰρ οἶδας, γύναι, εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα σώσεις; (16)
ἢ τί οἶδας, ἄνερ, εἰ τὴν γυναῖκα σώσεις; (16)

There appears to be little reason for Paul to have introduced a differentiation in v. 13, particularly one so subtle as the dropping of a prefix from a verb which had been used in the parallel statement.

Furthermore, both \mathfrak{P}^{46} and B frequently drop the prefix from compound words:⁵⁵

Rom. 3:11	(εκ)ζητων B
Rom. 8:17	(συν)πασχομεν \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Rom. 12:16	συν(απ)αγομενοι \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Rom. 15:15	(επ)αναμιμνησκων \mathfrak{P}^{46} B
1 Cor. 7:13	(συν)ευδοκει \mathfrak{P}^{46} B 81 1881* 2464
1 Cor. 14:23	ουν (συν)ελθη \mathfrak{P}^{46} B
1 Cor. 14:37	(επι)γινωσκετω \mathfrak{P}^{46} B Ψ 0243 6 81 1611 1739
2 Cor. 8:6	(προ)ενηρξατο B
Phil. 2:30	(ανα)πληρωση B 056 075 0142
Gal. 1:17	(αν/απ)ηλθον \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Gal. 2:13	(συν)απηχθη \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Eph. 2:2	(εν)εργουντες \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Col. 3:16	(εν)οικειτω \mathfrak{P}^{46}
Heb 1:6	(εισ)αγαγη \mathfrak{P}^{46} vid ⁵⁶
Heb 2:4	συν(επι)μαρτυρουντες B

⁵⁴Schrage II, p. 98-100 satisfactorily demonstrates that the two verbs are “scarcely to be differentiated” (p. 99).

⁵⁵Cf. B. Weiss, p. 34 and Royse, pp. 273-74.

⁵⁶ \mathfrak{P}^{46} reads: παλιν | [αγαγ]η.

Heb 6:11	(εν)δεικνυσθαι P ⁴⁶
Heb 7:27	(εφ)απαξ P ⁴⁶
Heb 8:10	(επι)γραφω P ⁴⁶ B Ψ 0285* ^{vid}
Heb 6:11	(επι)συναγωγην P ⁴⁶

Zuntz argues that since P⁴⁶ B did not make the same omission at 7:12, their reading at 7:13 is not likely to be part of a tendency toward omission.⁵⁷ However, the numerous singular readings in both P⁴⁶ and B in such examples are telling. The loss of the prefix in these manuscripts, like so many other types of variation (cf. the addition/omission of οτι and of the possessive pronouns, discussed above), is not a rigorously carried out program of editing, but a pattern of alteration that appears in apparently random places throughout certain manuscripts. The fact that the loss of the prefix rarely, if ever, genuinely affects the meaning of the text suggests a scribal oversight rather than intentional editing. This randomness, as in seen also in the omission of the possessive pronouns, suggest independent examples of a shared copying tendency. In only a few examples are these omissions also attested by manuscripts from within the same tradition: 1 Cor. 7:13; 14:37; and possibly Heb 8:10. This may be attributed to a shared random tendency, as is seen by other manuscripts that make similar errors:

7:25	(συγ)γνωμην 1836
7:35	(ευ)προσεδρον L
7:38	(εκ)γαμιζων
7:38	(εκ)γαμιζων
10:1	(δι)ηλθον 1241
11:17	(συν)ερχεσθε Ψ (also 2 Cor. 8:2)
12:23	περιτιθημεν] τιθημεν 623 923 915
Eph. 5:29	εκτρεφει] εντρεφει 436 ; τρεφει 88 378 1831 1872

Nouns:

12:10	ερμηνεια] διερμηνεια A D*
-------	----------------------------

⁵⁷Zuntz, p. 40 n. 5, with reference to the same argument by P. Benoit.

7:13.49; 7:14.52; 7:14.55

The substitution of *αυτον* for *τον ανδρα* at 7:13 is assimilation to the near context: it brings *μη̄ αφῑετω τον̄ ανδρα* into harmony with *μη̄ αφῑετω αυτη̄ν* in v. 12. The conflation *αυτον ανδρα* in *ℵ** points to an early origin for this reading, which aside from this has only late attestation (K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 *etc*). A similar conflation occurs at 1:29 in *ℵ^c: αυτου θεου*, a combination of *αυτου* (*C* Ψ*) and *του θεου* (*rel*).

7:14 shows two separate attempts to bring the parallel clauses into harmony. The harmonization attested in D F G and the Latin tradition is discussed in the chapter on D F G. Byzantine witnesses, however, show a different assimilation. The noun *αδελφος* occurs earlier in this section (7:12), but the nearer context uses forms of *ανηρ* modified by an adjective (7:13⁵⁸, 14a). The reading *ανδρι* in v. 14 has been harmonized in to the examples in the near context (K L 0142 0150 0151 *pm*), with further additions of the adjective either before the noun (1367) or after (629 2544). The Peshitta also shows the more developed harmonization, reading the equivalent of *τω ανδρι τω πιστω*. The manuscripts that happen to be later also show the highest amount of harmonization in these examples, with K L 0142 0150 0151 witnessing to the harmonized reading in each case. This is an indication that once a harmonized reading becomes part of the tradition, it will not be dislodged except by unintentional error.

7:14.57 [discussed at 5:11.30]

7:14.58

⁵⁸Most of the manuscripts that read *ανδρι* in v. 14 read *αυτον* in v. 13b (K L 0142 0151 *etc*). P Ψ 056^{*vid} read *αδελφω* in v. 14, but *αυτον* in v. 13.

The verb will usually be found in the singular number when subject of the verb is a neuter plural, here τα τέκνα. At 7:14, however, 81* 255 1319 2127 have shifted the verb to the plural εἰσιν in to bring the number of the verb into harmony with the noun.

7:15.60

The reading η η ἀδελφη (P^{46c1} A B C D K L Ψ 6 33) may be a secondary attempt to make clear that the disjunctive must be read here, a clarification which would have been necessary only before the use of accents and breathing marks in the manuscripts. In addition, usually a single article will only govern two nouns if the nouns both have the same referent. However, this only occurs (so far as can be determined) with nouns of the same gender, which is not the case here. The addition of the article may therefore be an attempt to clarify that two different individual are being discussed. Note that the correction in P⁴⁶ is toward the addition. On the other hand, η ἀδελφη may have been created either by a scribe or corrector assuming a transcriptional error or by haplography. In either case, the reading of 1739 is a conflation, likely caused by a misread correction (see further examples in the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses).

7:15.61

The singular reading βεβληκεν (69), although a legitimate form, is a confusion of the minuscule forms of kappa and beta.

7:15.62

The plural ημας (P⁴⁶ B D F G Ψ 056 0142 6 33 104 614 1739 1881 *etc*) is often attributed to a generalizing tendency in the tradition: “God has called us to peace.”⁵⁹ On the

⁵⁹Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 489; Thiselton, p. 534; Schrage II, p. 111 n. 338; Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen,” p. 381.

other hand, Paul does use the first person plural in other examples where he invokes a peaceful attitude in the midst of otherwise direct instruction (Rom. 5:1; 14:19). Furthermore, second person forms of the pronoun (7:14) and verbs (7:16) appear in the immediate context, making assimilation a strong possibility. In addition, manuscripts that have tended to harmonize in this section (see discussion above) witness that tendency here (K L 0142 0150 0151), though a few avoided it earlier (⌘ C). Therefore, *υμας* is a secondary harmonization to the near context.

7:16.63

The addition of a final -ς (C*) results in a nominative pronoun where the accusative is required (cf. 14:26). It is an accidental addition, though not uncommon in the manuscripts (cf. 2:4; 16:15).

7:16.64 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:16.65

A vowel interchange, similar to that which took place at 7:13.43

7:17.66

The addition/omission of the *καί* will be treated first. In the Greek witnesses it is present only in F G. This likely reflects the reading of the shared ancestor of D F G,⁶⁰ however, since it is found also in 75 78 89 (*unumquemque*) and 77 (*et*). The remnants of the lineation of this ancestor are still discernible in G, with the initial *κ*- written as an enlarged letter. Its loss in D can be attributed to comparison to other Greek witnesses. The presence of

⁶⁰A discussion of the relationships among the bilinguals is discussed in the chapter on D F G.

the conjunction also in the Peshitta points to an early origin for the addition. However, because its presence smooths the harsh, asyndetic parallel clauses, its omission would be inexplicable had it been present in the archetype. It should be noted that F G and the D-text also edit the conjunctions in 7:33-34 in order to produce a smoother text (see below).

The variation between ἐμερισεν (aorist) and μεμερικεν (perfect) is more difficult to assess. The aorist may have been assimilated to the superficially parallel examples of this tense in Rom. 12:3 and 2 Cor. 10:13.⁶¹ However, the example in Romans differs in that the verb is used transitively (ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως), with the additional difference of the position of the subject, to which only a few witness harmonize the passage in 1 Corinthians.⁶² The shift of the subject to the position prior to the verb is a common error which does not require the postulation of harmonization to a parallel passage. Assimilation to 2 Cor. 10:13 is even less likely given the different word order, the lack of a comparative particle (ὡς), and the presence of an indirect object (ἡμῖν) between the verb and the subject.

Other factors make assimilation to a parallel passage unlikely here. First, since no manuscript has adopted the reading μεμερικεν into the potential parallels in Rom. 12 and 2 Cor. 10 it is unlikely that this stood as the archetypal reading at 1 Cor. 7:17. Second, and more significantly, most of the manuscripts (P^{46c} 63 N* B 81 1739) that read the perfect tense here have assimilated the tense of the verb in similar situations. For example, at 6:14 the verb

⁶¹Zuntz, 256; B. Weiss, 43.

⁶²TuT cites thirty-one manuscripts (readings 7 and 9) with the same word order.

⁶³A corrector in P⁴⁶ wrote κ above the σ, but neither struck out the σ nor added μ at the beginning of the word; the corrector may therefore have intended ἐμερικεν or μεμερικεν.

εξεγερει has been altered to εξεγειρεν (P^{46c264} B 424^c 1739) to match the aorist tense verb which preceded (see further examples below in the discussion of 7:38). This is likely to have occurred in the same manuscripts at 7:17. Significantly, at both 6:14 and 7:17 P⁴⁶ has been annotated for the correction to the near context.

The final significant variation within this unit involves the subject of the verbs. The similarity of the *nomina sacra* led to numerous permutations:

ο <u>θς</u> . . . ο <u>κς</u>	K L 056 0142 0150 0151 6 <i>etc</i>
ο <u>θς</u> . . . ο <u>θς</u>	Ψ 255 321 322 330 385 489 1311
ο <u>κς</u> . . . ο <u>θς</u>	P ⁴⁶ κ A B C D F 33 69 81 88 104 256 441 1175 1739 1838 VL 75 78 89
ο <u>κς</u> . . . ο <u>κς</u>	181 915 917 1319 1875 2004
ο <u>κς</u> . . . ο <u>κς</u> ο <u>θς</u>	G

The manuscripts which read the same noun in both positions have suffered from assimilation to the previous noun. G reflects this in a unique way: the second κς has been introduced accidentally (perhaps by dittography), but the error was recognized and ο θς written as well. Correction is likely indicated by the underlined κς and the line written over the second ο, which is not a *spiritus* since these are not written in this manuscript. In any event, because the error is not reproduced in F it is unique to the scribe of G.

The choice between ο θς . . . ο κς and ο κς . . . ο θς as the archetypal reading is complex. The alteration of the θς to κς or κς to θς could have resulted simply from scribal carelessness. However, it is more likely that ο κς . . . ο θς was the archetypal reading. First, because the subject of the verb καλέω in Paul is never κύριος, but is frequently θεός (Rom. 8:28-30; 9:22-24; 1 Cor. 1:9; 7:15; 1 Thes. 2:12; 4:7). Second, in formulaic statements

⁶⁴The sequence of corrections in P⁴⁶ as described in NTaP: “The original εξεγειρει was changed to εξεγερει by a first corrector by marking out the first ι, then a second corrector improved to εξηγειρεν by an η above the unobliterated second ε, an ι above the marked out ι, and a change of the second ι to ν.”

throughout the epistles, and particularly in greetings, *θεός* is placed prior to *κύριος* (e.g., Rom. 1:7; 5:1; 1 Cor. 1:3, 9; 8:6), which may have influenced the change in word order in this passage. An growing interest in Trinitarian thinking may also have contributed to the alteration, since *θεός* would have been recognized as receiving the place of honor, followed by *κύριος*.

7:17.67

In 1 Corinthians Paul frequently appeals to the practices of other churches over and against those of Corinth (1:2; 4:17; 11:16, 36). “All the churches” is a phrase used also in other letters, with the adjective both preceding (Rom. 16:4; 1 Cor. 4:17; 14:33; 2 Cor. 8:18; 11:28) and following the noun (Rom. 16:16). The reading *εν πασαις ταις εκκλησιαις* (ⲛ 33 1827 1908 1926 ⲡ⁶⁵) is the result of assimilation to the more common word order, specifically 1 Cor. 4:17, which also uses the verb *διατάσσομαι/διδάσκω*.

7:17.68 [discussed in the chapter on D F G]

7:18.69; 7:18.72 [also 3:4.21]

D F G places the indefinite pronoun prior to the verb at 3:4, there also against the rest of the tradition, and at 7:18b. At 7:18a the pronoun is placed after the verb (also ⲡ¹⁵ Ψ 0150 915 917 1836 1875 1881 1912). This may indicate that D F G are less rigorous with respect to word order, even if it does not reveal a trend toward one position over the other. The verb *εκληθη* (K Ψ 0156 0142 *etc*) is the result of assimilation to the same form earlier in the verse.

7:19.73 [discussed in chapter on D F G}

⁶⁵von Soden’s *K*^r group supports this reading.

7:19.75

88 alone replaces *αλλα* with *ει μη*, which occurred at 7:17 with the same meaning.⁶⁶

7:20.77; 7:24.83

Three factors have contributed to the variation in this unit. First, the preposition *εν* appears twice: *εν τη κλησει η εκληθη εν ταυτη μενετω*. The preposition was added again before the relative pronoun in several witnesses (\mathfrak{P}^{15} 0150 257) in an apparent attempt to clarify the use of the dative case so that it matches the previous prepositional phrase. 1739* presents a unique reading. An erasure has obliterated what had been written where *εν ω* now stands (before *εκληθη*; see below), but it is likely that the original hand read *η* here with the rest of the tradition. However, the *εν* prior to *ταυτη μενετω* was never present in the text.⁶⁷

The second influence causing corruption here is the similarity of this passage to 7:24: *εν ω εκληθη αδελφοι, εν τουτω μενετω*. The singular reading of A at 7:20: *εν τουτω μενετω* can only have been imported from the later verse; because the neuter pronoun lacks an antecedent in 7:20, the reading in A cannot have been an attempted “improvement” in the text. The lectionary has influenced two continuous text manuscript here. A lection begins at 7:24,⁶⁸ which 1739 (discussed in the chapter on Family 1739) and 429 confuse with the similar 7:20. 429 reads *αδελφοι εκαστος εν ω εκληθη*, which moves the *αδελφοι* to the beginning of the clause as in both the lectionary manuscripts and the lectionary *titulus*.

⁶⁶BDR § 448 (9).

⁶⁷The collation in Lake and New, p. 172 notes the correction but do not attempt to reconstruct 1739*.

⁶⁸See R. Cocroft, *A Study of the Pauline Lessons in the Matthean Sections of the Greek Lectionary*, SD 32 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), p. 149.

7:21.78

The omission of *καί* in F G is unusual given these manuscripts' usual tendencies (see 7:17.66). Here, however, the *καί* does not function as a conjunction but adverbially as an intensifier.⁶⁹ The word is not omitted by these manuscripts in comparable examples (e.g., 2:10; 16:12). The omission of *et* is shared by 77 78, but also 61, which leaves open the possibility that the Latin text used by the editor of the immediate predecessor of F G lacked the conjunction. The editor then removed it from his Greek text for the sake of conformity to the Latin.

7:22.80; 7:3.10; 7:4.12

The addition/omission of the conjunctions in this passage presents several potentially conflicting arguments. The most common solution is to posit the shortest reading, *ομοιως*, as original, with *ομοιως δε και* and *ομοιως και* representing various attempts to soften the asyndeton. In this scenario, *ομοιως δε και* could be ascribed to harmonization to 1 Cor. 7:3, 4, though this is unlikely.⁷⁰ This reading, however, is not without difficulty. As Zuntz notes, *ομοιως* never stands alone in Paul, and in the NT is found in this way (at the beginning of a clause) only at 1 Peter (3:1, 7; 5:5). For Zuntz, however, this does not cast suspicion on the reading at 7:22 because here it is "strongly attested."⁷¹

While *ομοιως* with asyndeton is non-Pauline, *ομοιως δε και* is firm at 1 Cor. 7:4 and virtually firm at 7:3 (*ομοιως και* only A 056 0142 255). In addition, it is likely the

⁶⁹See BDR § 442 (8); BDAG, s.v. *καί* (2 b)

⁷⁰Zuntz (p. 188) seems to recognize the weakness of this argument: *ομοιως δε και* "was probably suggested, or at least eased, by the parallels in vii 3f."

⁷¹Zuntz, p. 188 n. 2.

archetypal reading at Rom. 1:27, where it is attested by A D* G P V 33 1505 1611 1739 2405 Clement. There N* B D¹ K L 049^c 056 0151 read τε in place of δε, which could have arisen due to the τε immediately preceding at 1:26 and τε και at 1:12, 14. Furthermore, ομοιως τε και is otherwise unattested in the NT, while additional NT examples of ομοιως δε και occur at Luke 5:10; 10:32 and James 2:25.

Ομοιως και could have arisen easily from either ομοιως δε και or ομοιως. Were it not for the frequent loss, as opposed to addition, of δε in otherwise firm readings (Luke 10:32; Rom. 1:27; 1 Cor. 7:3; James 2:25; see further below), this may be considered the archetypal reading. It is therefore more likely that ομοιως δε και led to ομοιως και than the reverse. Furthermore, the manner in which the versions translate this construction shows the tendency toward the simpler ομοιως και. The Peshitta and the Coptic routinely use only an adverb + conjunction to render ομοιως δε και (see below). While the Peshitta does not support ομοιως και in place of ομοιως δε και, at 1 Cor. 7:22 the fact that any conjunction is present means that it cannot support ομοιως. Finally, ομοιως και is not attested in the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum* except as a variant with ομοιως δε και.⁷²

One is therefore left with a decision between two readings at 7:22: ομοιως δε και or ομοιως. The fact that the minuscules are so divided at this place points to continued difficulty with this text throughout the history of transmission. Furthermore, the corrector of 424 remains silent here, departing from its usual relationship with B 6 1739. If one assumes ομοιως δε και as the archetypal reading at Rom. 1:27 and 1 Cor. 7:22, an interesting pattern emerges (the two examples from Luke are noted for the sake of completeness):

⁷²Zuntz (p. 188) argues that the reading ομοιως και arose from ομοιως without considering whether it may have arisen instead from ομοιως δε και, as is argued here. His argument is strained, however, claiming that it was influenced “by many parallels in the Gospels and by the very numerous Pauline instances of ουτως και.”

Luke 5:10	ομοιως δε και [no variation]
Luke 10:32	ομοιως δε και ομοιως και W 544 700
Rom. 1:27	ομοιως δε και A D [*] G P Ψ 33 1505 1611 1739 2495 Cl sy ^h <i>similiter autem et</i> 89 ομοιως τε και K [*] B D ¹ K L 049 ^c 056 0151 ομοιως δε και C 049 [*] 0278 co sy ^p
1 Cor. 7:3	ομοιως δε και N B C D F G K L P Y 0150 0151 614 1739 Or sy ^h <i>similiter autem et</i> 75 77 78 89 Vg ομοιως και A 056 0142 255 Or co <i>similiter autem</i> Cyp Amst(A) <i>lac</i> P ¹¹ P ⁴⁶
1 Cor. 7:4	ομοιως δε και [all Greek witnesses] sy ^h <i>similiter autem et</i> 64 75 77 78 Vg Amst(A) ομοιως και co <i>similiter et</i> 89 Cyp Amst Zeno <i>lac</i> P ¹¹
1 Cor.7:22	ομοιως δε και D F G 1 69 255 319 330 917 1108 1505 1611 1834 1836 1875 2495 <i>similiter autem et</i> 75 77 78 ομοιως και K L 056 0142 0150 0151 88 326 424 614 915 1175 1912 <i>similiter et</i> 61 89 R Am Pel Amst Amst(A) Sedul ομοιως P ¹¹ P ⁴⁶ N A B P Y 6 33 81 104 181 263 441 462 630 999 1319 1739 1838 1881 <i>similiter</i> 64 Vg <i>lac</i> C
James 2:5	ομοιως δε και N A B L 223 489 876 1022 1243 1739 1799 1960 2125 2401 2412 2423 ομοιως δε και 5 6 88 142 623 915 919 sy ^p co ουτως και C

There is a clear tendency for δε to drop out of the tradition. Since ομοιως δε και and ομοιως και are scarcely to be distinguished semantically⁷³ this is not surprising. Both Origen and Chrysostom, for example, cite 1 Cor. 7:3 twice, once with ομοιως δε και and once with ομοιως και.⁷⁴ Therefore, only the reading ομοιως δε και can account for all the

⁷³Denniston (p. 305-6) notes that δὲ καί may combine an “adversative or disjunctive sense with the idea of addition,” though καί may also follow a “purely connective” δέ.

⁷⁴Origen cites 1 Cor. 7:3 with ομοιως δε και in *De oratione* 28,4 and with ομοιως δε και in *Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 14,23; Chrysostom cites the passage with ομοιως και in *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 152 and with ομοιως δε και in *De*

other readings at 7:22. The loss of δε was taking place already in the second century in other passages and in the fathers. This then led to the omission of και, thereby introducing asyndeton. Furthermore, Zuntz himself provides a reason for the loss of δε και: ομοιως δε και is a “typical Koine-phrase.” Scribes and readers interested in improving the style of the text would have found a candidate for revision.

7:22.81

ⲡ⁴⁶ is the only witness to omit the article in seven places in 1 Corinthians, with the latter three of these potentially resulting from parablepsis:⁷⁵

- 7:22 (ο) ελευθερος
- 8:9 (η) εξουσια
- 11:24 (το) υπερ υμων
- 15:9 (του) θεου
- 14:13 διο (ο) λαλων
- 14:33 πασαις (ταις) εκκλησαις
- 15:48 και (οι) ουπανιοι

The example at 7:22 is likely the result of assimilation to anarthrous δουλος in the preceding clause, which matches the assimilation of the word that also takes place here in this manuscript (see discussion at 7:22.82).

7:22.82

One of the recognizable features of Pauline style is the use of parallelism, the virtual repetition of a previous clause with only one or two elements changed in the parallel.⁷⁶ Where

virginitate 28.

⁷⁵List from Royse, p. 258. He finds twenty-five other examples of ⲡ⁴⁶ alone omitting the article, of which seven may be due to a leap.

⁷⁶Cf. BDR § 490; Turner, *Style*, pp. 96-7.

the word order of the elements is repeated in the second clause the manuscripts do not deviate (e.g., 1 Cor. 3:5, 9; 6:16-17; 18-19; 9:1-2; 12:4-5, 15-16). However, in several cases in which *nomina sacra* are involved, the manuscripts do show variation in word order:

Rom. 8:14 υιου θεου εισιν Ν Α C D 1739
 υιου εισιν θεου B F G
 υιου εισιν θεου K L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151
 1 Cor. 7:22 δουλος εστιν χριστου Ϝ¹⁵ Ν^c A B D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
 1739
 δουλος εστιν του χριστου 33
 δουλος εστιν κυρου 257
 δουλος χριστου εστιν Ϝ⁴⁶ Ν^{*} F G 2004 1518

The parallelism of Rom. 8:14 is not as striking as in others, particularly in the difference between the function of the verbs, since εimi functions as the equative verb in a predicate nominative construction modified by a genitive noun. Similar examples occur at 1 Cor. 7:22 (see below) and Gal. 3:7 (where parallelism is not an issue), each time with variation. At Gal. 3:7, υιοι εισιν αβρααμ (Ϝ⁴⁶ Ν^{*} B Ψ) is altered to place the genitive immediately following the noun it modifies: εισιν υιοι αβρααμ (Ν Α C D F G K P 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0278 1739). This helps clarify the direction of alteration at Rom. 8:14 and 1 Cor. 7:22. Both υιοι εισιν θεου (K L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151) and υιοι θεου εισιν (Ν Α C D 1739) also place the genitive modifier immediately following the noun, with υιοι θεου εισιν also bringing the word order into conformity with the preceding clause. 1 Cor. 7:22 shows a similar sequence of variation, with δουλος χριστου εστιν (Ϝ⁴⁶ Ν^{*} F G 1518 2004) also bringing together the noun and the genitive as well as conforming to the word order to the preceding clause. Similar alteration is found at 1 Cor. 10:16:

εστιν του αιματος του χριστου . . . του σωματος εστιν του χριστου Ϝ⁴⁶
 εστιν του αιματος του χριστου . . . εστιν του σωματος του χριστου A co sy^p
 εστιν του αιματος του χριστου . . . του σωματος του χριστου εστιν B P 1175
 2464
 του αιματος του χριστου εστιν . . . του σωματος του κυριου εστιν D^{*} F G

του αιματος του χριστου εστιν . . . του σωματος του χριστου εστιν \aleph C K
L Ψ 056 0142 0151 1739

Several independent assimilations have taken place in this passage. The readings of D* F G and \aleph C K *pm* all stem from the same source, with D* F G reading κυριου in place of χριστου due to an early misreading of $\overline{\chi\gamma}$ as $\overline{\kappa\gamma}$.⁷⁷ The complete agreement in word order between the parallel phrases suggests a secondary harmonization. Harmonization between phrases also took place in A, which places the verb at the beginning each time. \mathfrak{P}^{46} has a unique word order, though the fact that this reading could not have easily led to the creation of the \aleph C D F G reading rules out the possibility of its being archetypal. The only reading which can account for the rise of the others is that found in B P 1175 2464. A co sy^p has assimilated the second part to the first; \aleph C D F G etc. the first to the second; and \mathfrak{P}^{46} reflects an error. One other possibility is that the verb εστιν was absent from archetype in the second phrase (του σωματος του χριστου). Though unattested, this would easily explain the entire range of variation. The manuscript that suffers the most from assimilation in these examples is \aleph , having the assimilated reading in every case. Several manuscripts do so in three of the examples; A C D F G 1739. B shows the least amount of assimilation of word order.

7:24.85

The shift of the case of θεω from the dative to the genitive θεου can be attributed to the difficulty of the meaning of παρα θεω within 7:17-24: "Let each one remain in the position in which he was called before God." In the discussion of 1 Cor. 7, one's proper

⁷⁷A similar error is likely the cause to the reading καιρω (D F G) for κυριω at Rom. 12:11.

relationship with others has been the focus, not one's standing before God.⁷⁸ The genitive θεου (056 0142 328 385 1518 1896) is smoother in this context: “. . . in which he was called by God” – and therefore secondary. A second resolution of the difficulty is the omission of παρα θεω altogether, as found in at least one manuscript (309).⁷⁹

7:25.88 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:26.91 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:26.94 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:28.97; 7:28.99

Two different types of variation are found here. The first involves the form of the aorist active stem of γαμέω, which circulated in two different forms in the manuscripts.⁸⁰ The Hellenistic form, --γαμησ-, is consistently used in the *Corpus Paulinum*. It stands without variation at 1 Cor. 7:33,34, but at 7:9 γαμησατωσαν is replaced with γαμειτωσαν (F G pc) and γαμησαι with γαμειν (8° A C° 0150 33 pc), both of which are the present tense form (see the discussions *ad loc.*). The Attic form, -γημ-⁸¹ never occurs in the NT without variation. G. D. Kilpatrick, in a discussion of variation involving this stem, notes that -

⁷⁸Schrage II, p. 143.

⁷⁹Tischendorf also cites here “13,” which is a commentary on the Pauline Epistles by Jacques LeFevre d' Etaples (Latin: Jacobus Faber Stapulensis) published in Paris in 1512 under the title *S. Pauli Epistolae XIV ex vulgata adiecta intelligentia ex graeco cum commentaries Jacobi Fabri Stapulensis*. LeFevre in this commentary does not specifically argue for the shorter text, but cites 7:24 ending with ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω. The next text discussed is the second clause of v. 25 (γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι)

⁸⁰Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 231.

⁸¹BDR §101¹⁶; W. Veitch, *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1871), pp. 146-7.

γαμησ- is firm in seven passages. After discussion the examples of variation, he concludes, “the Attic form is extremely unlikely in the NT.” He then argues for the non-Attic reading at Matt. 22:25, where both γαμησας (D W Y Π Z Γ Δ) and γημασ (N B L Θ Σ Φ) are attested, and at Luke 14:20, where γυναικα εγημα is the most widely attested reading. There D, supported by the early Syriac tradition, reads γυναικα ελαβον.⁸²

Twice in I Corinthians there is variation between the Attic and the Hellenistic forms, both at 7:28:

γαμησης Ϝ¹⁵ Ϝ⁴⁶ N B P Ψ 6 33 43 69 81 101^{ms} 181 917 1739 1834 1836 1838 1875
 γημης K L 056 0142 0150 0151 104 326 424 614 1175 Or Chr Thret Dam Photius
 γαμηση A
 λαβης γυναικα D F G sy^p
acceperis uxorem 75 77 78 89 Vg Amst Sedul
duxeris uxorem Te

γαμη D^o F G
 γημη *rel*

In the first example, γημης may have been created unintentionally due to haplography:

ΓΔΜΗCHC, with a subsequent interchange of the initial α to η. It is more likely, however, to represent an intentional correction away from the Hellenistic form.⁸³ This example, as well as the tendency of the tradition as a whole to replace the Hellenistic forms with the Attic, argues also for the direction of alteration to move from γαμη to γημη. The variation may have arisen accidentally due to a common vowel interchange.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the pattern of variation

⁸²G. D. Kilpatrick, “The Aorist of γαμειν in the New Testament,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 18 (1967), pp. 139-40.

⁸³Note that for the identical variation at Matt. 22:25 the manuscript support for the readings is virtually reversed, with the “Alexandrian” witnesses attesting the shorter, Attic form and the “Byzantine” witnesses the longer, Hellenistic form. Yet no editor in the last two centuries has printed the same reading both there and at 1 Cor. 7:28.

⁸⁴Mayser I,1 §5(α3), p. 38.

discussed here suggests that accidental alteration was influenced by the trend toward the Attic stem seen throughout the NT manuscript tradition.

The reading λαβης γυναικα, however, presents a completely different problem. The reading cannot be dismissed as a Latinism,⁸⁵ for the standard Latin idiom would be *duxeris uxorem*.⁸⁶ This is the way Tertullian twice renders the phrase in citations of this passage.⁸⁷ The rest of the Latin tradition, however, including the Vulgate, uses *acceperis*, which is literally equivalent to λαβης. Because this departs from typical Latin idiom it can only have been based on a Greek reading, so that the Latin tradition reflects a Grecism, rather than D F G attesting a Latinism. It is also read in the Peshitta, which uses the masculine form of the verb to render the phrase. D F G therefore cannot be dismissed as a Latinism here, and represents an early form of the text.

But is it the archetypal reading? The reading γυναικα ελαβον is found also in Codex Bezae at Luke 14:20⁸⁸ and similar forms are found, without variation, at Luke 20:28, 29, 31, for all of which the Latin consistently uses forms of the standard idiom *uxorem duxi*. This expression is clearly preferred in the LXX, which is reflecting the Hebrew idiom, with approximately 90 examples. Therefore, although found nowhere else in Paul, the idiom is certainly part of the vocabulary of the first century Christian communities.

It is likely the archetypal reading, since adaptation to the near context appears to have given rise to the other readings. In the previous verse Paul gives the instruction: “Are

⁸⁵As is done by Zuntz, pp. 88-89 and Fee, p. 325 n. 10.

⁸⁶Lewis and Short, s.v. *duco* (I B 4).

⁸⁷*De monogomia* 11,12 and *De exhortatione castitatis* 4. In the latter passage only *duxeris* is stated, but *uxorem* is clearly implied from the context.

⁸⁸Kilpatrick (“The Aorist of γαμειν,” p. 188) argues that this is the archetypal reading based on its replacement in the rest of the tradition with an Attic form.

you free of a wife? Do not seek a wife (ζητει γυναικα).” Then follows immediately our variant: “But if you marry (λαβης γυναικα) you are not sinning.” However, misunderstood as “take a wife” rather than “marry” there appears to be a contradiction with the preceding instruction: Why would one not be sinning if he “took a wife” since Paul had just instructed them not to “seek a wife”? However, recognizing that the idiom simply means “to marry” allows it to be read, properly, with v. 28: “If you (male) marry you do not sin,⁸⁹ and if a betrothed female marries, she does not sin.”⁹⁰ The second clause of v. 28 in fact provided the solution to the perceived difficulty: the replacement of λαβης γυναικα with a form of γαμέω. The variation between γαμησης and γημης, discussed above, therefore represents secondary variation; neither can be the source of λαβης γυναικα, but both are adaptations of a more difficult reading to the near context.⁹¹

7:28.100 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:29.103 [discussed at 7:8.28]

7:29.104 [readings of D F G discussed in chapter on D F G]

With the absence of punctuation in the earliest manuscripts, the position of εστιν determines whether το λοιπον should be read with what precedes or what follows. When placed after το λοιπον (D² K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 88 *pm*), the noun must be read with

⁸⁹The context makes clear that it is the male who is discussed in the first clause of 7:28.

⁹⁰On the meaning of παρθένος see the discussion of 7:33-34.

⁹¹Kilpatrick (“The aorist of γαμειν,” p. 188) argues that γαμησης is Hellenistic and γημης is Attic, and λαβης γυναικα “is both Hellenistic and Attic” the latter two “can be stylistic corrections of γαμησης.” However, since λαβης γυναικα is also Hellenistic it should not be ruled out.

the preceding clause: “. . . the time is limited as to what remains.”⁹² Both Chrysostom and Theodoret break off their citation of this text after το λοιπον εστιν, indicating that they understood the sentence in this way.⁹³ Theodoret’s brief comment here illustrates this thinking: “Life drives on toward the goal; the consummation of the present age is near.” On the other hand, when εστιν is placed immediately after συνεσταλμενος, το λοιπον must be read with the following clause: “. . . the time is limited. Furthermore/Therefore/In the time remaining . . .”⁹⁴ The precise use and meaning of το λοιπον is difficult here, likely contributing to scribal attempts to construe it with ο καιρος in the preceding clause.

7:29.106 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:30.108

The omission of the third και in the series by Ϙ⁴⁶ alone “disrupts polysyndeton.”⁹⁵

This manuscript omits και against all other witnesses also at 1 Cor. 14:21 and nine other places in the Pauline epistles.⁹⁶

⁹²Fee, p. 338 n. 10. Contra Fee, however, the “Western” witnesses do not construe the sentence in the same way. F G, retaining the lineation of their exemplar, begin a new sense line with λοιπον. The Vulgate sense-lines also understand the syntax in this way. D places λοιπον on its own line, perhaps reflecting a lack of certainty regarding the proper way to construe the text.

⁹³Chrysostom, *De virginitate* 72; Theodoret, *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas Sancti Pauli* MPG 82, p. 281.

⁹⁴The range of options is discussed by Conzelmann, p. 130 n. 3; M. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament. Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, NTTS 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), p. 26 argues that for το λοιπον in this passage “a temporal reference seems entirely suitable.”

⁹⁵Güting and Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, p. 61.

⁹⁶Royse, p. 257.

7:31.109 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:31.110

The loss of the prefix, resulting in *χρωμενοι* (Ψ 242 1898), is the result of assimilation to the same word earlier in the verse.⁹⁷ *Παραχρωμενοι* (L) is an interpretive alteration; *παραχρωμενοι* in other literature simply means “to use,” though the two NT occurrences, both in 1 Corinthians (also 9:18), imply misuse, *παραχρωμενοι* makes this intended meaning explicit. It is also found in direct citations of this passage in Basil and Theodoret⁹⁸ and an allusion in *Apostolic Constitutions* 2,25:

By distributing with righteousness to those in need, and you yourselves using the things from the Lord, but not abusing them (καὶ ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ χρώμενοι ἐκ τῶν κυριακῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ παραχρώμενοι) by eating from them, but not consuming them yourselves; by sharing in fellowship with those who lack, be free from stumbling before God.

7:32.111

Since 7:32-35 explains 7:29-31, the *δε* at the beginning of 7:32 does not have adversative force.⁹⁹ This is similar to the function of *θελω δε* at 1 Cor. 10:20b, which summarizes 10:19-20a. The loss of *δε /autem* in the Latin tradition may be attributed to translational choice, so that the force of the conjunction not be misinterpreted – notably VL 75 89 AMst lose *autem* also at 10:20.¹⁰⁰ This then led to the omission of *δε* in F G.

⁹⁷Examples of the loss of the prefix in other witnesses is provided at 7:13.47.

⁹⁸Basil, *Asceticon magnum* MPG 31, pp. 976 and 132; Theodoret, *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* MPG 82, p. 281 (three occurrences); von Soden’s citation of Origen for this reading is in error.

⁹⁹Schrage II, p. 177.

¹⁰⁰Cf. also the loss of the intensive *αυτων* at 7:35.

7:34.115; 7:34.116; 7:34.117; 7:34.118; 7:34.119; 7:34.120

1 Corinthians 7:33b-34a contains one of the more complex textual problems in the Pauline epistles. Origen and Jerome attempted to resolve the variations, yet these complexities have continued to demand the attention of modern commentators. The nature of the variations, the resulting differences in meaning, and the sophisticated nature of the parallelism which is produced in the different readings suggest that the passage has received intentional editorial attention rather than its having arisen from accidentally-created corruption. Furthermore, shifts in terminology and church practice in the second century provides a context for these intentional alterations. As a result, the manuscript tradition preserves this passage with different meanings: Is Paul providing a definition of the distinction between a “woman” and a “virgin”? Or is he contrasting the priorities of a married man and married woman with those of an unmarried woman?

Since the variation in this passage significantly affects its interpretation, several decisions regarding the exegesis of the preceding material must be made, particularly the precise meaning of the terms παρθένος and ἄγαμος. Throughout chapter 7, instructions on behavior which are structurally parallel are given to both men and women: 7:1-7 discusses whether or not a man or woman (γυνή) should marry; 7:8-9 gives advice to the unmarried (ἄγαμοι) and widows; 7:10-16 discourages separation of husband and wife (γυνή). Following an encouragement to accept the call of God to remain in the life “in which one was when called” (7:17-24) is a further encouragement for the παρθένοι to remain unmarried (7:25-28). This unit is complicated by the question over the meaning of παρθένων and παρθένος. The most likely intended context is that of engaged couples, with the plural τῶν παρθένων of 7:25 referring to engaged persons of either sex, vv. 27-28a referring to the male

betrothed and ἡ παρθένος 28b to the female betrothed, then v. 29 addressing both again.¹⁰¹

A similar issue of referent arises in 7:36-38, where again the most likely context is a discussion of the behavior of a male toward his betrothed (τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον), with encouragement to them to remain unmarried.¹⁰² Since the issue of the referent of παρθένος in 7:34 is critical to the resolution of the textual problem it will be discussed after examining the textual evidence.

The unit which immediately precedes that under discussion (7:29-31) provides what has been called the “Eschatological and Christological Foundation” for the conduct of the Christian.¹⁰³ The phrase Θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι (7:32a) introduces the overall unit 7:32-35 by connecting it to the eschatological motivation described in 7:28.¹⁰⁴ The function of 7:32-35 is to present an argument for remaining in an unmarried state. In 7:32 and 34 ἄγαμος again appears, having been used in 7:11 to describe the resultant state of a woman whose unbelieving husband had chosen to separate from her. While in that passage it may be used to describe (but does not necessarily entail) a divorced or separated woman, the same cannot be said of 7:32-34. In 7:32-33 the contrast of focus is drawn between ὁ ἄγαμος and ὁ γαμησας with no indication of whether or not the one who is ἄγαμος has been

¹⁰¹Schrage II, pp. 155-56; J. K. Elliott, “Paul’s Teaching on Marriage,” *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972), pp. 220-21; Thiselton, pp. 569-71. Thiselton, however, apparently misunderstands Elliott with the claim: “The application to male and female distinguishes this view from Elliott’s.” (p. 570). In fact, Elliott sees the singular παρθένος in v. 27 as referring to females (as does Thiselton), but the overall context of vv. 25-38 (as well as vv. 29-38) as discussing “advice to engaged couples” since it is introduced by the plural τῶν παρθένων (v. 25).

¹⁰²Thiselton, pp. 594-602; Schrage II, pp. 198-99; Elliott, “Paul’s Teaching on Marriage.”

¹⁰³Schrage II, pp. 166-68.

¹⁰⁴Cf. Schrage II, p. 177.

divorced. Likewise in 7:34-35, ἡ γυνή, ἡ ἄγαμος, and/or ἡ παρθένος (depending on the resolution of the textual problem) is contrasted with ἡ γαμησάσα. To argue that ἡ ἄγαμος has the very narrow meaning of a divorced or separated women is difficult in light of the use of the masculine in 7:32.¹⁰⁵

At issue in the textual tradition is 1) the meaning of the verb μεμέρισται (7:33); 2) whether its subject is ὁ γαμήσας (7:33) or ἡ γυνή (7:34); 3) the presence or absence of καί both before and after μεμέρισται; and 4) the position of ἡ γυνή, ἡ ἄγαμος, and ἡ παρθένος with the resultant differences in meaning. The variant in question, found at 1 Cor. 7:34a, exists in four basic forms:

- Form A: και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος Ϝ¹⁵ B P
 et divisus est et mulier innupta et virgo vg
- Form A.1: και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος Ϝ⁴⁶ K
 A (6) 1739
- Form B: μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος η αγαμος D² F^{*106} G K L Ψ 056
 0142 0150 0151 5 429 489 876 1243 1880
 divisa est et mulier et vir[g]o quae innupta est 75
 divisa est mulier et virgo quae innupta est 89
 divisa est et mulier et virgo quae non est nupta 77

¹⁰⁵Thiselton (p. 590) argues that ἡ ἄγαμος does refer to a previously married woman; he does not argue the same for the masculine form in v. 32, however. On the other hand, an argument, based on grammar, that divorced women are specifically excluded from ἡ ἄγαμος is made by Allen R. Guenther, "One Woman or Two? 1 Corinthians 7:34," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12 (2002), pp. 33-45. Most commentators (e.g., Conzelmann, p. 130; Fee, p. 345; Schrage II, p. 167) do not attempt to identify the referent any more precisely than simply "die unverheiratete Frau"/ "the unmarried woman," while Barrett, pp. 180-81, after considerable discussion, refuses to offer anything more precise than simply "unmarried."

¹⁰⁶The scribe noticed that his Vulgate text read *innupta* after *mulier*, while the D-text which he was adapting to the Vulgate read *innupta* after *virgo*. VL 77 uses instead *non est nupta*. This was noticed by the scribe, who then added the *innupta* into the Greek column in its proper location, that is, above the slight space between γυνη and και η παρθενος. However, no Greek equivalent stood in the text, so η αγαμος was added before *innupta*, that is, above και η γυνη. This reading is therefore not a correction of the Greek text (as it is cited in NTA^P), but another example of this manuscript's interest in the proper Latin renderings.

divisa mulier et virgo immaculata 78

Form B.1: και μεμερισται η γυνη και η παρθενος η αγαμος D*

Significantly, the addition/omission of the initial και and the position of η αγαμος are linked in every witness. That is, μεμερισται must be construed with 7:34a in witnesses that both omit και before the verb and also read η αγαμος only in the position immediately following η παρθενος and no other; the same is true of witnesses that read an initial και but use punctuation to force the verb to be read with what follows (Forms B and B.1). On the other hand, manuscripts that read the initial και and lack any punctuation force μεμερισται to be read with 7:33b (Form A and A.1).

Forms B and B.1 are found in the following manuscripts with punctuation or lineation¹⁰⁷:

- μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος · η αγαμος 5 429 489 876 1243 1880
- Μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος · η αγαμος L
- μεμερισται Η γυνη και η παρθενος η αγαμος 629^{c108}
- Μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος · Η αγαμος F*¹⁰⁹ G

¹⁰⁷A medial dot is signified by “·”; enlarged letters (indicating paragraph divisions) are capitalized; a line division is signified by “||”.

¹⁰⁸The H is enlarged and likely written in red ink (though this cannot be conclusively determined from the microfilm). This indicates a chapter division on the previous line, which is also marked by a medial dot. The correction in 629 encompasses only η παρθενος η αγαμος, which has obscured what had been previously written.

¹⁰⁹F capitalizes only the H found before αγαμος, extending the letter into the left-hand margin.

The reading of the majority of manuscripts is seen in the first two listed here.¹¹⁰ The origins of the punctuation and lineation of these witnesses has not been studied, though the similarity in the manuscripts seems to point to a shared tradition. The reading of F G is discussed below.

The manuscripts that read the initial καί but by their punctuation force the verb to be read with what follows are:

- || και μεμερισται η γυνη || και η παρθενος || η αγαμος μεριμνα τα του κυ D
- και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος · η αγαμος · 1874¹¹¹
- και μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος · η παρθενος 2464
- και μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος · η αγαμος 424
- και μεμερισται η γυνη και η παρθενος · η αγαμος · 915
- και μεμερισται η γυνη η αγαμος · και η παρθενος 2127

The text of D is discussed below. 2464 shows accidental assimilation to the near context in the repetition of η παρθενος. Given the important family of which it is a member, the reading of 424 is significant. The numerous corrections in this manuscript show a close relationship with 6 1739 1908 0121 0243.¹¹² Yet often the text is left uncorrected, frequently

¹¹⁰Cited as such by both the standard modern editions and Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, Second Edition (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985). The latter, however, since it designates this reading as supported by “M”, indicates that for this reading “the Majority Text is largely united but with defections in some strands” (p. vi). The *Textus Receptus* reads μεμερισται η γυνη και η παρθενος η αγαμος, a reading supported, so far as I can determine, only by 915^c 1241^s and a single manuscript of Methodius’ *Symposium* (discussed below).

¹¹¹In 1874 a new leaf begins with η αγαμος, perhaps accounting for the additional punctuation.

¹¹²J. Neville Birdsall, “The Text and Scholia of the Codex von der Goltz and its Allies, and their Bearing upon the Texts of the Works of Origen, especially the Commentary on Romans,” in *Origeniana*, ed. H. Crouzel, G. Lomiento, and J. Rius-Camps, Quaderni di “Vetera Christianorum” 12 (Università di Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975), pp. 215-222. 1908 is a member of this group only in Romans; 0121 and 0243 are not extant for this passage.

in places where it agrees with the “Byzantine Text.”¹¹³ The reading of 2127 agrees with \mathfrak{P}^{15}

B P *pc* in reading the initial *και* and placing *η αγαμος* immediately following *η γυνη*

(though it does not read the second *και*), yet the punctuation requires that the verb be

construed with 7:34a. Also somewhat ambiguous is 1241^s:

μεμερισται η γυνη και η παρθενος · η αγαμος 1241^s

However, although 1241^s lacks punctuation either before or after *μεμερισται*, the presence of

a medial stop before *η αγαμος* makes clear that this is the subject of the following clause.

Thus the manuscript reads *μεμερισται* with 7:34a.

In addition to these witnesses a pair of closely related manuscripts also matches Form A, but their punctuation shows indecision as to how the verb should be understood:

· και μεμερισται · και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος 256 263

Most manuscripts which read the initial *και* and place *η αγαμος* immediately following *η γυνη* (Forms A and A.1) do not use punctuation or any form of text division here; only \mathfrak{P}^{15} A 33 1739 do so:

· και μεμερισται · και η γυνη η αγαμος · και η παρθενος η αγαμος 1739
 και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος \mathfrak{P}^{15}
 και μεμερισται και Η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος A
 και μεμερισται · και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος 33

1739 places divisions both before and after the verb in a manner similar to that of 256 263,

yet with an additional division after the first occurrence of *η αγαμος*. More important,

however, is the similarity in the textual division (though not text form) shown by \mathfrak{P}^{15} and A,

both of which use a space to divide the text so that the verb is read with 7:33b. The break in

¹¹³E.g., in chapters 7 and 8 of 1 Corinthians: 7:13 αυτον; 7:18 τις εκληθη; 7:28 γημης; 8:2 ειδεναι τι, ουδεπω ουδεν, and εγνωκεν; 8:5 της γης. In addition, 6 and 424^a agree in seven places in chapters 7 and 8 with the “Byzantine Text” against 1739.

the text is further defined in A by adding an initial capital on the following line.¹¹⁴ The division in 33 is similar, which uses a medial stop rather than a space to indicate the break. Whether this similarity in text division is the result of a shared tradition or not, these witnesses understand the passage in the same way.

As a result of this investigation of the various forms of text division in the manuscripts, it is clear that there is a correlation between the presence or absence of *καί* before *μεμερισται* and the position of *η αγαμος*. Where *η αγαμος* stands only in the position following *η παρθενος*, either *καί* is present before *μεμερισται* or punctuation forces *μεμερισται* to be read with 7:34a (Form B and B.1). The manuscripts which employ punctuation to make this distinction may, therefore, be evidence of a later addition of *καί* in order to avoid asyndeton. However, whether using punctuation or not, the earliest manuscripts remain consistent in the correlation between the presence or absence of *καί* and the position of *η αγαμος*. Therefore, the variation of the initial *καί* is neither accidental, nor merely either a preference for or distaste of asyndeton,¹¹⁵ but is inextricably connected with the overall structure and meaning of the unit in 7:32-35.

Next, the four “Forms” identified earlier may be isolated into two earlier forms from which the others were derived. These two earliest forms are laid out with line divisions, both because these are found in the manuscripts and because they allow the parallelism of the unit to be seen (the square brackets indicate variation within these forms):

¹¹⁴Due to damage to the manuscript only the right hand leg of H is still visible.

¹¹⁵So Güting and Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, p. 42, discussed further below.

Form A (P¹⁵ B P)

- 1 θελω δε υμας αμεριμνους ειναι
ο αγαμος μεριμνα τα του κυ
- 3 πως αρεση τω [θω / κω]
ο δε γαμησας μεριμνα τα του κοσμου
- 5 πως αρεση τη γυναικι και μεμερισται
και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος μεριμνα τα του κυ
- 7 ινα η αγια [και] [τω] σωματι και [τω] πνευματι
η δε γαμησασα μεριμνα [τα του κοσμου]
- 9 πως αρεση τω ανδρι

Form B (D² F* G K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 429 489 876 1243 1880)

- 1 θελω δε υμας αμεριμνους ειναι
ο αγαμος μεριμνα τα του κυ
- 3 πως αρεση τω [θω / κω]
ο δε γαμησας μεριμνα τα του κοσμου
- 5 πως αρεση τη γυναικι
μεμερισται και η γυνη και η παρθενος
- 7 η αγαμος μεριμνα τα του κυ
ινα η αγια [και] [τω] σωματι και [τω] πνευματι
- 9 η δε γαμησασα μεριμνα [τα του κοσμου]
πως αρεση τω ανδρι

In both forms, the first four lines and the beginning of the fifth show the parallelism characteristic of the chapter as a whole: line one introduces the goal or theme of the unit; lines two and four contain the two contrasting subjects, and lines three and five the proper or improper focus of attention of those subjects.¹¹⁶

In addition, both forms have suffered from harmonization to the near context. In 7:32 (line three) the bulk of the tradition reads κυριω, with F G the only Greek manuscripts reading θεω. However, the reading is overwhelmingly attested in the Latin tradition, including Tertullian, Cyprian, the Vulgate, and the D-Text witnesses 77 89 Amst(A). This indicates a widespread knowledge of the reading in the West in the earliest stages of

¹¹⁶Lines three and five could be attached to lines two and four, respectively, but because the manuscripts that attest “Form B” show clear evidence of these line divisions (see further below), “Form A” was laid out in the same way for the sake of comparison.

transmission. Presumably, arguments that rely on the “weight” or number of the witnesses have influenced editors here. However, the reading κυριω should be recognized as harmonization to the immediately preceding κυριου, especially since it is difficult to account for a potential alteration from κυριω to θεω. Other examples of harmonization to the near context in this passage are the reading τω κοσμω for τη γυναικι at 7:33 (0150) and the addition of πως αρεσει τω κυριω after του κυριου at 7:34 (547). Given the similarity of the various clauses in this unit such harmonizations are to be expected.¹¹⁷

Differences between Forms A and B begin to emerge at the end of line five. In Form B, the verb μεμερισται stands without a conjunction. This results in an asyndetic clause which describes the contrast between η γυνη and η παρθενος. Furthermore, the adjective η αγαμος becomes the sole subject of the singular verb μεριμνα in line seven. This form may be translated:¹¹⁸ “But the married man thinks the things of the world, how he will please his wife. There is a division/distinction between the woman and the virgin. The unmarried woman thinks the things of the Lord. . . .”

In Form A, by contrast, και stands before μεμερισται, which connects the verb to the preceding phrase so that the subject of the verb is ο γαμησας (line four). This now requires

¹¹⁷At 7:34b, B and Tertullian do not read the second τα του κοσμου. The shorter text cannot be have arisen by parablepsis. Neither can Tertullian’s citations be dismissed as summaries, since he consistently shows the shorter reading in all three citations of this passage. B, it should be noted, does preserve the archetypical word order at 7:34a, one of only a handful of witnesses to do so. Most significantly, however, the reading η δε γαμησησα μεριμνα τα του κοσμου brings the clause into parallel with η αγαμος μεριμνα τα του κυριου at 7:34a. The fact that this passage has received significant editorial attention confirms the likelihood of assimilation here; τα του κοσμου at 7:34b should be considered secondary, a final example of harmonization to the near context which is common in this passage.

¹¹⁸Alternatives, particularly for the phrase “the woman and the virgin,” are discussed below.

και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος to be read as the compound subject of the singular verb μεριμνα, with η αγαμος, here standing immediately after η γυνη, functioning as an adjectival modifier of this noun. The sense of the text differs significantly from Form B: “But the married man thinks the things of the world, how he will please his wife, and he is divided. Both the unmarried woman and the virgin¹¹⁹ think the things of the Lord . . .”

These two forms show radical differences in both syntax and the understanding of certain terminology. One or the other must have been the result of intentional editing, particularly since the resultant structure in both cases is quite sophisticated. But which form is the result of careful editing? Based on both Pauline usage and the development of terminology in second century Christianity, it will be argued that Forms A.1, B, and B.1 are edited forms.

Derivative Forms of the Text

These two initial forms of the text produced distinct conflations. Form A.1 (και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος $\text{P}^{46} \text{ \& A 1739}$) repeats the adjective. In spite of the early age and “quality” of these witnesses, it is impossible for this to have been the original reading. First, it would have been impossible to read μεμερισται as meaning “make a distinction,” as it clearly was in the second century (see below), had both η γυνη and η παρθενος been modified by η αγαμος. Second, an argument for the accidental omission of η αγαμος is unlikely since it would have had to have taken place independently in both Form A and Form B, and in neither case is parablepsis a likely cause. However, this reading is easily accounted for as a conflation of the two forms of the text

¹¹⁹Alternatively, “The unmarried woman, i.e., a virgin”; or, “The unmarried woman, i.e., the betrothed;” see further below.

described above.¹²⁰ This is not exceptional in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , which attests other conflation.¹²¹ The reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} at 1 Cor. 7:33-34 is similar to these examples in that a combination of readings now found in B and F G respectively have been conflated. Recognizing this conflation is additional evidence that both Form A and Form B existed in the second century, since \mathfrak{P}^{46} is usually dated to the early third century. However, since $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is present before $\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, Form A.1 can only have been based on Form A, with the repeated η $\alpha\gamma\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ added as a reader's annotation or a correction from a manuscript which contained Form B.

Form B.1, found only in D and a few minuscules, is also a derivative form of the text. Given the stemmatic relationship between D and F G, either Form B is derived from Form B.1 or, *vice-versa*. The text of Form B.1 is presented here showing the lineation of D with the differences between the parallel Greek and Latin texts underlined:

1	θελω δε υμας αμεριμνους ειναι	1	<i>volo vos sine sollicitudine esse</i>
	ο αγαμος μεριμνα		<i>qui sine uxore est sollicitus est</i>
3	τα του $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$	3	<i>quae sunt \overline{dmi}</i>
	πως αρεση τω $\overline{\kappa\omega}$		<i>quomodo placeat \overline{dmo}</i>
5	ο δε γαμησας μεριμνα	5	<i>qui autem cum uxore est cogitat</i>
	τα του κοσμου		<i>quae sunt huius mundi</i>
7	πως αρεση τη γυναικι	7	<i>quomodo placeat uxori</i>
	<u>και</u> μεμερισται η γυνη		<i>divisa est <u>et</u> mulier</i>
9	και η παρθενος	9	<i>et virgo</i>
	η αγαμος μεριμνα τα του $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$		<i>quae innupta est cogitat quae sunt \overline{dmi}</i>
11	ινα η αγια σωματι και $\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$	11	<i>ut sit sancta <u>et</u> corpore et \overline{spu}</i>
	η δε γαμησασα		<i>quae autem nupta est</i>
13	μεριμνα τα του κοσμου	13	<i>cogitat quae sunt mundi</i>
	πως αρεση τω ανδρι		<i>quomodo placeat viro</i>

Strikingly, the only differences between the Greek and Latin columns of D are the addition/omission of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ / *et* in ll. 8 and 11. The Latin text (VL 75) is equivalent to Form B, the text of F G. This is not surprising; F G 75 often retain the readings of the shared ancestor

¹²⁰Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 490.

¹²¹Royse, p. 253.

of D 75 F 78 G 77 against D. Moreover, G preserves the lineation of this ancestor manuscript more faithfully than does D.¹²² The fact that μεμερισται has an initial capital in G shows that this was the beginning of the line, whereas in D και stands before the verb as the beginning of the line. This addition of και into the D F G line of transmission is probably the result of the editing of either D or a predecessor toward a manuscript similar to that which is commonly called the “Alexandrian” type. Both the additions of και in line eight and its omission in line eleven can be attributed to this editing. The loss of και following μεμερισται in line eight is more complex.

The omission of the correlative και at 7:34a by D (also 203 506 629) matches a pattern of omission by D in similar examples throughout the epistles. και as a correlative conjunction occurs in a number of places without variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* (excluding Hebrews), joining verbs (1 Cor. 4:11; Phil. 2:13; 4:9, 13), adverbs (1 Thess. 2:18), nouns (Tit. 1:15; Phlm. 16), pronouns (1 Cor. 6:13; Eph. 6:9; 1 Tim. 4:16), and clauses (1 Cor. 4:5; 6:14; 7:38). But in ten passages there is variation involving the initial και: When correlating verbs (Rom. 14:9; 2 Thess. 3:4; 1 Tim. 4:10); nouns (1 Cor. 1:30; 1 Cor. 7:34a; 1 Cor. 7:34b; 1 Cor. 10:32; 2 Cor. 12:12); adjectives (1 Thess 5:15); and clauses (1 Cor. 1:22). D alone or with a handful of unrelated witnesses omits the first και of the sequence at 1 Cor. 1:30; 7:34a; and 1 Tim. 4:10. In addition, it is joined in the same omission by only A in 2 Cor. 12:12 and \aleph^* A in 2 Thess. 3:4. No other manuscript omits the initial και with this frequency in these situations. At 7:34b (και τω σωματι και τω πνευματι) D also omits the initial και, but is here joined by \wp ⁴⁶ A P 6 33 43 69 1108 1175 1505 1611 2004. Because it is found in both F G and the Latin D-text its omission in D is likely to be the result of

¹²²Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus,” p. 291.

comparison to a manuscript of the “Alexandrian” tradition (as was also the addition of *καί* before *μεμερίσται*, which is missing in F G and the Latin D-text). The editing of D’s text throughout 7:34, and particularly 7:34b, likely prompted the same omission in D in 7:34a. This matches its tendencies elsewhere, and cannot be considered original.¹²³

Pauline Usage and 1 Cor. 7:33-34

Several grammatical and lexical issues point to Form A as the archetypal text. First, Paul’s use of the verb *μερίζω* is consistent. The verb in the active voice always has *θεός* or *κύριος* as the subject and always occurs in contexts of the divine distribution of “gifts” (Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 7:17; 10:13). However, since these examples do not match 7:34 in form or context they cannot be used to determine the meaning of the verb in 7:34. On the other hand, both the form and context of 7:34 are matched by the example of *μεμέρισται* at 1 Cor. 1:13. In both cases the perfect tense is used intransitively as a stative; “Is Christ divided?” This suggests that in 7:33-34, “the married man . . . is divided” (Form A) is the best way to understand the verb. Furthermore, J. Weiss argues for this understanding of the verb by ruling out the meaning “is divided” based on several contextual grounds, such as the naming of the categories rather than the use of a plural (e.g., *αἱ γυναῖκες*), and to say “the wife and

¹²³Güting and Mealand (p. 42) argue that the original reading at 7:34 was simply *μεμέρισται*, omitting the *καί* both before and after. They claim this is a conjecture, but it is the reading of at least 915^c 1241^s and the *Textus Receptus*. Their argument is made on the basis of examples of Paul where he presents the situation he is addressing by the use of parallel clauses. Most often, there seems to be a preference for asyndeton in the first clause but syndeton in the second (Rom. 14:2, 5, 22; 1 Cor. 3:4; 7:8, 12-15, 21, 32, 39; 14:4). Yet they also point out that one finds examples where both clauses lack conjunctions (1 Cor. 3:14; 7:18; 7:27f.) as well as examples where both clauses have conjunctions (1 Cor. 7:36; 11:31f.; 14:2f.). Therefore, a mechanical application of a principle that Paul prefers one combination over the other is unhelpful in this passage. Furthermore, regarding the omission of the second *καί*, they have not taken into account the editing in D and its tendency to omit *καί* in similar situations.

the virgin are divided:” results in nonsense.¹²⁴ In addition, the standard lexicons do not offer any examples which would suggest a meaning “to distinguish between two separate objects;”¹²⁵ all cited examples imply the division of a single object into two. The ancient lexicographers also show this understanding. Harpocration, Apion, Apollonius, Ps-Zonaras, Hesychius, and the Suda all use μερίζω to gloss δαίω (“to divide”) or δατέομαι (“to divide among themselves”).¹²⁶ Therefore, the most likely meaning of the verb μεμέρισται at 1 Cor. 7:34 is “he is divided [in loyalty].”

This is not, however, how the verb was understood already in the second century. Tertullian, who is likely employing an existing Latin translation,¹²⁷ uses *divisa est*, which is commonly used in the sense of “to distinguish between.”¹²⁸ Slightly later, the Peshitta¹²⁹ shows a similar understanding.¹³⁰ Greek writers of the third and fourth centuries, such as

¹²⁴“Das gibt keinen Sinn and hat keine Form.” J. Weiss, p. 203.

¹²⁵Cf. Liddell and Scott and BDAG.

¹²⁶Apollonius, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. δάσσονται; Harpocration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, s.v. δατέισθαι; Apion, *De glossis Homericis*, s.v. δαίω; Hesychius, *Lexicon*, s.v. δεδαίαται; *Suidae Lexicon*, s.v. δαίει, δαιτεῖσθαι.

¹²⁷Fröhlich, pp. 168-81. On the Greek basis of Tertullian’s text of *adversus Marcionem* see Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos* (ANTF 25; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1995), 40-97.

¹²⁸C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (New York: American Book Company, 1907), s.v. *divido* II; P. G. W. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *divido* (5b).

¹²⁹The lack of any citations in Syriac fathers prevents the re-creation of the Old Syriac text for this passage.

¹³⁰The Peshitta reads: ܩܘܠܘܢ ܩܘܠܘܢ ܕܘܠܘ ܐܢ ܕܘܢ ܦܢ ܩܘܠܘܢ. The postpositive particle ܦܢ clearly marks the noun ܩܘܠܘܢ as the beginning of a new clause, thus it attests Form B. This noun is also used at Rom. 3:22 and 1 Cor. 14:7 to render διαστολή. By way of contrast, at 1 Cor. 1:13, which in the Greek shows a similar context and usage of μερίζω to 7:34, the Peshitta uses ܩܘܠܘܢ (“is divided”) the Ethpael form of ܩܘܠܘܢ. Therefore the Peshitta also reads μεμέρισται as meaning “there is a distinction.”

Methodius and Chrysostom, also understand the verb in this way (see below). Finally, this would be an awkward way for Paul to say “there is a difference/distinction between;” elsewhere he uses διαστολή with either coordinated genitives (Rom. 10:12) or a plural dative (1 Cor. 14:7).¹³¹

Therefore, while an examination of Pauline usage argues that the verb should be understood as the stative (“is divided”), it is also clear that several early users of the text understood it to mean “there is a distinction.” While modern commentators reject this understanding,¹³² this early evidence should not be dismissed without accounting for its rise.

Recognizing the proper meaning of μεμέρισται in this context, however, raises the issue of the function of και before μεμερισται in Form A. It connects the verb to the previous clause but in a manner which is unusual in Greek: the conjunction here seems to imply result, almost equivalent to οὐν. This semitic-influenced usage is common in the NT, especially either to introduce the apodosis of conditional sentences or following temporal clauses.¹³³ While 7:33 is not structurally a conditional sentence, the subject ο γαμησας is

¹³¹The LXX also uses διαστολή with a plural genitive (Num. 30:7) and with ἀνὰ μέσον + coordinated genitives (Ex. 8:19).

¹³²Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NTC; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), p. 248 argues that “This verb is never used to indicate ‘a difference’ (NKJV), and it should not be translated in the active voice.” The only evidence he cites for this strong conclusion, however, is that the then standard Greek lexicon of the NT does not provide any examples of it being used in this way. According Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, “Appendix I: Notes on Selected Readings,” p. 115, this meaning is “ill attested and improbable.” They are followed in this judgment by Robertson and Plummer, p. 157. On the other hand, the translation “there is a distinction” is adopted by J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul* (New York: MacMillan, 1895), p. 234.

¹³³K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, Bd. I: Satzlehre Teil 1, Zweite, verbesserte Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), pp. 66-72; cf. BDR §442 (2).

functioning as a conditional participle, again a usage which shows semitic influence.¹³⁴

Therefore, the use of *καί μεμέρισται* in the sense of “so that he is divided” shows a usage that is not foreign to Paul, but is nevertheless unusual. These difficulties are resolved in Form B, indicating that this is a secondary form of 1 Cor. 7:33-34.

A second potential difficulty with Form A is that it ostensibly requires the singular verb *μεριμνᾷ* to have two subjects: “The unmarried woman and the virgin think the things of the Lord.” Already in Jerome, however, the argument is made that *ἡ παρθένος* is epexegetical to *ἡ ἄγαμος*: “The unmarried woman, that is, the virgin.”¹³⁵ However, a few modern commentators and English translations have opted to translate *καί* as a disjunctive: “the unmarried woman or the virgin.”¹³⁶ Furthermore, a recent suggestion is to regard both *ἡ ἄγαμος* and *ἡ παρθένος* as adjectival modifiers of *ἡ γυνή*: “The chaste unmarried woman.”¹³⁷ Nevertheless, most commentators adopt the epexegetical understanding, particularly since the construction is not unusual in the NT.¹³⁸ In addition, in passages where

¹³⁴Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, pp. 211-12. 1 Cor. 7:33 is cited on p. 212.

¹³⁵*Adversus Iovinianum* 2,259-260, discussed below.

¹³⁶Examples given by Thiselton, p. 590; see also Guenther, “One Woman or Two?” p. 36 n. 4.

¹³⁷Guenther, “One Woman or Two?”; This argument may be strengthened by noting that in other places Paul uses two adjectives to modify a single noun in a manner similar to that proposed by Guenther: *τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν* (1 Cor. 4:17); *ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ ἐπιπόθητοι* (Phil.4:1). There are, however, no other examples of *παρθένος* functioning adjectivally in Paul. Guenther also acknowledges that the epexegetical understanding is possible.

¹³⁸BDR §135 (1). An additional Pauline example is 2 Cor. 8:2.

incongruence exists between the number of subjects and the number of the verb there is variation in the manuscripts (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:50).¹³⁹

Third, the meaning of παρθένος is clearly an issue. As pointed out above there is considerable debate as to the precise referent of the word in each occurrence in 1 Cor. 7. Most modern commentators see the word as referring to a betrothed individual; preceded by the feminine article in 7:32-34 it would refer to betrothed woman. Others treat the example in 7:34 as unique within the chapter, either as a further clarification of what “unmarried” means, that is, “never married” or as an adjective: “the chaste unmarried woman.” In any case, the term clearly is not understood in this way already at the end of the second century by either Origen or Tertullian (see below), both of whom see the term as referring to either an unmarried, celibate woman or to a woman who has taken a vow of celibacy.

The witnesses that attest to Form B, however, have resolved these difficulties. The unusual initial και has been removed, which allows μεμερισται to be construed with v. 34; at the same time η αγαμος is removed to the position after η παρθενος, where it now becomes the sole subject of the singular verb μεριμνα. Finally, the meaning of η παρθενος matches that of the developing second-century Christian asceticism, removing the apparent lack of clarity that the word has within the context of 1 Cor. 7 in Form A.

1 Cor. 7:33-34 in Patristic Exegesis

The two earliest forms of 1 Cor. 7:33-34 which have been identified here are found in early Christian writings. In addition, the correlation between the position of η αγαμος and the presence or absence of και before μεμερισται is confirmed by the understanding of this

¹³⁹At 1 Cor. 15:50 the singular verb δυναται is replaced with the plural δυνανται in A C D K L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0243 33 1739 1881; F G and most Latin witnesses accomplish the same by replacing κληρονομησαι ου δυναται with ου κληρονομησουσιν.

passage shown by these writers. For example, Tertullian cites 1 Cor. 7:34 in Form B to clarify the meaning of “woman” in the discussion of the veiling of women prophets in 1 Cor.

11:

Also here [1 Cor. 11] he was capable of establishing a difference (*differentiam*) between the virgin and the wife, just as elsewhere he says, “There is a distinction (*divisa est*) between the wife and the virgin.” Therefore the women which he has not distinguished (*divisit*) by remaining silent, he has united in the other passage. Nevertheless, because in that place “there is a distinction between both the woman and the virgin” this distinction will have influence on this passage as well . . . “There is a distinction,” he says, “between the woman and the virgin.” Why? Because the unmarried, that is, the virgin, is concerned about the things which are of the Lord, so that she be holy in both body and spirit. The married woman, however, that is, not the virgin, is concerned about how she may please her husband.¹⁴⁰

While this writing is dated to his Montanist period (208/9), Tertullian again uses 1 Cor. 7:34 for the same purpose of clarifying the meaning of *mulier* (noting the fact that Greek uses the same word for “woman” and “wife”) in *De oratione* 22,2. This writing, dated to between 198 and 203, precedes any potential influence from Montanism. Furthermore, the fact that these writings are five to ten years apart shows a consistency in his understanding of the passage. In one additional passage he is not discussing specifically the “distinction” issue (*De monogomia* 3,3) but uses *innupti* as the subject of the verb *cogitat*, which implies the same understanding of 1 Cor. 7:33-34.

Yet, if the previous argument that Paul’s use of μεμέρισται rules out the meaning “there is a distinction,” why does Tertullian read it this way? One explanation may be that the Latin equivalent adopted in Tertullian’s translated text may have produced a misreading. For μεμέρισται Tertullian reads *divisa est*, which is commonly used in the sense of “to distinguish between,” particularly in rhetorical argumentation.¹⁴¹ Alternatively, familiarity

¹⁴⁰*De virginibus velandis* 4,3-4.

¹⁴¹Lewis and Short, s.v. *divido* (II); Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *divido* (5b).

with rhetorical terminology may have led to this understanding. The noun μερισμός is a technical rhetorical term used to describe “The arrangement of (related) individual matters separately showing their peculiarity.”¹⁴² Therefore, the verb μεμέρισται, from the same root (μερίζω) as μερισμός, may have suggested to the Latin translator that Paul was drawing a rhetorical distinction, thereby producing the misunderstanding. In any case, Tertullian’s own rhetorical background led him to understand this passage as drawing exactly this distinction. In the passage of *De virginibus velandis* cited above, Tertullian begins a lengthy section of “argument from definition” which shows the facility with which he uses rhetorical terminology and methodology.¹⁴³ This has likely influenced the manner in which he read 1 Cor. 7:33-34; it provided him with a distinction between “woman” and “virgin” which he needed to make his own argument.

Other Latin witnesses show the same understanding. The anonymous commentator on the epistles in VL 89¹⁴⁴ leaves no doubt as to what the subject of the verb is. The text of 1 Corinthians breaks off following *quomodo placeat uxori* (“how he may please his wife”), at which point follows the comment: “For that one (*illa*) is concerned about her husband, this one (*haec*) about God.” The feminine pronouns *illa* and *haec* as well as the noun *viro* leave no question that the comment is speaking about the distinction which follows: *divisa est mulier et virgo*.

¹⁴²R. D. Anderson, Jr., *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 24 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), p. 70.

¹⁴³This passage receives discussion as an example of Tertullian’s use of “formal topics” in R. D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 112-114.

¹⁴⁴Printed in H. J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, Band II: Die Texte (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 8 (Freiburg: Herder, 1974).

Most Greek writers know the same form of the text. Methodius of Olympus, active in the late third century, cites 7:34b in two passages of *Symposium* (1,1,14-15; 5,4,116-117) and 7:32-34 in a third (3,13,88). Each of these are identical for the portions cited, with ἡ ἀγαμος beginning a new clause and taken as the subject of μεριμνα. Furthermore, Methodius uses this passage to highlight the priorities of a virgin, even though the word παρθένος does not occur in his direct citation:

The virgin . . . should ever keep her mind occupied with thoughts that befit her state of virginity and with her thinking wipe away the foul humors of sensuality, lest some small spot of corruption, overlooked, breed the worm of incontinence. Thus, as the blessed Paul says, “the unmarried woman thinketh on the things of the Lord, how she may please God, that she may be holy both in body and spirit.” (1,1,14-15)¹⁴⁵

Methodius therefore sees ἡ ἀγαμος as referring to the same person as does ἡ παρθένος, precisely as does Form B.

While Methodius' text is firm regarding the position and function of ἡ ἀγαμος, there is uncertainty regarding whether or not he read the καί either before or after μεμέρισται. He cites 7:34a in only one passage (3,13,88); his text as printed in the critical editions reads:

[32] θέλω δὲ ἀμερίμνους ὑμᾶς εἶναι. Ὁ ἀγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ κυρίῳ· [33] ὁ δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῇ γυναικί. [34] Καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος. Ἡ ἀγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ᾖ ἡ ἀγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι· ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ ἀνδρί.

The καί is omitted both before and after μεμέρισται in one of the main witnesses to the text of *Symposium*, Patmiacus graecus 202 (P).¹⁴⁶ This manuscript, however, also omits καί before σώματι καὶ πνεύματι later in 7:34. Therefore, all three omissions may simply

¹⁴⁵Translation from H. Musurillo, trans. and ed., *St. Methodius. The Symposium: A Treatise on Chastity* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958).

¹⁴⁶A discussion of the relative value of the witnesses to this writing is found in N. G. Bonwetsch, *Methodius*, GCS 27 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1917), pp. xxx-xxxii; he is followed by Musurillo, *Méthode d'Olympe*, pp. 31-38.

reflect an editorial preference in this manuscript (similar to that seen in D above). However, although the uncertainty of the transmission of this text prevents a firm decision regarding the presence or absence of καί before μεμέρισται, it is clear that, in all three citations as well as his comments, Methodius attests Form B.

This cannot be dismissed as an insignificant agreement of Methodius with “Western” witnesses against “Alexandrian” witnesses, for these witnesses agree in other readings. For example, in his citation of 1 Cor. 7:28 (*Symposium* 3,13,85-86) Methodius is the only Greek witness, aside from the Greco-Latin bilinguals D F G, to read λαβης [γυναικα] where the rest of the manuscript tradition reads either γημης (K L 056 0142 *etc*) or γαμησης (P¹⁵ P⁴⁶ B P *etc*). The Peshitta also supports the reading λαβης γυναικα, as does the entire Latin tradition. As discussed above (at 7:28.97), this reading cannot be dismissed as a Latinism, in part because it shared by Methodius. Recognizing that Methodius has retained a reading lost to most of the rest of the Greek tradition at 7:28 confirms that he is able to offer additional early (3rd cent.) evidence for Form B, a reading attested only relatively late in the Greek manuscript tradition.

The later Greek tradition matches Methodius both in the citation of 7:33-34 and in interpretation. Chrysostom cites the passage in several places. In one he inserts a καί before ἡ ἄγαμος, which makes clear that 7:34a and 7:34b are distinct clauses. In another he uses this text, as does Tertullian, as a proof of the difference between “wife” and “virgin”:

The virgins should hear that virginity is not defined by this one thing; for she that is concerned about the things of the world cannot be a virgin, nor honorable. For after saying, “There is difference between a wife and a virgin” (μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος) he added this as the difference, and by it they are set apart from each other: When giving the definition of a virgin and her that is not a virgin he says neither marriage nor abstinence, but freedom from business and officiousness [7:35]. For it is not the cohabitation that is evil, but the hindrance to discipline.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷Chrysostomus, *In epistulam I ad Corinthios* [homiliae] MPG 61,p. 160.

The absence of ἡ ἄγαμος from his citation of the passage is telling; ἡ παρθένος for Chrysostom already entails “unmarried,” so it is not needed in his citation. Another fourth century writing, *De virginitate*, attributed to Basil the Great but likely authored by Basil of Ancyra, also understands the text to be discussing the distinction between married woman and (unmarried) virgin:

Therefore the unmarried woman thinks the things of the Lord, how she will please the Lord; but the married woman thinks the things of the world, how she will please her husband, and there is a distinction between a married woman and a virgin. The unmarried one thinks the things of the Lord, so that she be holy in body and spirit.¹⁴⁸

Finally, the same use of the passage is shown by a catena attributed to Oecumenius (6th cent):

“There is a distinction (μεμέρισται).” That is, they do not have the same concerns. However, they are distinguished (μεμερισμέναι) by the object of their attention. For, it says, “The virgin is concerned for the things of the Lord, so that she may be holy in body and in the Holy Spirit;” in the body through purity, but in the spirit through intimacy with God and through the indwelling of the comforting Spirit. But the married woman is concerned for the things of the world, for she desires to please her husband.¹⁴⁹

The understanding of the passage as clarifying the distinction between “married woman” and “virgin” in these Eastern writers, however, must have been the result of the text which they read. Their evidence is too late to have influenced the form of the text. In addition, their understanding of the term παρθένος differs from that of the context of 7:32-35.

Nevertheless, the congruence between these writers, the witness of Tertullian, and the unanimity of the pre-Vulgate Latin witnesses argues for an early origin of Form B.

¹⁴⁸*De virginitate* MPG 30, p. 720; cf. also MPG 30, p. 784: καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἢ γαμήσασα, καὶ ἡ παρθένος. Ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἵνα ἡ ἄγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι. Ἡ δὲ γαμήσασα μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ ἀνδρὶ. An additional citation at MPG 30, 705 is a block citation which matches the “Majority Text.”

¹⁴⁹Cited from K. Staab, *Pauluskommentar aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1933), 437.

Forms A and A.1, by contrast, have very little patristic and versional testimony. The Vulgate, which is not a completely new translation but one based on earlier versions (including the D-text),¹⁵⁰ shows a not uncommon adaptation toward readings found in “Alexandrian” manuscripts. Thus it attests Form A: *et divisus est et mulier innupta et virgo*. The D-text’s feminine participle *divisa est* has been replaced by the masculine *divisus est*, which makes clear that the subject is the *vir* of 7:33; *et* has been added before the participle, and *innupta* has been removed from modifying *virgo*¹⁵¹ to modifying *mulier*. The tenacity of the previous form is shown however, by the mixed reading *et divisa est* (61 F O¹ S^c U Amst(A)), all witnesses which attest some D-text readings but also show influence from the Vulgate. Jerome himself provides the possible explanation for the origin of the Vulgate reading, indirectly attesting to the fact that Form B is the predominant form in the Latin witnesses:

I now briefly warn the reader that in the Latin manuscripts this passage is to be read in this way: “there is a distinction between the virgin and the wife.” Although the words have a meaning of their own, and have by me and by others been interpreted in this way as showing the meaning of the passage, nevertheless they lack apostolic authority. Indeed the Apostle’s words are as we have translated them: “He is concerned about the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided.” And having finished this sentence he moves on to the virgins and those who abstain and says, “The unmarried woman and the virgin thinks (*cogitat*) of the things of the Lord, that she may be holy in body and in spirit.” Not every unmarried woman is also a virgin. But anyone who is a virgin is certainly (*utique*) unmarried. Perhaps due to elegance of expression he was able to repeat the same thing by means of another word: “an unmarried woman *and* a virgin”; or, clearly, he wished to define what it is to be “unmarried,” that is, a “virgin,” lest we think prostitutes, who are joined by fixed marriage to no man, are included as “unmarried.”¹⁵²

Jerome points out clearly the place where he believes the sentence division should fall. The problem of the two nouns (ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος/*mulier innupta et virgo*) is resolved in

¹⁵⁰Fröhlich, pp. 212-14.

¹⁵¹As in Cyprian, *Ad Quirinium* 3, 32 and Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* 4.3-4.

¹⁵²*Adversus Iovinianum* 2,259-260.

the same way as that suggested by Guenther:¹⁵³ “The unmarried woman who is a virgin.”

However, in the Latin tradition Jerome’s text is virtually unique; only Ambrose, also of the fourth century, shows a form of the text similar to Jerome, though not with consistency.¹⁵⁴

The only Greek writer to attest Form A or A.1 is Origen, whose citations of the relevant portions of this passage are preserved only in catenae. The famous tenth-century praxapostlos manuscript 1739 includes marginal notations of Origen’s comments on certain passages. This one, taken from book 4 of the now-lost *Stromata*, shows what is for Origen an unusual method for dealing with variation. When discussing other passages where variation occurs he rarely appeals to bare manuscript evidence,¹⁵⁵ yet here at the outset he appeals to the “more accurate copies” so that the text is settled and simply needs the proper interpretation. The marginal note in full reads:

In *Stromateis* 4 stands this saying: “At this statement it is argued that it seems superfluous that “the unmarried” lies next to “a virgin,” for in the more accurate copies (ἀκριβέστεροις ἀντιγράφοις) it is written: καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἄγαμος· καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἢ ἄγαμος). But to¹⁵⁶ this I say: Neither the one considering marriage

¹⁵³Guenther, “One Woman or Two.”

¹⁵⁴Ambrose’s citations are identical to the Vulgate in *De viduis* 1 and *De virginitate* 31. The citation in *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 7,196 is less clear; it ignores *divisus est*, but replaces *virgo* with *vidua* (widow). In addition, in *De virginibus* 1,23 reads only *et virgo cogitat quae sunt domini . . .*

¹⁵⁵See B. M. Metzger, “Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts” in J. Neville Birdsall, and Robert W. Thomson, eds., *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 78-95: “In several instances, however, he more or less definitely indicates his preference . . . In these cases his criteria were not derived from a study of the manuscripts themselves, but from various more or less inconsequential and irrelevant considerations.” (pp. 94-95).

¹⁵⁶The transcription of this note provided in Lake and New (p. 204) prints “(κατὰ)” for the abbreviation “ .” This is in error; Origen never uses the phrase λεκτέον [δὲ] κατὰ τοῦτο, but frequently uses λεκτέον [δὲ] πρὸς τοῦτο (*Contra Celsum* 1,1; 1,3; 1,9; *De principiis* 3,1,18; etc.). Furthermore, B. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 30 lists πρὸς for this abbreviation.

should be said to be a γυναῖκα ἄγαμον, even if at the present she seems to be unmarried, nor should the one inclined toward marriage and subjected to courtship [be said to be] a παρθένον ἄγαμον. For this reason it is not useless that καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος· καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος is said to μεριμνᾶ τὰ τοῦ κυ̅.”¹⁵⁷

According to Origen, the repetition of ἡ ἄγαμος prevents a misunderstanding that any woman or virgin can devote herself to the Lord. His text is identical to Form A.1 (found in \mathfrak{P}^{46} & A 1739 *pc*). However, as discussed above, it is impossible to see this as the archetypal reading, despite Origen’s claim that it is found in his “more accurate copies.” Significantly, the form of the text which Origen dismisses is not Form B but Form A, the reading now found in \mathfrak{P}^{15} B P. Therefore Origen supplies the earliest evidence for the existence of this form as well.

The other catena fragment on this passage attributed to Origen discusses the married man of 7:33:

Just as the unmarried man—who is not a slave of wife but is free, and so is a slave of Christ—is not divided (μὴ μεριζόμενος) by different things but is concerned only about the things of the Lord.¹⁵⁸

Because it is the married man who is “divided” Origen’s allusion presumes either Form A or A.1, though his comments are not sufficient to determine which. Only Origen and Jerome, therefore use Form A or A.1 of this passage. Even they, however, have a different understanding of the meaning of παρθένος than that shown in 1 Cor. 7.

The Context for a New Understanding of 1 Cor. 7:33-34

Paul’s goal in 1 Cor. 7 was to encourage a person to be free from distraction, hence celibacy may be a means to achieve that goal. Later writers, however, saw celibacy, and more

¹⁵⁷Folio 58v; text available in von der Goltz, *Textkritische Arbeit*, p. 64.

¹⁵⁸Cited in K. Staab, “Neue Fragmente aus dem Kommentar des Origenes zum Römerbrief,” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18 (1929), p. 75 (fr. 1).

specifically, female virginity, as a goal in itself.¹⁵⁹ This shift in thinking may have several causes. Deming, who locates Paul's language in Stoic thinking, argues that later writers were influenced by dualistic thinking:

What falls by the wayside, however, is the Stoic argument that adverse circumstances posed an obstacle to marrying, as well as Paul's argument against marrying based on apocalyptic expectations. Instead, many Christians from the second century onward drew their motivations for celibacy from a very different quarter, from the notion of body-soul dualism . . . As a result, Christian discussions on marriage from this period began to chart a new course. For the first time a negative evaluation of human sexuality enters into the equation.¹⁶⁰

Ford also argues that later writers, who saw 1 Cor. 7 as promoting "absolute celibacy," misunderstood Paul's arguments. In fact, "the recipients of St Paul's letter were not posing questions concerning celibacy and perhaps had no conception of this practice for women."¹⁶¹ She also sees a shift in thinking and practice taking place in the second century, with two possible contexts: The debate over the meaning of παρθένος in Isaiah 7:14 and the edict of bishop Callistus of Rome regarding the ecclesiastical status of childless individuals.¹⁶² An additional factor from the same period may have been the rise of a rank or order of "virgins" within Christian communities¹⁶³

This shift in thinking and practice directly influenced the reading of 1 Cor. 7.

According to Deming:

¹⁵⁹J. M. Ford, "St Paul, the Philogamist (I Cor. VII in Early Patristic Exegesis)," *New Testament Studies* 11 (1965), pp. 326-48, esp. p. 326 and pp. 345-47. Ford lists as examples the numerous writings devoted specifically to virginity beginning with Cyprian's *De habitu virginem*; Athanasius, for example, has five treatises devoted to the topic.

¹⁶⁰W. Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy. The Hellenistic Background of I Corinthians 7* (SNTMS 83; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 221-22.

¹⁶¹Ford, "St Paul, the Philogamist," p. 326.

¹⁶²Ford, "St Paul, the Philogamist," p. 345-8.

¹⁶³J. Laporte, *The Role of Women in Early Christianity* (Studies in Women and Religion 7; New York, Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982), pp. 70-71.

Celibacy, on the other hand, was promoted by the fathers as the preferred way of life for the believer. It not only allowed one to devote him or herself without distraction to the service of Christ, but it also made possible the achievement of a goal quite unknown to Paul, namely, the penultimate state of holiness associated with total sexual abstinence.¹⁶⁴

Ford notes that even individual words took on different meaning, including παρθένος, the word around which much variation focuses in 1 Cor. 7:34:

Origen, less restricted [than Clement and Tertullian] by fear of heretical aberrations concerning marriage, and using ‘παρθένος’ in the sense of *virgo intactus*, writes about the ideal of virginity but gives little proof that its practice was widespread especially for women. . . By the end of the third and the fourth century St. Methodius and St. Ambrose show that I Cor. vii was regarded as the *locus classicus* for teaching concerning virginity, especially with regard to women.¹⁶⁵

In this context of a developing terminology and practice the reading of 1 Cor. 7:33-34 by Tertullian and Origen becomes understandable. For Origen, the presence of ἡ ἄγαμος after ἡ παρθένος clarifies that both the γύνη and the παρθένος are presently and intend to remain “unmarried.” For him, παρθένος is neither exegetical nor part of a compound subject, but a category of women distinct from γύνη. This is possible only in a context where the term has a more circumscribed meaning than it has in 1 Cor. 7. Tertullian is more explicit in reading this passage as making a distinction between γύνη and παρθένος. This may have been a reading of his own creation or a text which he inherited. In either case, however, both he and Origen attest to the thinking that led to the text being read in this way. Once read in this way, it was a small second step to rewrite the text to make the reading explicit.

Conclusions

The archetypical reading of 1 Cor. 7:33-34 is και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος (P¹⁵ B P). The influence of the parallelism of the context, the

¹⁶⁴Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, pp. 223-24.

¹⁶⁵Ford, “St Paul, the Philogamist,” p. 345.

difficulty of several syntactical features, and the development of terminology and practice in the early church led to several simultaneous alterations that cannot be attributed to accidental corruption: η αγαμος shifts to the position after παρθενος, the initial και is omitted, and the verb μεμερισται is understood as meaning “make a distinction.” The resultant text is found today in D² F* G K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 429 489 876 1243 1880 *etc*, the earliest of which, Ψ, is dated to the eighth or ninth century. The witness of Tertullian and Methodius, however, show that the reading existed already in the second century. These two readings were then combined in the conflate reading και μεμερισται και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος, found today in ℘⁴⁶ ℞ A 1739 *pc*, for which Origen provides second century attestation. Finally, the tradition behind D produced its own unique conflation, which was not followed in the manuscript or patristic tradition.

7:35.121

The intensive pronoun αυτων is lost by ℘¹⁵ 1241^s, either by accidental leap (ΥΜΩΝΔΥΤΩΝ) or because it was viewed as superfluous. It is lacking also in the Latin tradition, likely another translation choice (as is the loss of δε at 7:32).

7:35.122; 10:33.128

Virtually the same witnesses read συμφερον at 7:35 and 10:33 (℞² F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 424 1175 1739 *pm*); of the major witnesses only D* varies (συμφερον at 7:35). There is little to distinguish between συμφερον (a participle) and συμφορον, either by sight or meaning. Notably, these would be the only occurrences of συμφερος in the NT, although as the less common word it may have been altered to the more common. On the other hand, συμφερον may have been altered for the sake of clarification, since the article in both cases, is separated from the participle, leading to some ambiguity.

7:37.130

The multiple locations of *εδραιος* call it into question. It is found both before *εν τη καρδια* (K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 424 *pm*; + *αυτου* \aleph^2 *pc sy^p*), after *εν τη καρδια αυτου* (\aleph^* A B D P 0278^{vid} 33 *pc*; - *αυτου* 1739 *pc*).¹⁶⁶ D differs from F G and the D-text in reading *εδραιος*. This, however, is a secondary insertion from Greek witnesses related to \aleph A (as discussed in the chapter on D F G). This leaves Φ^{46} F G and the D-text as witnesses to a text without *εδραιος*. Zuntz argues that because the word is Pauline and is used in Ignatius in combination with *ιστήμι* it must be genuine. He does not, however, account for why it would have been omitted.¹⁶⁷ Given that the word is common, not only with *ιστήμι* but also with *καρδία*,¹⁶⁸ it seems more likely that it supplies a perceived lack than that it was accidentally lost, particularly in witnesses that frequently preserve the earliest form of the text. Since Paul uses the perfect of *ιστήμι* without a modifier (Rom. 5:2; 1 Cor. 10:12; 15:1), the shorter reading matches Pauline style.

7:37.134; 7:38.142 7:38.147

Paul's instructions on whether or not to marry concludes with three short clauses made up a form of *ποιέω* + adverb. The context seems to indicate that the final clauses of vv. 37 and 38 should be parallel (*καλως ποιει/ποιησει*; *κρεισσον ποιει/ποιησει*) since they involve the topic at hand. The general instruction regarding marriage in general would seem

¹⁶⁶*Γενναιος* replaces *εδραιος* in 181 917 *pc*, though this is likely a substitution rather than an addition to text that lacked any adjective.

¹⁶⁷Zuntz, pp. 96-97.

¹⁶⁸E.g., Ephraem, *Reprehensio sui ipsius atque Confessio* p. 80; Cyril, *Solutiones* p. 559.

to require the more general present tense, and hence the future differentiates the specific instruction from the more general way of thinking regarding marriage. Not surprisingly, virtually all witnesses bring the tenses of ποιει/ποιησει into harmony. The reading ποιησει is found in:

7:37	ποιησει	ϩ ¹⁵ ϩ ⁴⁶ Ⲙ A B 6 33 424 ^c 1175 1739 <i>pc</i>
7:38(1)	ποιησει	ϩ ¹⁵ ϩ ⁴⁶ B 6 69 424 ^c 1739
7:38(2)	ποιησει	ϩ ¹⁵ ϩ ⁴⁶ Ⲙ* A B 0278 6 33 424 ^c 1739 <i>pc</i>

Only Ⲙ A read what the logical argumentation requires as the archetypical text.¹⁶⁹ All other manuscripts suffer from attraction to the other forms and even tenses, with the present ποιει influenced not only by the same form at 7:38 but also ἔχει and ἔχων (7:37) and γαμίζων *bis* (7:38).

7:38.138

While (εκ)γαμίζων without την εαυτου παρθενον may appear to be a non-interpolated form of the text, it is more plausible that the noun phrase has been lost due to an accidental leap, an attempt to balance its clause with the following clause, or, as Zuntz argues, a generalizing tendency.¹⁷⁰

7:38.143

As with the other alterations of conjunctions in this section (7:32 and 7:40), the concern for clear logical structure led to the replacement of και with δε (Ⲙ² K L P Ψ *pm*).

7:39.149

¹⁶⁹See B. Weiss, p. 41; Fee, p. 349 n. 4. Puzzlingly, Zuntz ignores the agreement in error of ϩ¹⁵ ϩ⁴⁶ B 6 424^c 1739, which clearly connects these witnesses.

¹⁷⁰Zuntz, p. 165 n. 1.

The resolution of the addition/omission of νομω (\aleph^2 D¹ F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm* sy) entails many of the same issues as the question of εδραιος at 7:37. Zuntz, as we saw above, accepts εδραιος but rejects νομω (without comment),¹⁷¹ probably on the basis of the “weight” of B 1739 *etc.* In this case, however, Zuntz is likely correct, particularly since νομω is absent from chapter 7 but found in the parallel at Rom. 7:2 (δέδεταί νόμω). Its use by Paul to support his argument in chapters 9 and 14 likely led to its addition here.

7:39.152

A 0278 make the obvious substitution of αποθανη for κοιμηθη. While found in early fathers,¹⁷² it is both the clearer reading and the one that harmonizes to Rom. 7:2-3. Indeed, Basil cites both passages in the same discussion in *De baptismo* (MPG 31, p. 1557).

7:39.153

The reading ο ανηρ αυτης (D F G L 6 424^c 1739 *pm*) is added to match the same phrase in the preceding clause. The addition disregards the anaphoric ο before ανηρ.

7:39.154 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

7:40.157

As at 7:32, the use of δε without adversative force caused problems in the manuscripts. Here, B 6 33 424^c 1739 2464 *al* read the more contextually meaningful γαρ, an intentional alteration that connects these witnesses to a shared ancestor.

7:40.159 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

¹⁷¹Zuntz, p. 166.

¹⁷²E.g., Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 13,8,6.

Notes on Chapter 8

8:1.1; 8:1.2

The addition of δε in \mathfrak{P}^{46} is likely due to assimilation to the near context in order to balance the δε in the succeeding clause.¹ Similar examples of \mathfrak{P}^{46} alone adding a conjunction to balance one which follows in the near context are found at Phil. 1:18 (αλλα), Heb. 8:2 (γαρ), and 11:22 (και). An additional influence here is the preceding statement, which functions concessively (οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκιν ἔχομεν). The addition of δε serves to set off 8:1b as Paul's qualification to what is a "topic marker" which introduces the next topic under discussion.² The omission of δε before αγαπη in 547 should be attributed to a similar influence, specifically from the immediately preceding context.

8:2.3; 10:2.102

Paul frequently contrasts two potential courses of action or situations by placing both into first class conditional statements (or, simple condition: εἰ + indicative). Typically the first clause is asyndetic with a contrastive δέ present in the second (1 Cor. 3:4, 15; 7:12, 15; 14:37, 38). This pattern is broken only when the two clauses are coordinated with what precedes, in which case either a γάρ (9:17; 11:5; 15:6) or δέ (7:36) is present in the first clause.³

¹Royse, 251-2, 264. According to Royse, this is one of 104 harmonizations to the local context in \mathfrak{P}^{46} .

²Margaret M. Mitchell, "Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians," *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989), 229-256.

³Some, though not all, of the examples cited in this paragraph are noted in Güting and Mealand, 40-42.

At 8:2, the pattern of the asyndetic first clause is found in \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B P Ψ 33 81 1739 *etc.* This combination of witnesses has led most observers to conclude that this is the original reading.⁴ Zuntz, for example, claims: “The addition obscures the argument: it suggests the continuation of a discussion already in progress, while actually Paul here only begins to elaborate the thesis propounded in ver. 1b.”⁵ Structurally, however, 8:1-3 introduces the issue at hand (περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων), which is then reintroduced in 8:4 (περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων).⁶ Furthermore, the οὖν of 8:4 signals that the previous argument has concluded, so that 8:1 and 8:2-3 must somehow stand in relation to each other. Since γνῶσις and ἀγάπη in 8:1 are contrasted with the verbs ἐγνωκέναι (*v.l.* εἰδέναί) and ἀγαπᾶ in 8:2-3 it is reasonable to conclude that 8:1 and 8:2-3 stand in a contrasting relationship to each other. Therefore the reading δε (D F G K L 056 0142 0151 88 *etc.*) is in fact the reading which best matches the Pauline pattern described above.

Before making a final decision on the reading at 8:2, it must be noted that a similar unit of variation occurs at 10:27.⁷ There the description of the circumstance is introduced by εἴ [δὲ] τις καλεῖ, while the contrasted circumstance is introduced with ἐὰν δέ τις ὑμῖν εἶπη (10:28). However, the two situations are not in a contrastive relationship with the material which precedes, but serve as potential examples where the Paul calls the Corinthians to consider the consequences of the argument made in 10:25-26. To read δε at 10:27 (with C

⁴E.g., Güting and Mealand, p. 43.

⁵Zuntz, p. 188.

⁶Compare also 1 Thes. 5:1 (περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν), which refocuses on a specific item of the argument made in 4:13-18. See Mitchell, “Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians,” specifically p. 253 n. 109 and Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 235 n. 278.

⁷Also noted by Zuntz, 188.

D² H K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 33 88 104 326 1912) would force a contrast which is not present in the context. Furthermore, the addition may be attributed to familiarity with the formula εἰ δὲ τις (1 Cor. 3:12; 7:36; 8:3; 11:16; 14:38) or perhaps to the fact that a citation from the LXX precedes, thus accounting for the fact that 33 104 both read the conjunction at 10:27 but not 8:2.

At both 8:2 and 10:27, ℘⁴⁶ ⋈ A B P 1739 lack the conjunction, while it is found in both passages in K L 056 0142 0151. Such additions in these witnesses have been found to be characteristic of the manuscripts. Güting and Mealand concluded that there is “a propensity in the Byzantine text to add δέ” in their test passages.⁸ They also conclude that ℘⁴⁶ often omits δέ. At the same time, however, they argue that B only lacks δέ in error in one passage of Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, while F G frequently add a secondary δέ.⁹ Therefore, manuscript tendencies cannot be solely decisive here. Nevertheless, D F G supported by their Latin counterparts VL 75 77 78 89 and the Vulgate, share what is, in the context, the most likely reading in both passages. The omission at 8:2 in witnesses such as ⋈ A B, which are often reliable in their use of particles, can be attributed to the influence of a large number of occurrences of δέ in these three verses (8:1 twice and 8:3).

8:2.4; 8:2.6 [also 2:8.27; 2:11.4; 14:11.48]

⁸Güting and Mealand, pp. 96-97.

⁹Güting and Mealand, p. 100. This had already been noted by Royse, pp. 257-58.

Perhaps surprisingly, given their similarity in meaning,¹⁰ few of the 152 examples of οἶδα and γινώσκω in the *Corpus Paulinum* show interchange between the verbs in the manuscripts:¹¹

Rom. 15:29	οἶδα δε <i>cett.</i> ; οἶδατε \mathfrak{P}^{46}] γινώσκω γαρ F G
1 Cor. 2:11	εγνώκεν \mathfrak{P}^1 \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B C D; εγνώ F G] οἶδεν L 056 <i>pm</i>
1 Cor. 2:12	εἰδωμεν \aleph A B C 1739 Maj; ἰδωμεν \mathfrak{P}^{46} D F G L] γνώμεν 1875
1 Cor. 14:11	εἶδω] γινώσκω F G
1 Thes. 5:12	εἰδεναι] οἶδατε Ψ

The form εἰδεναι is limited to witnesses which, in this chapter, show a text form that has undergone late revision (K L 056 0142 0151 *etc.*). Furthermore, early writers which typically agree in text form with these witnesses show both forms: εἰδεναι τι is found in Theodoret¹² and Chrysostom,¹³ but both also cite the text with εγνώκεναι τι,¹⁴ which is also the form used twice by Gregory of Nyssa¹⁵ and even a writing attributed to John of Damascus.¹⁶ The shift to εἰδεναι may have resulted from assimilation to other Pauline passages, notably 1 Cor. 2:2, which in the “Byzantine” witnesses results in a shift of τι to the position following εἰδεναι. In addition, εἰδεναι τι is a far more common phrase in Greek literature than

¹⁰See Stanley Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Voice and Mood*, Studies in Biblical Greek, 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), pp. 282-87.

¹¹This list does not include οἶδ- / εἶδ- interchange, such as 1 Cor. 2:9 (οἶδεν 216* 483 1518); 2:11 (εἶδεν 6 330 1831); and 13:2 (οὐδα = οἶδα F G).

¹²*Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* MPG 82, p. 288; 82, p. 713.

¹³*In epistulam i ad Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 162; *In epistulam i ad Thessalonicenses* MPG 62, p. 438; *De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli* 5,9.

¹⁴Theodoret, *Epistulae: Collectio Sirmondiana* 109; *De providentia orationes decem* MPG 83, p. 741; Chrysostom, *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt* 2,13,5.

¹⁵*In Canticum canticorum* 6,320; 6,326.

¹⁶*Commentarii in epistulas Paulis* MPG 95, p. 628.

εγνωκεναι τι. A search using TLG uncovered only one post-first century example aside from direct citations of 1 Cor. 8 (Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* 8,87), whereas approximately 200 examples of ειδεναι τι can be found.¹⁷ Thus a less common form was replaced with one that was more common.

The object τι is omitted by P^{46} , though as pointed out by Zuntz,¹⁸ several Latin writers lack the object: Tertullian, Rufinus' translation of Origen's works on the Psalms and Romans, Hilary, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster, to which could be added the commentary on Romans (8:28) by Cassiodorus. However, these Latin witnesses are inconsistent in the rendering of this verse: *si quis putat se cognivisse* (Rufinus); *qui putat se scire* (Hilary); *quod si quis existimat se scire* (Ambrosiaster); *si quis se putat scire* (Tertullian). Furthermore, Tertullian cites the passage without *aliquid* only in a single citation in *De pudicitia* 14; his citation in *De praescriptione* 27, which reads the *aliquid*, understands the verse to refer to a false content of knowledge, not the possession of knowledge itself.

This problematizes the argument made by several commentators who firmly reject the longer reading. Zuntz, for example, argues that "The question is not of 'recognizing something' or 'by degrees', but of the imagined possession of gnosis."¹⁹ Yet the early writers that witness to the shorter text do not, in fact read the verb as entailing the "act of knowing" apart from the content of what is known. Rufinus' translation of Origen's commentary on Romans (which preserves more material than the fragmentary single Greek witness,

¹⁷For example, apart from direct citations of 1 Cor. 2:2 and 8:2, Chrysostom uses ειδεναι τι seven times (*Ad illuminandos catecheses* MPG 49, p. 231; *In principium actorum* MPG 51, p. 66; *In Genesim* MPG 54, p. 606; *In epistulam ad Romanos* MPG 60, p. 558; *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* MPG 61, pp. 12, 101, 306), but he never uses εγνωκεναι τι except in a citation of 1 Cor. 8:2.

¹⁸Zuntz, p. 32.

¹⁹Zuntz, pp. 31-2; who also adopts the two singular readings of P^{46} in 8:3 (see below, *ad loc.*); his argumentation on all counts is adopted by Fee, 364-7.

discussed below) reads the shorter text, but his discussion of the implications of the passage show that he understands the passage, as did Tertullian, as discussing a lack of knowing the proper content, not merely the act of knowing:

I do not think that the apostle would consider the teaching and the form of teaching to be the same, but it seems to me that he would consider the form of teaching to be less than the teaching itself. And now indeed while in the present life we are in the body and this “earthly dwelling greatly burdens the thoughtful observation” we have the form of teaching, not the teaching itself, just as the apostle says in another place, “now, however, we see figuratively through a mirror,” but it is the teaching itself about which he says, “then, however, we will see face to face.” . . . We live among the nations in the shadow of Christ; therefore we live in the shadow of justice and in the shadow of wisdom and in the shadow of truth, even if we seem to be lovers of justice and wisdom and truth. For this reason, therefore, it is said: “If someone thinks he knows, he does not yet know as he ought to know.” For perhaps even the Word of God himself, in accordance with the fact that “the word became flesh and dwelled among us,” will be recognized in one way in the present station of life and another when that which is perfect will come, and will be perceived in the form of a servant now, but in the form of God and in equality with the Father at that time. For all of which we seem to live among the nations either in the form of teaching, as the apostle said, and not yet in the teaching itself, or in the shadow of Christ, as Jeremiah called it, and not yet Christ himself.²⁰

The comments are based on the phrase “form of teaching” in Rom. 6:17. The citation of 1 Cor. 6:3 is used to prove that proper knowledge, not merely the act of knowing, is necessary. The lack of an object did not produce, in Rufinus’ translation, a reading which “places emphasis on the fact of having knowledge itself.”²¹ Hilary, who also lacks the object, also

²⁰*Origenes in epistulam Pauli ad Romanos explanationum libri 6,3* (ad Rom. 6:16-18); cited from C. P. Hammond-Bammel, *Die Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes, Buch 4-6, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 33* (Freiburg: Herder, 1997), pp. 467-8.

²¹As Fee (p. 367) interprets the shorter text.

sees the lack of “knowing” as entailing the lack of knowing *about* something²² Furthermore, other commentators do not see the strong distinction in meaning between the two readings.²³

Instead of seeing τι as an addition produced by a misunderstanding of the passage, a more likely explanation is that the omission in \mathfrak{P}^{46} is the product of a single scribe. Origen is a potential supporting witness,²⁴ though one allusion reads only εἰ τις εἶπω for the first clause.²⁵ The citation of the passage in the Latin translations of Rufinus are less securely traced to Origen himself due to Rufinus’ freedom in translation,²⁶ particularly since the Greek of the Romans commentary preserves a citation of the passage in V,4²⁷ which is absent from Rufinus’ translation. As a result, the text of \mathfrak{P}^{46} may simply be an example of parablepsis. Royse notes that \mathfrak{P}^{46} alone omits single words one hundred twenty-nine times, only five of

²²“The confession of the apostle is harmonius to that which says, ‘Teach me to do you will,’ that is said by him, ‘And if someone thinks he knows, he does not yet know as he ought to know.’ If indeed up to now we do not know to pray and we do not learn to speak our desires by the spirit who is able to intercede for us in groans unutterable and our ignorance of hidden knowledge by feeling repaying according to the statement of the apostle, ‘for we do not know what we ought to pray; but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with unutterable groans, not confusedly a prophet is entrusted to pray, so that he is taught to complete the will of God.’” *Tractatus super Psalmos* 142,12.

²³For example, Schrage (II, p. 233 n. 127), responding to Fee’s argument, says, “Das ist nicht ganz auszuschließen, verkennt aber doch wohl den damit gegebenen Situationsbezug.”

²⁴*Commentarii in Romanos* 138. Cited from J. Scherer, *Le Commentaire d’Origène sur Rom. III.5-V.7*, Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, Bibliothèque d’Étude, 27 (s.l.: LeCaire, 1957).

²⁵*Commentarii in Romanos* 228.

²⁶C. P. Hammond-Bammel, *Die Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes, Buch 1-3*, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 16 (Freiburg: Herder, 1990), p. 28.

²⁷*Commentarii in Romanos* 138.

which result in nonsense.²⁸ Since the meaning of the passage is not significantly affected either way, its loss is more likely than its addition.

8:2.5

The reading ουδεπω is connected with the addition of ουδεν, for only manuscripts 431 and 460 read ουπω ουδεν, while every other witness that reads ουπω lacks ουδεν. Therefore, the decision regarding ουδεν must be made first. Ουδεν is easily accounted for as the addition of a direct object to parallel τι in the preceding clause; its omission cannot be explained on a transcriptional basis, nor would one expect the word to be intentionally omitted, particularly since τι was not also omitted (except in \mathfrak{P}^{46}). Furthermore, the “Byzantine Text” is again split here, with the earlier patristic witnesses to the this form of the text frequently lacking ουδεν.²⁹

No semantic distinction exists in the NT period between ουπω and ουδεπω.³⁰ Their resultant frequent interchange is evident even in the earliest manuscripts:

Luke 23:53	ουπω A B D \mathfrak{P}^{75}] ουδεπω Θ f^1 <i>pc</i>
John 7:6	ουπω \mathfrak{P}^{66} B Maj <i>rell</i>] ου \aleph^* ; ουδεπω W
John 7:30	ουπω] ουδεπω \mathfrak{P}^{66}
John 7:39	ουπω \aleph B D Θ W] ουδεπω \mathfrak{P}^{66} \mathfrak{P}^{75} <i>rell</i>
John 8:57	ουπω] ουδεπω D
Acts 8:16	ουπω 927 1505 1243 1245 1837 2344 H L P Maj] ουδεπω A B C D Ψ
1 Cor. 14:21	ουδε] ουδεπω F G

²⁸Royse (pp. 258–60) notes that this alone omits single words one hundred twenty-nine times, only five of these result in nonsense

²⁹E.g., Chrysostom, *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt* 2.13.5; Theodoret, *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* MPG 82, p. 288 (though reading ουδεπω); Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum canticorum* 6,320 and 6,326.

³⁰BDAG (s.v. οὔπω and οὐδέπω) gives an identical gloss for each: “the negation of extending time up to and beyond an expected point.”

In Acts 8:16 the variant is followed by ουδενι, which may have led scribes to alter ουδεπω to ουδε in order to avoid similar sounding words; regardless, in all the other examples, particularly those in John, there is little doubt that ουδεπω is the secondary alteration. This may reflect a development in usage. Hesychius, for example, glosses οὔπω with οὐδέπω, yet does not provide a corresponding entry for οὐδέπω.³¹ indicating that the former word is uncommon and the latter so common as to not need clarification.

As a whole, 1 Cor. 8:2 as it appears in the “Byzantine Text” must be seen as the result of intentional editing. Strong arguments can be made that εγνωκεναι, ουπω, omit ουδεν, and εγνω are each individually the archetypical reading. Yet none of these readings are present in “Byzantine” form of the text: ει δε τις δοκει ειδεναι τι, ουδεπω ουδεν εγνωκε . . . Furthermore, in several cases the patristic witnesses which often support “Byzantine” readings do not do so consistently for this passage. Therefore, the “Byzantine Text,” as it is printed in the *TR*, is the result of a very late (post-5th century), conscious effort to update the language of the text.

8:3.7; 8:3.8

ⲑ⁴⁶ and Clement alone attest to a form of 1 Cor. 8:3 that is markedly different from that of the rest of the tradition: ει δε τις αγαπα, ουτος εγνωσται; all other witnesses read τον θεον following αγαπα, while all others apart from Ⲭ* 33 read υπ αυτου following εγνωσται. These additions are likely secondary, for several reasons. First, the additions disrupt the flow of Paul’s argument, in spite of claims that the longer text reflects Pauline theology and, in this context, show the proper type of love in contrast to the Corinthian’s

³¹Cited from K. Latte, ed., *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1966).

“*gnosis*.” Barrett, for example, argues that the longer text highlights that “a Christian’s love for his fellows (which, rather than *gnosis*, should determine his actions) arises out of his grateful love to God.”³² This theme, however, is completely absent from the succeeding argument. Instead, as Zuntz points out, in this context the contrast is not between different *objects* of love, but between love and knowledge.³³ Furthermore, the shorter text flows logically from 8:1-2; 8:1 contrasts knowledge with love of other; 8:2 contrasts knowledge with the shorter text of 8:3, which focuses on love of the other. While it has been argued that the shorter text is “formal assimilation to ver. 2,” this argument cuts both ways, for the shorter text does suit the context better, whereas the longer text introduces new elements which are not developed in the succeeding argument.

Second, the lack of υπ αυτου in \aleph^* 33 is inexplicable had τον θεον stood in the text. The argument has been made that the omission in \aleph^* 33 was “accidental, having arisen perhaps from the copyist’s expectation that Paul was going to say something like, “If anyone loves God, this man truly knows him.”³⁴ Had this been the difficulty, however, one might have expected the verb also to have been altered and αυτου altered to αυτον , neither of which took place. Furthermore, parablepsis cannot have been an accidental cause for the omission. A more likely explanation for the state of the manuscript tradition is that the archetypal text lacked both τον θεον and υπ αυτου . In the process of transmission τον θεον was added, with υπ αυτου a subsequent addition made to clear up the agent of the verb εγνωσται .

³²Barrett, p. 191; also Merklein, p. 181.

³³Zuntz, pp. 31-32.

³⁴Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 566-7.

Finally, the shorter text coheres with similar statements in 1 Corinthians, particularly 13:2, 8 and particularly 12 (ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην) and, stated negatively, 14:38 (εἰ δέ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖται). In addition, while the only other Pauline occurrences of γινώσκω in the perfect each have an object (1 Cor. 2:8, 11; 2 Cor. 5:16), the aorist at 1 Cor. 13:12 matches the usage here.

Can Gnostic influence on the textual tradition account for the alteration? Perhaps surprisingly, no direct use of this passage is found in Gnostic literature, though several potential allusions have been identified.³⁵ *Gospel of Thomas* Saying 3 reads, according to the Coptic text, “When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize that you are the sons of the living father.” 1 Cor. 8:3, however, uses the third person verb where *Thomas* uses the second person. In addition, this is the only point of contact between 1 Cor. 8:3 and *Thomas*, which mentions also the result of knowledge: that one becomes a “son of the father.” The Coptic *Thomas*, however, is a translation of a Greek *Vorlage*³⁶; for this passage the Greek is fragmentarily preserved in P.Oxy 654, which differs significantly from 1 Cor. 8:3: “[Whoever] knows (γνῶ) [himself] will discover this. [And when] you come to know yourselves (ἐαυτοὺς γνώσεσθαί) [you will realize that] you are [sons] of the [living] father.” The phrase “you will become known,” found at 1 Cor. 8:3 and in the Coptic text, is missing; P.Oxy 654 has in its place “you will find . . .” Furthermore, P.Oxy 654 uses different verb forms than 1 Cor. 8:3 as well as the reflexive pronoun, which is absent in the Pauline text. Finally, at 1 Cor. 8:3 “love” is the desired action, not “knowing

³⁵Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul*, p. 71; here, however, *Thomas* 3 is identified as directly citing 1 Cor. 8:3.

³⁶Harold W. Attridge, “Appendix: The Greek Fragments,” pp. 96-128 in *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7*, ed. Bentley Layton, Nag Hammadi Studies XX (Leiden: Brill, 1989); the original language of the *Gospel of Thomas* is discussed on p. 99-101.

oneself' which is encouraged in *Thomas* 32. Therefore, any dependence on, or even allusion to, 1 Cor. 8:3 is unlikely. More likely the parallels between *Thomas* and 1 Cor. 8 reflect common Gnostic vocabulary.³⁷ The same linguistic parallels exist between *Thomas* and Clement, thereby also making difficult any argument that Clement (and P⁴⁶, which shares the reading) have been influenced by Gnostic thought.

Clement is the earliest witness to 1 Cor. 8:3 (*Stromata* 1,11,54,2-4):

“And I will know” it says, “not the speech of the puffed up, rather the power” [1 Cor. 4:19], he writes to rebuke those who think themselves and appear to be wise, but are not wise. “For the kingdom of God is in a word” [1 Cor. 4:20], not in what is not true, or in persuasion according to opinion, but “in power,” he said, for the truth alone in powerful. And again, “if someone thinks he knows anything, he does not yet know as he needs to know.” For the truth is never an opinion; instead, the assumption of knowledge “puffs up” and fills with pride, but “love builds up,” since it is not engaged in opinion, but in the truth. For which reason it says, “If someone loves, this one is known.”

Clement's introduction to the citation makes clear that love of others, not of God, is entailed in the ἀγαπή of 1 Cor. 8:3, verifying that he knew only the shorter reading and demonstrating that the shorter text of this passage is part of a shared tradition which precedes both P⁴⁶ and Clement.

In conclusion, the longer reading represents a secondary development in the tradition.³⁸ The addition of τὸν θεὸν can be understood as an adaptation of this passage to

³⁷Compare *Gospel of Truth* 19,32-33: “They knew, they were known” and *Book of Thomas the Confessor* 138,15-18: “You have (in fact) already come to know, and you will be called ‘the one who knows himself.’ For he who has not known himself has known nothing, but he who has known himself has at the same time already achieved knowledge about the depth of the all.” References and translation from C. A. Evans, R. L. Webb, and R. A. Wiebe, *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible. A Synopsis and Index*, New Testament Tools and Studies 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1993). See also Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 3,1,1,1: “Therefore it is, as appears, the greatest of all lessons to know one's self. For if one knows himself, he will know God; and by knowing God he will be made like God.”

³⁸Thiselton, p. 625-6 and Schrage II, pp. 234-5 also prefer the shorter text.

the familiar “greatest commandment” given in Matt. 22:37 and Luke 10:27 (cited from Deut. 6:5).

8:4.9

In place of βρωσεως, D* P 242 1836 read γνωσεως. This cannot be the result of accidental confusion of two letters (BP and ΓN). Instead, the reading arose due to the numerous occurrences of γνω- in the preceding verses of chapter 8: γνωσιν, γνωσις (8:1); εγνωκεναι, εγνω, γνωναι (8:2); and particularly εγνωσται (8:3), which occurs just a few words prior to the unit of variation. Because this reading makes sense in context it is likely the result of an unconscious assimilation to the immediately preceding material. The presence of the reading in D is of importance in determining the ancestor(s) of the manuscript. We have shown elsewhere that a predecessor of D has been edited on the basis of a manuscript (or several) with a text similar to N B 33. Here D moves away from F G and its own Latin text (which reads *escis*). While not common, the D-text does use *autem* to translate ουν:

Rom. 13:10	ουν] δε D F G; <i>autem</i> 75 77 89; <i>ergo</i> 78 Vg
1 Cor. 8:4	ουν F G Maj] δε D 33 88 915; <i>autem</i> 75 89 Vg; <i>ergo</i> 77 78
1 Cor. 15:11	ουν] δε D F G; <i>autem</i> 75 77 78 89; <i>enim</i> Vg
2 Cor. 9:5	ουν D F G; <i>autem</i> 89 Spe, <i>ergo</i> 77 78 Vg

The conjunction δε is a secondary addition based on the formulaic περι δε. The presence of both δε and ουν in P⁴⁶ 919 920 999 1149 1245 1872 shows several otherwise unrelated manuscripts making a similar addition, perhaps by conflation.

8:4.10 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

8:4.11 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

8:4.12 [discussed at 7:8.29]

8:4.13

The addition of *ετερος* after *θεος* (\aleph^2 K L 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm*) is similar to the pattern of expansion found in other places in 1 Corinthians.³⁹ Neither accidental omission by leap (since the *nomen sacrum* would have been written as $\overline{\Theta\zeta}$, not $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\zeta$) nor intentional alteration can account for the shorter reading, particularly since the longer reading matches Pentateuchal warnings against “other gods.”⁴⁰

8:5.15

D is assimilated to the near context with the reading *λεγόμενοι θεοὶ καὶ κυριοὶ*, which is adapted from the same phrase later in the sentence. The addition of the article in F G (*οὶ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ*) is a latinism, with the article added to match the D-text’s *qui*.

8:5.18

The likely explanation of the reading *πολλοὶ εἰσὶν θεοὶ* in \mathfrak{P}^{46} is that *θεοὶ* has been reintroduced into the text by the scribe after having been accidentally omitted. \mathfrak{P}^{46} is particularly prone to such minor leaps, with twenty-four examples found by Royse.⁴¹ While BDF⁴² sees \mathfrak{P}^{46} as retaining an original *chiasmus* here, the reading of 378 (*εἰσὶν πολλοὶ θεοὶ*) would actually be a better example of such. Furthermore, in 2 Cor. 8:7 an accidental word order variation in \mathfrak{P}^{46} has created what appears to be *chiasmus*.⁴³

³⁹Zuntz (p. 165) cites 1 Cor. 7:5; 11:24; see also the chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses.

⁴⁰E.g., Ex. 20:3; 23:13; 34:14; Deut. 4:28; 5:7; 6:14; 7:4; 8:19; etc. Cf. Fee, 369 n. 1.

⁴¹Royse, p. 261.

⁴²§477(1); the suggestion is not adopted in the latest edition of BDR.

⁴³Royse, p. 320 n. 236.

8:6.19

The only manuscript that reads $\eta\mu\iota\nu \delta\epsilon$, 33, is closely related to the two manuscripts that read $\eta\mu\iota\nu$ (\mathfrak{P}^{46} B). Furthermore, 33 adds $\delta\epsilon$ alone at 2:1 and replaces $\alpha\lambda\lambda \omicron$ with $\omicron \delta\epsilon$ in 3:4 (with only 483 1611 1827). Therefore $\delta\epsilon$ is a secondary addition to a text which lacked any conjunction.⁴⁴ As a result, only $\alpha\lambda\lambda \eta\mu\iota\nu$ or $\eta\mu\iota\nu$ can be the archetypal text. Most commentators accept that this passage is a pre-Pauline confessional statement.⁴⁵ In other passages in which Paul cites similar material the citation is not connected to the preceding material with a conjunction.⁴⁶ However, in this case the citation is the apodosis of the conditional sentence introduced by $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$ in 8:5. Apodictic $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ is common in Paul, particularly in contexts, such as this, where the protasis is concessive or describes a negative situation (e.g., 1 Cor. 4:15; 2 Cor. 4:16; 11:6;).⁴⁷ This usage is classical,⁴⁸ though an argument that the addition is an improvement in style according to classical standards is difficult to sustain given the fact that only one manuscript (33) reads an alternative addition. Weiss suggests that $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ was omitted due to the use of the passage as a confessional statement; when the passage was used without its context the conjunction became nonsensical and was dropped.⁴⁹ Examples of this abound in patristic writings which postdate both \mathfrak{P}^{46} and B, such

⁴⁴J. Weiss, p. 222 n. 5.

⁴⁵E.g., Thiselton, p. 637; Conzelmann, p. 144 n. 38; Schrage II, p. 241.

⁴⁶Though in the *Hauptbriefe* only Rom. 11:33-36; elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum* Eph. 4:5-6; Col. 1:5-20; Phil. 2:6-11; 1 Thes. 5:16-22.

⁴⁷BDR §448(5).

⁴⁸Denniston, p. 11-12.

⁴⁹J. Weiss, p. 222 n. 5.

as Augustine.⁵⁰ While an interesting (and to this point untestable) argument, it should be noted that neither \mathfrak{P}^{46} nor B show any form of punctuation or spacing before the passage which would set it off as having received special attention.⁵¹ Furthermore, the passage begins neither a lection in any of the later lectionary systems⁵² nor a chapter heading in the Euthalian apparatus,⁵³ indicating that any vestige of liturgical or confessional use of this passage did not influence later systems.

Turning to the patristic data, Clement paraphrases the passage but does read *ἀλλά: Καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπεγνώκαμεν, φησὶν, ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀλλὰ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶν εἷς ἡμῶν θεός, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Paedagogus 2,1,5,10)*. Significantly, Clement departs from the witnesses with which he normally agrees (see discussion above). The reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} B is therefore likely to be secondary within its own cluster of manuscripts. On the other hand, early support for the shorter reading is provided by Irenaeus: *Scimus autem quia nihil est idolum et quoniam nemo Deus nisi unus. Etenim si sunt qui dicuntur dii sive in caelo sive in terra, nobis unus Deus Pater . . . (Adversus haereses 3,6,5)*.⁵⁴ Likewise here ample context is provided to be certain that

⁵⁰E.g., *De trinitate* 1,12: *nobis unus deus . . .*, though later in the same work (2,19) the same passage is cited with *sed*.

⁵¹B does have “umlauts” in the margin, which may indicate knowledge of a different reading; see discussion at 14:34-34.

⁵²The Synaxarion reading in the Matthean portion of the lectionary (παρ τῆς ζ' εβδ) begins at 1 Cor. 7:35 and ends after 8:7; see Cocroft, *Study of the Pauline Lessons in the Matthean Sections of the Greek Lectionary*, Studies and Documents 32 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), p. 150.

⁵³A κεφαλια begins at 8:1: *περὶ διαφορᾶς ἐδεσμάτων, καὶ ἀποχῆς δαιμονικοῦ σεβασματοῦ* (as in 1874); an abbreviated form appears in 1739: *ἐπὶ διαφορᾶς ἐδεσμάτων*. A few manuscripts apparently place the κεφαλια at 8:4; see MPG 85, p. 755.

⁵⁴An allusion in 4,33,3, which begins with *confitentur unum Deum Patrem et ex hoc omnia*, cannot be cited.

Irenaeus did not read a conjunction. Nevertheless, the comments which immediately follow show that he understood the passage as drawing a distinction between “One God” and “gods,” noting that Paul makes that break between verses 5 and 6: “For he distinguishes and separates those who are indeed called gods but are not from the One God, the Father, from whom are all things, and confessed most strongly by his own person one Lord Jesus Christ.” However, only the Latin translation of *Adversus haereses* is available here. While Latin does make use of *si . . . tamen* in a manner similar to εἰ [εἰπερ] . . . ἀλλὰ,⁵⁵ the concessive use of *etiam si* is possible without *tamen*.⁵⁶ Therefore, the witness of Irenaeus is of limited value in supporting the shorter reading.

In conclusion, particularly Pauline usage but also the departure of \mathfrak{P}^{46} B from their normal supporting witnesses suggests a secondary omission, though the motivation for the omission remains unclear.⁵⁷

8:6.20

The addition of the article before a *nomen sacrum* is common in F G. The omission of θεος by \aleph^* is likely accidental (εἰ| $\overline{\text{C}\Theta\text{C}}$) since the adjective εἰς never modifies πατηρ in the NT and only at Mal. 2:10 in the LXX (and even there paralleled with θεος εἰς). The similarities of the omission here and the reading ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ omit υἱοῦ θεοῦ in Mark

⁵⁵E.g., C. Julius Caesar, *De bello Gallico* 7,34,4: *Quae tametsi Caesar intellegebat, tamen quam mitissime potest legatos appellat*; M. Tullius Cicero, *Epistula ad familiares* 16,26,1 (ad Tironem): *etiam si quod scribas non habebis, scribito tamen*; *de Officiis* 3,9,38: *si omnes does hominesque celare possimus, nihil tamen avare, nihil iniuste, nihil libidinose, nihil incontinetur esse faciendum*. Cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *si* (9) and *tamen* (3a).

⁵⁶M. Tullius Cicero, *Epistula ad familiares* 16,27,1 (ad Tironem) *etiam si te veniens in medio foro videro, dissaviabor*. Cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *etiamsi*.

⁵⁷Other omissions of ἀλλὰ include: 1 Cor. 2:5 (056 0142); 2:9 (A); 3:5 (read ἀλλ ο Byz; omit *cett*); 3:6 (read δε 33 483 1611 1827); 5:39 (D); 14:19 (\aleph^*); 2 Cor. 1:13 (F G); 2:17 (F G).

1:1 (⌘* Θ 28 pc) are interesting: both deal with *nomina sacra*, both may have been caused by accidental leap, and both occur in fairly stereotypical phrases.

8:6.21 [see also 14:4.14]

The addition of καὶ ο in ϩ⁴⁶ (and καὶ without the article in 056 0142) matches a stereotypical phrase in Paul: “God and Father . . .”⁵⁸

8:6.22 [discussed at 12:19.80; cf. also chapter on D F G]

8:6.24

The reading δι' ον in B may simply have arisen through error (ON for a poorly written ΟΥ).⁵⁹ However, the use of διὰ + accusative to express personal agency is not an impossible construction; it occurs both in classical Greek⁶⁰ and the LXX (Is. 35:10) and is somewhat interchangeable with διὰ + genitive in vulgar Ptolemaic documents.⁶¹ It occurs in the NT particularly in contexts where an authoritative figure is the mediate cause of the action (John 6:57; Rom. 8:20).⁶² The example in Romans is particularly appropriate, since it occurs (as does 1 Cor. 8:6) in a discussion of the work of Christ in relation to creation, though in Romans the creation is “subjected” by Christ whereas in 1 Corinthians it “exists” through him.

⁵⁸Rom. 15:6; 1 Cor. 15:24; 2 Cor. 1:3; 11:31; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:3; 4:6; 5:20; Phil. 4:20; 1 The. 1:3; 3:11, 3:13;

⁵⁹B. Weiss, p. 55, argues that the reading may have either been an assimilation to εἰς αὐτὸν earlier in the first or simply an error.

⁶⁰Schwyzler II, p. 432-4.

⁶¹Mayser II.2, p. 368-9.

⁶²BDR §223³; Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 105-6; BDAG, s.v. διὰ (B2d).

Were δι ον the archetypical reading, adaptation to δι ου is easily explainable as assimilation to the more common usage as well as the near context (εξ ου and δι αυτου in 8:6). However, the change may reflect a development in Greek. Jannaris notes that the use of δια + accusative to express agency becomes common in the period from AD 300-600;⁶³ it supplants δια + genitive in Modern Greek.⁶⁴ Given the rarity of δια + accusative to express personal agency in Paul, it is unlikely that δι ον is the archetypical reading. Instead, it is the result of either an accidental error or adaptation of the text to the preceding εις αυτον.

8:6.25

The addition of a bicolon describing the work of the Holy Spirit can only be a secondary development. It is structurally based to the previous two bicola, and no plausible explanation for its omission can be given. Furthermore, even within the Byzantine tradition the reading is extremely poorly attested, being found only in 056 0142 and a handful of other manuscripts and correctors. Nor does the Latin or any other version read the addition, again pointing to a later (post-versional) addition to the tradition. Finally, as Westcott and Hort have pointed out, Chrysostom, who often supports the “Byzantine Text,” notes specifically that this passage does not mention the Holy Spirit:

But if someone might say, “For what reason does he not mention the Holy Spirit,” to this we might say: His statement was against idolaters, and the struggle was against “many gods and many lords.” For this reason, after he said that the Father is “God” he called the Son, “Lord.”⁶⁵

⁶³Jannaris §1534; he does not, however, cite any examples of personal agency.

⁶⁴Moulton, *Accidence*, p. 105-6.

⁶⁵Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Corinthios I* (MPG 61, p. 164).

The earliest potential evidence for the addition is Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales* (MPG 77, p. 841), which matches the reading of 056 0142. Yet this evidence is extremely doubtful, for in six other verbatim citations of the passage he does not make any reference to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ In addition, Gregory of Nazianzus has often been cited as supporting the addition;⁶⁷ In fact, he adds only καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα,⁶⁸ the reading found also in 1881.

While not attested in the “Byzantine Text” as a whole, as are other Trinitarian additions such as 6:20 and Rom. 16:25-27, it is found in 056 0142, which attests other unique theological additions, such as καὶ before πατήρ earlier in 8:6.

8:7.27; 8:7.32

The reading τη συνειδησει is found in the bilingual tradition as well as all Latin and Syriac witnesses; the reading therefore predates the standardization of the “Byzantine Text.” However, no clear motivation for an alteration to συνηθεια can be detected, particularly since both assimilation to συνειδησις later in the verse⁶⁹ and the fact that it is a key term in this pericope⁷⁰ are likely causes of corruption.

⁶⁶*De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* MPG 68, p. 412; *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam* MPG 70, p. 89; 70, p. 856; *Quod unus sit Christus* 723; 749; *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate* MPG 75, p. 49.

⁶⁷E.g., by Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 115; von Soden; Zuntz, p. 164.

⁶⁸*In sancta lumina*, MPG 36, p. 348: Ἡμῖν δὲ, εἰς Θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα· τοῦ ἐξ οὗ, καὶ δι’ οὗ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ, μὴ φύσεις τεμνόντων οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον αἱ προθέσεις, ἢ αἱ τάξεις τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλὰ χαρακτηριζόντων μιᾶς καὶ ἀσυχύτου φύσεως ιδιότητος.

⁶⁹Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 557.

⁷⁰B. Weiss, p. 11.

The readings in F G are less easily explainable. They agree with D and the Latin tradition (*in conscientia[m]*) in reading τη συνιδησι in 8:7a, but in 8:7b read ιδησεις against the same witnesses. This could be construed as a corrupt spelling of ειδησεις (“knowledge”), though even this is clearly secondary since it not a Pauline word. The correction in G may give a clue as to the origin of the reading. The article (η) is written by the original hand but marked out by means of one supra- and one superlinear dot. The somewhat unique Greek script⁷¹ of this manuscript results in a very close similarity between H and N, as may be seen, for example, in the word ΔCΘENHC at the end of the same line as the reading under discussion, in which the N and H, standing next to each other, are nearly identical. The omission of συν- can therefore be explained as accidental parablepsis: ΗCΥΝΙΔΗCΕΙC. The correction then makes reference to the text at hand (as opposed to the exemplar) notes the resultant nominative plural form ειδησεις, and deletes the now incorrect singular article. F, on the other hand, shows no signs of correction but agrees exactly with G^c.

8:7.28; 8:27.30

The reading ειδωλοθυτου (256 263 330 424^c 915 1739) is an assimilation to the following ειδωλοθυτον. Two manuscripts substitute plural forms for the singular nouns (των ειδωλων for του ειδωλου 1836 and ειδωλοθυτα for ειδωλοθυτον 0150), likely indicating copying by sense rather than by letter. The removal of εως αρτι to the position after after του ειδωλου (A L P 33 88 1175 Maj) attempts to resolve the awkward word order: του ειδωλου now modifies συνειδησις rather than an unstated object, even though this is

⁷¹Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, describes the script as “course and peculiar”; on the other hand, Frede (*Alltlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 51) sees it as “typisch westlicher Majuskel.”

common in Paul (Rom. 9:3; Phil. 1:5; Col. 1:4; 2 Thes. 3:14).⁷² At the same time εως αρτι becomes more closely associated with the verb εσθιουσιν, where it would construe more smoothly.⁷³ While the sentence is grammatically clearer, its meaning in this context is not,⁷⁴ particularly since the focus of the passage is not the continuation of the eating but the continuation of the habit. For the position of εως αρτι witnessed by the rest of the tradition one may compare 1 Cor. 4:13.

8:7.29

The omission of ως (056 0142 218 241 424* 547 642 876 1518) results in a loss the hypothetical nature of Paul's discourse, that even though idols do not exist one may still mistakenly believe that a food is indeed sacrificed to an idol and therefore eat it as such. The strong confession of 8:6 may have influenced the omission, though the secondary word order read by all these witnesses (see 8:7.28) made such an omission more likely: "With the consciousness of an idol they eat even now a thing sacrificed to an idol."

8:7.31

The replacement of εσθιουσιν by εστιν in ℵ* is the result of copying by sense rather than sight; with εστιν the improper action in the text becomes what one considers the ειδωλοθυτος instead of the specific action of eating. This suits the context, but is likely influence by the γνωσις earlier in the verse and the argumentation of 8:5-6.

8:7.33; 8:12.52

⁷²BDR §269 (1b).

⁷³Robertson and Plummer, p. 169.

⁷⁴Cf. the KJV's "with conscience of the idol"; NKJV's "with consciousness of the idol"; or ASV's "being used until now to the idol."

Twice in chapter 8, \mathfrak{P}^{46} and Clement share unique readings in which the verb ἀσθενέω are involved. In 8:7 the adjective and participle ασθενης ουσα are ellided into the participle ασθενουσα (also 629*). Since no change in meaning takes place which would suggest intentional alteration, one may expect assimilation to 8:12 where the participle again occurs following συνειδησις. However, there \mathfrak{P}^{46} omits ασθενουσαν, which would seem to eliminate the argument that assimilation has taken place in this manuscript. Clement, on the other hand, paraphrases the sentence but includes the participle, albeit modifying a different noun: οἱ δὲ τὴν συνείδησιν τύπτοντες τῶν ἀσθενούντων ἀδελφῶν εἰς Χριστὸν ἁμαρτανούσιν (*Paedagogus* 2,10.5). Nonetheless, Clement does not support the reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} ; ⁷⁵significantly, the participle is found in other related witnesses such as \aleph B 1739 Origen (*Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* (23,241). This indicates that the omission is limited to \mathfrak{P}^{46} , another example of parablepsis in this manuscript (due to a leap from CΥΝΕΙΔΗCΙΝ to ΔCΘΕΝΟΥCΔΝ). ⁷⁶Since the omission in 8:12 can be attributed as solely due to the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{46} we may now revisit the reading at 8:7. Since both Clement and \mathfrak{P}^{46} ellide the words the assimilation took place in a predecessor witness of that narrow vein of the tradition.

8:8.34

Ημας possibly represents a “generalizing tendency,” though the variation of between the first and second person pronoun is common (1:6.14; 1:8.18; 1:13.42; 1:18.58; 2:5.15; 3:3.14; 8:9.40 *etc.*) and is more likely caused by the confusion of similar sounds.

⁷⁵As is indicated by Mees, p. I,139 and II,157.

⁷⁶Royse, p. 259.

8:8.35

The present tense form *παριστησιν* (N² D K L P Ψ 056 0142 915^{mg} 1241) may be the result of assimilation to the present tense verbs which follow.⁷⁷ F G should also be cited in support of this reading, since their reading *συνιστησιν* is the result of adaptation to the Latin *commendat*. On the other hand, the witnesses which read the future tense form *παραστησει* (*παραστησει* ℞⁴⁶ N* A B 0150 5 6 33 81 88 181 256 424^c 915^{txt} 1175 1241^s 1739) often read a secondary future tense (see 6:14.47).

8:8.36; 8:8.37

The structural similarity between the two clauses has led to confusion in the manuscripts. As Zuntz notes, a skip from *ουτε* to *ουτε* must have occurred, which was then corrected by a marginal note. This marginal note would then have been reinserted into the text of a later copy in the wrong location.⁷⁸ However, which word order is secondary? The tradition resolves itself into two basic readings: *ουτε [γαρ] εαν φαγωμεν περισσευομεν ουτε εαν μη φαγωμεν υστερουμεθα* (N A^c D F G P Ψ 0150 5 33^c 88 104 915 *pm*) and *ουτε [γαρ] εαν μη φαγωμεν υστερουμεθα ουτε εαν φαγωμεν περισσευομεν* (℞⁴⁶ A* 0151 (33)⁷⁹ 81 181 630 917 1836 1874 1875 1877 2200). The reading of B 1739 (*μη φαγωμεν υστερουμεθα ουτε εαν φαγωμεν περισσευομεθα*) is a secondary assimilation of

⁷⁷Schrage II, p. 259 n. 279. Fee (p. 377 n. 4) argues that the present tense reflects a “generalizing tendency,” though why one should consider the present tense to be more “generalizing” than the future is unclear.

⁷⁸Zuntz, p. 162.

⁷⁹33 has a sight/sound confusion: *φαγομεν* in place of *φαγωμεν*.

the verb forms, which also takes place in numerous other manuscripts and even one citation of the passage by Origen.⁸⁰

It must first be noted that in other cases \mathfrak{P}^{46} & B have a demonstrated reliability when the textual tradition shows word order variation, for example 7:33-34.⁸¹ Yet in this passage \mathfrak{P}^{46} and B disagree both with each other and with other witnesses which usually support their readings, notably &, Clement (*Paedagogus* 2,8,74,4) and Origen (*Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 11,12; 11,14; *Contra Celsum* 8,29). Tertullian (*De ieiunio adversus psychicos* 15) provides another early witness to this word order. This immediately casts suspicion on the word order of \mathfrak{P}^{46} A* B 1739 as the result of a single predecessor manuscript. A second reason to question this word order is the loss of $\gamma\alpha\rho$, which, as Zuntz notes, has likely been caused by the same skip from ουτε to ουτε .⁸² In addition, Paul shows several other examples of $\text{ουτε } \gamma\alpha\rho \dots \text{ουτε}$ (Gal. 1:12; 5:6; 6:15; 1 Thes. 2:5).⁸³

The strongest argument for the \mathfrak{P}^{46} A* B 1739 word order is that the other reading has been assimilated to the context. In this scenario, an intentional alteration shifted the negative clause, which does not appear to follow from 8:8a, to the position following the

⁸⁰*Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 11,12: $\text{ουτε } \gamma\alpha\rho \text{ εαν } \phi\alpha\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \text{ περισσευομεθα } \text{ουτε } \text{εαν } \phi\alpha\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \text{ υστερουμεθα}$. The exact agreement with 1918 here, which is clearly not the result of a close stemmatic relationship, shows the random nature of the assimilations in the tradition.

⁸¹Cf. also Zuntz, p. 162.

⁸²Zuntz, p. 194. Fee (p. 377 n. 6) dismisses this argument as “improbable” without further explanation. However, as Royse has demonstrated, accidental loss by a leap is a common error in the early manuscript tradition and in \mathfrak{P}^{46} in particular. It is difficult to believe the \mathfrak{P}^{46} B are immune from this error, particularly when they disagree with their usual supporting witnesses. Furthermore, Fee fails to note the \mathfrak{P}^{46} and B 1739 do not precisely agree.

⁸³Zuntz (p. 194) cites the latter three of these passages as parallels, the last incorrectly as “I Thes. ii. 15.”

positive clause in order to allow the argumentation to flow more smoothly.⁸⁴ Furthermore, the negative clause anticipates what follows in 8:9.⁸⁵ However, given the fact that parablepsis may have occurred here, and the fact that the resultant text does not produce a significantly different reading⁸⁶ should make one cautious in proposing an intentional alteration. In addition, this very argument can be used to demonstrate that the \aleph D F G and “Byzantine” reading is in fact the proper reading in context,⁸⁷ since it alone follows the sequence of Paul’s argument. In the end, the \wp^{46} A* B 1739 reading should be considered secondary. The combination of the narrowness of attestation to a handful of closely related manuscripts, the likelihood of accidental corruption, the lack of patristic support, the impact on the omission of $\gamma\alpha\rho$, and the fact that the \aleph D F G Maj reading best fits the context all outweigh an argument which proposes intentional alteration in order to produce a reading which, in the end, makes no difference in the meaning of the passage.

8:9.38

This is one of ten places where \wp^{46} alone omits $\delta\epsilon$.⁸⁸

8:9.39

This is one of thirty-two places where \wp^{46} alone omits the article.⁸⁹

⁸⁴Fee, p. 337 n. 6; Conzelmann, p. 146 n. 3; Thiselton, p. 645.

⁸⁵B. Weiss, p. 136-37.

⁸⁶Noted by Lietzmann, p. 38-39; Schrage, by not commenting the variation, apparently considers the alterations irrelevant.

⁸⁷As is argued by Zuntz, p. 162.

⁸⁸Royse, p. 257-8; elsewhere in 1 Cor. only at 16:6.

⁸⁹Royse, p. 258; elsewhere in 1 Cor. at 7:22; 11:24; 14:13, 33; 15:9, 48.

8:9.40; 8:10.43; 8:11.48; 8:13.55; 8:13.57

A series of additions or omissions of pronouns in 8:9-13 may reflect a generalizing tendency, as argued by Schrage.⁹⁰ This argument is complicated, however, by the fact in 8:7 Paul is making general statements without using 1st or 2nd person subjects, but in 8:8 shifts to 1st person, 8:9-12 to 2nd person, and 8:13 back to 1st person. In the midst of these shifts, it seems as likely that pronouns would have been added in order to clarify the person of the subjects as omission for the sake of generalization. For example, at 8:9 the shift from υμων to ημων (P 1241^s) is understandable since in 8:8 the subjects had been in the 1st person. In addition, individual manuscript tendencies must be taken into account. The omission of the same pronoun (υμων at 8:9) in \mathfrak{P}^{46} reflects not only a common phenomenon (discussed at 7:5.19), but one that is especially frequent in \mathfrak{P}^{46} .⁹¹ Since “generalization” is not the only potential cause of variation in this section, one cannot dismiss the shorter texts so easily.

The near context is a likely factor in the addition of σε in 8:10. Both 8:9 and 8:11 use the 2nd person; 8:10 without σε would not have any 2nd person verbs or pronouns. More specifically, the ση of 8:11 may have influenced the addition in 8:10.⁹² Furthermore, the use of the personal pronoun with the attributive participle may reflect an improvement toward a “classical” style.⁹³ The shorter text is attested in \mathfrak{P}^{46} B F G as well as VL 77 78 (*habentem scientiam*) and, in a different form, in VL 89 and the Vulgate (*eum qui habet scientiam*);

⁹⁰Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen,” p. 381, which mentions only the omission of σε in 8:10 and the two omissions of μου in 8:13. Cf. also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 557; Fee, p. 377 n. 7; and Barrett p. 188 n. 1.

⁹¹Royse, p. 258.

⁹²Zuntz, p. 92.

⁹³So BDR § 412 (5), which cites Rom. 9:20; 14:4 and 1 Thes. 4:15, 17 as Pauline parallels. However, all of these differ from the example at 1 Cor. 8:10 in that they are nominative and, at least to some extent, the pronoun is emphatic.

independent accidental omission is unlikely in all these witnesses. The presence of $\sigma\epsilon$ in D, adopted from a second witness from outside the bilingual tradition, has resulted in a unique reading in VL 75: *te qui habet scientia[m]*.⁹⁴

A second potential “generalizing” reading is the omission of $\sigma\eta$ in the phrase $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\eta\ \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\eta$ (8:10) by B alone. However, in this case the omission is likely accidental since it is read only by B and can be accounted for by accidental leap: $\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\chi\eta$.

Finally, $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ following $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\nu$ is omitted twice at 8:13 by F G 77 78 Cyprian. However, the first person pronoun attached to a form of $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\varsigma$ is highly unusual. The only other example in the *Corpus Paulinum* is 2 Cor. 2:13, where Paul describes Timothy as “my brother.” When speaking of a “brother” in a hypothetical situation every other example uses either the second person (Rom. 14:10, 15, 21) or third person (1 Cor. 6:5; 1 Thes. 4:6). Accidental omission of the pronouns is not likely. While Zuntz claims that “the omission of the first $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ (before $\omicron\upsilon$) is a mere scribal error,”⁹⁵ a more likely accidental omission would have been the loss $\omicron\upsilon$, not $\mu\omicron\upsilon$. Furthermore, this cannot account for the loss of the second $\mu\omicron\upsilon$; had the first omission been accidental, how could the scribe have intentionally omitted the second? More likely is the addition of the pronoun to match the first person verbs ($\phi\alpha\gamma\omega$, $\sigma\kappa\alpha\nu\delta\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\omega$) with which Paul transitions to the concrete example of his own “putting aside of rights” in 9:1-18. This would account for Clement’s text, which reads $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ after the second occurrence of $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\nu$ but not the first (*Paedagogus* 2,1,10,4), since both verbs occurs between the first and the second $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\nu$. Accounting for the reading D VL 89, which reads the first pronoun but not the second, is more difficult. However, since VL 75, D’s Latin

⁹⁴Though shared also by Amst(A), another indication of the close relationship between these witnesses.

⁹⁵Zuntz, p. 244 n. 1.

counterpart, lacks the pronoun in both places, and F G agree with VL 75, one is strongly inclined to identify their reading as that of the mutual ancestor of these manuscripts.⁹⁶

“Generalizing” tendencies, therefore, seem to be less of a factor in causing variation than harmonization to the near context.

8:9.41

The visual similarity between ΔCΘΕΝΕC IN and ΔCΘΕΝΟΥC IN created the possibility for corruption, even though rarely does one find adjective/verb substitutions in the manuscripts. Nowhere else in Paul, however, does an indicative verb follow an article. The reading ασθενουσιν (L Ψ 88 915) must therefore be secondary.

8:10.45

Ασθενης οουσα (255 256 489 1319 2127) harmonizes to the same wording at 8:5.

8:10.46

The placement of the object (τα ειδωλοθυτα) between the article and the infinitive (Ϟ⁴⁶ & A B *pm*) is not paralleled in Paul. In the eleven examples of a preposition + articular infinitive taking an object, the object is in the position immediately following the infinitive.⁹⁷ Furthermore, only in Rom. 13:8 (μηδενι μηδεν οφειλετε ει μη το αλληλους αγαπαν) is the object in the position between the article and the infinitive. Even here, however, the object is a reciprocal pronoun, which implies that it functions both as subject and object.

⁹⁶Vogels (“Der Codex Claromontanus,” p. 290) also sees the text of F G VL 75 as representing that of the parent manuscript of these witnesses.

⁹⁷Rom. 11:11; 15:8; 1 Cor. 10:6; 2 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 4:17; 1 Thes. 2:9; 3:2, 5, 10, 13; 4:9; 2 Thes. 3:8. None of these have any variation in word order in the manuscripts.

The alternative word order, εἰς τὸ εσθιεῖν τὰ εἰδωλοθῦτα is attested only in D F G, the entire Latin tradition (*ad manducandum idolothyta/immolata*) and the Peshitta (ܩܘܠܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܣܝܘܬܐ), though in the latter the object is in the singular.⁹⁸ Only two explanations are possible for this data: Either an ancestor of the Latin and the Peshitta made the alteration, with the Latin then influencing D F G; or, this reading is that of the same mutual ancestor, which is now preserved in all strains of the “Western” text.⁹⁹ In the latter case one must then determine whether or not it is also the archetypal reading, a question made more difficult by the fact that no patristic citation of this passage is preserved until the fourth century.

Given the Pauline usage described above, one would be led to argue that εἰς τὸ εσθιεῖν τὰ εἰδωλοθῦτα is more Pauline and hence the archetypal reading. However, there is no obvious reason for the shift of τὰ εἰδωλοθῦτα in the rest of the tradition, particularly to a word order which is so unusual. This unusual placement of the object may have been the result of Paul’s desire to place emphasis on the action of eating, hence εσθιεῖν is placed at the end of the sentence. On the other hand, one may wish to conjecture that τὰ εἰδωλοθῦτα is instead a marginal note which was later interpolated into the text in different locations; were this the case, however, one would expect instead the singular form (εἰδωλοθῦτον) found in 8:7. The most likely explanation in this case is therefore that a shift in word order was made in a shared ancestor of the “Western Text” in order to produce a smoother, more typical reading. This is one of several examples of secondary word order in these witnesses. The reading of D F G in this case is not the result of Latinism, but a reading inherited from a Greek ancestor.

⁹⁸So also VL 61: *ad manducandum immolatum*.

⁹⁹An argument that sees both the Latin and the Peshitta as simply making independent translational choices does not sufficiently account for their agreement here nor throughout the epistles.

8:11.47

The variation of the form of the verb can be attributed to phonological variation in both Greek and Latin. The two most commonly attested Greek forms are easily confused: ἀπολείται (F G L *pm*), the future indicative form of ἀπολύω; and ἀπολλυται¹⁰⁰ (Ϟ⁴⁶ κ* A B D* K 33 1739), the present indicative of ἀπόλλυμι. The Latin forms are even more confundable. The perfect form of *pereo* could be written either as *perit* (Cyprian, Cassiodorus) or *perivit*.¹⁰¹ The former is easily confused with the present form *perit* (VL 61 75 89 Augustine) and the latter for the future form *peribit*¹⁰² (VL 77 78 VG Ambrosiaster Jerome Pelagius). This could also be written as *periet*¹⁰³ (Irenaeus; cf. *Sapientia* 4:19), which itself is easily confused with both *perit* and *peribit*. It is little wonder that Latin support can be found for every Greek form, and that the Greek witnesses do not show typical groupings (apart from Ϟ⁴⁶ κ* B 33, discussed below).¹⁰⁴ The future is likely produced by assimilation to οἰκοδομηθήσεται in the previous clause.

8:12.51

F G frequently omit the article (see chapter on D F G). The omission of και (also F G) is likely secondary. Examples can be found of one or more predicate participles being governed by the same verb yet without any conjunction (Rom. 12:10-13; 2 Cor. 3:2-4; Gal.

¹⁰⁰Compare also ἀπολυεται (1831), the present indicative form of ἀπολύω.

¹⁰¹*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *pereo*.

¹⁰²See R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2. Aufl., 1. Bd.: Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre (Hannover: Hahnsche, 1912), pp. 42-43.

¹⁰³Lewis & Short, s.v. *pereo*.

¹⁰⁴The Syriac (both the Peshitta and Harclean), which typically agrees with D F G and the Latin tradition, reads the Peal (perfect) form of the verb.

4:4; Eph. 5:18-21), which makes the shorter reading at least plausible. However, the omission is likely the result of the layout of the D F G ancestor, which was written in sense-lines.¹⁰⁵ G, which retains vestiges in the lineation through capitalization of the initial letter of each line, divides the text as follows:

ΟΥΤΩC ΔΕ ΔΜΑΡΤΑΝΟΝΤΕC ΕΙC ΔΔΕΛΦΟΥC
 ΤΥΠΤΟΝΤΕC ΑΥΤΩΝ ΤΗΝ CΥΝΙΔΕCΙΝ ΔCΘΕΝΟΥCΑΝ ΕΙC Χ̄Ν
 ΔΜΑΡΤΑΝΝΕΤΑΙ

While VL 75, like its ancestor, lacks *et*, D reads the *καί*. However, agreement among VL 75 89 F G is traceable to their ancestor. The addition of *καί* in D from a second source has contributed to an unusual lineation:

ΟΥΤΩC ΔΕ ΔΜΑΡΤΑΝΟΝΤΕC	<i>si autem peccantes</i>
ΕΙC ΤΟΥC ΔΔΕΛΦΟΥC	<i>in fratres</i>
ΚΑΙ ΤΥΠΤΟΝΤΕC ΑΥΤΩΝ	<i>percutientes ipsorum</i>
ΤΗΝ CΥΝΙΔΕCΙΝ ΔCΘΕΝΟΥCΑΝ	<i>conscientiam infirmam</i>
ΕΙC Χ̄Ν ΔΜΑΡΤΑΝΕΤΕ	<i>in x̄ro peccatis</i>

While the lineation in D is shorter than that of its ancestor, the addition of *καί* has contributed to the length problem with the result that *αυτων* no longer stands on the same line as the noun which it modifies.

8:12.52 [discussed at 8:7.33]

¹⁰⁵VL 89 also retains indications of sense-lines; these match those in G, indicating a shared tradition.

Notes on Chapter 9

9:1.1

Arguments could be made for either sequence. *Αποστολος* may have been placed in the initial position due its perception as the more important element. On the other hand, *αποστολος* may have been removed to the latter position so that it could stand near 9:1b, which contains one of the descriptions of an apostle (one who has seen Christ). J. Weiss considers *οὐκ εἰμι ἐλεύθερος* to be an interpolative gloss, based on what he sees as the difficulty of identifying precisely from what this freedom consists. Both the shifting position of the two clauses and the split in the Western tradition¹ are considered to be evidence for this conjecture.² While the problem remains of identifying the point in the transmission history of the letter when the gloss would have been inserted into the text,³ this would not be the only potential example.⁴

Nevertheless, word order variation involving similar words and clauses is common in the manuscript tradition. The closest parallel to the situation in 9:1 is the variation at 3:5,⁵ where *Ἀπολλῶς . . . Παῦλος* was transposed out of deference to Paul. While either reading could explain the other, the reading of D F G and the Latin tradition, which is prone to word order variation, causes one to be reluctant to trust its witness in these situations.⁶ Of

¹Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 14,7), Ambrose (*Epistulae* 37,21), and the Vulgate support sequence *liber . . . apostolos*.

²J. Weiss, p. 232.

³See Lietzmann, p. 39.

⁴Cf. Zuntz, pp. 16-17, who sees similar such glosses (though not this one) arising from the hand of the compiler of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

⁵Comparison may also be made to 13:1, where 1241 transposes *αγγελων* and *ανθρωπων*.

⁶Cf. also Lietzmann, p. 39.

additional interest here is relationship between the “Byzantine” and “Western” lines of the text; this is yet another example which shows the former’s reliance upon the latter, as opposed to the “Alexandrian” tradition.

9:1.6

1241 interchanges the first person for the second person pronoun three times in 9:1-2 (see also 9:2.8; 9:11.32; 9:12.37; and the confusion at 9:11.35).

9:2.8 [noted at 9:1.6]

9:2.9

The reading μου της αποστολης (ⲛ B P 0150 33 104 181 467 1739 1875 Or) results in the genitive pronoun modifying either σφραγίς or ἀποστολῆς.⁷ The latter would be somewhat unusual, though not as unusual as indicated by Zuntz⁸ since it occurs several times in Paul (Rom. 11:14; 1 Cor. 9:27, 11:24; Phil. 2:2; 4:14). On the other hand, D F G had difficulty with the genitive personal pronoun preceding the noun it modifies. These manuscripts alone move the pronoun to the position following the noun at Rom. 11:14 and Phil. 4:14, though in both cases influence from the Latin may have occurred. Given the ambiguity of μου της αποστολης and the variation apparent in similar examples, it is likely that this is the archetypal reading, with της εμης αποστολης (ⲡ⁴⁶ vid⁹ D F G K L Ψ 056

⁷It modifies σφραγίς according to Thiselton, p. 663; ἀποστολῆς according to Schrage II, p. 278, 290.

⁸Zuntz, p. 125.

⁹ⲡ⁴⁶ reads: [[σφραγίς της] εμης αποστο[λης

0142 0151 5 6¹⁰ 81 88 326 424 614 876 915 1175 1241^s 1834 1881 sy) clarifying the grammar by assimilation to the phrase ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία, which stands in the next clause.

9:4.13 [discussed at 10:7.26]

9:5.14

The witnesses preserve only two readings: ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα and γυναίκας. The former is attested by the overwhelming majority, with the plural form read only by F G and the Latin tradition. The first issue to be resolved is the split between D and F G, specifically, whether or not has F G been adapted to the Latin text. The lineation of D, however, shows that the F G reading is the reading of the shared ancestor of D F G. In G, its corresponding Latin text (VL 77), and VL 89 the lineation the entire clause stands on a single line:

numquid non habemus potestatem mulieres circumducendi
μη οὐκ εχομεν εξουσιαν γυναικας περιαγειν

However in D both the lineation and the Latin text are disrupted, so that ἀδελφὴν / *sororem* is separated from its predicate, γυναῖκα / *mulierem*:

ΜΗ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΟΜΕΝ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΝ ΔΔ ΕΛΦΗ *numquid non habemus potestatem sorore*
ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑΣ ΠΕΡΙΔΓΕΙΝ *muliere circumducendi*

Both the disruption of the sense lines and the singular reading *muliere* points to a secondary adaptation in D.¹¹ This is similar to the corruption produced in this manuscript at Rom.

16:25-27 and 1 Cor. 9:20, both additional examples of secondary adaptation to readings found now in \aleph A C. The agreement of F G VL 77 78 89 (as well as 61 Amst Sedul) points to *mulieres* as the archetypical D-text reading. In this instance, therefore, F G is not adapted to the Latin but preserves the original Greek and Latin readings of this shared tradition.

¹⁰von Soden cites 6 as reading μου της αποστολης.

¹¹Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 290.

In addition to the evidence of F G, the patristic evidence is critical here. Zuntz in particular, who argues for *γυναικας*, claims:

The authority of this Western reading is immensely strengthened by the agreement of Tertullian, Clement, and particularly Aphraates (the latter in a long and precise quotation). No one, I suppose, will maintain that the 'Persian Sage' used this wording upon some special information from Carthage or Poitiers; it must then have originated a long time before separate Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian texts came into being.¹²

The evidence is not entirely clear, however. For example, Zuntz notes that Clement twice cites the passage with the reading *ἀδελφὴν γυναικα*,¹³ yet still sees significance in Clement's uses of the passage in *Paedagogus* 2,1,9:

Therefore the natural use of food is a matter of indifference. "For neither if we eat do we benefit," it says, "nor if we eat not are we worse off." However, it is not rational for those deemed worthy to share divine and spiritual food to "partake in the tables of demons." "Do we not have the right to eat and to drink," the apostle says, "and to take along wives" (*καὶ γυναικας περιάγεσθαι*)? But clearly by conquering pleasures we prevent lusts.

However, this citation of 1 Cor. 9:5 is an adaptation, making assimilation to the number of the verb *ἔχομεν* more likely outside the context of 1 Cor. 9. In addition, the fact that whether or not the wife is a "sister" is not decisive to Clement's argument, so its omission is not surprising. Given his two other citations of this passage, it is likely that the reading *γυναικας* in *Paedagogus* 2,1,9 is not evidence of a shared line of tradition with F G but represents an independent adaptation.

Zuntz also finds significance in Aphraat's use of the passage. The Syriac manuscript tradition is united in supporting the traditional reading (*ܐܕܝܠܗܝܢ ܘܡܝܗܘܒܝܢ* = *ἀδελφὴν γυναικα*). Aphraat, however, from whom is preserved the only pre-Peshitta citation of this passage,

¹²Zuntz, p. 138.

¹³*Stromata* 3,6,53,2; 4,15,97,4.

cites 1 Cor. 9:4-5 with the reading of F G (ܡܘܨܐ = γυναικας).¹⁴ The citation occurs in the midst of a discussion of biblical figures who abstained from sexual contact with women, such as Elijah and the Shunamite. The final example he brings up is Paul and Barnabas (*Dem.* I,264,27):¹⁵

Furthermore, the holy apostle said concerning himself and concerning Barnabas, “Why is it not permitted to us to eat and to drink and to take along wives with us?” But it was neither seemly nor proper.

Aphraat’s citation is precisely matched by the Peshitta of 1 Cor. 9:4-5, apart from the ellipsis of ܡܘܨܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ (“is it not a right to us”) in 9:5 and the critical substitution of ܡܘܨܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ (= και γυναικας) for ܡܘܨܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ (= αδελφην γυναικα). In fact, the Peshitta is so similar to Aphraat’s citation they matches in the use of the prepositional phrase ܡܘܨܐ (“with us”) following the infinitive ܡܘܨܐ (“to take along”). It is likely, therefore, that Aphraat is citing his pre-Peshitta Old Syriac text carefully. While Aphraat does not here focus on whether or not the wives are Christian but whether they are present at all, the preciseness of the citation makes adaptation to the context unlikely. This would be yet another example of the shared heritage of the Old Syriac tradition and the Latin/”Western” tradition.

The earliest evidence for the passage is Tertullian, whose witness to the reading *uxores* is consistent. In *De monogomia* 8,5-7 he notes that the word is translated a Greek word which in Latin could mean either “woman” (*mulier*) or wife (*uxor*) and argues that the former should be understood here rather than that Paul was married. In *De exhortatione castitatis* 8,3 he cites 1 Cor. 9:5 with the reading *uxores*, here focusing on Paul’s refusal to use the right to marry. The rest of the Latin tradition, apart from the Vulgate and witnesses

¹⁴Vööbus (*Altsyrische Paulustext*, p. 45) translates with “*mulieres*.”

¹⁵Cited in *NTSU* according to the Pierot edition: I/264,27.

influenced by it, reads *mulieres*. The significance of the interpretive issues between “wives” and “women,” particularly in the West, will be discussed below.

As a result, the only witnesses supporting *γυναίκα*s are F G, the non-Vulgate Latin witnesses, and Aphraat. However, both the context of 1 Cor. 9 and a review of the use of this passage in the early church shows that more than simply the weight of numbers must be considered.

The first question to consider is whether or not Paul elsewhere qualifies *γυνή* with an adjective or a predicate when discussing “Christian wives.” It is perhaps striking that Paul rarely uses *ἀδελφή* with the meaning “female member of the Christian community.” Two examples are found in greeting sections of his letters: Rom. 16:1 (Phoebe) and Phlm. 2 (Apphia).¹⁶ The only other example is 1 Cor. 7:15, where Paul argues that neither an *ἀδελφός* nor an *ἀδελφή* are bound to remain married to an unbeliever. In the immediately preceding context, however, *ἀδελφός* is used for the believing husband (7:12, 14) but only *γυνή* for the believing wife (7:13, 14). Although the context is quite clear that this is a “believing” wife, at 7:14 several witnesses (D F G 629 sy^p and, in different ways, virtually the entire Latin tradition) add the adjective *τη πιστη* based on the *ἄπιστος* of the same verse. In spite of the insertion, it is clear that Paul is able to use either *ἀδελφή* or *γυνή* to describe a Christian wife. However he does not elsewhere qualify *γυνή* with an adjective or a predicate to make clear that she is a member of the Christian community.

Next, one must determine whether the argument of 1 Cor. 9:5 requires the additional qualification that a wife accompanying an apostle be a Christian. 9:4-6 is comprised of a series of questions in which Paul describes the “rights” that he has but of which he has not

¹⁶*ἀδελφή* is also used to describe a family relationship in Rom. 16:15 and, if considered Pauline, 1 Tim. 5:2.

made use: Food and drink at the expense of the community, the right for one's wife to receive the same, and being provided for in such a way that work is not necessary. These "rights" are stated rather broadly, and the addition of qualifications to them would have undermined the force of the argument. This has already been pointed out regarding the "right" of food and drink (9:4). While there may be a background reference to the eating and drinking of something that is εἰδωλόθυτος, "the main thrust of 9:4-27 is that of renouncing "rights" in more general terms, and the allusion to food sacrificed to idols remains indirect. Otherwise the force of the argument loses momentum as it moves on to a series of broader examples."¹⁷ The same holds for 9:5. The argumentation in chapter 7 would leave little room for an interpretation of 9:5 which would see Paul as implying in any way that he would assume the "rights" of an apostle to include being accompanied by a non-Christian wife. As we have already seen above, Paul twice uses γυναῖκα without explicit qualification to refer to a Christian wife, and we have seen that some users of the manuscripts felt the need to add such qualification at 7:14. Such qualification is not necessary here, and in fact may detract from the force of the argument by raising an issue that is not relevant to the situation – it is hardly possible that anyone was accusing Paul of have a non-Christian wife. Therefore, while the passage may be mined for the information that it provides regarding the practices of early Christian itinerant preachers such as Paul,¹⁸ it is clear that providing such information is not the goal of the argument of 9:4-6.¹⁹ However, these practices are precisely what drew the

¹⁷Schrage II, p. 291 and Thiselton, p. 679, who references for this argument Héring, Lang, Wolff, and Senft.

¹⁸For these implications see Schrage II, pp. 292-3; Thiselton, p. 680-681.

¹⁹Indeed, the commentators who read ἀδελφῶν hardly draw attention to this additional "qualification": J. Weiss (p. 234) merely places translates the word as "eine (christliche) Schwester" and moves on without further mention. Schrage (II p. 292) mentions it only in a subordinate clause ("unzweifelhaft Christinnen") while discussing early Christian practice, not the passage itself. Robertson and Plummer (p. 180) discuss the history of

attention of early Christian writers to this passage. One must consider that this very information, secondary to the thrust of Paul's argument, is what led to the alteration of the text.

Turning from 1 Cor. itself to the use of this passage in the early church, we find that the second century saw a change in attitude toward marriage and continence from the NT writings. In 1 Corinthians 7, for example, a temporary continence is encouraged, but marriage is not denigrated nor to be avoided.²⁰ However, by the beginning of the third century permanent continence, the avoidance of marriage, and particular emphasis placed on the "purity" of the clergy were major marks of Christianity, whether of an "orthodox" or "gnostic" orientation. The causes of this shift were likely numerous. J. Massingberd Ford finds it in the influence of middle-Platonic and Philonic thinking,²¹ K. Neiderwimmer in the blending of an eschatological perspective with an emerging catholicization of the church,²² and Peter Brown in an early Christians desire to disassociate themselves from the prevailing culture.²³ While this development cannot be reviewed here, the early writers themselves show a struggle to apply specific passages from the NT, and particularly 1 Cor. 9:5, to these changing Christian attitudes. The use of this passage in the debates of the second century

interpretation, but do not mention the ἀδελφὴν when discussing the meaning of the passage.

²⁰For a summary of the issues, see Gordon D. Fee, "1 Corinthians 7:1-7 Revisited," in *Paul and the Corinthians. Studies on a Community in Conflict*, ed. T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott, SNT 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 197-213.

²¹*A Trilogy on Wisdom and Celibacy* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967).

²²*Askese und Mysterium. Über Ehe, Ehescheidung und Eheverzicht in den Anfängen des christlichen Glaubens* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975).

²³*The Body and Society. Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (Columbia University Press, 1988).

church supports the conclusion that the reading *γυναϊκας* would have been problematic in many contexts, but that *αδελφην γυναικα* resolves every one of the potential issues.

One difficulty with the plural was that it might be taken to imply that Paul is permitting women being held in common. This was apparently a practice of the Carpocratians, or at least was described as their practice by Clement of Alexandria:

The followers of Carpocrates and Epiphanes consider women (*γυναϊκας*) to be common property, from which has flown the greatest blasphemy against The Name [of Christ].

The noble Carpocratians teach these things. They say that these and some others who are eager for the same evil things gather for meals (for I myself would not call their gathering a “love-feast”), men together with women, then after they have stuffed themselves . . . having knocked the lamp which gives off the light out of the way in order to mix together, however they want, with whatever women they wish, and so practicing in this “love-feast” common ownership.²⁴

Similar charges were apparently made by Celsus.²⁵ There is also evidence that the itinerant missionaries of the post-NT period faced charges of sexual impropriety as a result of traveling with women who were not their wives. The *Acta Philippi*, a fourth-century composite but containing earlier material,²⁶ describes a charge made against Mariamne:

“And the tyrant said to the priests, ‘Make an announcement around the city so that all men and women may come to see her shame, for she travels around with these mages [Philip and Bartholemew] and likely commits adultery with them (*παντως ὅτι μοιχεύεται ὑπ’ αὐτῶν*).’²⁷

²⁴Or perhaps “sexual intercourse” is implied with *τήν κοινωνίαν*.

²⁵See Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6,40.

²⁶See Aurelio de Santos Oro, “Later Acts of the Apostles” in *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, rev. ed., ed. Edgar Hennecke and William Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: James Clarke; Louisville: John Knox, 1992), p. 125, who mentions in particular the martyrdom section (which includes section 125) as likely pre-dating the final composition.

²⁷*Acta Philippi* 125.

To a scribe/reader familiar with such complaints, the plural γυναικας would be much more troubling than would the singular αδελφην γυναικα.

The commentaries by Robertson and Plummer and by Schrage²⁸ draw attention to a second way in which this passage may have been affected by early church practice. Clergy marriage was an issue already in the second century; a text which described the apostles as married would have caused difficulty in some Christian circles. Tertullian (*De monogomia* 8,5-7), who reads here *uxores*, suggests that instead *mulieres* should be understood:

For should we not, if by the Greeks "women" [*mulieres*] and "wives" [*uxores*] are easily named with a common vocable by virtue of custom—but there is a proper vocable for "wives"—therefore interpret Paul in such a way as if he demonstrates that the apostles had wives? For if he were discussing marriage—which he does in what follows—where the apostle would have been better able to name some example, it would appear proper to say: "Do we not have the authority of taking along wives [*uxores*] just as the rest of the apostles and Cephas?" Yet where he connects these things which show his refraining from provision of sustenance, saying: "For do we not have the authority of eating and drinking?" he does not demonstrate that wives [*uxores*] were led about by the apostles, and those who do not have them nevertheless have the authority of eating and drinking, but they simply have women [*mulieres*] who ministered to them in the same way as the institution by which also they accompanied the Lord.

This interpretation is standard in the western church. It is reflected in the Vulgate's *sororem mulierem* as well as the D-text's *mulieres*. Most clearly expressing this interpretation, and at the same time showing some of the difficulties with the plural form, is Jerome (*Adversus Iovinianum* 1,26²⁹):

If, however, [Jovian] set this before us to prove that all the apostles had wives: "Do we not have the authority of taking along women [*mulieres*] or wives [*uxores*] (since γυνή in Greek signifies both) just as the other apostles, and Cephas, and the brothers of the Lord," let him add that which is in the Greek copies: "Do we not have the right to take along sisters who are women [*sorores mulieres*] or wives [*uxores*]?" From which it is apparent that he refers to other holy women who, according to Jewish custom, served teachers from their own means just as we read that even the Lord himself practiced. Now also the sequence of the words signifies this: "Do we not have

²⁸Robertson and Plummer, p. 180; Schrage II, p. 292 n. 79.

²⁹MPL 23, p. 277.

the authority of eating and drinking, or taking along women sisters?" Where he places first the things concerning eating and drinking, and then introduces things concerning women sisters, it is clear that we are required to understand not "wives" [*uxores*] but those, as we said, who served from their own means. . . . Or at least if we take γυναικας as "wives" [*uxores*] not "women" [*mulieres*], that which is added to it, "sisters" [*sorores*] annuls "wives" [*uxores*] and shows that she is a sister in spirit, not in marriage.

Jerome may attest to a reading no longer found in the manuscript tradition: αδελφας γυναικας.³⁰ His argument, however, is for the presence of "sister" in the text and not a discussion of the singular and plural forms. It should also be noticed that he seems to know the reading *sorores uxores*, which is also, however, absent from any other Latin witness. It is therefore most likely that he is not citing an actual known reading but simply adapting *sororem* to the plural form.

A second developing issue is clergy marriage. In the late second century, neither in the east nor in the west is there particular difficulty with the apostles being married. This married person, however, was to lead a life of continence. According to Tertullian (*De exhortatione castitatis* 8,3):

Also, it was permitted to the apostles to marry and to lead around wives [*uxores*], and it was permitted to be sustained according to the gospel. But the one who on occasion did not use this right also, it is certain, calls us to his example, teaching that approval is in this, in which "permission" lays the foundation for the test of abstinence.

Other western writers, such as Hilary of Potiers (*Tractatus in Ps. 118*, Nun 14,14) show a very similar understanding of the passage. Brown summarizes a possible motivation for this interpretation: "The continence of its clergy and of its spiritual guides announced to the Roman world of the late second century that the church was a new form of the public body."³¹

³⁰Cited as such, with uncertainty, in the apparatus of the NA²⁷.

³¹Brown, p. 100.

If these issues did impact the reading of 1 Cor. 9:5, it is clear that merely shifting from the plural to the singular would not resolve all the issues. The addition of the vocable ἀδελφή, however, does. This word is used in the second century with very specific references beyond merely “Christian sister” as it is generally understood by modern commentators. One way in which this word was used is seen as early as the *Shepherd of Hermas*: men are encouraged to consider their wives to be “sisters”: “But make these words known to all your children, and to your wife, who is about to become like a sister to you.”³² Significantly, Hermas is not yet able to consider his wife a sister until the visions increase his knowledge. This practice is only for the “mature” believers, precisely what Paul would have been considered. Clement also would have the husband consider his wife as a “sister” through sexual renunciation, though in this context “sister” does not mean “Christian” but “as if having the same father.” Clement argues that as the “gnostic” assimilates to God, matters pertaining to the world are viewed in the proper perspective (*Stromata* 6,12,100,3):

He will consider the good life to be best all, preferring neither children nor marriage nor parents to love of God and righteousness in life. After begetting children the wife is considered a sister by this man (ἀδελφή δὲ τούτῳ ἢ γυναῖκα . . . κρίνεται), as if she had the same father.

This use of ἀδελφή may reflect that of 1 Tim. 5:2. Admittedly, the word order of the reading at 1 Cor. 9:5 (ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα) must be understood as “take along a sister as wife,” not “a wife as a sister.” It is also clear, however, that some early church writers (and most modern translations) understood the double accusative as an adjective, i.e., “sisterly women,” most notably Jerome (*Adversus Iovinianum* 1,26, cited above). The reading ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα

³²6,3; translation from M. W. Holmes, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999). Hermas also considers a Christian woman, Rhoda, as his “sister” (1,1; 1,7).

may therefore be the result of an attempt to describe the apostles as having wives but remaining continent.

A second use of the term ἀδελφή in the second century is to denote a woman who is in a kind of a “spiritual” marriage, where a Christian man and woman live together. Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses* 1,1,12) makes mention of the practice, though in a critical way: “But again, others of them who at first pretended to live with them as sisters in a holy manner, after the passing of time were disgraced when the sister became pregnant by the brother.” By the beginning of the fourth century, this practice was specifically condemned by the council at Ancyra (314), Canon 19: “We prohibit virgins living together as sisters with a man.”³³ In Canon 3 of Nicea (325) clergy in particular were forbidden the practice (using the term συνείσακτος): “This great synod absolutely forbids a bishop, presbyter, deacon, or any other clergy to keep a woman who has been brought in (συνείσακτον) to live with.”³⁴ The presence of ἀδελφην at 1 Cor. 9:5 may be the result of this second century practice, an attempt to portray Paul and Barnabas as living only in a “spiritual marriage.”

The only argument based on internal evidence in favor of ἀδελφην γυναικα is that γυναικας represents an assimilation to the number of the verb (ἔχομεν).³⁵ This scenario, however, does not account for the loss of ἀδελφην,³⁶ for no witnesses read the plural ἀδελφας γυναικας or its equivalent. Furthermore, given Paul’s usage and the argumentation of 1 Cor. 9:4-6, ἀδελφην appears to be a foreign element to the text. Finally, given the

³³Text in Friedrich Lauchert, *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien, nebst den Apostolischen Kanones* (Frieburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896).

³⁴Translation from Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1 (London: Sheed & Ward; Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990).

³⁵Fee, p. 397 n. 1; J. Weiss (p. 234 n. 1) dismisses it as a “pedantische Korrektheit.”

³⁶Zuntz, p. 138.

developing attitudes towards marriage and sexual practice in the second century and the specific attention paid to the examples of the apostles and to this very passage, it is far more likely that ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα is the result of an intentional alteration of γυναικας than that the latter is a clumsy correction.

9:6.16

A form of ἔχω + infinitive is found four times in 1 Cor. 9:4-6. Only in the last example is there variation regarding the presence of an article before the infinitive (του μη εργαζεσθαι D¹ K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 88 104 326 424 614 876 1241^s etc).³⁷ The use of the genitive article + infinitive following ἐξουσία is found in the NT only at Luke 10:19, with the article omitted by W^f. None of the other NT examples show variation,³⁸ including the only other Pauline example (Rom. 9:21). The rarity of the use of the articular infinitive in Paul and the NT speaks against reading it at 1 Cor. 9:6, even though assimilation to the previous anarthrous infinitives would also have been a possibility. The use of τοῦ + infinitive following ἐξουσία does match classical usage,³⁹ and may be considered an example of a sporadic attempt to conform the NT text to such.

9:7.18

³⁷The use of the gerundive in the genitive with *potestas* at 9:4 (*manducandi, bibendi*), 9:5 (*circumducendi*) and 9:6 (*operandi*) reflects standard Latin usage, so that neither *hoc non operandi* (Vulgate, Tert Amst) nor *operandi* (rel) can be seen as supporting the addition of the article.

³⁸Matt. 9:6; Mark 2:10; 3:15; Luke 5:24; 12:5; John 10:18; 19:10; Acts 9:14; Rev. 11:6; Rev. 16:9.

³⁹Cf. Liddell and Scott, s.v. ἐξουσία for examples; two examples not cited there but similar to 1 Cor. 9:5 are Isocrates, *Areopagiticus* 20: ὥσθ' ἡγεῖσθαι . . . τὴν δ' ἐξουσίαν τοῦ ταῦτα ποιεῖν εὐδαιμονίαν; and Demosthenes, *In Aristogitonem* 2 7: καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐξουσίαν παρ' ὑμῶν τοῦ παρανομεῖν εἰληφότα.

The reading εκ του καρπου (P⁴⁶ N² D¹ K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 88 104 326 424 614 876 915 1241s 1834 1881; *de fructu* ar t vg^{mss}: A¹ F¹ L O P W Amst Amst(A) Spec Aug) is likely assimilation to εκ του γαλακτος, which follows later in the verse.⁴⁰ This reading also softens the expression somewhat, clarifying that the worker gets a portion of, not all of, the fruit.

The Latin tradition is confused here; both *fructum* and *de fructu* are found, but so also is *de fructum* (VL 75 89 vg^{mss}: A* F* R V^c) which is grammatically improper. This reading may be a conflation;⁴¹ if so, its presence in both 75 and 89 as well as the Vulgate witnesses generally closest to the D-text attest to its early origin.

9:7.20

The addition of και πινει in D F G attest an expansion typical of these witnesses. It matches precisely 1 Cor. 11:29 and may have been influenced by μη ουκ εχομεν εξουσιαν φαγειν και πειν; at 9:4, but the more likely motive for the expansion is to match the context, for typically one might expect to drink the fruit of the vine. The addition is confined to the bilingual tradition, without even VL 89 or the Ambrosiaster tradition attesting it.

9:7.21

While several commentators have attempted to locate other examples of a series of three questions in Paul, no passage matches the examples at 1 Cor. 9:7 closely enough to help determine whether or not the archetypical text read the conjunction. Zuntz notes that 1 Cor. 15:29f. and 2 Cor. 11:29 consist of only 2 clauses; neither are 2 Cor. 6:14 and Eph. 1:18 precisely parallel. He then argues that, without parallels for comparison, one must fall back

⁴⁰Zuntz, p 50; Fee, p. 397 n. 2.

⁴¹Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 278 in a discussion of the text of VL 75.

on the observation that removal of original asyndeton is characteristic of the tradition.⁴²

Güting and Mealand, however, believe that Pauline parallels have influenced the textual tradition, concluding that η was added as an adaptation to Pauline style “There are Pauline parallels for this lack of diversity, compare for instance 2 Cor. 11:29. A rhetorical question develops two parallel metaphors without varying the particle used.”⁴³ They further argue when a particle is used to introduce that last of a series of questions, the final question is distinguished from the others.⁴⁴ It is questionable, however, to cite a classical usage as decisive, particularly since we have no comparable examples by our author.

Clabeaux dismisses the shorter reading, seeing its origin in a desire to avoid the repetition of similar sounds: $\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota\epsilon\iota \eta$.⁴⁵ Yet the manuscripts that attest the longer reading do not avoid, and in fact create, similar strings of vowels in other places: $\lambda\alpha\lambda\omega \eta \epsilon\iota$ (1 Cor. 9:8 F G; $\lambda\alpha\lambda\omega \eta \textit{rel}$); $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ (1 Cor. 9:12 F G; $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta \textit{rel}$).

\wp ⁴⁶ has already shown an interest in the conjoining of questions: At both 1:13 and 5:13 $\mu\eta$ is altered to η . In these examples the alteration ensures a proper answer to a rhetorical question, but also provides a conjunction in the last of a series of questions. Its addition here may match the classical usage described above, or, as Zuntz argued, simply the result of a distaste for asyndeton.⁴⁶

9:7.22

⁴²Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, pp. 104-5.

⁴³Güting and Mealand, p. 50.

⁴⁴Güting and Mealand, p. 61, citing Denniston, pp. xliv and 104.

⁴⁵Clabeaux, p. 105.

⁴⁶Fee (p. 397 n. 3) argues that η “was removed by an early scribe to conform the preceding clause to the preceding one,” though again the lack of parallel examples for the sake of comparison makes either proving or disproving this argument impossible.

1241 substitutes the diminutive ποίμνιον for ποίμνην. In the patristic writings these two words are virtually interchangeable⁴⁷ The *Apostolic Constitutions*, for example, uses the diminutive form three times in 2,10, then the normal form five times in 2,20 before one example of ποίμνιον at the end of that section. This interchangeability is the result of the use of both forms in the NT: ποίμνιον occurs four other times without alteration of the diminutive (Luke 12:32; Acts 20:28,29; 1 Pet. 5:2⁴⁸) and ποίμνη four times without alteration to the diminutive⁴⁹ (Matt. 26:31 = Zech. 13:7; Luke 2:8; John 10:16; 1 Cor. 9:7⁵⁰).

Assimilation of ποιμνιον to the following ποιμνην at 9:7 is a possibility, but had ποιμνιον stood in the archetypal text, one would have expected assimilation of the ποιμνης at 9:7b to the diminutive form at 9:7a. In fact, 1241 reads αυτης for της ποιμνης at 9:7b. Since ποιμνης is the archetypal reading (see below), ποιμνιον must be considered another example of the erratic copying habits of 1241 (cf., *inter alia*, 9:1.6; 9:2.8).

9:7.23 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

The reading of Ϟ⁴⁶, which lacks either της ποιμνης or αυτης, is another example of parablepsis in this manuscript.⁵¹

9:8.24 [discussed at 6:5.15]

⁴⁷Cf. Lampe, s.v. ποίμνιον.

⁴⁸At 1 Pet. 5:2 Ϟ reads ενυμνιον, a difficult form but nevertheless not a shift from ποίμνιον to ποίμνη.

⁴⁹Hence, this interchange is not discussed in J. K. Elliott, "Nouns with Diminutive Endings in the New Testament," *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970) pp. 391-8.

⁵⁰The bilinguals and a few other witnesses read αυτης for της ποιμνης; see below.

⁵¹Royse, 255; Cf. Zuntz, 19, who labels it simply a "blunder."

9:8.25

The relationship between the two questions in 9:8 first is awkward. Fee, explaining the text as it stands in $\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B C D 33 81 181 255 1739 2127 \text{ sy}^h \text{ pc}$, writes:

It begins with the negative particle μή, thus indicating a negative response (I do not, do I?). The ἢ καί (= “or also”) both joins the two contrasts (“I λαλῶ these things”/“the Law λέγει these things”) and recommends the second alternative (cf. Rom. 4:9). The awkwardness results because the recommended alternative, which is still part of the original sentence, expects a *positive* answer.⁵²

He goes on to explain that the “Majority Text” “cleans all this up” replacing the ου before λεγει with ουχι before και, thereby creating a question that expects a positive answer. He does not, however, note a third possible reading, to which we now turn.

F G have an impossible reading which must go back to their shared immediate predecessor manuscript: η ει και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει. This text is then matched by their Latin counterparts VL 77 78: *an si et lex haec dixit*, an equally impossible reading in context which can only be another example of the slavish adaptation of the Latin text of immediate ancestor of F G to the Greek. The reading η ει is clearly an error, but one which may stem from more than one cause: either a corrector’s annotation has been adopted into the text as a conflation rather than as a replacement, or this may be another example of the doubling of vowels shown by these manuscripts (εγενηθη η σοφια 1 Cor. 1:30; ουσου ουκ 2:9; δε εφημει 7:29), with the repeated η in a subsequent copy altered to ει. The predecessor form of this text (η και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει) has survived in several witnesses. Ψ preserves this exactly. This manuscript, in spite of a somewhat thorough revision toward the Byzantine text, occasionally preserves unique readings found otherwise only in the “Western Text.” So too do several Latin manuscripts: VL 61 89 H (*an et lex haec dicit*). VL 89 is a descendant of the “pre-grecized” D-text (see chapter on D F G). If this form of the text is that of the D F G

⁵²Fee, p. 405. 46.

archetype, then D VL 75 can be accounted for as another example of correction toward the text now found in \aleph A. A third supporting witness is the Peshitta, which can only have been based on this reading: ܠܘ ܥܝܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܢܘܡܘܫܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܡܘܫܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܡܘܫܐ (“Lo! Even the Law says these things.”).

The Harklean, on the other hand, differs from the Peshitta only in the addition of the negative (ܠܘ) before the verb, thus matching the reading of Ψ^{46} \aleph A B C D. Finally, the reading is found in the textual tradition of Epiphanius’ *Panarion* as a possible reading of Marcion. The convergence of these lines of tradition confirms that the reading of Ψ and, in corrupted form, F G, must be early.

But which reading is archetypal? The reading η ουχι και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει cannot have given rise to either of the alternatives, but could have been derived from either form of the text. It therefore must be secondary. As with other secondary readings in the Byzantine text unsupported by the D F G line, the Ψ^{46} B line, or any version, this reading must be a late development in the tradition. The decision between the two other alternatives is more difficult. We have already seen several examples of the editing of rhetorical questions (e.g., 1:13; 5:13); in both cases it is Ψ^{46} , virtually alone, which alters $\mu\eta$ into η in order to clarify the proper response to the question. F G and the Latin tradition have not shown this tendency. Furthermore, the reading ου λεγει matches the three preceding questions in 9:6-7 in the placing of the negative before the main verb at the end of the clause (οὐκ ἔχομεν 9:6; οὐκ ἔσθίει 9:7 *bis*); assimilation to the near context is therefore a strong possibility. On the other hand, several factors speak in favor of the reading η και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει. As Fee has pointed out (cited above), η καί joins two contrasts and recommends the second. But a closer parallel to the structure of 1 Cor. 9:8 is found in 1 Cor. 9:9-10. There a rhetorical question is also introduced with $\mu\eta$, the disjunctive η proposes the alternative, and, most importantly, the alternative is not expressed as a negative question, but

as a positive: ἦ δι' ἡμᾶς πάντως λέγει; Immediately following this positive statement is an affirmation (δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐγράφη). This is precisely parallel to 9:8 in F G Ψ VL 61 89 sy^p, with the affirmation following in 9:9: γεγράφται γάρ (see below). On the other hand, no parallel exists for the P⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C D text of 9:8. Similar is 9:4-6, with μή introducing two questions (9:4-5) and ἦ a third (9:6) which has the negative particle before the verb (οὐκ ἔχομεν) as does the P⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C D text of 9:8. However, in 9:6 the anticipated answer is negative, while in 9:8 the anticipated answer is positive. Furthermore, no affirmation follows the question in 9:6 as we find in 9:8-9 and 9:10, naturally, since a negative response is expected. This makes the P⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C D text of 9:8 unique in Paul; no example of two questions, one anticipating a negative response introduced by μή and one anticipating a positive response connected to the previous question by ἦ exists in Paul. In conclusion, either the F G Ψ text or the P⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C D text of 9:8 may have been adapted to the near context. However, the three negative questions which precede in 9:6-7 are more likely to have caused an insertion than the single question which follows in 9:10 to have caused a deletion. The lack of a parallel in Paul to the latter's structure casts further suspicion on it. Finally, it will be argued that the addition of οὐ caused the corruption in the immediately following clause in 9:10, to which we turn below.

9:9.26

The introductory phrase in 9:9 has spawned more variation than any other such formulae in Paul. The greatest number of witnesses supports the longest readings: ἐν γὰρ τῷ μωσεως νομῷ γεγράφται (⋈ A B C K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 88 424 614 876 1241^s 1739) and ἐν γὰρ τῷ νομῷ μωσεως γεγράφται (915 *pm*⁵³). P⁴⁶ alone among the Greek

⁵³von Soden's *K*^c group supports this reading.

witnesses,⁵⁴ but with the support of VL 89 Amst, reads the same phrase without *μωσεως*.

Finally, D F G read simply *γεγραπται γαρ*.

Those who regard the longer reading (and specifically the *ⲛ A B C* form) as archetypal do so for two reasons: First, this form is considered the most difficult reading, and, second, the D F G reading is the result of assimilation or adaptation to Pauline style.⁵⁵ The reading of *ⲡ*⁴⁶ has not received consideration as the source reading.⁵⁶

Zuntz is inclined toward the shorter reading, listing it as one of a handful of example of original readings found only in the “Western text.” The longer readings are suspicious because 1) there is variation in word order; 2) “Law of Moses” is never used elsewhere in Paul; 3) only at 1 Cor. 14:21 is “it is written” modified by a reference to the book; 4) the “shorter reading is a stylistic improvement”; and 5) the shorter reading is paralleled in Gal 3:10 and 4:22.⁵⁷

Because the reading of D F G and their counterparts VL 75 77 78 is not supported by the rest of the Latin tradition (including VL 89) or the Peshitta, one may immediately suspect a unique alteration attributable to their shared ancestor. However, similar alterations are not made by this group of witnesses when encountering longer introductory formula.⁵⁸

⁵⁴It is difficult to be certain of Marcion’s here, since the passage is cited differently twice (*Panarion* 42,11,3 and 42,12,3) and Epiphanius is discussing his text of both 1 Cor. 9:8 and 9:9. Schmid’s reconstruction of his text and explanation of the discrepancies is most plausible (*Marcion und Sein Apostolos*, pp. 159-161): ἐν (γάρ) τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ (γέγραπται). Clabeaux’s reconstruction (*A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul*, p. 66-7) fails for several reasons, not least of which is a failure to account for all the Greek manuscript data, including *ⲡ*⁴⁶.

⁵⁵Fee, p. 398 n. 5; Güting and Mealand, p. 39.

⁵⁶Royse, p. 266, considers the omission of *μωσεως* an assimilation to *νομος* at 9:9.

⁵⁷Zuntz, p. 138. Cf. Kilpatrick, “The Text of the Epistles,” p. 57.

⁵⁸Güting and Mealand (pp. 39-40) point to 1 Cor. 15:45 as a parallel example, but there the variation is dissimilar from that at 9:9 in that shorter readings are involved: *ουτως*

Furthermore, support for the D F G reading may be found in Origen, whose three citations of this introductory formula are inconsistent. In *Contra Celsum* 2,13 it matches the \aleph A B reading, in *Contra Celsum* 4,49 it matches \mathfrak{P}^{46} , and in *De principiis* 4,2,6, in a long a precise citation, matches D F G:⁵⁹

De principiis 4.2.6: τῆς δὲ ὡς ἂν εἰς ψυχὴν ἀναγομένης διηγήσεως παράδειγμα τὸ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ πρὸς Κορινθίους κείμενον. γεγραπται γάρ· φησιν οὐ φημῶσις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα. ἔπειτα διηγούμενος τοῦτον τὸν νόμον ἐπιφέρει· μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ; ἢ δι' ἡμᾶς πάντως λέγει; δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐγράφη, ὅτι ὀφείλει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾶν καὶ ὁ ἀλοῶν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν.

The placement of φησιν immediately following the first few words of a precise scriptural citation takes place routinely in *De Principiis*. Compare:

Ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, τί ὁ σωτὴρ ἀποκρίνεται πρὸς τοὺς πυθομένους, διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς πολλοῖς λαλεῖς· ἵνα φησιν βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσι καὶ μὴ συνιῶσι· μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἀφεθῆ αὐτοῖς. [Mark 4:10] (3,1,7)

γῆ φησιν ἡ πιούσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρωόμενον . . . [Heb. 6:7] (3,1,10)

λέγετέ μοι φησὶν οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; [Gal. 4:21] (4,2,6)

Origen's use of the introductory formula in *De principiis* 4,2,6 must therefore be taken as evidence of the circulation of the reading γεγραπται γαρ prior to the D F G bilingual tradition.

This reading should be regarded as archetypical for several reasons, in addition to those listed by Zuntz and Kilpatrick. First, if assimilation to Pauline style was at work in the reading, the more likely assimilation would have been καθως γεγραπται, which occurs far

και γεγραπται and καθως γεγραπται (which would be, unlike 9:9, alteration to the more common Pauline formula).

⁵⁹This citation is not noticed by Hannah, *Origen's Text of 1 Corinthians*, pp. 94-95, who goes on to exclude the reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} VL 89 from his tabulations because it is a "singular" (*sic*) reading, not noting the additional support of Ambrosiaster.

more frequently than γεγραπται γαρ. Second, the examples of assimilation in D F G do not delete but make additions. Comparison may be made to 9:7, where these manuscripts add και πινει from the near context and 1 Cor. 11:29 (see above); neither at 9:4 or 11:29 is και πινει(v) lost by assimilation to 9:7. Third, the context itself provides motivation for the lengthening of the text, but not for a shortening. In 9:9 Paul cites a text which is clearly from Deuteronomy. In 9:10 however, he uses γαρ εγραφη οτι to introduce another passage which is clearly not from a scriptural source.⁶⁰ In order to clarify that at 9:9 a scriptural text was being cited, but that at 9:10 an unknown source was being used, the addition was made for the former. This would account for the unique nature of the corruptions in this passage, which are unparalleled in the *Corpus Paulinum*. Furthermore, it would rule out the argument that μωσεως should be read, for a reader concerned that a text regarded as authoritative not be overlooked would be prone to add the identifier, which, as we saw above, is a non-Pauline expression. Its relatively late attestation (4th century, apart from one citation in Origen) may coincide with the introduction of marginal equipment, typically the *diple*, to mark citations.⁶¹ This leaves only γεγραπται γαρ and εν γαρ τω νομω γεγραπται as viable options. Both have the advantage of matching Pauline usage, though the latter only at 1 Cor. 14:21. The adaptation of κημωσεις to φινμωσεις in the citation itself (see below) already in P⁴⁶ shows that even at this early stage of transmission the text of this passage was compared with and

⁶⁰Fee (p. 409 n. 68) argues that 9:10b is a Pauline creation, not a citation of a now lost source; Fee cites here the author's who consider it a citation, to which may now be added Schrage II, 302. Schrage notes, contra Fee, that εγραφη is used to introduce scriptural citations, e.g. Rom. 4:23.

⁶¹As far as I can determine, B is the earliest Pauline manuscript to use these; I have not been able to locate a discussion of the history of the use of *diple* in biblical manuscripts, but their use in manuscripts other Greek texts is analyzed in Kathleen McNamee, "Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri" (Ph.D diss., Duke University, 1977), pp. 105-109.

altered to the LXX citation; this comparison may have led also to the expansion to the introductory formula. As a result, γεγραπται γαρ is most likely the archetypal reading.

9:9.27

Very little distinguishes κημόω from φιμόω semantically. The critical issues involved in this passage are the influence of the LXX (Deut. 25:4) and whether one or the other is, using Lietzmann's terminology, "unliterarische."⁶² Zuntz, who does not see this issue as settled on the "literariness" of a given term, notes that the Byzantine lexica attest κημόω.⁶³ In fact both verbs are found in here: Pseudo-Zonaras lists this verb with the gloss χαλιναγωγῶ, Photius with the glosses φιμοῦν and χαλινοῦν. Hesychius and the *Suda* have entries only for the noun form. But at the same time Hesychius provides an entry for φιμοῖ, giving the glosses: δεσμευεῖ ("fetter"), εμφράττει ("block up"), ἄγχει ("compress"), and ἐπιστομέζει ("bridle"). Entries in the *Suda* and in Photius are identical to each other, providing the last of these two glosses. This evidence is therefore divided. The usage in literary texts is also divided.⁶⁴ It is therefore difficult to determine which verb is, in fact, "less literary," which for the NA text is apparently the decisive argument, since in fact neither verb is well-attested. However, given the apparent familiarity with the verb in Philo, Josephus, and the Testament of Job, no doubt drawn from its use in the Septuagint, it would appear that it would be more

⁶²is apparently the origin of the decisive argument for Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 492, and repeated by the commentaries. Lietzmann, p. 41, notes simply: "Das unliterarische κημώσεις (so B D G von κήμος der Maulkorb) haben die meisten Handschriften (zB. S [=N] A C K L P) durch φιμώσεις (=LXX) ersetzt."

⁶³Zuntz, p. 37.

⁶⁴κημόω is used (in the infinitive) in Xenophon, *De re equestri* 5,3 and Pollux, *Onomasticon* 1,202; φιμόω in Aristophanes, *Nubes* 592; Strabo, *Geographica* 3,2,6; Philo, *De Virtutibus* 145, but this in a reference to Deut. 25:4; Josephus, *De bello judaico* 5,32; *Testamentum Jobi* 27,3.

likely for alteration to take place in that direction rather than toward κημώω. In addition, Paul appears to alter his citations of the LXX slightly, as one finds also at 1 Cor. 1:19 where ἀθετήσω stands, without variation, in place of the κρύψω of Is. 29:14; 3:20, where σοφῶν is used in place of Ps. 93:11's ἀνθρώπων; and 15:55, where τὸ νῖκος replaces the ἡ δίκη found in Hos. 13:14. There appears to be no evidence which would alter Zuntz's conclusion: "In such cases it is on the whole a safe rule to regard as original that reading which differs from the Septuagint. In the present instance there is no special reason to suggest a different solution." Only B* D* F G 1739 preserve the κημώσεις.

9:9.28

D F G, the Latin tradition, and a handful of Greek minuscules (including 88 915) read the preposition περι before των βωων. The only other Pauline occurrence of the impersonal verb μέλει (1 Cor. 7:21) does not take an object, so comparison to the author's typical usage cannot be made in this case. In the NT, when this verb takes an object, the object is expressed either in the genitive alone (Acts 18:17) or as a prepositional phrase governed by περί (John 10:13; 12:6; and 1 Pet. 5:7).⁶⁵ The D F G reading cannot be classified as a Latinism since the genitive case (*eorum*) without a preposition is used as the object of *cura est* at Acts 18:17. Most likely, a tendency to add prepositions to strengthen the cases as well as the influence of other prepositional phrases in the near context (δι' ἡμᾶς 9:10 *bis*; ἐπ' ἐλπίδι 9:11 *bis*) led to the addition here.

9:10.30; 9:10.31

⁶⁵ Each time without any manuscript omitting περί, though at 1 Pet. 5:7, ὑπέρ replaces περί in several minuscules.

The citation of what is likely an unknown apocryphal writing⁶⁶ in 9:10 has produced three forms of the text:

- A: οφειλει επ ελπιδι ο αροτριων αροτριαν και ο αλων επ ελπιδι του μετεχειν (P⁴⁶ N* A B C P 0150 33 88 915 1611 1739 Or Did sy^p sy^{h^{xt}})
- B: ο επ ελπιδι αροτριων οφειλει αροτριαν και ο αλων της ελπιδος αυτου μετεχειν (D (F G)⁶⁷ VL 75 (77) 78 sy^{h^{mg}})
- C: επ ελπιδι οφειλει ο αροτριων αροτριαν και ο αλων της ελπιδος αυτου μετεχειν επ ελπιδι (N² D¹ K L Ψ 056 0151 5 6 424 614 876 1175 1241^s sy^p Chr Cy Thret)

Form C is derived from forms A and B. The presence in the second clause of both της ελπιδος αυτου and επ ελπιδι point to a conflation.⁶⁸ There is conflicting evidence, however, as to whether form A or form B is the secondary form. First, the word order in the first clause of form A, ο αροτριων αροτριαν, matches precisely Isaiah 28:14, the passage in the LXX which is the closest in wording to 1 Cor. 9:10. Second, the two clauses in form A match in the use of επ ελπιδι. As a result, this form may have been harmonized both the LXX and to the near context. On the other hand, the word order of the first clause in form A is more difficult than that of form B. With both the verb and the prepositional phrase standing before the subject, it is more likely that οφειλει was shifted to the position after the subject and επ ελπιδι into the “sandwich position” between the article and participle than that form B was altered to form A.

⁶⁶Lietzmann, p. 41; J. Weiss, p. 237; Schrage II, p. 302.

⁶⁷F G shows two alterations from D. First, εφ ελπίζει (cf. P⁴⁶) has been corrupted into two words: εφελπι δει, for which VL 77 supplies the impossible *in spe debet*. Second, οφειλει is read both before ο εφελπι and after αροτριων. This is likely to have been added from the Vulgate, which reads *debet* before *in spe*. As a result, the first clause in 77 reads: *debet qui in spe debet qui arat debet arare*; 78, on the other hand, preserves the D-text reading with 75: *in spe qui arat debet arare*.

⁶⁸Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 492; Fee, p. 398 n. 7.

The variations in the second clause again show that form A was likely altered to form B. Both forms have Pauline parallels. While the former reflects his use of the articular infinitive, with τοῦ + infinitive modifying a noun,⁶⁹ both the simple infinitive (found in D F G) and ἵνα + subjunctive are equivalent.⁷⁰ However, there is no potential difficulty with form B. Furthermore, in form A there is an ellipsis of ἀλοᾶν;⁷¹ a scribe/reader who assumed that the οφείλει of the first clause also governed the infinitive in the second, may have altered the prepositional phrase to the genitive and the article to a personal pronoun.⁷² The lack of early citations of this passage by either Latin or Syriac fathers prevents determining whether or not form B was limited only to the Greco-Latin bilinguals. Since the reading is found in the margin of two manuscripts of the Syriac Harklean version,⁷³ it appears to have circulated elsewhere, though whether this is the result of an early corruption or a later comparison of the Harklean to the Latin tradition is not clear.

9:11.32 [noted at 9:1.6]

9.11.34

The addition of the negative particle οὐ (D 330 2400; VL 75 89 Amst(A)) is another example of clarifying a rhetorical question (see 1:13; 5:13; 9:8). The editing in D which produced this reading is discussed in the chapter on D F G.

⁶⁹See especially Moulton, *Accidence*, pp. 216-18.

⁷⁰BDR §400³.

⁷¹BDR §479⁴.

⁷²While F G occasionally lose the article before the infinitive (1 Cor. 11:22; 14:39), attributing the corruption to this tendency would not account for the presence of the reading in D.

⁷³*Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung* 2,1, p. 376, n. 6.

9:12.37

The shifting of the possessive genitive to the position following the noun it modifies takes place also at 2:7.23 in nearly the same witnesses (σοφιαν θεου L Ψ 056 0142 614)⁷⁴.

The shift to the first person pronoun ημων in 1241 is noted at 9:1.6.

9:13.38

The reading πολλω before μαλλον (0222^{vid} 255 330) matches several other Pauline examples in form (Rom. 5:10, 15, 17; 1 Cor. 12:22; 2 Cor. 3:9, 11; Phil. 2:12⁷⁵). However, while nothing can account for its omission, its addition can be explained as an intensification of the question.

9:12.39 [cf. 7:13.46]

The shift from the demonstrative (ταυτη) to the personal (αυτη F G) is likely the result of careless copying. Significantly the loss creates *hiatus* as it follows εξουσια, indicating a less than careful concern for Greek style on the part of the shared ancestor of F G. A similar loss of initial consonant takes place at 3:17: φθερει αυτον (A D F G) for φθερει τουτον.

9:12.40

The placement of the indefinite pronoun τις when it is used adjectivally in attributive relationship to the noun it modifies is consistent in Paul. It is placed after the noun only in contexts where it makes little difference semantically (Rom. 15:26; Col. 2:23), and prior to the noun where the context requires the sense of “some” or “any” (1 Cor. 5:11; 1 Cor. 7:12; 1

⁷⁴K, which has the altered text at 9:13, is not extant for 2:7.

⁷⁵Without variation, apart from the insertion of ουν at Rom. 5:15 by A.

Cor. 11:18; Gal. 6:1; Phil. 2:1; Phil. 4:8; 1 Thes. 4:2). Only four examples show variation, either by addition/omission or word order:

Rom. 1:13	ινα τινα καρπον σχω ινα καρπον τινα σχω ινα καρπον σχω	<i>rel</i> (G εχω; F <i>lac</i>) 131 (εχω) 999 L
Rom. 8:39	τις κτισις κτισις	<i>rel</i> Ϟ ⁴⁶ D F G <i>pc</i>
1 Cor. 9:13	[εγ]κοπην τινα τινα [εγ]κοπην	D F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 88 915 Or ⁷⁶ Ⲙ A B C 0222 ^{vid 77} 33 81 104 181 255 263 326 467 547 917 1311 1739
1 Cor. 16:7	[εγ]κοπην χρονον τινα τινα χρονον	Cl Or VL 77 78 <i>rel</i> 0142

At Rom. 8:39, the shorter reading in Ϟ⁴⁶ D F G has much to commend it, and should therefore not be cited as an example of Pauline usage. Both the omission of the pronoun and its shift in Rom. 1:13 are likely examples of parablepsis, with *τινα* following *ινα* skipped over, but in a few manuscripts replaced after the noun when the mistake had been noticed. The singular reading of 0142 can be dismissed as a mistake of the scribe of this manuscript; its close relative 056, with which it shares a close common ancestor, reads the standard word order. This leaves only 1 Cor. 9:13 as a problematic text. The omission of *τινα* in Clement (*Stromata* 4,15, 97,4) may be due to the use of the citation,⁷⁸ while VL 77 78 have an extremely confused text at this point due to the corresponding Greek text. G shows improper word division, with some of the Latin compressed to fit the available space above the Greek:

nonoffendimusoffendiculū demus
μη εν κοπηντιν_αδωμεν

⁷⁶Origen only alludes the passage in *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios* 40; his text at this point is not certain.

⁷⁷0222 reads: | ινα μη [τινα] | ενκο[πην] | δωμε[ν τω]

⁷⁸Mees, p. 139.

F, by the use of medial points, shows the proper word division, but the attempt to formulate the possible Latin translations in the shared exemplar of F G must have led to the loss of *quod*; it cannot be traced to an early form of the text.

Therefore, only the word order variation must be explained. Pauline usage would favor reading the adjectival pronoun before the noun (“that we not cause any hindrance”⁷⁹). The shift of the position cannot be accounted for on simple transcriptional grounds, but may have been influenced by the noun-pronoun word order earlier in the verse (τη εξουσια ταυτη).

9:13.43

While the article may have been lost simply “aus Nachlässigkeit oder zur Erleichterung,”⁸⁰ there is likely intentionality in either the omission or addition. At issue is whether one eats, reading the article (⌘ B D* F G 6 1739 *pc*) “the sacrifices of the temple”⁸¹ or, not reading the article, “on the basis of temple service.”⁸² Zuntz argues that Paul is not here referring to eating of the temple sacrifices, as is done in other contexts such as Mark 2:26, but to the earning one’s living as a result of the service at the Jerusalem temple. Most commentators, however, do not see a reference to the Jerusalem temple but to typical Jewish and Greco-Roman cultic practices.⁸³ It is clear from the context that the addressees of 1 Corinthians are familiar with such practices, whereas the Jerusalem temple and its sacrificial

⁷⁹While discussing the omission of *τινα* in Clement, Mees (p. 139) notes that the pronoun is “dem Sinn entsprechende.”

⁸⁰B. Weiss, p. 75.

⁸¹Lietzmann, p. 42; Conzelmann, p. 156 n. 2; Fee, p. 398 n. 8; Thiselton, pp. 691-2; Schrage II, 307-8.

⁸²Zuntz, p. 51;

⁸³Thiselton, p. 692; Schrage II, p. 307-8; Conzelmann, p. 157.

system receives little, if any, mention in this letter.⁸⁴ An early reader of the letter may have been uncomfortable with having the eating of idol sacrifices, which 1 Cor. 8-10 discourages, as a point of comparison (οὕτως καὶ) for the provision of those who preach the Gospel and removing the τα. The fact that the text without the article is in perfect parallel with 9:14 (ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) provides an additional motivation to a scribe/reader for its excision.

9:13.44

The variation between παρεδρεοντες (P⁴⁶ N^{*} A B C D P 0150 33 81 1175 1739 2464) and προσεδρευοντες (N² K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 88 424 915) is another example of the interchange of the prefixes of compound verbs. The near context of 1 Cor. 9 does not provide an example of either preposition to which the form may have been assimilated. Rather, the alteration may be the result a shift in the use of the words. Παραδρεύω is typically glossed as “wait, attend upon.”⁸⁵ In ecclesiastical contexts it is used in the sense of to “gaze at” or to “sit beside” as at a vigil.⁸⁶ This usage overlaps with προσεδρεύω, though the latter term is that used in descriptions of the service of Levitical priesthood,⁸⁷ priests “at the altar,”⁸⁸ and of liturgical service.⁸⁹ Apart from direct citations of 1 Cor. 9:13, παραδρεύω

⁸⁴The only potential reference is to “Israel according to the flesh” and the eating of sacrifices, but this likely refers back to the Golden Calf incident referenced in 9:7. See Thiselton, p. 771.

⁸⁵Liddell and Scott, s.v. παραδρεύω; it is also used in grammatical contexts as “to be preceded” according to Sophocles, s.v. παραδρεύω.

⁸⁶Lampe, s.v. παραδρεύω.

⁸⁷E.g., *Constitutiones Apostolorum* 2,25 (twice); Cyril of Alexandria, *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* MPG 68, p. 721.

⁸⁸E.g., Origen, *Exhortatio ad martyrium* 30.

⁸⁹E.g., Chrysostom, *In Mattheum*, Homilia 67,3.

is rarely used in the same contexts.⁹⁰ While interchange of the prefixes of compound verbs is frequent in the manuscripts, this alteration is likely the result of the ascendancy of the use of προσεδρεύω in religious contexts.

9:15.46

Shift in verb tense is a common variation, usually the result of the influence of the near context. This is likely the case also here, with the aorist ἐχρησαμεθα occurring earlier at 9:12 and ουδενι ἐχρησαμην τουτων (K L 056 0142 0151 6 88 915 1241) parallel to ουκ εγραψα δε ταυτα in the following clause. These same manuscripts also shift ουδεις to the position before the verb, with the subsequent loss of ου. This is likely accidental. Parablepsis produced a skip from ου to ουδεις, with the verb then supplied but the ου now superfluous. Elsewhere in Paul the partitive genitive is never separated from its head substantive by a verb.⁹¹

9:15.47

6 alone reads the future indicative γενησεται for the aorist subjunctive γενηται. The use of the future indicative following ἵνα is extremely rare in the *Corpus Paulinum*; only 1 Cor. 9:18 shows it without variation.⁹²

⁹⁰Using the same criteria, only Gregory of Nyssa, *De vita Mosis*, 2,194 and Gregory of Nazianzenus, *Orationes* 26 (MPG 35, p. 1236) has been located, none in discussions of the Levitical priesthood.

⁹¹Compare its use with εἷς (Rom. 12:5); οὐδείς (Rom. 14:7; 1 Cor. 1:14); τις (1 Cor. 10:7, 8, 9, 10; 1 Thes. 2:9); and ἕκαστος (Rom. 14:12; 15:2; 1 Cor. 1:12; 12:18; 16:2; Eph. 4:7; 1 Thes. 2:11; 4:4; 2 Thess. 1:3; 3:8).

⁹²See BDR § 369(2⁵), e.g., Gal. 2:4, where vowel interchange makes the choice between καταδουλοσιν, καταδωλοσιν, καταδουλωσενται, or καταδουλωσωνται difficult, and 1 Cor. 13:3. θήσω at Gal. 2:19 could be either indicative or subjunctive. Eph. 6:3 uses the future to indicate subsequent following a previous subjunctive, for which see BDR § 369(3).

9:15.49; 9:19.68

The loss of *γαρ*, without obvious motivation, takes places frequently in later manuscripts:

1:11.33	206*
1:18.55	P 049 216* 326 328 1175 1836
3:2.8	81 915
3:4.20	941
9:15.49	1241
9:19.68	206 1912

9:15.50; 9:15.51 [also discussed in chapter on D F G]

The text of 9:15 is difficult both syntactically and textually. The Byzantine text shows the least amount of difficulty: *καλον γαρ μοι μαλλον αποθανειν η το καυχημα μου ινα τις κενωση* (K Ψ 056 *etc.*). In this form of the passage the first clause is compared to the second by *μαλλον . . . η*, with *ινα . . . κενωση* parallel to *αποθανειν*.⁹³ This form, however, because it is the least difficult, cannot account for the other readings. It must therefore be a secondary form.

The most difficult form of the text is found in *ℵ* B D* 33 1739*: *καλον γαρ μοι μαλλον αποθανειν η το καυχημα μου ουδεις κενωσει*. In this form of the text, the syntax is disrupted after *η* so that no comparative to the previous clause is supplied. A new clause then begins with *το καυχημα*. This disruption is called “anacoluthon” or “aposiopesis,”⁹⁴ and is generally attributed to “strong emotion.”⁹⁵ While other examples of

⁹³BDR §369⁵.

⁹⁴The former by BDR § 369⁵; the latter by B. Weiss, p. 21; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 492.

⁹⁵Roger L. Omanson, “Some Comments About Style and Meaning: 1 Corinthians 9:15 and 7:10,” *The Bible Translator* 34 (1983): 135-39.

anacolutha do occur in Paul,⁹⁶ this would be the only example where a comparison is not completed.

While the vocables of this form of the text seem to require breaking off the sentence after *μαλλον η*, in fact the witnesses that provide indications that they understand the passage in a different way. Some break the text between *μαλλον* and *η*: 1739 places a medial dot there and 33 places a small dot on the baseline.⁹⁷ D, on the other hand, does not signal a break but conjoins the two clauses:

ΚΑΛΟΝ ΓΑΡ ΜΟΙ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ	<i>bonum enim mihi est magis</i>
ΑΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΝ ΗΤΟ ΚΑΥΧΗΜΑ ΜΟΥ	<i>mori quam gloriam meam</i>
ΟΥΔΙ ΚΕΝΩΣΕΙ	<i>nemo exinaniet</i>

The relationship between D and both F G and N B will be discussed below; at this point it is necessary only to point out that even the witnesses which syntactically appear to require anacoluthon do not understand it this way. Perhaps, in these witnesses, the classical usage of *ἦ* = “truly” is being understood,⁹⁸ a usage, however, which is not found elsewhere in the NT.⁹⁹ In any event, punctuation or lineation was used in these witnesses to soften the anacoluthon.

Some manuscripts resorted to alteration of the wording to ameliorate the text. P⁴⁶ shows its difficulty with the passage by altering the word order, producing a nonsense reading: *καλον γαρ μοι αποθανειν η μαλλον η το καυχημα μου ουδεις κενωσει*. The presence of one or the other of the examples of *η* could construe, but not both. The alteration

⁹⁶See BDR § 466-70; Turner, *Style*, p. 86.

⁹⁷33 uses both a medial dot to indicate larger breaks and a smaller dot on the baseline to indicate subordinate clauses, e.g., before *εαν* at 9:16 and *μισθον* at 9:17.

⁹⁸Denniston, pp. 280-81.

⁹⁹BDR §441⁵; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 492.

may simply be another example in this manuscript of an accidental shift in word order that was not prompted by a similar endings of the words involved,¹⁰⁰ or an intentional shift in order to resolve the breaking off of the sentence after αποθανειν by placing the infinitive prior to the μαλλον η, so that the first clause is compared to the second. Other manuscripts, apparently independently, attempt a similar resolution: 205 209^c 1837 read αποθανειν η μαλλον without the repetition of η.¹⁰¹ The copyist of P⁴⁶, after making the word order shift, continued with the η that stood following αποθανειν in the exemplar, but when μαλλον was reintroduced also wrote the η which preceded το καυχημα. In the Latin tradition, Ambrosiaster¹⁰² and VL 89 loses the comparative altogether: *gloriam meam nemo evacuabit*.¹⁰³

A second way that the anacoluthon was softened was to alter the second clause rather than the comparative adverb and particle, thereby producing a comparison between 9:15c and 9:15d. This takes place in three ways. First A 1175 add μη before κενωσει, which either produces an interrogative¹⁰⁴ or, more likely strengthens the negative assertion.¹⁰⁵ Second, F G

¹⁰⁰Royse, p. 261.

¹⁰¹The omission of μαλλον in 33 may be the result of parablepsis, made more likely by the fact that the particle η was still present to make the comparison.

¹⁰²Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas*, ad 1 Cor. 9:15. The lemma is not interrupted by comment here, so the lack of the particle is a firm reading.

¹⁰³VL 89, in what is a common error, reads the perfect *evacuavit* for the future *evacuabit*. Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 14) apparently supports the B reading at 9:15d, but as he cites only a portion of the passage it cannot be determined whether or not he read the particle: . . . *et gloriam meam nemo inaniet*.

¹⁰⁴B. Weiss, p. 21.

¹⁰⁵Conzelmann, p. 156 n. 6. Compare also ινα τις μη κενωση 181 and ινα τις ου μη κενωση 917 1836 1875.

read η το καυχημα μου τις κενωσει. In the lineation preserved by F,¹⁰⁶ καλον extends into the margin and η is enlarged, thereby indicating the beginning of a new line and unit of thought. Third, K Ψ 056 0142 5 6 88 915 1241 read $\iota\nu\alpha$ + subjunctive instead of the future κενωσει: η το καυχημα μου $\iota\nu\alpha$ τις κενωση. This brings the verb in 9:15d into parallel with the infinitive in 9:15d,¹⁰⁷ which might appear to be dependant on the reading found in F G,¹⁰⁸ but this is argued against in the chapter on D F G, where influence from the Vulgate on F G is shown to be more likely.

9:16.52

\mathfrak{P}^{46} alone lacks $\gamma\alpha\rho$. According to Güting and Mealand, “We have evidence of some presumably very early loss of particles and the creation of secondary asyndeta in the tradition common to \mathfrak{P}^{46} and D.” However, they also note that \mathfrak{P}^{46} is among a handful of manuscripts “that are unlikely to lose it [i.e., $\gamma\alpha\rho$].”¹⁰⁹ The authors do not provide a discussion to support their conclusion, but in a list indicate that \mathfrak{P}^{46} alone preserves the original reading for this passage.¹¹⁰ Yet \mathfrak{P}^{46} alone lacks the preposition in four other passages (Gal. 3:28; Heb. 10:26; 12:10; 13:11).¹¹¹ Furthermore, in this context the $\gamma\alpha\rho$ indicates that “Paul now intends to

¹⁰⁶G enlarges the initial letter in καλον but no other letter until εαν, so its lineation cannot be determined.

¹⁰⁷BDR §369⁵.

¹⁰⁸B. Weiss (p. 21) implies that the reading of F G is dependant on that of K Ψ : “FG sogar das $\iota\nu\alpha$ nicht mit aufnehmen.”

¹⁰⁹Güting and Mealand, pp. 102, 104.

¹¹⁰Güting and Mealand, pp. 137-38.

¹¹¹Royse, p. 258.

explain the final clause in v. 15.”¹¹² Its loss in \mathfrak{P}^{46} may be attributed to its corrupted text of 9:15, where the beginning of the final clause is not clear due to its earlier error.

9:16.54; 9:16.59

The variation among $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ at 9:16 should be attributed confusion due to phonetic similarity. This is certainly the case in the bilinguals, since the read $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ twice but the D-text reading is the present *evangelizem*. In other examples of parallel conditional clauses in Paul, both clauses use either the present (Rom. 2:25; 12:20; Rom. 14:8; 1 Cor. 13:2¹¹³ or the aorist tense (Rom. 7:3; 1 Cor. 7:28; 8:8; 13:3; 14:6). Zuntz argues that in this case the present tense should be read for the first example but the aorist for the second (found only in B C Vulgate) since in 9:16a Paul refers to habitual action but in 9:16b to a one time (potential) action.¹¹⁴ However, this time-based understanding of the tense system is no longer viable, particularly in the case of conditional sentences.¹¹⁵ Instead, the present tense is more likely given the $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ in 9:17.

9:16.55

The unusual cluster of witnesses reading $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$ ($\aleph^* D F G Amst$) means that it cannot be dismissed as “Western.” Were it adopted here, there would be difficulty in determining precisely its meaning. It is used frequently to denote “thanks,” though since in Paul only God receives it (Rom. 6:17; 7:25; 1 Cor. 15:57; 2 Cor. 2:14; 8:16; 9:15) it is not likely to be the

¹¹²Fee, p. 418.

¹¹³The perfect $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ does not alter the pattern since present tense forms do not exist for this verb.

¹¹⁴Zuntz, p. 110; also Fee p. 414 n. 3.

¹¹⁵See S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Studies in Biblical Greek 1 (New York: Lang, 1989), pp. 294-304.

usage here. More likely should it be understood to denote “a favor” or “reward”¹¹⁶ which is found in Luke (1:30; 2:42) and Acts (7:46) but not elsewhere in Paul. However, the context seems to require this meaning. In 9:16 Paul argues that the reason he does not receive a “reward” for his activity is that he is under compulsion to preach. 9:17 further clarifies (γάρ) this thought, that his preaching is not his choice, for if it were he would receive a wage (μισθός). But he does not receive this since his preaching activity results from a stewardship (οἰκονομία) which has been entrusted to him (9:17b). Therefore, μισθός in 9:17 parallels whichever noun is adopted in 9:16. Because this καυχημα would originate with Paul, it cannot stand in parallel to μισθός whereas χάρις, as something he receives, matches the flow of the argument.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, in Phil. 2:16 Paul writes that he will have a καύχημα as the result of his preaching the Gospel, whereas adopting that reading at 9:16 would claim that he does not. The alteration from χάρις to καυχημα is not difficult to explain: An early scribe/reader may have misunderstood χάρις to mean “divine gift” and found difficulty with Paul writing that he does not have such a gift. The καυχημα of 9:15 provided a ready replacement. No plausible explanation has been advanced for the alteration from καυχημα to χάρις.¹¹⁸

9:16.57

¹¹⁶The suggestion of BDAG, s.v. χάρις 2b.

¹¹⁷Compare Fee, p. 415: “. . . he is under divine compulsion to proclaim the good news (v. 16). But with that he adds a new wrinkle: Since he is under ‘compulsion,’ he cannot receive ‘pay,’ for ‘pay’ implies voluntary labor. His labor has been ‘involuntary’ in the sense of v. 16, that divine destiny has prescribed his task—he is a ‘slave’ entrusted with a charge.” Where Fee sees a “new wrinkle” in 9:17, the γάρ would suggest instead a clarification of the preceding statement.

¹¹⁸Fee (p. 414 n. 2) claims that καυχημα is “undoubtedly original,” though without explanation. Lietzmann (p. 180) explains that καυχημα would not contradict the argument at 1 Cor. 1:29 and 4:7, but does not account for the reading χάρις.

A string of five sentences, each introduced by γάρ, begins in v. 16. The function of γάρ is not entirely clear in each case, however, and the argumentation of 9:16-18 is not linear.¹¹⁹ In order to clarify the argument somewhat, δε has been substituted in 9:16d (N² K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 88 876 1175 1241 *etc*). This creates a contrast between the statements ἐὰν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα and οὐαὶ μοί ἐστιν ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, whereas the latter clause is better understood as a further explanation of the preceding ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται.¹²⁰

9:16.58; 9:18.62

At 9:16, the future εσται (F G) in place of the present has two potential sources. It may have been adapted to εσται (D F G alone) at 9:18, or conformed to the local Latin text used by the shared exemplar of these manuscripts. VL 77^{alt} (*mihi est vel erit*) 78 Amst(A) read *erit*; Amst the same in a different position (*erit mihi*). The original D-text reading (*est mihi*) is preserved in VL 75 77 (*mihi est vel erit*) 89. Aside from 77 78 Amst(A) the entire Latin tradition shares this reading, with only the second of Augustine's citations of the passage in *De sermone Domini in monte* 2,54 and *Epistulae* 1 of Agatho¹²¹ showing the future. These two exceptions likely demonstrate the suitability of the future in this context and is not evidence of a shared tradition with VL 77 78 Amst(A). Perhaps the future in VL 77 78 may have been added to a text that lacked any verb form, as is now attested by VL 61 and Sedulius Scottus. In any case, it is possible that both assimilation to 9:18 and influence from the Latin led to the alteration.

¹¹⁹Fee, p. 415.

¹²⁰Fee, p. 418.

¹²¹Agatho, *Epistulae* 1 (MPL 87, p. 1169).

At 9:18 only D F G and their Latin counterparts read the future. They are also the only witnesses which read the pronoun after the verb, though variation exists as to the case of the pronoun (see below). However, the future tense may have been influenced by *θησω* in the next clause. That these witnesses have a secondary reading in tense suggests that their word order here is also secondary.

9:17.61

The addition of the negative particle (69 216* 440 1505) brings the apodosis into logical agreement with the protasis, for a *μισθός* should not be expected for something done willingly or freely (*ἐκῶν*). This local adaptation, however, disrupts the flow of argument, for 9:18a assumes that Paul has received a *μισθός*.

9:18.62

Both *μου* (ℵ* A C K 1 5 6 33 1739 2464 *etc*) and *μοι* (℘⁴⁶ ℵ² B^c L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 876 1611 *etc*) may have been influenced by the near context, with *μου* matching *τη εξουσιᾳ μου* in the next clause and *μοι* matching *μοι εστιν* at 9:16c.¹²² A handful of witnesses (B*¹²³ 254 and approximately thirteen others) do not read any pronoun. This

¹²²The D F G reading (*εσται μοι*) is discussed above.

¹²³NTaP cites B as reading *ουν μου εστιν*, Tischendorf, von Soden, and Swanson as *ουν μοι εστιν* (none of whom note a correction or difficulty here), and NA²⁷ only notes B as “*incert.*” In the manuscript itself an abbreviation follows *ουν*: mu is written in semi-minuscle style with the legs extending out on the baseline. A small omicron is written above the mu, and a single line extends downward from the lower loop of mu. This is, as far as I can determine, a unique abbreviation in B. Examples of similar abbreviations at the end of a line in the manuscript show a small omicron written to the right of the preceding letter as opposed to above it (as in Heb. 1:3 *καθαρισμον*). Since no original ink is visible beyond this abbreviation, the line would not be abnormally short without the abbreviation, and the addition brings the text into line with the “Byzantine” text used by later correctors, the original hand is likely to have read *τις ουν εστιν*. In any case, citing the manuscript as reading *μου* is extremely doubtful, given the typical agreement of B with ℵ 6 33 1739, all of which read *μοι*.

reading is initially attractive as the source reading which would explain the μου/μοι variation as independent additions. It would not in itself, however, account for the verb tense and order variation in D F G. In addition, none of the witnesses that share the shorter reading show regular patterns of agreement. Since B alone or with a handful of other witnesses frequently omits the possessive pronoun (see 7:5.19), this reading is likely an accidental omission which does not materially alter the sense of the passage. Outside of the gospels, where the genitive is always used with μισθός (Matt. 5:12; 6:2 10:41, 42; Mark 9:41; Luke 6:23, 35; 10:7 [LXX citation, also 1 Tim. 5:18]), all of the examples use the indirect object when a μισθός is or will be given to someone (Rom. 4:4, Rev. 11:18) and the genitive when it is already possessed (Jam. 5:4; Rev. 22:12). The D F G reading (εσται μοι), limited to these witnesses and their Latin counterparts (see above), assumes this future reward but is likely based on the future tense of θησω in the next clause. The visual and semantic similarity between μου and μοι makes determining the archetypal reading difficult. Given the pattern of assimilation to the near context so prevalent in the tradition, it is likely that μοι is the result of influence from the two examples in 9:16.

9:18.63

While ευαγγελιον του χριστου (F G K L P 056 0151 6 88 424 876 915) appears to have been adapted from 9:12¹²⁴ (τω ευαγγελιω του χριστου), its omission cannot be explained. Its presence in F G cannot be attributed to influence from the “Byzantine” text, since although the D-text lacks *christi* (VL 75 89 Amst), it is found in *Speculum* 31, Hesychius, and Jerome (*Adversus Iovinianum* 2,22). Furthermore, its presence in the Syriac points to an early origin for the reading. The reading of 0142 (θησω το ευαγγελιον θησω

¹²⁴Fee, p. 414 n. 4.

του χριστου) is an obviously impossible corruption of the reading of its sister manuscript 056.

9:18.64 [discussed in the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

9:18.65

In the NT, the verb *χρᾶμαι* takes a dative object (Acts 27:3, 17; 1 Cor. 9:12, 15; 2 Cor. 1:17; 3:12; 1 Tim. 1:8; 5:23). *καταχρᾶμαι* occurs only at 1 Cor. 7:31 and 9:18. In the former passage both verbs occur: *καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι [τὸν κόσμον / τῷ κόσμῳ] ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι*, with the object expressed both in the accusative ($\mathfrak{P}^{15} \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* \text{A B } \delta \text{ D}^* \text{ F G } 33 \text{ 81 } 1739^*$)¹²⁵ and the dative ($\aleph^2 \text{ D}^1 \text{ K L P } \Psi \text{ rel}$). The accusative form is the “more difficult”¹²⁶ with *χρᾶμαι*, and likely the archetypal reading here, since the dative is more likely to have been conformed to the usage with *χρᾶμαι* because it occurs first in the sentence. Yet because *καταχρώμενοι* uses the same word as the object the use of the accusative case is legitimate—though by no means required—since *καταχράομαι* used in the sense of “misuse” or “abuse” may take a dative object.¹²⁷

At 9:18 the cause of corruption is likely an attempt to clarify the grammar. The dative case may have been perceived as difficult for several reasons. First, it does not match the case expected with the compound verb (*κατα-*). Second, the subject of the infinitive should be expressed in the accusative, but here the dative had been used because of the verb stem.

¹²⁵The addition of the demonstrative in D F G is discussed in the D F G paper.

¹²⁶Schrage II, p. 175 n. 698,

¹²⁷See Liddell and Scott, s.v. *καταχράομαι* (II.3). Similarly the Latin equivalents *utor* and *abutor* may take either the ablative or the accusative (see Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary* under the respective entries). For this reason, and because D F G read the accusative while VL 75 77 78 read the ablative at 9:18, influence from the Latin on the Greek text of the bilinguals in this passage must be ruled out.

And third, the parallel in 7:31 may have suggested itself. The fact that 6 shares the reading with D F G shows that the “improvement” may have suggested itself to more than one scribe.¹²⁸

Two minor variants exist: \aleph^* adds $\epsilon\nu$ before the article, perhaps in a random addition to strengthen the dative or, more likely, under the influence of the $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omega$ $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omega$ which follows. F reads $\mu\omicron\iota$ for $\mu\omicron\upsilon$, one of a number of simple blunders unique to this manuscript.

9:19.67

Two minor additions to $\tau\omega$ $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omega$ are present in the tradition. D^* (but not VL 75) 1845 add $\mu\omicron\upsilon$, likely influenced by the preceding $\tau\eta$ $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$. In the *Hauptbriefe*, $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ is modified by the first person pronoun only at Rom. 2:16.¹²⁹ The second addition is $\tau\omega\nu$ $\phi\omega\tau\omega\nu$ found in 1241. In the NT this noun never modifies $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$. Its addition here is neither random nor theologically motivated, but caused by the lectionary markings in the manuscripts. $\tau\omega\nu$ $\phi\omega\tau\omega\nu$ is the title of the lection which follows immediately after 9:19. Having mistaken the lection title for a correction (whether this stood in the margin or in the text itself, as it does in 1241), a previous scribe inserted it into the text.

9:19.68 [discussed at 9:15.49]

9:19.69 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

9:20.73

¹²⁸von Soden also cites 999 with this reading, though Swanson cites it with the mass of manuscripts.

¹²⁹Also Rom. 16:25-27 (likely secondary) and 2 Tim. 2:8.

At 9:20-22 three consecutive sentences are governed by ἐγένετο (9:20), with the penultimate sentence repeating the same verb (9:22) and a final summarizing sentence using the perfect form (γέγονα 9:23). All of these sentences are asyndetic apart from the first. A few witnesses lack this καί (D* 69 326 1149 VL 89 sa). Güting and Mealand suggest that this may be the original reading since it would create five consecutive asyndetic sentences. However, the omission is more likely. The καί is used consecutively to introduce a result from what precedes, akin to examples in 2 Cor. 11:9 and 33b.¹³⁰ Had the archetypal text lacked καί, there would appear to be little reason for its addition here.

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

Two causes of corruption are possible. Either ὡς was added by assimilation to the parallel examples in 9:20b and 9:21a,¹³¹ or omitted at 9:20b due to discomfort over Paul styling himself as one who was only “like a Jew.”¹³² The use of this passage by early writers helps clarify what a scribe may have been likely to do. For example, Tertullian’s citations of the passage leave some ambiguity. The allusion in *De praescriptione haereticorum* 24,¹³³ because it paraphrases 9:20b in such a way as to leave uncertainty as to whether or not ὡς was read there (as it is in all extant witnesses), cannot be used to determine his text.

¹³⁰See further BDAG s.v. καί (1bζ) and BDR §442 (2).

¹³¹Fee, p. 422 n. 5: “In this instance Paul did not use ὡς, although it was added by some early scribes and became the MajT reading.”

¹³²This solution is proposed by Fee, p. 422 n. 2: “A few scribes . . ., apparently feeling the dissonance of a Jew saying that he became *like* a Jew, omitted the ὡς” Apparently, Fee sees the omission as taking place independently, but, as we have seen elsewhere, the texts of F G and 6 424^c 1739 often share unique readings.

¹³³“Paul himself said that he became all things to all people, to the Jews and Jew, to the non-Jews a non-Jew, so that he might win all.”

Furthermore, both in *Adversus Marcionem* 5,3,5 he cites both 9:19 and again 9:20 without the equivalent of ὡς:

Therefore he temporarily conceded [in Galatia] as was necessary, and for this reason he had Timothy circumcised and having after shaved them brought some into the temple, which are described in Acts. This is so appropriate that it agrees with the profession by the apostle, that to the Jews he made himself a Jew (*factum se iudaeis iudaeum*) so that he might win the Jews, and he conducted himself under the law (*sub lege agentem*) because of those who conducted themselves under the law, as also because of those “secretly came in” [Gal 2:4], and finally “he became all things to all men, that he might gain all.”

Tertullian does not see any difficulty in Paul describing himself as “making himself” a Jew.

A similar lack of concern over the phrase is shown by Clement of Alexandria, who uses

Ἑβραῖος to speak of the ethnic identity and Ἰουδαῖος to describe the practices:

The noble apostle circumcised Timothy, although shouting out and writing that a circumcision done by hands is of no benefit. But so that he not, by tearing them away suddenly from the law to the circumcision of the heart by faith, compel those among the Hebrews (τῶν Ἑβραίων) who were listening – though still refusing to follow completely – to break the community, by accomodating himself “he became to the Jews a Jew (Ἰουδαίοις Ἰουδαῖος ἐγένετο), so that he might gain all.”¹³⁴

Clement uses Ἑβραῖος this way also in *Stromata* 1,2,21,3, where it replaces Ἰουδαῖοι in an otherwise verbatim citation of 1 Cor. 1:22. This is only one of dozens of examples of this use of vocabulary in his writings, and this is not a usage unique to him.¹³⁵ Furthermore, the Pauline writings themselves show this usage; both 2 Cor. 11:22 and Phil. 3:5 use Ἑβραῖος of ethnic identity, and the treatise appended to the *Corpus Paulinum* was given the title ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΣ. Even in Gal. 2:15 Ἰουδαῖοι is modified with φύσει, indicating that, for Paul, Ἰουδαῖος when unmodified, do not necessarily entail ethnicity.

¹³⁴*Stromata* 7,9,53,3.

¹³⁵Cf. Lampe, s.v. Ἑβραῖος (A).

The assumption that Paul's identity was non-Jewish is so pervasive in the early church that even Chrysostom can describe Paul's reverting to the practices of Judaism as being unnatural to the apostle:

“And I became,” he says, “to the Jews like a Jew, in order that I might win the Jews.” And how did this happen? When he was circumcised so that he might purify circumcision. For this reason he did not say, “a Jew,” but “like a Jew” – this was prudent. What do you say? The universal herald, who touch the heavens themselves and shined so brightly in grace, did he so quickly descend so far? No, for this is to ascend. For you are not to look to this – that he only descended; rather that he also raised up the one who was bent down and led him up to himself . . . For in order to turn those who truly were [Jews] against these things, he became [a Jew] himself not in reality, only appearing to be, but not really being nor doing these things because he had a mind so inclined.”¹³⁶

Chrysostom's exegesis shows precisely why ὡς may have been intentionally added: Paul could not have stooped so low (in Chrysostom's thinking) so as to take up these practices again. The ὡς protects Paul from being too closely identified with Jewish practices, which he of course explicitly denounced elsewhere in his writings. Thus Chrysostom provides an example of the thinking which may have led to the addition of ὡς.

In addition to lexical and patristic evidence, the context of 1 Cor. 9:19-23 supports understanding Ἰουδαῖος as referring to certain practices, not ethnicity. The parallel statements are all governed by the ἐγένομην of 9:20 and refer to not to states of being but to his actions: Paul became one who acted as if he were alternatively under the Law or Law-less or who did weak things. The verb ποίω in 9:23 makes it even more obvious that he is discussing what a person is to “do.” The longhand sentence therefore implied by ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος is “to those who do Jewish things I became one who did Jewish things.” The lack of the qualifying clauses μὴ ὢν Ἰουδαῖος and μὴ ὢν ἀσθενής at 9:22, for which there are parallels at 9:20b and 9:21a, can be explained by the fact that Paul

¹³⁶Chrysostom, *In epistulam I ad Corinthios*, MPG 61, p. 184.

was in fact, at least to some degree, both Ἰουδαῖος and ἀσθενής.¹³⁷ The former by virtue of his birth, the latter because of his “conscience” and refusal to exercise his “rights” as seen in the overall argument in 1 Cor. 8-10.

This line of argumentation is found already in Origen. Origen’s text is relatively firm due to the number of citations, the precision of the citations, and the comments made on the text. Only in *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 10,7 does ὡς appear (without variation in the manuscripts of this writing), but it does not appear in the comments on the passage which follow immediately:

When he is shaved and presents an offering or circumcises Timothy, he is a Jew; but when he says to the Athenians, “I find on altar on which it is written, ‘To an unknown god,’ which you worship because you are ignorant, this one I proclaim to you;” and “as also some of your own poets have said, ‘For we are also his offspring;”” to the one without law he became like one without law, testifying godliness to the most ungodly. . . Even Paul himself “became to the Jews a Jew (τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Ἰουδαῖος), that he might win the Jews.” So also in the Acts of the Apostles it is written that he even presents an offering on the altar, so that he might persuade the Jews that he was not apostate from the law.¹³⁸

The lack is even more certain in the margin of 1739, which preserves material purported to be from Origen’s now lost *Stromata*:

In the fourth book of the *Stromata* concerning the present passage it says this about the text: It must be noted that to the Jews and to the weak he became a Jew and weak. But to those under the law he did not become one “under the law” but “like one under the law” and to the lawless he did not become [lawless] but “like a lawless one.” But for this reason to the Jews he became a Jew and not like a Jew (Ἰουδαίοις Ἰουδαῖος γίνεται καὶ οὐχ ὡς Ἰουδαῖος), otherwise it would say at this place “and I became to the Jews a Jew not being myself a Jew.” But also about the weak it does not say: “Not being myself weak.” For the one was a denial of his Jewishness in

¹³⁷With reference to the lack of the qualifying clauses in 9:20b-21: “The rhetorical parallelism . . . is nevertheless different in structure. He *is* a Jew. To the Gentiles he must *become* a Gentile. The problem is not how he can live in a Jewish fashion, but how he can live in a Gentile fashion.” Conzelmann, pp. 160-61 (emphasis original).

¹³⁸Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*, 10,7.

secret, but the other a deception and not accepting the participation by all in the weakness of humans.¹³⁹

The finding of significance in the lack of a qualifying $\mu\eta\ \omega\upsilon\nu'$ $\text{Iou}\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is remarkably similar (aside from Origen's last sentence) to comments recently made by Schrage.¹⁴⁰ Schrage, however, assumes the $\omega\varsigma$ while Origen omits it. It is therefore doubtful that the presence or absence of $\omega\varsigma$ would have made a significant difference in meaning. In fact, both Origen (who lacks $\omega\varsigma$) and Ambrosiaster (who reads it)¹⁴¹ use the identical examples from Paul's life to explain the passage and come to similar conclusions.

Arguments may therefore be made either for the addition of $\omega\varsigma$ or its omission, although with little or no early evidence of the thinking which would have led to the latter. Far more likely than an intentional alteration to "protect" Paul, the $\omega\varsigma$ was likely added both at 9:20a and 9:22 by assimilation to the examples in 9:20b and 9:21. Were $\omega\varsigma$ lacking in both places, the resultant text would show the symmetry so characteristic of Paul: the first and the final examples he provides lack both the comparative adverb ($\omega\varsigma$) as well as the qualifying clause ($\mu\eta\ \omega\upsilon\nu\ \dots$).

The manuscripts preserving the lack of $\omega\varsigma$ in 9:20a are F G* 6* 326 424^c 1739 and, as we saw above, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, and in addition Jerome and Sedulius Scottus. The fact that different witnesses preserve the shorter text at 9:22 (\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* A B 1739 VL: 75 89 F Ambrosiaster Cyprian Ambrose), and that in both cases so few avoid the addition, shows that the tendency to assimilation was very strong, and once added to the text would not have been likely to prompt enough concern to lead to its intentional deletion, as discussed above.

¹³⁹1739, f. 59v.

¹⁴⁰Schrage II, 340.

¹⁴¹Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas*, ad 9:20.

The witness among the Pauline bilinguals is divided at 9:20. F G* omit the adverb, but only VL 77* does so as well. VL 75 89 read *quasi* and VL 78 matches the Vulgate's *tamquam*, as is to be expected. A marginal note in G¹⁴² reads $\omega\varsigma$ with a supralinear *quasi*. This note is likely reproduced from a mutual ancestor of D F G, most of which are corrections to the type of text found in \aleph A (as discussed in the chapter on D F G).

9:19.71; 9:21.82; 9:22.87; 9:22.91 [reading of D discussed in chapter on D F G]

The alternative forms of the nasal stem verb $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\iota\nu\omega$ has caused confusion in the manuscripts. According to BDR,¹⁴³ Hellenistic Greek typically uses the termination $-\alpha\nu\alpha$ in the aorist, while noting also that the Attic termination $-\eta\sigma\alpha$ is also found in the NT. Other grammars do not see a preponderance of one form over the other.¹⁴⁴ In addition, both Attic and Hellenistic Greek use $-\alpha\nu\omega$ and $-\eta\sigma\omega$ as future forms. Modern editors distinguish the future form from the subjunctive by means of accents.¹⁴⁵

In the Pauline epistles the verb occurs only four times in 1 Cor. 9 and at Phil. 3:8. The latter passages shows no variation in the manuscripts, though Cyril shifts from $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\eta\sigma\omega$ to $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\nu\omega$ in two citations.¹⁴⁶ In 1 Corinthians, neither example at 9:20 shows variation, at

¹⁴²The transcript of F by F. H. Scrivener, *Codex Augiensis* (London: Deighton Bell and Co., 1883) reads the same notation in that manuscript (and is followed in this by Wordsworth and White), but this must be the result of confusion with G, since nothing is visible here in F and no other editor finds such a note.

¹⁴³BDR §72(1).

¹⁴⁴Cf. Moulton & Howard, *Accidence*, p. 243; for classical Greek: Veitch, *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective*, pp. 364-5.

¹⁴⁵E.g., Westcott-Hort prints $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}$ at 1 Cor. 9:21, indicating a future indicative form; von Soden prints $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$, indicating an aorist subjunctive.

¹⁴⁶*Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate* (MPG 75, p. 468) and *Commentarii in Ioannem* 3,6 (on John 6:32-33).

9:22 the only witnesses reading σωσω are patristic writings, and at 9:19 σωσω is read by only a single witness (241). At 9:21, however, the manuscript tradition splits between κερδησω $\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^2 D K L \Psi 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 104 296 429 436 467 1912 2298$ etc and κερδανω $\aleph^* A B C F G P 33 69 181 296 630 917 1175 1739 1836 1875 1881 1898$. A decision based on Pauline usage would see κερδανω as the corruption, but it would be difficult to explain why it took place only here among the four examples that occur so closely together. On the other hand, assimilation to the near context would account quite easily for the shift from κερδανω to κερδησω, but it would be difficult to account for Paul's unique use of this form for the third of four parallel examples. The alternative would be to conjecture the use of κερδανω in one or more of the occurrences in this context with only the third example preserved in the tradition, but this would amount only to guesswork as to which form should be read for each of the four occurrences. Given the propensity toward assimilation, the reading κερδησω is most likely secondary, though the archetypal reading is not satisfactorily accounted for.

9:22.89 [discussed at 12:19.80]

9:22.90 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

9:23.92

The shift between παντα and τουτο (K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 88 326 424 614 *pm*) is, so far as I can determine, unique in the Pauline manuscripts. While παντα, it may be argued, could have resulted from assimilation to the preceding examples of πᾶς in 19-22, it must also be noted that the use of the singular demonstrative pronoun in this way is unusual.

When referring to previous items, the plural is always used, whether πάντα (1 Cor.

10:31;14:40), ταῦτα (1 Cor. 4:6, 14; 10:6,11), or πάντα δὲ ταῦτα (1 Cor. 12:11¹⁴⁷). On the other hand, the singular τοῦτο is used to refer to specific items, such as a statement (e.g., 1 Cor. 7:6, 26, 29, 35) or an action (e.g., 1 Cor. 4:17; 7:37; 9:17). In fact, examples of the juxtaposition use of plural forms and the singular form of οὗτος in the same context shows Paul's usual practice. In 1 Cor. 4:1-13 Paul contrasts his behavior with that of the Corinthians, then in 4:14 moves the argument along by using the plural for to summarize the previous material: οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς γράφω ταῦτα. But in 4:17, when explaining why he sent Timothy, he uses the singular: διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον. The referent of this pronoun is the fact that Paul is their "father."

The issue at 1 Cor. 9:23, then, is whether the referent should be Paul's becoming "all things to all people," necessitating the singular τοῦτο, or all of the actions described 9:19-22 (and likely more), requiring the plural πάντα. It could be argued that the meaning of the passage is not affected; 9:23b is a summary restatement of 9:19, and includes all the accomodating behaviors described in 9:20-22a. Therefore the τοῦτο, which grammatically refers only to 19:22b, in so doing refers to all of 9:19-2.¹⁴⁸ However, as Schrage notes, Paul is explaining that the Gospel itself drives his accomodating behavior, and indeed all of his behavior.¹⁴⁹ 9:23 may be viewed instead as summarizing of all of the actions described in 9:1-22, and introducing the conclusion of the unit in 9:24-27. The shift to τοῦτο "narrows

¹⁴⁷v.l. ταῦτα δε παντα (D F G 181) and παντα δε (547 pc).

¹⁴⁸Fee, p. 423 n. 7.

¹⁴⁹Schrage II, p. 348.

Paul's perspective considerably," and while grammatically acceptable, is likely the result of scrupulous conformation of the pronoun to a precise referent.¹⁵⁰

9:24.94 [discussed at 7:8.29]

9:24.96

The clause *εγω δε λεγω υμιν* (F G VL 77 78) is not paralleled in Paul, but matches exactly six examples from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44).¹⁵¹

Assimilation to either the near context or other Pauline passages must therefore be excluded.

In both F and G, the *εγω* and the subsequent *ουτως* are written with the initial letter capitalized, indicating that the clause represents a full sense line. It cannot have been omitted from the X ancestor of D F G, however, for neither D nor any of the Latin tradition reads the clause. This must therefore be a creation of the predecessor of F G. While the motivation for the insertion must remain uncertain, it does match other examples of expansionistic, interpretive variation found in F G.

9:25.97

The transitional (or resumptive) use of *μεν ουν* is found in both classical Greek¹⁵² and in the NT,¹⁵³ and specifically Pauline, writings (Rom. 11:13; Phil. 2:23). In all three

¹⁵⁰Metzger, *Textual Commentary* p. 493, describes the motivation for *τουτο* in a desire "to define the meaning more precisely."

¹⁵¹Eph. 5:32 (*εγω δε λεγω*) is similar, though here it does not introduce a contrastive idea but a further clarification.

¹⁵²Denniston, p. 470-73.

¹⁵³Turner, *Syntax*, p. 337.

Pauline examples where μέν οὖν is used this way,¹⁵⁴ omission of the οὖν can be found in the tradition:

Rom. 11:13	<i>omit ουν</i> L Ψ 056 0142 6 33 1739 2464 π
	<i>omit μεν ουν</i> D F G pc
1 Cor. 9:25	<i>omit ουν</i> K 5 489 623 88 915 1912 1926
Phil. 2:23	<i>omit ουν</i> 1836 1875

The omission of ουν is likely the result of a scribes lack of familiarity with the use of μέν οὖν. If οὖν is understood to have meaning independent of μέν, its omission is understandable in these contexts where an inferential meaning is inappropriate.

9:26.98

1241 reads πιστευω in place of πυκτευω. Since neither the verb πιστευω nor its noun derivative has appeared in 1 Corinthians since chapter 2, assimilation to near context is not a possibility. Instead, this must be an example of replacing a less common verb with one that is more common. The resulting text in 1241 construes, though it loses the image being developed in this section: “Therefore I do not believe like one fighting the air.” indicate that 1241 was copying by unit of thought, not by word or letter; the shifts in the number of the pronouns in 9:1-2 are further evidence of this.

¹⁵⁴For another use of μέν οὖν, see discussion under 6:7.24.

Notes on Chapter 10

10:1.1

The reading δε (ℵ^c K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 88 104 424* 614 876 1241 1834 1912 likely replaced γαρ in order to make clear the switch of topic in 10:1 from that of chapter 9. This may have been encouraged by the textual divisions present in the manuscripts themselves. For example, L begins a new paragraph at 10:1, with an enlarged initial omicron in the margin; Ψ enlarges the same letter and places a marker (“+”) immediately before 10:1. The lectionary system may have been a factor as well, since a new lection begins at this point (cf. 424 876).

10:1.3 [noted at 7:13.47]

10:2.4

Some commentaries put considerable weight on the difference between the middle εβαπτισαντο (℘^{46c1} B K L P 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 424 614 876 1175 1241 1739 *pm*) and the passive εβαπτισθησαν. Zuntz, for example, argues, “the Jews ‘had themselves baptized’, by cloud and sea, with inner assent; the divine miracle thus became an act of their own volition. Such meaningful subtleties do not arise from corruption, but they are easily obliterated by more commonplace variants – here by the passive.” While most commentaries are reluctant to place so great a significance on the middle form itself,² it should also be noted

¹The middle imperfect form εβαπτιζοντο, found only in ℘^{46*}, is unlikely since the aorist tense is used exclusively in chapter 10 until the γάρ in v. 4; it is likely a simple confusion of sound based on εβαπτισαντο.

²E.g., Conzelmann, p. 164 n. 1; Schrage II, p. 390 n. 44.

that all the verb forms in 10:1-4 are active, not passive, indicating that to at least some extent Paul's point is that the people in the wilderness were not unwillingly brought along.

Whatever the meaning of the middle voice in this context, it is more likely that this form would be altered to the passive. The aorist passive matches the standard Pauline formula εἰς + followed by an aorist passive form of βαπτίζω (Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 1:13, 15; 12:13; Gal. 3:27; also Rom. 6:3 ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς). There appears to be little reason to change from the passive to the middle form. While the middle form of this verb never occurs in Paul, neither does he elsewhere discuss pre-Christian "baptizing" (whether or not he views such baptism sacramentally). Furthermore, as discussed above, the middle form better suits the context.

10:2.5 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

10:3.6; 10:3.7; 10:4.8; 10:4.9

Parablepsis explains the loss of αυτο (ΤΟΔΥΤΟ) in \mathfrak{P}^{46} A C* at 10:3,4.³ The resultant text at 10:3 would have been το βρωμα πνευματικον. The anarthrous adjective following an arthrous noun occurs frequently in Paul in predicate constructions (e.g. 1 Cor. 3:13; 12:12)⁴ or with the adjective functioning adverbially (1 Cor. 4:9), but never as attributive except with ὄλος and πᾶς⁵. The subsequent omission of auto at 4:8, attested only by \mathfrak{P}^{46} A, may then be assimilation to the text produced by the previous error.

10:4.12; 10:26.101

³Zuntz, p. 65 n. 7; Fee 442 n. 3.

⁴Cf. BDR §270.

⁵Examples of which are found at 1 Cor. 7:17; 13:2; 14:23 15:7; 16:20; cf. BDR §275.

The most likely direction of alteration at 10:4 is from η πετρα δε (⌘ B D^{*2} (F G)⁶ 330 629 1739) to the normal position of the postpositive, η δε πετρα. The former position may have been altered in the interest of removing harshness.⁷ Similar issues prompted alteration at 10:26 from του κυριου γαρ (⌘ B C D F G 5 33 88 915 *pc*) to του γαρ κυριου. The manuscripts that make the change in both places include Ϝ⁴⁶ A K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 81 104 424 614 876 1175 1241 *pm*. Comparison should be made to 1 Cor. 11:7, where η γυνη δε is altered in a few manuscripts to η γυνη δε (1505 1611 1735 2495).
10:5.14; 10:9.34 [cf. 12:18.76]

1 Cor. 10:1-13 uses Pentateuchal imagery, themes, and symbols that are not found elsewhere in 1 Corinthians. While this has led some commentaries to conclude that this section is a pre-Pauline document,⁸ most accept that the unit is integral to the argument of 8:1-11:1.⁹ Within this section the events of the wilderness wandering described in the Pentateuch are used as examples from which the Corinthians, those upon whom the “end of the age” has come, should learn. These events are described in terms of their eschatological fulfillment,¹⁰ so that, for example, Christ was the rock that followed (10:5). In two places, however, there is textual uncertainty as to whether it was Christ or it was “God” or the

⁶The reading γυνη δε in F G may have been influenced by the position of δε, but more likely reflects the tendency of these witnesses to lose the article (see D F G paper).

⁷C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament. Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*, WUNT 167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), p. 426) notes that Paul uses both positions, but that writing the postpositive between the article and noun alleviates the “harshness” of the other position.

⁸Conzelmann (p. 165) describes 10:1-10 as a “piece of teaching that was already established before the composing of the epistle.”

⁹Thiselton, pp. 722-23; Schrage II, pp. 384-85.

¹⁰Schrage II, pp. 407-8.

“Lord” who was active in the wanderings. It will be argued here that alterations took place in the interest of conformity to the Penteteuchal narratives¹¹ and within the framework of a growing distinction among the persons of the Trinity. The result is that “Christ” should be the implied subject at 10:5 and read at 10:9 as the archetypical text.

The problem at 10:9 is the less complex of the two, with the textual tradition dividing into three readings. The most widely attested is *χριστον*, found in most Greek manuscripts (ⲡ⁴⁶ D F G K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 424 614 876 915 1241 1739 *pm*), virtually the entire Latin and Syriac traditions, and such early witnesses as Marcion,¹² Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 4,27,3) and a scholion attributed to Origen in the margin of 1739. A second reading, *κυριον*, is attested by fewer but “weighty” manuscripts (Ⲡ B C P 0150 33 104 181 256 263 1175 *pc*), scattered versional witnesses,¹³ and Theodoret.¹⁴ A third reading, *θεον*, is found only in A 81 *pc* without any versional or patristic support.¹⁵

Which reading best suits the overall context? Osburn argues that the context of 8:1-11:1 favors the reading *χριστον*, based on the reference to Christ at 10:4, the statement in 8:6 that there is “one Lord, Jesus Christ,” and the conclusion in 11:1 that the Corinthians are to imitate Paul as he imitates Christ. Osburn concludes, “the exhortation in 10:9 was made in view of the fact that the Corinthians must reckon with Christ.”

¹¹The most obvious example is 10:8, where 69 81 441 *sy^htxt* replace “23,000” with “24,000,” the exact figure provided in Num. 25:9.

¹²Cited in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,8; 42,12,3.

¹³Including some a marginal note in the Harklean manuscript and some Coptic manuscripts.

¹⁴*Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli*, MPG 82,304.

¹⁵Θεος replaces other *nomina sacra* also at 1 Cor. 14:37 and 1 Thes. 3:12.

Furthermore, there are obvious motivations for alteration from *χριστον*. First, the fact that the event described in 10:9 is summarized from Numbers 21. There the serpents were sent by the “Lord” (21:7), clearly not Christ.¹⁶ Second, the term *θεος* may have been another attempt to resolve the historical difficulty, but may also have been the result of assimilation to 10:5 (see below).

On the other hand, alteration from *κυριον* or *θεον* to *χριστον* would be difficult to explain. While some have argued that Marcion is responsible for the change, Osburn has shown both that *χριστον* was not unique to Marcion in the second century and that Epiphanius’ comment that Marcion was responsible for the alteration is incorrect, but simply a guess as to the cause of corruption.¹⁷ As a result, the reading *χριστον* should be regarded as archetypical at 10:9.

Resolving this problem, and noticing the reasons for the corruption, help us to disentangle the issue of the presence of absence of *ο θεος* at 10:5. This passage also refers to events in the Pentateuch, here to Numbers 14. Again, as at 10:9, the Pentateuch obviously does not describe Christ as the one who strewed dead bodies in the wilderness. Yet the shorter reading assumes just this, with the *χριστος* of v. 4 the implied subject. If one uses a text-critical method which places significant weight on “external evidence” this problem is easily resolved, for only two late Greek manuscripts and two early Greek fathers support the shorter reading (see below). As a result, Fee, for example, rejects the shorter text outright: “Textual variation needs a pedigree to be accepted as original, and this one has none.”¹⁸

¹⁶Zuntz, p. 126; Schrage II, p. 400 n. 101.

¹⁷Carroll D. Osburn, “The Text of 1 Corinthians 10:9,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis* (ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 201-212.

¹⁸Fee, p. 442 n. 4.

Lietzmann accepts that the shorter reading may be original, but he hesitates given the manuscript evidence. Only Zuntz argues that the shorter text is archetypical. However, because the patristic witness is both early and clear, it cannot be dismissed without investigation.

First, the witness of Marcion. His handling on the early part of 1 Cor. 10 is discussed by Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* 5,7,11-12), but only Epiphanius (*Panarion* 42,11,8) cites and discusses 10:5. Nevertheless, several factors point to the shorter text having been Marcion's text. First, Epiphanius provides a long citation encompassing vv. 1-9 and 11 in his scholia section (*Panarion* 42,11,8). Marcion's text of 10:5 in this citation matches the Greek manuscript tradition (which otherwise has only minor variation) apart from the lack of ο θεος. In addition, as Zuntz points out, one could assume that had Marcion read ο θεος in his text he would have highlighted the passage in order to show the cruelty of this god.¹⁹ Furthermore, that this is indeed Marcion's text, and not an error in the transmission of Marcion's writings, is confirmed by the comments Epiphanius makes on the passage in 42,12,3 (ref. 17):

But the apostle says that Christ was displeased with most of them, surely because of their lawless behavior. But if he was displeased with those who did things the Law calls lawless, then he was angry with such people because he himself had given the Law! And he teaches that the Law is his own Law, was given as a temporary measure, and served a legitimate purpose till his incarnation. . . Then again, "Neither let us tempt the Lord." [1 Cor. 10:9] In place of "Lord" Marcion put "Christ." But "Lord" and "Christ" are the same even if Marcion disagrees, since Christ's name has already been used at the words, "The rock was Christ, yet with many of them he was not well pleased."

Here Epiphanius is contrasting both his text of Paul and his theology with those of Marcion. He does not highlight Marcion's assumption that the subject of the verb in v. 5 is Χριστός, and goes on to comment that Christ himself gave the Law, which functioned until his

¹⁹Zuntz, p. 232.

incarnation. Clearly Epiphanius agrees that the text of 10:5 lacks any explicit subject, and that the subject should therefore be Χριστός. That this is not an oversight on the part of Epiphanius is confirmed by his care in pointing out that Marcion's text read Χριστόν in v. 9 while Epiphanius' read Κύριον. It is not only clear, therefore, that Marcion's text lacked ο θεος, but Epiphanius' manuscript likely did as well. Unfortunately, Epiphanius does not cite this passage elsewhere in his writings. However, the care with which he analyzes Marcion's text and his handling of the text points to the conclusion that certainly Marcion and perhaps also Epiphanius may be cited as witnesses for the shorter text at 1 Cor. 10:5

The other patristic witness for the shorter reading is Clement of Alexandria. As was the case also with Epiphanius and Marcion, the comments made by Clement show that his text also lacks an explicit subject in v. 5 (*Stromata* 7,6,104,4):

“For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers,” says the apostle, “that all were under the cloud and partook of spiritual food and drink,” proving clearly that not all those who heard the word found room for the greatness of knowledge in word and deed. Therefore he also supplied: “But he was not pleased with all of them.” Who is this? The one who said, “Why do you call me ‘Lord’ and not do the will of the Father.” That is the teaching of the savior, which is our spiritual food, and drink that stops thirst, the ‘water of life’ of the gnostic.

The fact that Clement asks the question, “Who is this?” makes clear that his text lacks an explicit subject in v. 5. Clement's answer, that the subject of the verb is Christ, not only matches his argument but also the way the shorter text reads at 1 Cor. 10:5.

The Greek manuscript tradition, however, is remarkably solid in agreement that ο θεος should stand in the text. Apparently, only the minuscules 547 and 1311 lack the subject.²⁰ These, however, may have omitted the words either by oversight or by assimilation to the subject of v. 4; there is little evidence that their texts regularly carry early readings

²⁰While the information is provided only by von Soden these manuscripts are not cited by any other editor, so there is no reason to doubt his accuracy here.

which the rest of the tradition has lost. In addition, the Latin and Syriac manuscript traditions are also united in reading the equivalent of ο θεος. There is also early patristic evidence for the longer reading, including Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 4,27,3) and, if the catenae tradition ascription is to be trusted, Origen (*Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios*, 45).

It must therefore be concluded that the both the longer and the shorter readings were circulating in the second century. For those who insist that the “best” or “most” witnesses must be decisive in textual decisions, the issue would be closed. However, the context of 1 Cor. 1-13, the direction of corruption at 10:9, and the most likely direction of corruption at 10:5 suggests that the shorter reading was indeed archetypal. The text of 1 Cor. 10:1-13 as reconstructed here is consistent in describing the events in the wilderness as if Christ were present. It makes clear that the Corinthians, by also sinning in the presence of Christ, would face the same judgment if their actions continued.

10:6.16, 10:6.17

Four manuscripts (181 1836 1874 1875) replace the predicate nominative τυποι with a prepositional phrase (εις τυπον). At least two of these manuscripts (181 1874²¹) also substitute the dative (ημιν) for the more difficult (ημων).²² While τυποι may represent a *prima facie* assimilation to the plural ταυτα, the apparent attempts to smooth the text in several ways points to both τυποι and ημων as the archetypal readings.

10:6.20

²¹181 cited from von Soden; 1874 from Swanson, *1 Corinthians*. von Soden cites 1836 as reading εις τυπον ημιν but Swanson cites it as reading εις τυπον. I have not verified this manuscript.

²²Though it is unclear how precisely to take this genitive; see Fee, p. 451 n. 7.

This, according to Royse (p. 244), is the only example of \mathfrak{P}^{46} avoiding crasis without additional support. Compare the discussions of crasis at 2:1.1 and 13:2.7.

10:7.22

The itacistic reading $\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (F G pc) for $\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ resulted in a shift from the nominative $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\iota$ to the accusative $\epsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\varsigma$, which now functions as the subject of the infinitive $\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

10:7.23; 10:9.35; 10:10.42

The presence of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ after $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ is in question in three places from 10:7 to 10:10, a section full of structurally similar sentences. Paul is consistent in his use of adverbial $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ²³ in this situation: $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ is found if the same verb is present in the two clauses which are being compared (Rom. 15:7; 10:6; 1 Cor. 10:14; 2 Cor. 1:14) as well as when the verb in the first clause is implied in the second (Rom. 1:13; 1 Cor. 11:1; 2 Cor. 11:12). He is also consistent in not placing $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ after $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ in four specific situations: when the two clauses have different verb stems (1 Cor. 1:5; 4:17; 5:7; 11:2; 12:11; 12:18; 15:38, 49; 2 Cor. 1:5; 4:1; 2), when one clause has a negative particle (1 Cor. 8:2; 2 Cor. 8:5); when $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ is followed by $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$: (2 Cor. 8:6; 10:7), and when $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ is used with a verb of speaking or thinking (*passim*).

At 1 Cor. 10:6-11, this pattern is followed for the first example of $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ at 10:6 (no v.l.). However, at 10:7 only D* sy^p read a conjunction, not is it found in any witnesses at 10:8. Given the pattern described above, a $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ should have been expected in both places. Again at 10:9 and 10:10 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ would be expected, but is attested only by K L and the typical

²³Cf. BDAG, s.v. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ (2c).

“Byzantine” witnesses. It is most likely that Paul used adverbial *καί* as he normally would for the first sentence (10:6), but for the subsequent sentences broke his pattern and allowed the similar structure to make the comparison rather repeatedly employing *καί*. Adverbial *καί* is never omitted elsewhere in the *Hauptbriefe*,²⁴ and there is no reason to assume its omission here. The additions at 10:7, 9, and 10 are all explainable as assimilation to the near context.

The variation between *ως γεγραπται* and *ωσπερ γεγραπται* presents a unique problem, for neither has a parallel elsewhere in Paul. The only other interchange between *ως* and *ωσπερ* is at 8:5,²⁵ and that only in minuscule 38. Apart from deciding on the basis of the “weight of the witnesses” (*ως* is read by only C P 424 614 1241 *pm* but apparently also Marcion²⁶ there is little upon which to base a decision. Three other readings here are easily resolved. First, D* sy^p read *καθως και τινες αυτων ως*, likely assimilation to the near context (see 10:7.23). Second, 33 reads *καθως τινες αυτων καθως*, clearly influenced by the immediately preceding *καθώς*. Finally, A 1898 strengthen the genitive with the addition of *εξ*.

10:7.26; 9:4.13; 11:22.82

All three Pauline examples of the present infinitive of *πίνω* show variation in spelling. While the differences are not significant in terms of meaning, the consistency of the witnesses which use the form *πειν* does point to an older tradition than those which use *πιειν*. The four examples in the epistles are:

²⁴VL 75 and some manuscripts of Cyprian’s *Ad Quirinium* 3,53 omit *et* (= *καί*) at 1 Cor. 13:12; see discussion *ad loc*. See also 11:19.75, where \mathfrak{P}^{46} B D* 6 1739 add *και*. This brings the two clauses of 11:19 into closer parallel.

²⁵The variation at 4:13 involves improper word division: *ως περικαθαρματα* becomes *ως περι καθαρματα* in G* 69 1927 and *ωσπερ καθαρματα* in 327.

²⁶As cited in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,8; 42,12,3. See the discussion by Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 165.

Rom. 14:21 πειν B^{*27} D^{*} ; πινειν F G] πειν B^c D² *rell* (P⁴⁶ *lac*)
 1 Cor. 9:4 πειν P⁴⁶ N^{*} B^{*} D^{*} ; πιν F G] πειν N² B² D² *rell*
 1 Cor. 10:7 πειν P⁴⁶ N^{*} B^{*} D^{*} F G] πειν B² D² *rell*
 1 Cor. 11:22 πειν F G 876] πινειν *rell*

Before assessing the difference between πειν and πειν, the readings in F G must be explained. At Rom. 14:21, πινειν is clearly a nonsense reading.²⁸ It can be explained, however, as the result of a misunderstood correction in the predecessor of F G. A similar misunderstood correction of vowels appears at 1 Cor. 9:8, where F G read η ει και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει, again a nonsense reading. The πιν at 9:4 can therefore be explained as a “successful” interpretation of the same correction made at that place. As a result, F G may be cited at all three places as indirect support for the reading of D, which, of course, stems from the same ancestor manuscript as F G. There is, therefore, remarkable consistency among these witnesses (P⁴⁶ N B D F G) in reading πειν.

The differences in spelling can be attributed to a development in Greek itself. A “Hellenistic Contraction” developed around 100 BC which substituted a single *i*-sound where two occur consecutively.²⁹ Moulton and Howard suggest that the later NT writings are more likely to use the contraction than the earlier. For Paul they believe that inconsistency is the rule, perhaps reflective of the amanuenses of the individual letters.³⁰ This is unlikely for two reasons. First, because it is clear that the *Corpus Paulinum* was issued as a single collection,

²⁷B is cited incorrectly by Tischendorf, von Soden, and NTA^P as reading πειν. The original hand was retraced as πειν, to which a corrector added a small superscript iota (π'ειν). Only Swanson cites the manuscript correctly.

²⁸While the form matches the present active infinitive of πινάω, Paul can hardly be advocated the right “to be dirty.”

²⁹See Schwyzer I, p. 194; Mayser I,1, p. 64; Gignac I, 295; Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, pp. 64-65; and BDR §31(2).

³⁰Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 65.

it is likely that such spelling inconsistencies would have been standardized. Second, they are working with incorrect information regarding the reading of B at Rom. 14:21 (see note 21), and so accept (against Westcott-Hort) $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ at that place. The additional witness of \mathfrak{P}^{46} and clarifying the reading of B now shows the consistency of these witnesses.

However, the Atticistic movement, beginning in the second century, rejected the Hellenistic contraction by urging again the use $\iota\epsilon\iota$ in place of $\epsilon\iota$. Pseudo-Herodian³¹ specifically rejects $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$:

Those who say “I want to drink” ($\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$) with one syllable are wrong, it is better to say “to drink ($\pi\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$) with two syllables; for only in this way it was also said by the all ancients, and by the poet, “to drink whenever the heart desires.” (*Iliad* 4,263; 8,189; *Odyssey* 8,70).

Similar concerns about this collocation of vowels are expressed by Moeris, who rejects $\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (υ 11).³² While “merely” an alteration in spelling, it does show that Atticism is a genuine cause of corruption in some cases. It should be noted that only B D F G and, where extant, \mathfrak{P}^{46} , avoids this corruption.

10:7.28

The third person singular $\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta$ is suspect because, apart from the immediately preceding verb $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$, the singular with the collective noun $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ never occurs elsewhere in Paul (here in a citation of Ex. 32:6). The fact that both D and VL 77 78 read the plural *surrexerunt* indicates that the shift to $\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta$ is unique to F and G. This corruption may have arisen from two different causes. Either the singular $\alpha\nu\sigma\epsilon\tau\eta$ has been assimilated to the

³¹*De locutionem pravatatibus*, cited from J. A. Cramer, ed. *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836) [reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963], p. 261. Reference provided by BDR §31².

³²Hansen, Dirk U., hrsg., *Das attizistische Lexicon des Moeris*, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, Bd. 9, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998).

previous verb, *εκαθισεν*, or a simple blunder which lost the end of the verb. Additional examples of these types of corruptions are provided in the chapter on D F G.

10:8.27

Five times in 10:8-13 the bilinguals add a prefix to a verb. Of these, one is also witnessed by many other manuscripts and one is found only in F G:

- 10:8 *εκπορνεωμεν* D* F G] *πορνευ[ω/ο]μεν* *rell*
 10:8 *εξεπορνευσαν* D* F G 056 0142 4 81 385 424* 876] *επορνευσαν* *rell*
 10:9 *εξεπειρασαν* ⋈ C D* F G P 33 69 81 104 181 206 256 263 326 917 1175
 1739 1758 2127 2464 *al* Or^{1739 mg}] *επειρασ[α/ειν]* ϖ⁴⁶ A B D² K L Ψ 056
 0142 0150 0151 5 6 88 424 614 876 915 1241 *pm*
 10:13 *ου καταλαβη* F G] *ουκ ειληφεν* *rell*
 10:13 *αφησει* D F G] *εασει* *rell*

Zuntz suggests that the first example at 10:8 has been influence by the LXX.³³ This is possible (for the second also) given that *ἐκπορνεῦσαι* occurs in the section of the Pentateuch upon which Paul's allusion is based (Lev. 25:1). The third example, *εξεπειρασαν*, may also have been altered under the same influence since it occurs in the LXX of Ps. 77:18 (also in the context of Israel testing God in the wilderness). This Psalm, however, does not directly reference the Num. 21 account, so influence from the LXX is only remotely likely. Instead, it is more likely that *εξεπειρασαν* has been influenced by the immediately preceding *εξεπειραζωμεν*.³⁴ This influence from the near context explains the large number of witnesses that share the same error.

The reading *ου καταλαβη* at 10:13, unique to F G, has likely been influenced by the Latin *adprehendat* (77 78 Vg). These manuscripts have several other examples of the addition of a prefix due its presence the corresponding Latin text (e.g., 7:9; 8:7; 8:9,

³³Zuntz, p. 87 n. 2; he is correct in suspecting an error in von Soden's citation of 1739, which in fact reads *πορνεωμεν*.

³⁴B. Weiss, p. 34.

discussed in the chapter on D F G). The shift in tense from the perfect to the aorist is also attributable to the Latin even though *adprehendat* is the present tense, for the D-text (and usually the rest of the Latin tradition) regularly uses the present form of *ad-/comprendo* where the Greek καταλαμβάνω is in the aorist, e.g. Eph. 3:18; Phil. 3:12a; and particularly 1 Thes. 5:14 (*adprehendat* for καταλαβη³⁵).

More difficult to account for is the reading αφησει (D F G) at 10:13. It is clearly secondary, since the only other examples of αφιημι in Paul are used to refer to marital separation (1 Cor. 7:11-13). Since the same witnesses add so many prefixes in a short span of text, one gets the impression that the scribe/reader wished to add them wherever possible.

10:8.31

Hellenistic Greek used prepositions to strengthen case usages more frequently than did earlier Greek, and the trend continued and increased through later Greek.³⁶ This resulted in a tendency to add prepositions in the manuscripts of Paul. Here only ℘⁴⁶ ⑈ B D* F G avoid the addition of εν before μια.

10:9.40; 10:10.44

The interchange between the aorist form απωλοντο (C D F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 33 88 424 614 876 915 1241 *pm*) and the imperfect απολλουντο (℘⁴⁶ ⑈ A^{vid} B 81 330 794 1311 1739) forces one to decide whether Paul describes the plague of the serpents as a process (απολλουντο) or a single event (απωλοντο). The imperfect form is used in 10:1-13 only at 10:4, where the “rock that [habitually] followed” is identified as Christ. Even the

³⁵F G read καταλαβοι, but οι for η is a simple interchange due to similar pronunciation. See Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar*, §44.

³⁶Moulton, pp. 61-2.

eating of the manna (10:3), the Israelites' drinking (10:4), and Christ not being pleased (see discussion at 10:5) are in the aorist, even though they are described in the Pentateuch as taking place over extended periods of time. While assimilation to the textually certain form of ἀπωλοντο at 10:10 may be cited as a cause of corruption, it would be more likely that the prior example would influence the second, as took place in A 1739 with the reading ἀπωλλυντο at both 10:9 and 10. Since assimilation to the LXX is apparent throughout 10:1-13, it is possible that the imperfect is a secondary attempt to convey that the event described in Num. 21 took place over a period of time.³⁷ More likely, however, ἀπωλλυντο is simply an accidental corruption due to the visual and aural similarity of the forms. The fact that ℞⁴⁶ reads only a single λ (ἀπωλυντο) shows even more clearly how the corruption could have been produced.

10:10.41

In conformity to the previous first person plural indicatives (πορνεύωμεν, v. 8; ἐκπειράζωμεν, v. 9), the imperative γογγυζετε has been altered to γογγυζομεν (℞ D F G 33 999).³⁸ The imperative forms a small *inclusio* with the first verb of exhortation in the unit, γίνεσθε (10:7).

10:10.45 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

In another example of difficulties understanding the Greek in the predecessor manuscript of F G, ολεθρευτου is corrupted to ολεθρευ, apparently in the mistaken assumption that του was an article. These witnesses frequently drop the article (see the chapter on D F G).

³⁷Schrage II, p. 401 n. 105, though he assumes that the imperfect is the correct text.

³⁸Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (1st ed.), p. 560; cited by Fee, p. 451 n. 3.

10:11.46

The shifting word order has led to the conclusion that both ταυτα δε παντα (C K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 88 424 614 876 915 1241 *pm sy*) and παντα δε ταυτα (N D F G *pc*) are secondary additions to ταυτα δε (A B 33 630 1175 1739 1881 2464 *Mcion*^E)³⁹ which “heighten the narrative.”⁴⁰ It is often further argued that the longer forms represent harmonizations to other examples in the epistles (e.g., 1 Cor. 12:11).⁴¹ However, this argument is not without difficulties. For example, at 1 Cor. 12:11 D F G read παντα δε ταυτα while the rest of the tradition reads ταυτα δε παντα. The word order variation there cannot be ascribed to an insertion since at that place no witnesses read ταυτα δε. Furthermore, at 9:23 the majority of witnesses *replaces* παντα with τουτο, they do not add it as is assumed at 10:11. Finally, neither harmonization nor a desire to add emphasis caused any corruption at 10:6, where ταυτα δε stands without variation in an identical situation: it introduces Paul’s inferences after a discussion of several episodes from the Pentateuch. Once the weaknesses of the arguments for the shorter text are pointed out, it becomes clear that ταυτα δε is easily explained as assimilation to the ταυτα δε of 10:6,⁴² and that the word order variation has been caused by the similarity of ταυτα and παντα. Because D F G alone read παντα δε ταυτα at 12:11 and at 10:11 (joined only by N), and further because they are prone to word order variation, one should be suspicious of παντα δε ταυτα.

³⁹Zuntz, p. 166 n. 5; Fee, p. 451 n. 4.

⁴⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 494.

⁴¹ Lietzmann, p. 47; Zuntz (p. 166 n. 5) argues that the assimilation is to examples in the gospels.

⁴² Note that A also assimilates to the preceding context with the reading θεον at 10:9.

10:11.47

As was the case at 10:5, the early patristic evidence is crucial to the resolution of the problem here. Again the witness of Marcion is involved, but at 10:11 his text is more uncertain than it was at 10:5. Epiphanius (*Panarion* 42,11,8; 42,12,3) cites Marcion's text as reading ταυτ' ατυπως, which some have taken to be a tendentious rendering by Marcion. Both Zuntz and Schmid have shown, however, that this reading is extremely unlikely, both because of the difficulty of the meaning of the word and its limited use elsewhere.⁴³ However, this reading is more easily explained as improper division of the words, which should then be rendered as ταυτα τυπως or, if there was an error in vocalization, ταυτα τυπος. The latter reading is found also in the Greek manuscript tradition (1973 2143).

Zuntz uses the evidence of Marcion (which he amends to ταυτα τυπος) to argue that the presence of three different readings early in the tradition points to three separate conjectures. The archetypal text, he claims, read simply ταυτα [δε παντα] συνεβαινε[ιν]. He rejects τυποι and τυπος as additions prompted by 10:6 and τυπικως as a further adaptation "which does not occur anywhere in the oldest Christian literature."⁴⁴ Yet this argument can be turned around, for if there is no evidence of its early use, why would it have been introduced into the manuscripts?

The word τυπικως is clearly not impossible. It occurs, as Liddell and Scott indicates, in medical writers, glossed as something "conforming to type."⁴⁵ It is similarly used in a 5th

⁴³Zuntz, p. 233; Schmid (pp. 224-25) further points out that the proper term would have been αντίτυπος.

⁴⁴Zuntz, p. 233.

⁴⁵LSJ cites Oribasius, *Collectiones medicae* (8.47.11), to which could be added Stephanus, *De magna et sacra arte*, vol 2, p. 249.

cen. commentary on Plato.⁴⁶ So while the term is rare, it is clearly attested. It finds a new usage, however, in some manuscripts of 1 Cor. 10:11. Rather than meaning “typically,” it now becomes a *terminus technicus* for a mode of interpretation. One of the first firm examples of the term used in this way is Clement of Alexandria,⁴⁷ *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 4.66.1:

The Savior taught the apostles, the first things typologically and mystically, the later things parabolically and , the third things clearly and uncovered, privately.⁴⁸

Clement is a bit creative here. The adverb ἡνιγμένως, formed from the perfect passive participle of ἀνίσσομαι, is rarely attested elsewhere,⁴⁹ while γυμνῶς is not listed in LSJ. Their forms, however, are derived from common adjectives. The adverb μυστικῶς has only a few examples listed in LSJ. The other terms, παραβολικῶς and σαφῶς (elsewhere σαφεῶς), are quite common. These common terms may have led to the *ad hoc* creation of the forms ἡνιγμένως and γυμνῶς in this passage, perhaps to provide some balance to the couplets Clement has formed. Τυπικῶς, while an attested form, is not used with the meaning “as a type” prior to Clement. After Clement, however, and especially beginning with Origen, it becomes a standard term to describe a form of Christian exegesis.⁵⁰

⁴⁶Proclus, *In Platonis Parmenidem* pp. 847, 848.

⁴⁷It should be noted that Clement alludes to 1 Cor. 10:6 (*Paedagogus* 2.10.89 and 2.10.101), in the latter example using the term τύποι, but he never cites the passage. He neither cites nor clearly alludes to 1 Cor. 10:11.

⁴⁸Ο Σωτήρ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους ἐδίδασκεν, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τυπικῶς καὶ μυστικῶς, τὰ δὲ ὕστερα παραβολικῶς καὶ ἡνιγμένως, τὰ δὲ τρίτα σαφῶς καὶ γυμνῶς κατὰ μόνας.

⁴⁹LSJ provide only a single reference to Plotinus for the term.

⁵⁰See the numerous references in Lampe.

Origen makes significant use of the term and in particular 1 Cor. 10:11. Not only does he cite or allude to the passage 6 times,⁵¹ he also uses the term to describe his interpretative method.⁵² At least one use of the term occurs in proximity to a citation of 1 Cor. 10:11.⁵³ The use of this passage by Origen is significant, since it is more likely that Origen found the term in 1 Cor. 10:11 and then adopted it for use in the interpretation of other passages than that he imported a foreign term into his exegetical method. Ronald Heine summarizes:

There is a cluster of Pauline texts (Rom. 7:14; 1 Cor. 2:10-16; 9:9-10; 10:11; 2 Cor. 3:6; 3:15-16; and Gal. 4:24) to which Origen appeals whenever he finds it necessary to discuss or defend the way in which he reads the Bible. His frequent citations of these texts demonstrate that he was convinced that he was following the Pauline model found in the Scriptures themselves when he looked for the deeper meaning.⁵⁴

Origen is not the only father to use 1 Cor. 10:11 in this way. Similar use is made by Hippolytus when commenting on the Susanna⁵⁵ account and by both Athanasius and Chrysostom when commenting on David and Absalom in Psalm 142.⁵⁶ The widespread and consistent use of 1 Cor. 10:11 and τυπικῶς by early writers suggests that they adopted a term which they had already found in their texts of Paul.

⁵¹*Contra Celsum* 4,43; *De principiis* 4,2,6 (2x); *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 1,6,34; *Fragmenta in Lucam* (in catenis) 125; *Philocalia* 1,13. In addition, references in *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam i ad Corinthios* (in catenis) 34 and 46.

⁵²*Contra Celsum* 6,70.

⁵³E.g. a discussion of temple worship (based on John 4) in *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 1,6,35, which follows shortly a citation of 1 Cor. 10:11 at 1,6,34.

⁵⁴Cf. Ronald Heine, "Reading the Bible with Origen," in *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity*, ed. and trans. by Paul M. Blowers (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1997), p. 136.

⁵⁵*Commentarium in Daniele* 1,16,3.

⁵⁶Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos* MPG 75, 541; Chrysostom, *Expositiones in Psalmos* MPG 55, 452.

The Greco-Latin bilinguals are the most “significant” manuscripts witnessing to the reading τύποι. Their reading cannot be dismissed as having been influenced by the Latin here, which reads *in figura*. While all editions cite *in figura* as supporting τυπικῶς, the identical translation is used at 10:6, where, aside from a handful of minuscules,⁵⁷ the Greek reads the predicate nominative: τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν. This, however, is translated *in figura facta sunt nostri* (vg); *in figura nostri facta sunt* (f g); or *in figura factam sunt nostri* (d). Only Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* 5,7) uses the nominative here, though of a different vocable: *exempla nobis sunt facta*. The reading of D F G must therefore be considered a viable Greek reading.

In contrast, τύπος was frequently used in the early period. Already in the *Epistle of Barnabas* we find regular use of the term when discussing OT events.⁵⁸ Numerous other examples are provided in Lampe. This provides further support for the argument that τυποι was the more familiar term, and as such replaced τυπικῶς at 1 Cor. 10:11.

The question in Cor. 10:11 then becomes this: Was τυπικῶς part of the terminology of Greek Christian exegesis already by the mid-2nd century, and then written into the text of 1 Corinthians? Or did the early scribes conform this passage to the earlier, nearly identical phraseology of 10:6 by replacing τυποι with τυπικῶς? One difficulty with the first argument is that the term was not introduced into the text at 10:6 in a virtually identical construction. Therefore, the latter is the more likely explanation. This is further confirmed by

⁵⁷The only variant associated with τυπος at 10:6 is the alteration of the predicate nominative into the prepositional phrase εἰς τυπον in 181 1836 1875 (which finds a parallel in the Latin witnesses: *in figura*, both at 10:6 and 11). All three manuscripts read τυπικῶς at 10:11, hence no need to alter the predicate nominative.

⁵⁸7,3; 7,7; 7,10; 7,11; 8,1; 12,2; 12,5; 12,6; 12,10; 13,5. Lietzmann (p. 45) provides most of these references; he also cites *Visiones pastoris* IV,1,1 (=22,1); IV,2,5 (=23,5); and IV,3,6 (=24,6). *Barnabas* also uses the term at 19,4; 51,2; and 87,1-2, but none of these refer to OT events, and in fact the examples in 87 refer to impressions of stones made in plaster.

the fact that Paul elsewhere “creates” or “adapts” vocabulary (e.g., 1 Cor. 2:4), so that τυπικως does not need to be viewed as impossibly difficult. D F G L joined by the Byzantine minuscules read τυποι; harmonization to the preceding context is not at all surprising in these witnesses.

In addition, the substitution of the adverb with a noun caused a second corruption. In order to match the predicate nominative, συνεβναινον replaced συνεβαινεν,⁵⁹ thus matching the number of τυποι. This reading has additional significance for the tracing of the history of the text, for a large portion of the “Byzantine” text (L 056 0142 0150 5 6 424 876 1241 *pm*) follows the D F G line of the text and not the \mathfrak{P} ⁴⁶ A B C line.

10:13.54

The word order εασει πειρασθηναι υμας (B 69 1175) would be unique in Paul. When the pronoun functions as both the object of a finite verb and the subject of an infinitive the word order is always verb-pronoun-infinitive, as in [εασει/αφησει] υμας πειρασθηναι (e.g., Rom. 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:13; 14:34; 2 Cor. 1:8; 2:8, etc.). B. Weiss attributes the alteration to a simple scribal error in which υμας was skipped initially but then written after the πειρασθηναι.⁶⁰

10:13.55

The reading υπερ ο ου δυνασθαι⁶¹ υπενεγκειν (F G alone) is immediately suspicious for several reasons. First, δυνασθαι υπενεγκειν is clearly modeled on the same words at the end of the verse. Second, the resultant text (“God will not allow you to be tested

⁵⁹BDR §133⁵.

⁶⁰B. Weiss, p. 128.

⁶¹δυνασθαι is a phonological alteration of δυνασθε.

beyond what you are not able to endure”) is nonsense in context. Third, the reading is not found in any of its near relatives (D VL 75 89), but is the basis of the reading *id quod non potestis* in VL 77 78 (their Latin counterparts), which has regularly been adapted to F G. The immediate suspect in the case of nonsense is some kind of error in copying. Here the error was likely caused by a skip to the ου δυνασθαι υπενεγκειν at the end of the verse.⁶²

Perhaps the skip was made from ΥΠΕΡΩ to ΤΟΥΔΥΝΑΘΑΙ. While this skip is not immediately obvious, it is more understandable when these same types of errors are found throughout F G.

10:13.58

The addition of υμας before υπενεγκειν (N² D² K Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 104 326 614 876 1175 1241 *pm*) not only clarifies the subject of the infinitive phrase του δυνασθαι,⁶³ it also matches the υμας πειρασθηναι earlier in the verse.

10:15.61; 10:15.62 [reading of D discussed in chapter on D F G]

Two phonological errors are found here. First, N^{*} 1241 replace υμεις with υμας, which however is nonsensical since Paul is not judging the Corinthians here but asking them to evaluate his argument. Second, 876 changes the same pronoun to ημεις, a common change in the manuscripts but apparently the only time this interchange occurs in this manuscript in 1 Corinthians.

10:16.64; 10:16.67 [discussed at 7:22.82]

⁶²F retains the paragraph division by beginning enlarging the initial letter of διοπερ (10:14) and placing it in the margin.

⁶³Fee p. 351, n. 5 sees the motivation for the insertion as “to make a more readable sentence.”

10:16.66

Several witnesses avoid the inverse attraction of the noun to the relative pronoun⁶⁴ by shifting τον αρτον to the nominative ο αρτος (Ψ 5 256 1611 *pc*). The same was avoided with the neuter το ποτηριον earlier in the verse since the nominative and accusative forms are identical.

10:17.68

The non-Vulgate Latin tradition and D F G make clear that both the cup and the bread are “shared” in the Eucharist (αρτου και του [ενος] ποτηριου). While the omission may be the result of a scribal leap, an addition is more likely. Its presence may have been suggested by the mention of both the cup and the bread at 10:16 or – perhaps lest a reader forget – to make clear that both the cup and the bread are part of the sacramental meal.⁶⁵

The bilinguals are not united here. D separates itself from F G⁶⁶ and both differ slightly from the Latin. The reading of the Latin counterparts to F G has been adapted to the Greek by the omission of the preposition *de*; this helps clarify in a small way the relationship between the Greek and Latin texts, for assimilation was accomplished by omission in the Latin, not addition in the Greek. D’s text, which lacks ενος before ποτηριου, is likely to be an omission unique to this scribe, for *uno* is present in its Latin counterpart (75) and the entire D-Text, including 89. Furthermore, since 77 78 lose *de* due to influence from the Greek, it is more unlikely that the editor would have added ενος based on the Latin.

⁶⁴BDR §295.

⁶⁵Fee, p. 462 n. 2 attributes the reading to a “growing liturgical consciousness.”

⁶⁶G* reads αρτου και του ενος αρτου ποτηριου. This is an obvious dittography which was caught by the original scribe, probably when the Latin interlinear translation was added.

10:18.70 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

10:19.72 - 10:20.80 [see also 10:28.112]

Two similar questions in 10:19 were the cause of both unintentional and intentional alteration. The potential for the loss of one of the questions by accidental leap was realized by several manuscripts: Ψ skipped over the first question (οτι [ειδωλον / ειδωλοθυτον] τι εστιν) while Ϟ⁴⁶ ⑈* A C* 6 33 915 *al* lost the second (η οτι [ειδωλον / ειδωλοθυτον] τι εστιν). While Clark argued that “the witnesses favoring omission are too early, too many, and too respectable for the omission to be dismissed as homoioteleuton,”⁶⁷ all editions and most researchers have recognized that accidental loss is more likely than intentional addition.⁶⁸ In making this argument, however, Clark provides a likely motivation for several intentional alterations:

If the omission is genuine, Paul refrains here from dismissing the idol itself as a nonentity, notwithstanding his declaration in 8:4. This more cautious, and more confusing, explanation of Paul about meat offering, idols, demons, and the many gods, gave way later to a sweeping and inclusive renunciation of all.⁶⁹

This need for a sweeping renunciation was apparently felt by several scribes/readers.

Wishing to be certain that Paul (τί οὖν φημι;) could not be misunderstood to leave open the question of whether or not an idol or idol sacrifice was “anything,” the rhetorical questions were altered into negative assertions.

⁶⁷Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” p. 60.

⁶⁸Zuntz, p. 140 n. 5; Fee, p. 462 n. 3.

⁶⁹Clark, p. 60.

This took place in three different ways. First, Several witnesses (489 927 1827) add οὐχ before the first οὔτι; this turns two questions which assume negative answers into explicit negative statements.

The second alteration is found in D F G and the Latin tradition (apart from the Vulgate), which replace η with οὐχ and drops the οὔτι at the beginning of 10:20. This turns the second question into an answer for the first: “That an idol sacrifice is anything? Not that an idol⁷⁰ is anything, but what they sacrifice . . .” The reading is not limited to the “bilinguals,” for it is found twice in Tertullian,⁷¹ in a lengthy citation in the *Speculum* and in Ambrosiaster’s⁷² commentary, both witnesses that typically agree with the D-text. Furthermore, Augustine twice cites the passage with the negative⁷³ while at other times matches the Vulgate.⁷⁴ This widespread attestation indicates that the reading is very early in the Latin tradition. This alteration had the additional effect of making the οὔτι at the beginning of 10:20 superfluous, so it was omitted (D F G VL 75 77 78 89 *pc*).

A third attempt to remove the ambiguity is found in the Peshitta, which resolves the difficulty in a unique way by placing the negative at the beginning of v. 21:

⁷⁰F G read εἰδωλοθυτον both in the first clause and the second; this is clearly another example of accidental assimilation to the near context, for D and VL 75 78 89 read εἰδωλον / *idolum*, and even 77 reads *idolum vel idolithitum* in an attempt to match the corrupted Greek text.

⁷¹*De spectaculis* 13 and *De corona* 17,8. Tertullian cites only the “answer” (“Not that an idol is anything”), not the question. This, however, is unlikely to be the result of a text without the question, for only he needs only the “answer” to make his point in both passages.

⁷²The lemma in the Amiens manuscript of Ambrosiaster’s commentary omits the question (*quia simulacro immolatum sit aliquid*), but this was likely lost due accidental leap from *quia* to *non quia* or from *aliquid* to *aliquid*. Similar such leaps are present in this manuscript (e.g., 14:21 *aliis et in labiis aliis*).

⁷³*De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* 14,34 and *De doctrina christiana* 2,36.

⁷⁴*Contra Adimantum* 3 (p. 152); *Epistula* 102,19.

ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ (“Is an idol anything, or is a sacrifice of an idol anything? No, but . . .”).

The use of ܩܕܝܫܐ matches the translation used for οὐχὶ ἀλλά in Rom. 3:27. The placement of the negative particle at the beginning of v. 20 is not based on any known Greek witnesses, nor can it have been adapted from D F G and the Latin (with which it frequently agrees), for two reasons. First, the particle is in a different location in the Peshitta. Second, the Peshitta consistently translates οὐχ ὅτι (*non quod* or *non quia*) with either ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ (2 Cor. 1:24; Phil. 3:12; 4:11; 2 Thes. 3:9) or simply ܩܕܝܫܐ (2 Cor. 3:5; Phil 4:17). Therefore, the Peshitta is a third independent attempt to resolve the rhetorical questions in 10:19.

It is extremely unlikely that scribes/readers would turn a clear statement against idols into open-ended, unanswered questions. In addition, this passage is only one of several rhetorical questions in 1 Corinthians that have been altered for the sake of clarification (Cf. 1:13.39; 3:5.27; 5:6.15; 5:12.36; 5:12.37).

Additional evidence of the secondary nature of the text of this passage as found in D F G can be seen in the word order variation, which twice move τὶ to the position following εἰσὶν. These witnesses also move τὶ to the position after the verb in 1 Cor. 2:2 and 10:31. Latin is not an influence, for at 10:31 D F G do so against their Latin counterparts.

10:20.81; 10:20.82

As B. Weiss has shown, the manuscript tradition betrays obvious tampering here.⁷⁵

The implied subject was supplied, resulting in θουουσιν τα εθνη (P⁴⁶ & A C P Ψ 33^{vid} 69 81 104 256 1175 1241 1611 1739 2127 2464 *al sy* Origen). That the addition is found in

⁷⁵B. Weiss, p. 81; also Zuntz, p. 102. Zuntz is followed by Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 494; Fee, p. 462 n. 4; and Schrage II, p. 445 n. 378.

witnesses typically regarded as “early” and “significant” certainly bears mention. Later, scribes altered the number of both examples of the verb in the sentence to match the collective noun (θευει τα εθνη K 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 326 424 614 876 915 917 1881 *pm*). The archetypical text for this part of 10:21 is preserved in the Greek manuscript tradition only by B D F G, but also VL 75, Marcion,⁷⁶ the Ambrosiaster commentary, and the *Speculum* (44). Furthermore, an allusion to the passage by Tertullian is probably based on the same text: “Not that an idol is anything,' as the Apostle says, but that what they do they do to demons who actually live in the consecrated idols, whether of dead people or – so they think – of gods.” (*De spectaculis* 13).

The development of the readings for the second half of the verse is not so easily untangled. The singular θευει is clearly secondary (K L 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 104 424 614 876 915; see above). But the word order variation is more complex (και ου θεω θυουσιν N A B C P Ψ 33 69 81 181 256 630 1241 1739 1875 2127; θυουσιν και ου θεω P⁴⁶ D (F) G 104 330 385 460 1108 1505 1611 1838 1898 1912 Mcion sy). The shifting position of the verb, without any possibility of parablepsis as the cause, immediately suggests an interpolation. This is made all the more likely by the fact that the only Greek manuscripts to avoid the addition earlier in the verse split here, with B placing the verb last and D F G the verb first.

The suggestion of an interpolation is strengthened by the fact that some of the witnesses that preserve the archetypical text in 10:20a have a shorter text here. Marcion may have read only και ου θεω, with θυουσιν perhaps omitted with the assumption that the previous example would be supplied by the reader. The evidence is too uncertain too

⁷⁶Cited in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,8 and 42,12,3.

decide.⁷⁷ On the other hand, two witnesses which preserved 10:20a accurately read only *immolant* (=θυουσιν): Ambrosiaster's commentary⁷⁸ and the *Speculum*, aside from the allusion in Tertullian (cited above), which makes to reference to God. Furthermore, because neither θυουσιν nor και ου θεω / *et non deo* could have been accidentally omitted by a leap, the possibility of an addition to the text must be considered.

Additional support for the reading θυουσιν / *immolant* is provided by a precise citation from Porphyry's *Contra Christianos*. After deriding Paul's argument in chap. 10 as full of contradictions, he cites (λέγων) 1 Cor. 10:20: ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις θύουσιν· οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι (fr. 32). Since there is no obvious motivation for the omission of και ου θεω, and his text is otherwise identical to many Greek manuscripts, this witness adds to the support for the shorter text.

While no motivation can be described for an omission, the LXX is a potential source for the addition. The phrase και ου θεω is found three times in contexts where worship of idols is contrasted with worship of God. The closest parallels to 1 Cor. 10:20 are Deut. 32:17 and Odes 2:17, both of which read ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θεοῖς οἷς οὐκ ἤδεισαν. This raises the possibility that και ου θεω was added to 1 Cor. 10:20 in order to conform to the LXX. Some commentators have argued that Paul is actually citing Deut. 32:17 here, thus accounting for the language.⁷⁹ This argument is strengthened by the allusion

⁷⁷Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,8 and 42,12,3. Schmid (p. 180-81) hesitates to reconstruct Marcion's text here with certainty: "In v. 20 hatte der marcionitische Text das θύουσι² mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit *nicht* nach δαιμονίοις gelesen. Ob es gänzlich gefehlt hat, is nicht zu entscheiden." (emphasis original).

⁷⁸Vogels reconstructs the text this way in *Das corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster*; the editors who completed his edition in the *CSEL* series place *et non deo* in brackets, indicating that it is omitted in the primary manuscripts.

⁷⁹Conzelmann, p. 170; Thiselton, p. 775.

to another passage from the same chapter (Deut. 32:21) at 1 Cor. 10:21. But it remains unlikely for two reasons. First, the wording and word order is different, with θύουσιν standing before δαιμονιοις in the LXX but after either δαιμονιοις or θεω in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians.⁸⁰ Second, Paul nowhere else speaks of “sacrifices to God” as ritual performances, but as something done outside any kind of temple (Rom. 12:1; Eph. 5:2; Phil. 2:17; 4:18).⁸¹ While Paul’s reference το τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Cor. 10:18) clearly invokes a Pentateuchal background for this section,⁸² this does not *require* that Deut. 32 must be a citation (rather than an allusion) at 1 Cor. 10:20 any more than it does at 10:22, which is clearly only an allusion. Third, not reading και ου θεω would match 10:1-13, also a passage with numerous allusions to the Pentateuch. There Paul named only Christ/Lord (not God); without και ου θεω the same would hold true for 10:14-22 (cf. 10:16, 22).

Therefore, the most viable argument on internal grounds is that και ου θεω is a secondary addition from the LXX to δαιμονιοις θύουσιν, with its shifting position as they primary evidence. A correction or marginal note would account for the fact that B and D F G, which preserved the archetypal text earlier in the verse, split here, and that even P⁴⁶ reads here with D F G and not its usual allies N A B. With this form of the text, the allusion to

⁸⁰Thiselton misinterprets Nestle-Aland’s use of brackets around θύουσιν when he claims: “Even the secondary addition of a second θύουσιν in some MSS suggests an early failure to recognize the quotation.” (p. 775) In fact, no manuscript omits the verb (only the uncertain witness of Epiphanius omits the verb, and this is not cited by NA²⁷), and the introduction to NA²⁷ (p. 49*) lists this unit of variation as an example of the use of brackets to indicate uncertainty in word order.

⁸¹Schrage II (p. 444-445) argues that και ου θεω should be understood as “to a no-god.” This understanding, based on the LXX, is possible, but in 1 Cor. 10:20 the plural δαιμονιοις would require the plural θεοι (cf. Ps. 95:5: ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνῶν δαιμόνια). Otherwise the text would be unclear as to the identity of the “not-god”: “What they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and they sacrifice to a not-god.”

⁸²Thiselton, p. 775, etc.

Deut. 32 remains intact, the odd use of “sacrifice to God” (or “a god”) is dealt with, and Paul’s usage of divine names matches 10:1-13. Although the witnesses with this reading are not generally recognized as “significant,” they are among only a handful of witnesses to preserve the archetypical text for the first part of 10:20. It may therefore be safely concluded that Paul reminded the Corinthians in 10:20 that “what they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons. I do not want you to be participants with demons.”

10:23.91; 10:23.95

The two examples of addition/omission of $\mu\omicron\iota$ in the clause $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \mu\omicron\iota \epsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ are related to the same phrase in 6:12. There, all witnesses apart from C* read the $\mu\omicron\iota$, whereas at 10:23 it is lacking in $\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* A B C^* D (F G)^{83} 81 181^* 424^c 1739^{*84} 2125 2464 pc VL 75 (77 78) 89 Vg$. Since the pronoun was not frequently omitted at 6:12, there is no reason to assume that it has been at 10:23.⁸⁵ Instead, assimilation to 6:12 is the likely motivation for the insertions at 10:23.⁸⁶

10:23.92; 10:23.94 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

10:24.96; 10:24.97; 10:24.98

⁸³Because parablepsis has occurred in F G and VL 77 78, they cannot be cited for the second example.

⁸⁴A corrector adds a supralinear $\mu\omicron\iota$ in the first example, but not the second.

⁸⁵Schrage, “Ethische Tendenzen,” p. 381 argues that the omission of $\mu\omicron\iota$ by C* at 6:12 is an example of a “generalizing” tendency in the tradition, but he does not make the same argument for the examples at 10:23. As discussed at 6:12, there is little to support the argument of a widespread “tendency” toward generalization in the tradition.

⁸⁶Fee, p. 475 n. 1; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 494-5.

A similar statement in Phil. 2:4 (μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι) has influenced the text here. A and Tertullian⁸⁷ read the plural at both places where the singular το is read.⁸⁸ This may have come from Phil. 2 or, more likely, to get around the problem that it is not obvious what “one thing” one should not seek for himself, but for his neighbor. Two other readings are more likely to have been directly influenced by Philippians: the addition of καὶ after ἀλλὰ in a handful of witnesses (424* 876 pc sy^p) and the addition of ἕκαστος in most manuscripts (K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 104 326 424* 876 917 1836 1875 1898 sy).⁸⁹ The widespread use and familiarity of the *Carmen Christi* of Phil. 2:5-11 would account for the familiarity that scribes/readers would have had with Phil. 2, thus resulting in its influence on the text of 1 Cor.

10:25.99; 10:27.109

The alteration of the prefix of a compound verb is common. Διακρινοντες at 10:25 (P 915) and at 10:27 (L) may both have been influenced by the examples of δια which follow immediately each occurrence.

10:26.101 [discussed at 10:4.12]

10:27.102 [see also 8:2.3]

After Paul states the principle which should guide the Corinthians' behavior in 10:23-24, he introduces two situations in which food associated with idols may be encountered: the

⁸⁷*De cultu feminarum* 2,2, using the possessive pronoun *vestra*.

⁸⁸A and the Coptic tradition makes a similar change in number at 10:24:106: παντα τα παρατιθεμενα for παν το παρατιθεμενον.

⁸⁹Fee, p. 475 n. 2 argues that addition is secondary because it is “against all early evidence” without explaining a motivation for the alteration.

macellum 10:25-26 and at a private home (10:27-28). Both of these are introduced asyndetically, with the δε at 10:28 marking the contrast between the things that might happen during the meal at the home. Although the behavior advocated in 10:27 does not contrast with that advocated in 10:25-26, many manuscripts add δε at the beginning of v. 27 (C D² H K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 33 88 104 326 424* 614 876 915 1241 1912 *pm*). This is apparently an effort to distinguish the two situations but failing to see that Paul draws the contrast between the responses (vv. 27 and 28), not the situations (vv. 25 and 27).

10:27.103; 10:27.106; 10:27.111

Further examples of ημ- / υμ- variation in 1241; see the discussion at 9:1.6.

10:27.104; 10:29.118 [discussed in the chapter on D F G]

10:27.108 [discussed in the “Alexandrian Witnesses” chapter]

10:28.112; 10:19.74; 10:19.78

Assimilation to the preceding context affected a NT *hapax legomenon* at 10:28, where the manuscripts present us with εἰδωλόθυτον (C D F G K L P Ψ 33 88 1739^c sy^h Tert) or ἱερόθυτον (℘⁴⁶ ⋈ A B H 1739* sy^p). We find Theodore of Mopsuestia, for example, using the two interchangeably, even when he comments on 1 Cor. 8:13 (where ἱερόθυτος never occurs as a variant in the manuscript tradition):

Therefore look with contempt on the food even if it is not a sacrifice to an idol (ἱερόθυτον). For the one not eating will not have anything lesser before God, nor will the one eating have more abundance of things. To the one who will ask me why I, being an apostle, do not eat a sacrifice to an idol (εἰδωλόθυτον), I answer this: So that I will not scandalize them. For even though I have the right also from the Gospel

to eat and to drink as also the Lord commanded, and to take about a wife, I will do none of these⁹⁰

What distinguishes these terms, however, is the writers that use them. εἰδωλόθυτος is the term of LXX and other NT writings (twice in Acts) and is far more common in literature written and used by early Christians.⁹¹ ἱερόθυτος never occurs in the LXX or NT aside from the textual tradition of 1 Corinthians, but is much more common than εἰδωλόθυτος outside of these writings. On this basis Zuntz sees εἰδωλόθυτον as a corruption at 10:28: “He was quoting an interlocutor. The Jewish-Christian coinage εἰδωλόθυτον, which Paul normally uses, has in most witnesses displaced this peculiarity of his diction.”⁹² One should note, however, that it is not the mere rarity of a term which causes corruption, but the repeated use of a similar word in the previous context, which then is introduced in place of the “less common” word. This accounts easily for the reading εἰδωλόθυτον at 10:28; it has made its appearance already in 8:1,4,7,10 and 10:19.

However an additional factor may be involved in this corruption at 10:28. Far from being unfamiliar to scribes the word appears to have been quite well known, and in fact rejected as inappropriate by both grammarians and church fathers. Phrynicius rejects the

⁹⁰*Fragmenta in epistulam 1 ad Corinthios*: Καταφρονεῖτε οὖν βρώματος κἄν μὴ ἱερόθυτον ἦ· οὔτε γὰρ μὴ φαγόντες ἔλαττόν τι ἔχομεν παρὰ θεῶ, οὔτε φαγόντες περισσοτέρου τινὸς ἀπολαύσομεν. Τοῖς ἐρωτῶσί με διὰ τί οὐκ ἐσθίω εἰδωλόθυτον ἀπόστολος ὢν, τοῦτο ἀπολογοῦμαι· ἵνα μὴ ἄλλους σκανδαλίσω. καὶ γὰρ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν, καὶ γυναῖκα περιάγειν, οὐδὲν τούτων ποιῶ πανταχοῦ συμπνέων τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Cited from Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 184.

⁹¹E.g., 4 Maccabees 5:2; Didache 6,3; Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 34,8; 35.1; Irenaeus, *Adverses Haereses* 1,1,12; *Sybilline Oracles* 2 1.96

⁹²Zuntz, p. 134.

term,⁹³ though he does not suggest εἰδωλόθυτος as an improvement. More significant, however, may be the way Origen handles the distinction between these terms:

Let us see what Celsus further says of God, and how he urges us to the use of those things which are properly called idol sacrifices (εἰδωλοθύτων), or, still better, offerings to demons (δαιμονιοθύτων), although, in his ignorance of what is truly holy (ἱερόν), and what sacrifices are well-pleasing to God, he calls them “holy sacrifices” (ἱεροθύτων).⁹⁴

After these things Celsus discusses what is said by Jews and Christians when defending abstention from idol sacrifices (εἰδωλοθύτων), that is, by saying that one who is dedicated to the most high God must not eat with demons. What he says against these has been discussed. Concerning food and drink, we think that a man can only be said to eat and drink with demons when he eats what are called by many “sacred victims” (τὰ καλούμενα παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἱερόθυστα) and when he drinks the wine of libation to the demons.⁹⁵

It is clear that Origen sees the term as inappropriate theologically. Similar discomfort with ἱερόθυτος may have contributed to the alteration of ἱερόθυτον at 1 Cor. 10:28. Lack of familiarity with the term can hardly be the cause; rather the term was thought to be inappropriate from both a linguistic and a theological perspective. The five previous occurrences of εἰδωλόθυτος in 1 Corinthians provided a convenient, even if in some manuscripts accidental, solution to this difficulty.

⁹³*Eclogae* 130 Ἱερόθυτον οὐκ ἔρεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀρχαίως θεόθυτον. Also: *Praeparatio sophistica* 74.7 θεόθυστα ἃ οἱ πολλοὶ ἱερόθυστα καλοῦσι. Κρατῖνος. τὰ τοῖς θεοῖς θυόμενα ἱερεῖα.

⁹⁴*Contra Celsum* 8.21: Ἰδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς Κέλσω λεγόμενα περὶ θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς προτρέπει ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὡς μὲν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εἰδωλοθύτων χρῆσιν ἢ, ἴν’ οὕτως ὀνομάσω, δαιμονιοθύτων, ὡς δ’ αὐτὸς προσαγορεύσαι ἄν, ἅτε μὴ εἰδῶς, τί τὸ ἀληθῶς ἱερόν, καὶ ποδαπαὶ αἱ παρὰ τούτῳ θυσίαι, ἱεροθύτων.

⁹⁵*Contra Celsum* 8.31: Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Κέλσος τὸ ὁμολογουμένως ὑπὸ Χριστιανῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων λεγόμενον τίθησιν, ἀπολογουμένων περὶ τῆς τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων ἀποχῆς καὶ φασκόντων μὴ δεῖν συνεστιᾶσθαι δαίμοσι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ· πρὸς ὃ εἶπε τὰ ἐκκείμενα. Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν, ὅσον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, τοῦ συνεστιᾶσθαι δαίμοσι τρόπους ἄλλους οὐκ ἴσμεν ἢ καθ’ οὓς τὰ καλούμενα παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἱερόθυστα ἐσθίει τις καὶ πίνει τὸν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς δαιμονίοις γινομένων σπονδῶν οἶνον·

Turning to 1 Cor. 10:19 one encounters a remarkable amount of variation, of which the major variants and their present-day manuscript evidence is as follows:

1. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ψ 945 1831 1881 1912
2. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ ℞⁴⁶ A C* 6 1836
3. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ℞*
4. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ Η ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ K L 056 0142 0151 88 326 915 1912
5. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΤΙ Η ΕΣΤΙΝ ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ ℞^a B C^c P 69 81 104 181 256 263 441 467 917 1175 1319 1739 1834 1875 1898
6. ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΙ ΟΥΧ ΟΤΙ ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΙ F G

Among the earliest patristic witnesses one finds citations only in Tertullian and Marcion, neither of which matches up with the “major” Greek manuscripts. Tertullian's text is apparently only one clause in length;⁹⁶ Marcion has a unique form of the text. Epiphanius cites his text as: ὅτι ἱερόθυτον τί ἐστίν; ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν. How is this to be explained, as this is the only now extant witness to the reading ἱερόθυτον at 10:19? At first this appears attractive as a possible source for the readings listed above. 1 Cor. 10:19 is similar to 10:28 in that it may be referring to a “slogan” of Paul's opponents; using Zuntz's argument above, that in the mouth of the opponents one should expect ἱερόθυτον, as well as the discomfort with the term outlined above, one might be persuaded to adopt that reading here as well. Zuntz, however, does not. He argues that an ancestor of the manuscript used by Marcion had written the ἱερόθυτον from 10:28⁹⁷ into the margin, and a subsequent copy, this one used by Marcion, inserted it into the text in place of εἰδωλον(!). As Schmid points out, this could only have taken place if the sequence of 10:19 now found in the Majority text

⁹⁶Tertullian, *De spectaculis* 13 reads: *non quod idolum sit aliquid*, the equivalent of reading 1 above. The reference in *De corona* 7 is likewise of only one clause, though clearly a paraphrase.

⁹⁷This requires, of course, this ancestor to be related to ℞⁴⁶ ℞ A B H 1739, among the few witnesses to ἱερόθυτον at 10:8. Unfortunately Marcion's text of 1 Cor. 10:28 has not been preserved.

was the basis;⁹⁸ Zuntz, however, was unable to do this,⁹⁹ positing instead a rather strained scenario: “In the copy which Marcion used, the marginal variant, instead of replacing εἰδωλόθυτόν in ver. 19a, had occupied the place of εἶδωλον in ver. 19b.”¹⁰⁰

A more plausible explanation is that the text used by Marcion was only one clause in length: ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν. A marginal note posited by Zuntz could well have existed, but instead of being read as an explanation of εἰδωλόθυτόν it was added in the form of an additional, identical question. This resulted in the repetitive: ὅτι ἱερόθυτον τί ἐστίν; ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν. This reading might find support as being the one giving rise to the others as it would have been an invitation to alteration. However, similar examples in the Pauline epistles of a virtually verbatim repetition of a question or statement are not to be found, and it would be difficult to see a need for this repetition here. Marcion's ὅτι ἱερόθυτον τί ἐστίν should therefore be considered an addition,¹⁰¹ and this text which suffered the corruption yet another witness to this verse existing only as a single clause in the second century.

What appears to be the simplest solution at 10:19 is parablepsis that one or the other clause was omitted, resulting in the shorter text.¹⁰² Yet in this case there is an extremely large number of manuscripts that witness to the shorter text, far more than one normally finds in

⁹⁸Schmid, 188.

⁹⁹Perhaps because this is the sequence of the “Byzantine” witnesses against B 1739, while \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* A suffer from (apparently) parablepsis. In other words, none of the manuscripts that read ἱερόθυτον at 10:28 have the word order that would suit this reconstruction at 10:19.

¹⁰⁰Zuntz, p. 229.

¹⁰¹The way Epiphanius himself treated it. See above.

¹⁰²So Metzger in the first edition of the *Textual Commentary*, p. 560; the note was dropped in the second edition.

these types of variants. The data can be accounted for in this way: ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν stood alone after τί οὖν φημι. The εἰδωλόθυτον was accidentally shortened to εἰδωλον due to the influence of the context, where the issue not what is eaten so much as at whose table one is eating. This also explains the problem of the shift in the sequence of εἰδωλόθυτον and εἰδωλον,¹⁰³ which is best seen as separate confluences of two shorter readings which produced the different sequences. An additional factor is the similarity to the wording of 8:4, where the issue of τῆς βρώσεως τῶν εἰδωλόθυτων is raised, and resolved immediately with the strong assertion that οἶδαμεν οὐδέν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. To raise only the rhetorical question of whether εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστίν may have been perceived, as Clark explains, as a “more cautious, and more confusing explanation Paul about about meat offerings, idols, demons, and the many gods gave way later to a sweeping and inclusive renunciation of them all.”¹⁰⁴

Therefore, ἱερόθυτος has been corrupted into εἰδωλόθυτος at 1 Cor. 10:28, but caused a corruption at 10:19. Its removal from the text at 10:28 is due not to the unfamiliarity of the scribes with the term but to the influence of numerous preceding occurrences of εἰδωλόθυτος in 1 Corinthians as well as a discomfort with the appropriateness of the term itself. Not surprisingly, D F G, here joined by numerous witnesses, suffer from assimilation to the near, preceding context. ℘⁴⁶ ⋈ A B H 1739* sy^p avoid this corruption.

10:28.113

¹⁰³The reading of F G, ὅτι εἰδωλοθυτον ἐστίν τι οὐχ ὅτι εἰδωλοθυτον ἐστίν τι, should not be attributed to familiarity with the reading of Marcion, but to harmonization to the preceding context (a common fault in these witnesses).

¹⁰⁴Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” p. 60.

The long addition in the majority of manuscripts (H^c K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 104 105 326 424 614 876 *pm sy^h*) is simply adopted from 10:26.¹⁰⁵ Its omission cannot be accounted for either as accidental loss or intentional excision. Zuntz makes comparison to a similar addition by repetition at 16:15 (adopted from 16:17) in virtually the same witnesses.¹⁰⁶ The archetypal text was δι εκεινον τον μηνυσαντα και [δια] την συνειδησιν (⑆ A B C (D) H* P 0150 33 81 181 256* 630 1175 1241 1739 2127 2464 *al sy^p*). Parablepsis has affected witnesses which often betray such errors; Ϝ⁴⁶ preserves only δι εκεινον and F G only δια την συνειδησιν.

10:29.116 [discussed at 14:4.14]

10:29.118; 10:30.119; 10:28.117

Without any textual evidence, J. Weiss and Zuntz argue that v. 29 is a post-Pauline interpolation.¹⁰⁷ The fact that no response is given to what is presumably an interlocutor's questions is the key difficulty. While the numerous interpretations offered by commentators attest to this difficulty,¹⁰⁸ recent work on rhetorical argumentation has shown that these questions are not out of place here.¹⁰⁹

The difficulties in sorting out the function of the questions has impacted the textual tradition. For example, one manuscript (1827) omits the difficult γαρ at 10:29b. In addition,

¹⁰⁵Metzger, *Textual Commentary*. 495. A corrector of C adds the same phrase after 10:31.

¹⁰⁶Zuntz, p. 163.

¹⁰⁷J. Weiss, pp. 265-66; Zuntz, p. 19.

¹⁰⁸See esp. Thiselton, pp. 788-93.

¹⁰⁹See esp. Duane F. Watson, "1 Corinthians 10:23-11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989), pp. 301-18.

several witnesses, including much of the Latin tradition (33 VL 61 78 89 Vg) add an inferential particle at the beginning of 10:30 in order to bring that question in line with that of 10:29b. Finally, a few late manuscripts (242 629 1908) but also \mathfrak{P}^{46} add δε, which apparently misunderstands the question at 10:30 as contrasting with the previous one.¹¹⁰ \mathfrak{P}^{46} is not overly prone to adding δέ against all other witnesses; examples are to be found only at 1 Cor. 8:1 and Phil. 4:18.¹¹¹

10:31.120

An example of addition by assimilation in L, which reads ειτε ουν εσθιετε ειτε ουν πινετε; it is the only witness to read the second ουν.

10:31.121 [discussed at 10:19-20]

10:31.122 [discussed at 10:28.113]

10:32.123

Paul use of conjunctions in the phrase “Jews and Greeks” is consistent:

Rom. 1:16	ιουδαιω τε [πρωτον] και ελλησι] ιουδαιω πρωτον και ελλησι \mathfrak{N}^*
Rom. 2:9	ιουδαιου τε πρωτον και ελληνος
Rom. 2:10	ιουδαιω τε πρωτον και ελληνι
Rom. 3:9	ιουδαιους τε και ελληνας] ιουδαιους τε πρωτον και ελληνας A
Rom. 10:12	ιουδαιου τε και ελληνος] ιουδαιω και ελληνι D
1 Cor.1:24	ιουδαιοις τε και ελλησιν] ιουδαιοις και ελλησιν F G 104 489 927

¹¹⁰Güting and Mealand (p. 50) argue that δε is secondary because “ \mathfrak{P}^{46} is a sole witness here and \mathfrak{P}^{46} is known to transmit secondary particles elsewhere.” While there are other witnesses that also read δε, the agreement is not likely to be the result of a shared line of transmission.

¹¹¹Royse, p. 252.

All these examples come when only Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλληνας are coordinated. In 1 Cor. 10:32, however, three items are coordinated, which requires a different use of conjunctions. This is preserved in the reading και ἰουδαιοῖς γινεσθε και ελλησι και τη εκκλησια (P⁴⁶ N^{*} A B C 33 69 81 326 1175 1241 1739 *pc*). Other witnesses, however, ignore the factor of the third item and force the standard Pauline formula on the text: γινεσθε και ἰουδαιοῖς . . . (N² D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 88 424 614 876 915 *pm*) and γινεσθε ἰουδαιοῖς τε και . . . (F G). The altered passages also move the verb in order to preserve the formulaic sequence.

10:32.124 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

10:33.128 [discussed at 7:35.122]

Notes on Chapter 11

11:1.1

0150 omits *καθως*, the only example of a manuscript omitting this adverb in 1 Corinthians. The omission is likely the result of parablepsis (*κ̅α̅θ̅ω̅ς̅ κ̅α̅ι̅*).

11:2.3; 15:31.129

Paul frequently addresses his hearers as *αδελφοι*. The noun in the vocative is found without variation at 1 Cor. 1:10; 10:1; and 16:15. In several other passages where direct address is used, this frequent use of *αδελφοι* has resulted in its addition in the manuscripts:¹

- 4:16 παρακαλω ουν υμας αδελφοι 365 1319 1573
 παρακαλω ουν υμας *rell*
- 10:14 αδελφοι 642 1827
 αγαπητοι *rell*
- 11:2 επαινω δε υμας \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B C P 81 181 206 630 1175 1739 2464 *pc*
 επαινω δε υμας αδελφοι D F G K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 33 88 104
 326 424 614 876 915 1241^s *pm*
- 15:31 καυχησιν ην εχω \mathfrak{P}^{46} D F G L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0243 6 1739 1837 *pm*
 καυχησιν αδελφοι ην εχω \aleph A B K P 0150 0151 33 43 69 81 88 104 256
 263 915 1175 1241^s 1611 2110 2127 2400 2464 *al*
 καυχησιν ην εχω αδελφοι 61 326

Similar additions are found at Rom. 15:15 (\mathfrak{P}^{46} D F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151; αδελφοι μου 049) and Eph. 6:10² (F G Ψ ; αδελφοι μου \aleph^2 K L P 049 056 0142 0150; αδελφοι *post ενδυναμουσθε* A 0278). In each of these cases, Zuntz's conclusion is certainly correct: :

“The pronoun all but called for the addition. Had the vocative been there originally, its omission would be inexplicable.”³ What is of note in these examples is no manuscript

¹The only passage where it has been omitted is 7:24 (by 104 206* 241 255 326 1831), likely the result of the plural *αδελφοι* following the singular *εκαστος*. This also prompted D F G to move *αδελφοι* to the position following the verb. See discussion *ad loc*.

²Discussed by Zuntz, pp. 176-177.

³Zuntz, p. 176. Cf. Fee, p. 498 n. 24; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 495.

avoids the insertion in every place. Some are less prone to it than others, however. \mathfrak{P}^{46} adds it only at Rom. 15:15 while \mathfrak{N} B do so only at 1 Cor. 15:31. F G has the highest number of insertions with four (D avoids it at Eph. 6:10⁴).

11.2.4; 10:33.126 [see also 12:19.80]

At 11:2, as at 9:25 and 10:33, $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ is used not as the object of the verb but to indicate the circumstances under which the action of the verb takes place.⁵ Hence the Latin manuscript tradition renders $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ at 10:33⁶ with *per omnia* and at 11:2, in many witnesses, either *in omnia* (vg^{mss}: C N* T) or *per omnia* (VL 78 vg^{mss}: B D F^c G¹ Θ^c K L M N^c O P S U V W Z). A few Greek witnesses also attempt a clarification. At 10:25 F G read $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$, though this is more likely assimilation to the Latin than in independent Greek reading. At 11:2 P 1242 2004 2464 match this modal or attendant circumstance use of $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ by replacing it with the adverb $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$.⁷

11:2.6; 11:2.7 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

11:3.9

Paul typically uses the phrase $\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ [or $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$] $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\nu$ to introduce a teaching or practice which his audience does not accept (Rom. 1:13; 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; 12:1; 2 Cor. 1:8), but at 1 Cor. 11:3 $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ is comparable. The $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ is most likely

⁴This may have been under the influence of the Latin, for it is also lacking in VL 75 89 and Lucifer.

⁵BDR §154³; for 11:2 the translations “in allen” or “in jeder” are suggested.

⁶VL 78 offers both *in omnia* and *secundum omnia* as options.

⁷Schrage (“Ethische Tendenzen,” p. 381) argues that $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ at 11:2 reflects a “generalizing” move. However, it more likely reflects a clarification of the use of $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$, particularly since the manuscripts show difficulty with the same usage at 10:33.

adversative, but could be understood as a consecutive.⁸ In similar contexts where $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is not obviously contrastive F G and the D-Text omit or alter the conjunction. In addition to this passage (omit $\delta\epsilon$ F G VL 77 89), the same witnesses virtually alone alter the $\delta\epsilon$ at 1 Cor. 7:32 F G VL 75 77 78 89 (omit $\delta\epsilon$ after $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$) and read $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$ for $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$ $\delta\epsilon$ at Rom. 16:19 (D F G VL 75 77 78 89).⁹ This tendency toward a smoother text might be viewed as a Latinism, with F G altered to match. However, \mathfrak{P}^{46} reads a conflation at Rom. 16:19 ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$ $\delta\epsilon$), showing that the reading existed in Greek in the second century.¹⁰ This tendency must therefore be attributed to the shared ancestor of D F G and to the Greek basis of the D-Text. D departs from this form of the text by adding the $\delta\epsilon$ that had been omitted in its ancestor at 1 Cor. 7:32 and 11:3. This is the result of correction to a Greek witness similar to \aleph A, and shows again that F G more faithfully preserve the shared ancestor of D F G than does D.

11:3.11; 11:3.14

When confronted with the choice of whether or not to read the article before $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, Zuntz tentatively offers this suggestion: "I suspect that the omissions are genuine and the additions spurious."¹¹ He notes that D F G omit the article at Rom 15:3 (with 1739) and 1 Cor. 11:3 (with B^* *al*), while F G alone add it in Rom 15:18 and 1 Cor. 5:7, to which 1 Cor. 4:1 should be added. Typically F G omit the article, probably under the influence of the

⁸Fee (p. 501 n. 36) argues that the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ must be adversative to v. 2, but notes that the NIV suggests a consecutive ("now").

⁹F G and the Latin tradition retain the conjunction at 1 Cor. 14:5, where it is omitted for the same reason in by 131 1734.

¹⁰Discussed, with other examples, in the chapter on D F G.

¹¹Zuntz, p. 103 n. 2.

Latin's lack of an equivalent. However, the article may have been added in these manuscripts due to the presence of the *nomen sacrum*.

At 11:3 the situation is more complex because there are two separate units of variation involving *a nomen sacrum*. B. Weiss suggests that the article was added in most manuscripts (not read by B* D* F G *pc*) under the influence of του χριστου later in the sentence.¹² However, this του is not read by most manuscripts (including \mathfrak{P}^{46} C F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 104 424 614 876 1241^s 1739), making assimilation unlikely. Weiss' argument would hold true, however, at 1 Cor. 1:17. There του χριστου occurs later in the sentence, with B F G (along with \mathfrak{P}^{46} *pc*) adding the article before χριστος. As the following list demonstrates, the manuscripts show almost no consistency for this type of variation.

Article lacking in few manuscripts:

1 Cor. 1:9	θεος	C
1 Cor. 2:12	το εκ θεου	489 927 945 1243
1 Cor. 2:12	τα εκ θεου	489 927
	τα υπο θεου	945
1 Cor. 2:14	θεου	1506 1827 1875
1 Cor. 3:19	θεω	C D F G 440
1 Cor. 4:5	θεος	D*
1 Cor. 4:5	απο θεου	D 1243 1611 <i>pc</i>
1 Cor. 10:32	θεου	F (αυτου θεου G)
1 Cor. 11:3	χριστος	B* D* F G P 1243 1874 2147
1 Cor. 11:13	θεω	Ψ 330 2400
1 Cor. 11:23	παρα κυριου απο θεου	D (απο του κυριου <i>rell</i>) F G
1 Cor. 11:23	κυριος	5
2 Cor. 11:3	χριστον	\aleph F G 075 0121 0243
Eph. 2:13	χριστου	\mathfrak{P}^{46} B
Phil. 1:17	χριστον	\aleph^1 B F G Ψ 0278 (\mathfrak{P}^{46} <i>lac</i>)

Article read by few manuscripts:

1 Cor. 1:17	ο χριστος	\mathfrak{P}^{46} B F G <i>pc</i>
1 Cor. 3:11	ο χριστος	1505 2495

¹²B. Weiss, p. 73.

1 Cor. 3:16	του θεου (1)	378 104 1315 1874 1912
1 Cor. 4:1	του θεου	F G
1 Cor. 8:6	ιησους ο χριστος	P 614 2412
Rom. 9:28	ο κυριος	B
Phil. 3:8	του χριστου ιησου	ϑ ⁴⁶ ϑ ⁶¹ B
1 Thess. 4:1	τω κυριω	Ⲛ A 075 (ϑ ⁴⁶ lac)
2 Thess. 2:13	του κυριου	Ⲛ A Ψ (ϑ ⁴⁶ lac)

Manuscripts divided:

1 Cor. 11:3	του χριστου	Ⲛ A B D 33 43 69 81 88 181 256 263 436 915 917 1175 1319 1611 1834 1836 1837 1875 1898 2127 C1 Eus Chr χριστου ϑ ⁴⁶ C F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 104 326 424 614 876 1241 ^s 1739 1912
1 Cor. 11:32	του κυριου	Ⲛ B C 0150 33 69 104 234 436 547 618 1175 1738 1831 1838 κυριου ϑ ⁴⁶ A D F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 81 88 104 181 326 424 614 915 917 1241 ^s 1739 1834 1836 1875 1881 1898 1912
1 Tim. 5:5	θεον	C F G P Y 048 0150 ^o τον θεον Ⲛ ² A D ² K L 056 075 0142 0151 θεου 0150 [*] κυριον Ⲛ [*] τον κυριον D [*]

11.3.12

Three consecutive clauses with similar structure led to two adaptations to the near context. G* writes χριστου after κεφαλη δε (1), the result of a skip to κεφαλη δε χριστου in the next clause.¹³ P omits the second δε (κεφαλη γυναικος), thereby matching the previous clause.

11:4.16; 11:10.42

¹³The *nomen sacra* has been marked out with a line for deletion, nevertheless $\overline{\text{xri}}$ is written supralinear.

The opaqueness of both the meaning and significance of having one's head covered in 11:2-16 has resulted in slight disruption to the tradition.¹⁴ At 11:4 several witnesses (216 424* 440 999 1315) fill in the missing object with the noun *καλυμμα*. This noun does not occur in this context, though a cognate verb, *καταλύπτω*, occurs several times at 11:6-7. Again at 11:10, a few bohairic manuscripts, some Vulgate manuscripts¹⁵ (N O^c P W Z⁴) and Latin fathers, including Irenaeus,¹⁶ replace *ἐξουσιαν* with *καλυμμα*. At both places the motivation is a desire for clarity. Furthermore, both cases must have been the result of intentional editing. As at 6:5, the Greek manuscripts are content to let a difficult passage stand, but the versional and patristic witnesses make the alterations in order to produce a more readable text.

11:5.18

11:4 and 11:5 stand in structural parallel. In each, Paul expresses the (presumably) shared understanding of the significance of a man (v. 4) or a woman (v. 5) praying or prophesying with the head either covered or uncovered. However, the manuscripts (and some

¹⁴This section is viewed today as one of the most difficult passages in Paul, and has been the subject of much recent study. The passage was not, however, frequently used by the ancient writers. This may have been because the issue of head covering was unique to the time or situation of 1 Corinthians, while it was not an issue to later users of this text. In any case, the lack of the use of 11:1-13 has resulted in relatively few variations, and none that significantly affect the interpretation of the passage.

¹⁵Lorenzo Valla in the sixteenth century noted the reading in some manuscripts of the Vulgate, commenting: "Melius in aliis codicibus legitur 'potestatem' non 'velamen'". In *Collatio novi testamenti*, ed. Alessandro Perosa, Studi e Testi, I (Firenze: Sansoni Editore, 1970), 207.

¹⁶Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2,40; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechelem* 13; *Commentariorum in Matheum* 3; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1,8,2. This last citation is describing the teachings of the Valentinians. In the introduction to the citation of 1 Cor. 8:10, the antecedent of *εἰπόντα* / *dicentem* appears to be Paul, but may be the Valentinian teacher Ptolemy. The citation is understood in the latter way by Zuntz (p. 143) and the NA²⁷ apparatus. In either case, Irenaeus does not comment on any difference between his text and that of the Valentinians.

modern translators and commentators) are undecided as to whether v. 5 stands in contrastive¹⁷ or consecutive¹⁸ relationship. Most Greek witnesses read δε, which would favor (though not require) a contrastive relationship. A consecutive relationship is understood by several witnesses, however. A and the Peshitta read και / -א, while P and Ambrosiaster lack any conjunction.

The fact that several readings are attested here causes Güting and Mealand to adopt the shortest as archetypical.¹⁹ After noting that the sequence in the vast majority of witnesses “is inconspicuous and in harmony with frequent stylistic patterns” they nevertheless accept the witness of P for two reasons. First, the asyndeton matches other examples of parallel phrases, each with asyndeta (1 Cor. 3:14; 7:18, 27). Second, they argue that the reading in A (και) indicates a disruption in the tradition, with the original asyndeton removed either with the addition of δε or και. However, this reconstruction is unlikely. On stylistic grounds, the δε parallels other similar examples such as 1 Cor. 7:8, 12-15, 21, 32, 39; 14:4 (all of which they cite on pp. 40-41), since these examples, like 11:4-5, are contrastive. Furthermore, the witnesses that attest the minority readings are not innocent of altering conjunctions elsewhere. P alone removes δε (prior to γυναικος) also at 11:3; A sy^p (with a few other later witnesses) replace הַ with και at 11:27; and the Peshitta, as do most translations, often uses conjunctions which are more natural in that language, and not necessarily identical to their common Greek equivalents (e.g., וְ “for” at 1 Cor. 4:4 and 13:8, the latter where the Greek

¹⁷Fee, p. 508; Schrage II, p. 489 translates with “aber” (without discussion); Conzelmann, p. 181, translates with “however” without discussion; Lindemann, p. 241 labels 5a an “entgegengesetzte Aussage.”

¹⁸Fee, p. 508 n. 66 lists the English translations that assume a connective relationship; most, however, assume a contrastive. Thiselton, p. 800, does not translate a conjunction, thereby assuming a consecutive relationship.

¹⁹Güting and Mealand, p. 44-5.

uses δέ). Instead of pointing to an early insertion, the readings of A sy^P and P Ambrosiaster more likely reflect attempts to clarify the relationship between vv. 4 and 5.

11:5.21

The personal pronoun regularly stands for the reflexive;²⁰ similarity in sound and the tendency of the stronger vowel sound to supplant the weaker²¹ leads to frequent confusion of the pronouns in the NT manuscripts. At 11:5, while assimilation to the preceding την κεφαλην αυτου is a possibility,²² it is more likely that a desire to clarify whose head is shamed led to the alteration to εαυτης. Notably, B D 6 join a small number of witnesses that make the clarification.

11:6.25

The replacement of κειρασθω with κειρεσθω is likely simply a confusion of sound, though the shift from the aorist to the present may have been influenced by the present imperative κατακαλυπτεσθω at the end of the sentence. The near context has also influenced a reading found only in B, which adds η ξυρασθω after κειρασθω. This can only be an addition from 11:6b, where the same verb is found in the infinitive form. The fact that it is changed to the imperative to suit its new context indicates intentional editing. B. Weiss points to two similar examples of intentional additions in B which were based on the near

²⁰Jannaris §1405.

²¹Jannaris §150c.

²²B. Weiss, p. 26.

context: the addition of *και ταις επιθυμαις* at Eph.2:5 (from Eph. 2:3; also read by Ψ) and the addition of *και το χρυσουν θυμιατηριον* at Heb. 9:2 (based on 9:4).²³

11:7.29 [discussed at 5:3.7]

11:7.30 [discussed at 10:4.12]

11:9.36

1241 alone omits *και γαρ*. This may have been caused by the fact that a new lection begins at this place, making the conjunctions unnecessary.

11:9.40

℘⁴⁶ alone replaces *ανδρα* with *ανθρωπον*, a word that shares semantic overlap with *άνήρ* but does not appear elsewhere in this context.

²³B. Weiss, p. 127.

11:10.41

At both 11:8 and 11:9 Paul uses the word order verb-subject. There is no obvious reason to depart from that word order here, therefore the reading $\eta \gamma\upsilon\nu\eta \sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota$ (H 33 69 255 256 263 1108 1311 1319 1611 2127) was likely made in order to place the subject before the verb, as was done at 10:5 (see also 12:18.76).

11:11.44

In 11:4-9, in his comparison between of the significance of a man's praying or prophesying with his head covered and a woman doing the same, Paul always discusses the man first (vv. 4-5, 7, 8, 9). However, at verse 10 the argument shifts to the reasons that a woman ought to pray with her head covered. Since the focus of the argument has shifted, the woman is discussed first at vv. 10-12, followed by comparison to the man. At 11:10, 12 this sequence is preserved without variation. At 11:11, however, the majority of witnesses discuss the man first ($\sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon \alpha\nu\eta\rho \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon \gamma\upsilon\nu\eta \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ D¹ K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 69 81 88 104 181 424 876 915 *pm*). This is likely the result of assimilation to the sequence found in 11:4-9, but disrupts the shift in focus that has taken place in v. 10.

11:12.48

The shift from $\delta\iota\alpha$ to $\epsilon\kappa$ (K 0151 33 *pc*) was caused either by the similar meaning in this context or from the influence $\epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ at the end of the sentence.

11:13.49 [discussed in the chapter on D F G]

11:14.53

Paul never introduces a question that expects a negative answer with ἢ οὐδέ. His consistent (as also in the other writings of the NT) formula being ἢ οὐκ (Rom. 9:21; 2 Cor. 13:5), especially in the phrase ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε (Rom. 11:2; 1 Cor. 6:2, 15, 16²⁴). The conjunction ἢ may have been added here either to remove the asyndeton or under the influence of the examples of ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε earlier in the book.²⁵ More significantly, it matches the tendency of the “Byzantine” witnesses to add conjunctions in order to clarify Paul’s logical argumentation.

11:14.54

The NT follows classical usage when αὐτός in the predicate position functions as an intensive modifier to a noun.²⁶ Several examples may be found in the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum*:

Rom. 8:16	αὐτο το πνευμα] το πνευμα 1827; αὐτος το πνευμα 33
Rom. 8:21	αὐτη η κτισις] αὐτη κτισις F G
Rom. 8:26a	το πνευμα (1)] αὐτο το πνευμα 1735 ²⁷
Rom. 8:26b	αὐτο το πνευμα] αὐτο πνευμα 489; το πνευμα 1004
1 Cor. 11:14	η φυσις F G; η φυσις αὐτη (αὐτης ϐ ⁴⁶)] αὐτη η φυσις D ¹ K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 pm]
1 Cor. 15:28	αὐτος ο υιος] αὐτος 205 Te Ir Hipp Amst
2 Cor. 8:19	αὐτου του κυριου] αὐτην του κυριου P 0243; του κυριου B C D* F G L ²⁸
2 Cor. 11:14	αὐτος γαρ ο σατανας

²⁴For the examples in 1 Cor. 6 see the discussion at 6:2.5.

²⁵Güting and Mealand do not account for the addition but simply dismiss based on manuscript authority: “Good and widespread tradition lacks the addition here.” (p. 51).

²⁶BDR §288; Kühner-Gerth, §468.

²⁷A clear example of assimilation to the following occurrence.

²⁸ϐ⁴⁶ has a lengthy parablepsis here, which prevents its citation for this unit of variation.

1 The. 3:11	αυτος δε ο θεος
1 The. 4:16	αυτος ο κυριος
1 The. 5:13	αυτος δε ο θεος
2 The. 2:16	αυτος δε ο κυριος
2 The. 3:16	αυτος δε ο κυριος] αυτος δε ο κυριος F G L

Two of these examples may be confidently dismissed as secondary introductions of the pronoun.²⁹ The addition at Rom. 8:26a has been inserted based on the identical wording later in the sentence, while at 1 Cor. 3:13 (already discussed) the *αυτο* is not intensive but a reflexive pronoun referring back to *το εργον*. Three other examples are questionable based on Pauline usage. Having removed 1 Cor. 3:13 from consideration, 1 Cor. 11:14 stands out as the only example in the manuscripts of the pronoun standing after the noun. This deviates from both classical and Pauline usage, which suggests that the position is secondary. However, it is more likely that this unusual position would have been altered than that the pronoun would have moved from the normal position. Therefore, the archetypal text of 1 Cor. 11:14 likely read *η φυσις αυτη*, with some witnesses moving the pronoun for stylistic reasons.³⁰

11:14.55; 11:18.70; 11:20.78

Further examples of 1241 shifting from *υμ-* to *ημ-*.

11:14.57

γαρ never occurs in a clause introduced by *οτι* in the *Corpus Paulinum*. The *οτι* (N^o 1243) makes sense only if *οτι* is taken as *ο τι* (the neuter form of *οστις*) so that the passage is understood in this way: “Does not nature itself teach us something? For if a man . . .”

²⁹The reading of F G, which lack the *αυτη*, cannot be archetypal since it was omitted in this witnesses by adaptation to the Latin text. See the chapter on D F G.

³⁰This wording precisely matches Rom. 8:21, though assimilation to that remote parallel is not as likely as alteration for stylistic reasons.

While the reading construes, it is more likely a scribal adaptation based on a misreading of ὅτι than the archetypical text. The *Corpus Paulinum* shows only one example of ὅστις in a question (Rom. 6:2).

11:14.58

F G lost the initial letter of ατιμια, turning “dishonor” into “honor” and resulting in the opposite argument to what is being made in the context. The alpha may have been lost because the preceding word ends with the same letter (κομα), but both the lineation in D and the fact that G capitalizes the initial letter of τιμια makes clear that the two words stood on separate lines. The loss of the letter may have been a simple blunder, though again it shows that the editing of F G was done by someone who was not entirely certain of what the Greek text read. A comparable example is αμορφα for μορφα at 12:2.4.

11:15.61

Zuntz argues that the addition of αυτη here destroys the argument by analogy that Paul develops based on Stoic thinking. That Paul’s argument can be attributed to Stoicism has been denied by many commentators.³¹ Furthermore, it is doubtful that the presence of αυτη results in a significantly different understanding of the passage.³² Apart from any question of the meaning of the passage, it is more likely that the pronoun has been added by assimilation to the near context. The preceding question (11:15a) uses the same form, prompting its addition here. Furthermore, the presence of the pronoun in some manuscripts before the verb and in some following the verb points to independent and secondary

³¹E.g., Thiselton, pp. 844-46, who provides references to other discussions.

³²Conzelmann, p. 190 n. 95, responding directly to Zuntz: “In reality it [the presence of αυτη] makes no difference.”

insertion.³³ Finally, addition by assimilation to the near context is not unknown in the witnesses that read the pronoun. A very similar situation occurs at 2:4, where only \mathfrak{P}^{46} F G avoid the insertions, whereas \aleph A B and the rest of the Greek tradition make various additions based on 2:13.

11.17.64

The addition/omission of a single letter (ν) at the end of both παραγελλω[ν] and επαινω[ν] caused considerable confusion in the tradition, with every combination of forms found in the manuscript tradition. B and D have the least sensible texts here. B writes both as participles (παραγελλων ουκ επαινων) while D writes them as indicatives.³⁴ As Lietzmann points out, the reading that is necessary in the context is παραγελλων ουκ επαινω, for in the succeeding clause Paul rebukes but does not command.³⁵

11:17.65

Atticism has played a role in several variations involving the spelling of comparative adjective and adverbs. Moeris favors ἥττω as the Attic form and rejects ἥσσονα as Hellenistic.³⁶ The manuscripts read as follows:³⁷

³³Zuntz, p. 127; Fee, p. 524 n. 2.

³⁴Vogels ("Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 278) D's reading as a conflation, but it is more likely a copying error. It is found also 81 263, but also in VL 89's *praecipio non laudo*.

³⁵H. Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord's Supper* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), p. 55; cf. also B. Weiss, p. 51; Fee, p. 534-5, n. 15; Conzelmann, 192 n. 1; Barrett, p. 258 n. 1.

³⁶Moeris, *Atticistica*, η 10. See also J. K. Elliott, "Moeris and the Textual Tradition of the Greek New Testament," 148-9.

³⁷For the purposes of this list, only variations involving -σσ- / -ττ- are not; differences in spelling involving vowels are not.

1 Cor. 7:9	κρεισσον κρειπτον	A C F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 614 Ϟ ⁴⁶ ⑆ B D 33 69 81 206 321 429 1175 1739
1 Cor. 7:38	κρεισσον	all witnesses apart from 69 (κρειπτον)
1 Cor. 11:17	κρεισσον κρειπτον	⑆ A B C D* F G P 0150 33 81 104 181 917 1175 1241 ^a 1739 D ² K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 326 424 614 876 915
1 Cor. 11:17	ησσον ηπτον ελαπτον	⑆ A B C D* P 0150 33 81 104 181 917 1175 1241 ^a 1739 D ² K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 424 424 614 876 915 F G
1 Cor. 12:31	μειζονα κρειπτονα κρεισσονα	Ϟ ⁴⁶ ⑆ A B C 0150 K L Ψ 056 0142 0151 D F G
2 Cor. 12:15	ησσον ηπτον ελασσον	Ϟ ⁴⁶ ⑆* A B D* P 0243 ⑆ ² D ² K L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0295 ^{vid} 614 876 915 F G (<i>minus</i>)
Gal. 4:17	ζηλουτε	+ ζηλουτε δε τα κριπτω χαρισματα D F G lat

NA²⁷ simply follows the “best manuscripts” by printing -σσ- in the two examples at 11:17 but -ττ- at 7:9. In the *Corpus Paulinum*, only at 1 Tim. 5:9 is -ττ- found without variation (ελαπτον; ηπτον 056 0142). Otherwise, A always writes -σσ-, which is the preferred reading in each place, while the “Byzantine” text prefers -ττ-. This type of variation is very helpful in clarifying the relationship among D and F G (see the discussion in the chapter on D F G).

11:17.67; 11:18.69 [discussed at 7:13.47]

11:18.68 [discussed at 5:3.7]

11:18.72; 11:19.74; 11:19.76

In three consecutive clauses there is variation involving εν υμιν. At 11:18, all manuscripts read the phrase, though D F G and both the Latin and Syriac tradition place the phrase after the verb. Εν υμιν here functions adverbially (modifying απαρχειν) not adjectivally (modifying σχισματα), therefore the position after the verb should be expected (cf. 1 Th. 2:13 ἐνέργεται ἐν ὑμῖν). However, Paul typically places the prepositional phrase after the noun when the verb is εἰμί or its equivalent (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:11 ἔριδες ἐν ὑμῖν

εἶσιν; 1 Cor. 14:25 ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν). The shift to σχίσματα ὑπαρχειν ἐν ὑμῖν may represent a tendency among these witnesses, particularly D F G and the Latin, to avoid having the verb stand at the end of the clause. Similar shifts take place at 10:19 (twice) and 11:13. The Syriac tradition makes the same shift at 11:19a against all Greek witnesses, again moving the prepositional phrase (ܐܢܗܘܢ) to the position following the verb.

At 11:19 there are two places where the presence of ἐν ὑμῖν is in question. The first (after αἵρεσις) involves issues of both assimilation and meaning. Αἵρεσις is used in the NT to refer to either a “group that holds tenets distinctive to it” or to “that which distinguishes a group’s thinking.”³⁸ However, in the post-NT period the term was used of a group’s teaching which differed from Christianity’s to such an extent that, from the perspective of the users of the term, they had removed themselves from Christianity. Already in the letters of Ignatius this latter usage is found, clearly at *Trallians* 6,2 and likely at *Ephesians* 6,2. This usage is continued by Origen³⁹ and, if the catena tradition is to be trusted, Ammonius (presumably of Alexandria), who understand αἵρεσις in Acts 28:22 to mean “heresies,” even though the context makes clear that it should be “sects:”

The Jews call faith in Christ a heresy, “because everywhere it is spoken against.”⁴⁰ Look! even the Jews testify that Christ is proclaimed everywhere, except not all, it says, receive the proclamation, but some Jews or Greeks condemn it, or also other heretics who do not agree with the true faith. For it is necessary that there be heresies, so that the proven ones might shine, and so that what was prophesied about Christ by Simeon the prophet might be fulfilled through them, who said about him: “Behold,

³⁸BDAG, s.v. αἵρεσις.

³⁹Also Origen, *Contra Celsum* 3,13 after citing 1 Cor. 11:19 (with ἐν ὑμῖν read twice) at the beginning of the section, he concludes: “But it may be that Celsus has come to know of certain heresies which do not share with us even the name of Jesus. Probably he had heard of the so-called Ophites and Cainites, or some other such doctrine which has entirely abandoned Jesus.”

⁴⁰Acts 28:22; αἵρεσις occurs earlier in the verse, in the sense of “sect.”

this child is chosen for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and a sign which is spoken against.”⁴¹

It should be noted that Ammonius does not read *εν υμιν* at either potential location. He may have lost it either because he is only paraphrasing or because he wished to apply the passage in his own day.

It is this later understanding which may have influenced the text of 1 Cor. 11:19. Zuntz argues that the omission of *εν υμιν* “gives to the sentence a generalizing character which may have suited some readers or scribes but does not fit the context.”⁴² We have already seen this as a possibility in Ammonius’ citation. Though not noting the variant, Schrage argues that the presence of *εν υμιν* speaks against reading this passage as speaking of future *αἵρεσεις*. But earlier users of 1 Corinthians applied the passage generally even though they read *εν υμιν*. And if applied generally, beyond the situation in Corinth, readers and interpreters would likely have had difficulty with Paul saying that “heresies are necessary.”

Evidence of this difficulty is found in both Greek and Latin writers. A comment ascribed to Theodoret argues specifically that *αἵρεσεις* should not be understood to refer to teachings:

“He means “divisions” not “teachings,” but these are the things of those who lust for power, which things he spoke against at the beginning of the epistle. But he very prudently tempers an excessive accusation. For he did not say simply “I believe,” rather “partly I believe it. For it is necessary that there be divisions among you, so that the proven ones be evident among you.” *αἵρεσεις* means those who love strife, not those who differ in teachings. But the *δεῖ* is not compulsory of the matter, but is

⁴¹*Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 3, p. 415.

⁴²Zuntz, p. 141.

prescient. This was also spoken of by the Lord, “It is necessary that scandals [σκάνδαλα] occur.”⁴³

In the Latin tradition, the equivalent of *εν υμιν* is lacking in virtually all witnesses and 1 Cor. 11:19 is universally understood to refer to “heresies.” Elsewhere in the NT, *αἵρεσες* is understood both in its NT sense (translated with *secta* at Acts 24:5; 26:5; 28:22, Gal. 5:20 VL 78* Vg; 2 Pet. 2:1) as well as the later sense (*hereses* at 1 Cor. 11:19; Gal. 5:20 VL 61 75 77 78^c 89).⁴⁴ Already with Tertullian, however, we find 1 Cor. 11:19 used numerous times in his apologetic writings, always understood to refer to “heresies.” His concern about the import of this passage is expressed pithily, in the midst of a discussion of Marcion and Valentinus: “For it is necessary that there be heresies. And yet although they are necessary, it does not follow that heresies are a good thing.”⁴⁵ It is evident here that Tertullian understands this passage to refer to circumstances beyond Corinth. He is unlikely to have intentionally omitted the equivalent of *εν υμιν*, however, since he never includes it in any reference or citation to the passage. He does, however, read the phrase in a citation of 11:18 (*De baptismo* 14,2). Beyond Tertullian, perhaps the most obvious sign of difficulty with this passage is an insertion in the Codex Ulmensis, a ninth century Vulgate manuscript. Immediately following *hereses* appears a note from the commentary of Cassiodorus explaining how heresies could be “necessary.”⁴⁶

⁴³*Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* MPG 82, p. 316; similar comments are found in Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 225.

⁴⁴The Syriac tradition, in contrast with the Latin, accurately renders *αἵρεσεις* with ܐܘܪܝܘܢܐ (“contention, strife”) in the Peshitta and the plural of ܐܘܪܝܘܢܐ in the Harklean. The latter is built on the verb stem ܐܘܪܝܘܢܐ (“quarrelsome, contentious”).

⁴⁵*De praescriptione haereticorum* 30. 1 Cor. 11:19 is also cited in the same book at section 39 and at *De resurrectione mortuorum* 63.

⁴⁶Reference and text from Wordsworth-White, *ad loc*, though the editors do not indicate the source of the insertion (MPL 68, p. 533).

This lengthy review of the use of this passage has been necessary to demonstrate that there was difficulty with the meaning of the word αἵρεσις. Early Greek writers understood the term in the sense of “heresies,” and, as a result of a poor translation choice (which was, however, consistently followed), so did the Latin writers. However, whether understood as “divisions” or “heresies,” the writers sought in way or another to clarify that heresies, although “necessary,” were not welcome. Theodoret and Chrysostom did so by appealing to the context of 1 Corinthians itself. The presence of ἐν ὑμῖν in their texts aided this line of argumentation, for the αἵρεσις could then be seen as a result of the situation in Corinth. Given the difficulties that the Latin tradition had with the claim that (as they understood it) “heresies are necessary,” it seems extremely unlikely that either ἐν ὑμῖν would have been intentionally ignored in translation, or that *in vobis* would have been intentionally omitted. It is more likely that the Latin tradition was based on the text now found in D F G, and that its writers could not appeal to the prepositional phrase because it was not available to them.

Since intentional omission is not likely, a far more likely cause of corruption is insertion of the phrase from the near context. In the preceding sentence, as we saw above, ἐν ὑμῖν occurs after σχίσματα.

The question of the addition/omission of ἐν ὑμῖν at the end of the verse (omit ℘⁴⁶ C 2464) is less difficult. The addition of ἐν ὑμῖν in the previous clause made this occurrence superfluous, resulting in its loss in these few witnesses.⁴⁷ In similar fashion, ℘⁴⁶ loses ὑμας at 11:22,⁴⁸ which was redundant after the preceding clause (τι εἶπω ὑμῖν).

⁴⁷According to Fee (p. 535 n. 17), the phrase was omitted “probably because it comes at the end of Paul’s sentence, which would have been complete in the scribe’s mind without it.”

⁴⁸Royse, p. 266, attributes the loss to harmonization to the following clause.

11:19.75

“*ἵνα καί* is common in the epistles, yet rarely sees variation.⁴⁹ Zuntz sees the *καί* as secondary, since *ἵνα καί* assumes a “longish, unwritten sentiment leading up to the notion of ‘that also’, which is properly ascribed to *ἵνα καί* in other Pauline passages.”⁵⁰ Yet others argue that the *καί* was more likely deleted than added.⁵¹ What has not been observed, however, is that the two clauses of 11:19 have influenced each other through addition and omission. As seen above, most witnesses bring the two into parallel by the addition of *ἐν ὑμῖν* to the first clause. This raises the issue of whether *καί* after *ἵνα* was added to bring the two clauses into parallel (no witness omits the first *καί*), or whether reading a *καί* in two consecutive clauses was perceived as difficult with the result that the second was omitted. Confirming this are several observations. First, as discussed 10:7.23, adverbial *καί* is nowhere else omitted by the manuscripts in the *Hauptbriefe*. Second, *καί . . . ἵνα καί* occurs nowhere else in the epistles.⁵² Finally, the likelihood of influence from the near context makes it more likely that the *καί* was added (P⁴⁶ B D* 6 1739) than omitted.

11:20.77

After a digression regarding the presence of divisions in the community (10:19), Paul returns to the topic under discussion, the gatherings for meals. This is signaled most clearly

⁴⁹In the *Hauptbriefe*: Rom. 8:17 (P⁴⁶ omit *καί*); 11:31; 14:9; 1 Cor. 4:8; 7:29; 14:19 (323 omit *καί*); 16:16 (1881 omit *καί*); 2 Cor. 4:10, 11; 8:7, 14.

⁵⁰Zuntz, p. 211.

⁵¹B. Weiss, p. 112; Lindemann, p. 250.

⁵²At Rom. 14:9 (*εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, ἵνα καὶ . . .*) the first *καί* is copulative, not correlative, as at 1 Cor. 11:19.

by a repetition of *συνερχομένον* (10:18, 20).⁵³ When reintroducing a topic, *οὖν* is frequently used as a consecutive coordinating conjunction (compare 1 Cor. 8:4),⁵⁴ matching the usage here.⁵⁵ Its loss in \mathfrak{P}^{46} D* F G (and the non-Vulgate Latin tradition) can be attributed either to an accidental leap (*ΚΥΝΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΩΝΟΥΝ*)⁵⁶ or to confusion over the function *οὖν*. When used as it is here, *οὖν* functions as a structural marker and is frequently left untranslated or rendered with a loose connective.⁵⁷ Since it did not significantly contribute to the meaning of the passage, it may have been overlooked by an early scribe. The fact that the loss is shared by \mathfrak{P}^{46} D* F G is likely not accidental, but another example of the close relationship among these witnesses.

11:20.79 [discussed in D F G section]

11:21.81

The substitution of prepositions takes place regularly in the manuscripts. Since *ἐπι* + infinitive never occurs in the *Corpus Paulinum*, the reading of D F G has little possibility of being archetypal. Instead, it is most likely the result of assimilation to *ἐπι το αὐτο* of the preceding clause.⁵⁸ A few witnesses (3 33 1108 1611) read *εἰς το φαγειν*. In the NT there is

⁵³W. Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 3. Teilband 1 Kor 11,17-14,40. Evangelisch-Katholisch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Zürich: Benziger, 1999), p. 22 [hereafter Schrage III].

⁵⁴BDR § 451²; BDAG, s.v. *οὖν* 2a.

⁵⁵Fee, p. 535 n. 18 and Güting and Mealand, p. 36 n. 45.

⁵⁶So Zuntz, p. 192.

⁵⁷Schrage (III, p. 8), for example, translates with “nun (so)”; Lindemann (p. 247) with “also”; Barrett (p. 259) with “so then.”

⁵⁸The infrequent use of *ἐπί* leads Jannaris (§ 1583) to suggest that “there is strong reason to suspect that its post-Christian record was due, at least since [the Transitional Period, AD 300-600], to an Atticistic or scholarly zeal.” These dates, however, are too late to have

overlap between ἐν and εἰς.⁵⁹ The alteration, however, is probably the result of the growing use of εἰς in place of ἐν which began already in the Hellenistic period.⁶⁰ Assimilation is also possible, since εἰς το εσθιειν (11:22) and εἰς το φαγειν (11:33) are also found in this context. However, the fact that all witnesses retain εἰς in these places – and none harmonize to 11:21– shows that εἰς is more likely to substitute for ἐν than ἐν for replace εἰς.

11:22.82 [discussed at 10:7.26]

11:22.84

In the *Hauptbriefe* the neuter interrogative pronoun is followed by the verb or the subject thirteen times,⁶¹ in addition to numerous examples of brief questions consisting of only the interrogative and verb. Especially relevant, because it also uses λέγω, is Rom. 11:4 (τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός;).⁶² The only exceptions to this pattern are Rom. 4:3, a citation of Is. 29:6, and 1 Cor. 14:6. In statements where Paul uses λέγω, the verb may either precede the indirect object (Gal. 4:21; 5:2, 21) or follow it (Rom. 11:13; 1 Cor. 15:34, 51). This may have influenced the wording ὑμῖν λεγω, though similar witnesses also shift ὑμῖν to the position preceding the verb at 1 Cor. 3:1 (ὑμῖν λεγω D^{*.2} L P Ψ 048^{vid} 049 0150 0151 5 6 88 104 251 489 623 915 1739 1827 1912 2143).

influenced the shared ancestor of D F G.

⁵⁹Cf. BDR §§205-6.

⁶⁰Jannaris §§1548, 1549.

⁶¹Rom. 4:1; 8:31; 11:2, 4; 14:10; 1 Cor. 3:5 (2x); 4:7; 10:30; 15:29, 30; 2 Cor. 12:13; Gal 4:30.

⁶²Cf. also 2 Thess. 2:5 (ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν;), which is also question but does not use the interrogative pronoun.

11:22.85 [also 1:15.50; 1:16.51]

The similarity of the forms of the verbs at 11:22 is remarkably parallel to the situation at 1:15. There, two forms of βαπτίζω stand consecutively. The manuscript tradition reads either εβαπτισα εβαπτισα (L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 88 326 614 *al* syr^p), εβαπτισα βεβαπτικα D F G b d f g Amst(A), or εβαπτισθητε εβαπτισα ϩ⁴⁶ ⋈ A B C* E 0150 5 6 33 69 81 88 104 206 424^c 429 436 441 614 1175 1739 *al*. In that passage the preceding context has likely created the reading εβαπτισθητε εβαπτισα, for the same forms stand in two consecutive clauses at 1:13-14, both of which are similar to 1:15 and 16a. In addition, the first person εβαπτισα is difficult at 1:15, thus providing motivation for assimilation.⁶³ The reading εβαπτισα εβαπτισα has also likely resulted from assimilation, with the first form preserved correctly but the second altered to match 1:14b. The reading most likely to have caused the others is εβαπτισα βεβαπτικα. The perfect form is unique in this context, but Paul frequently uses a perfect form “in a past context, often parallel with other past-referring verb forms.”⁶⁴ Comparison may be made to 1 Cor. 15:3 εγηγερται, which is preceded by two and followed by one aorist verb forms. The difficulty of εβαπτισα at 1:14 and the uniqueness of βεβαπτικα in this context invited alteration by assimilation to the near context.

Similar verb forms also stand together at 11:22. The present tense form ἐπαινῶ stands at 11:3 and 17, and again in the final clause at 11:22. In the fifth clause at 11:22, ϩ⁴⁶ B F G, joined by the entire Latin tradition (apart from a few late Vulgate witnesses), read the present tense επαινω (*laudo*).⁶⁵ The vast majority of witnesses, however, read επαινεσω,

⁶³Lindemann, p. 42.

⁶⁴Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, p. 260, with Pauline examples on pp. 262-3.

⁶⁵The defection of D from F G VL 75 and the D-text indicates another correction away from the shared ancestor of D F G under the influence of a Greek witness similar to A.

which may be either an aorist subjunctive or future indicative form. The tendency toward assimilation makes it likely that *επαινω* is the secondary reading.⁶⁶ This is confirmed by comparison to other examples of questions in Paul. After a question such as “what do we say?” Paul frequently follows with another question, the answer to which is clearly negative. The verb in the second question is typically in the subjunctive:⁶⁷

- Rom. 6:1 *επιμενωμεν* A B C D F G Ψ 33 Λ 88 489 424^c;
 επιμενομεν ⑆ K P 049 6 1739
 επιμενουμεν 056 *pc*
- Rom. 6:15 *αμαρτησωμεν* ⑆ A B C D K L P Ψ 049 056 33 88 1739 *pm*
 αμαρτησομεν 6 424 489 629 1881 *al*
 ημαρτησαμεν F G
- 1 Cor. 4:21 *ελθω* *rell*
 ελθειν 630 1827
- 1 Cor. 11:22 *επαινεσω* ⑆ A C D
 επαινω ϩ⁴⁶ B F G

11:23.93 [discussed in chapter on “Alexandrian” witnesses]

11:23-25

These passages are among the most likely to have been corrupted in the course of transmission. Not only are the normal scribal alterations possible, but also likely is harmonization to the parallel accounts in the synoptic gospels, in particular the very similar account in Luke.⁶⁸ This can be seen in some manuscripts directly. Several witnesses (G 5

⁶⁶B. Weiss, p. 41; Zuntz, p. 92; Fee, p. 535 n. 20.

⁶⁷The example at 1 Cor. 10:19 must use *εστιν* (cf. Rom. 8:31; 9:14, where the *εστιν* is assumed) since it is in a predicate nominative construction.

⁶⁸The textual uncertainty of Luke 22:19a-20 has long been discussed. Westcott and Hort considered it to be a secondary adaptation based on 1 Cor. 11 (*Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, Appendix, pp. 63-4. If it were clear that the Lukan passage is adopted from 1 Cor. 11, we would have the earliest evidence for the text of 1 Corinthians. However, the wording in the longer text of Luke appears to be too distinct, particularly in the use of *διδόμενον* and *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* without Paul’s *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, to be accepted as clearly derived from 1 Corinthians and useful in making textual decisions for this passage.

1739) place a reference to Matthew in the margin at this place. Though this is too late have caused the harmonization, it does show that at least some users of 1 Corinthians saw the passage as parallel to Matthew. Furthermore, this passage (along with the accounts in the Synoptics) was taken up almost immediately, it appears, for use in Christian rites. This means that adaptation to wording familiar from a worship context is a potential source of corruption. Each of these potential causes of corruption will be examined for each unit of variation, though because of its unique role in the transmission of these passages, the possibility of liturgical influence will be examined in detail. An additional complication in this section is that Paul indicates that the material recorded in these verses is not his own, and scholarship has universally accepted this claim.⁶⁹ Therefore, appeals to Pauline usage are not able to resolve textual problems in this section.

Influence from liturgical texts is regularly assumed,⁷⁰ though verifying it is extremely problematic for several reasons. First, there is no single line of liturgical tradition nor a single “primitive” liturgy which can be reconstructed.⁷¹ If the wording of worship rites were to impact the transmission of the NT it would have been to a local usage, with the result that whatever readings would creep into the manuscripts would vary based on the worship practices of the scribes/readers. One would therefore expect wide variation in the NT manuscripts and many singular readings, not a few readings with widespread attestation.

⁶⁹E.g., Schrage III, pp. 29-30; Thiselton, pp. 866-7. Joachim Jeremias (*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. from the third German edition by Norman Perrin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 104) lists nine specific lexical and syntactical features of this passage that are not found elsewhere in Paul.

⁷⁰E.g., Fee (p. 545 n. 1) notes that λαβετε φαγετε at 11:24 has been borrowed from Matt 26:26, but at the same time is a “liturgical” assimilation.”

⁷¹See, *inter alia*, Gregory Dix, “Primitive Consecration Prayers,” *Theology* 37 (1938): 261-83 and Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 139-43.

Second, liturgical prayers were oral, not written, during the period during which the text of Paul was in the most flux. Bradshaw observes,

In most cases, these [eucharistic] prayers probably circulated orally rather than in written form until perhaps the late third or even the early fourth century, when the relatively fluid prayer traditions began to crystallize, and more stable, written texts began to appear. The increasing use of written texts at that time would have been encouraged both by pressures towards doctrinal conformity and by the desire to provide more elevated and polished forms appropriate to the new surroundings created by the building of large city churches.⁷²

The oral element introduces even more potential variation. It also cautions us against easily identifying the source of a reading in the Pauline manuscripts with a specific liturgical document. The third difficulty in the use of these texts is that recent research has cautioned against identifying individual texts with specific locations and dates. A prime example is the case of Hippolytus and the *Apostolic Tradition*, ostensibly the earliest extant liturgical text. There is now uncertainty as to the identity of Hippolytus, whether or not a work titled *Apostolic Tradition* was actually attributed to him in antiquity, the original provenance of the document, and, most significant for the purpose of comparison to the text of 1 Cor. 11, its date.⁷³ Bradshaw summarizes,

[We] judge the work to be an aggregation of material from different sources, quite possibly arising from different geographical regions and probably from different historical periods, from perhaps as early as the mid-second century to as late as the mid-fourth. . . We thus think it unlikely that it represents the practice of any single Christian community.⁷⁴

Were the entire document to be of mid-second century origin, the *Apostolic Tradition* would provide a potential source for readings that have entered the transmission of the manuscripts

⁷²Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, pp. 142-3.

⁷³Full discussion of these issues is provided in P. F. Bradshaw, M. E. Johnson, and L. E. Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition. A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 1-15.

⁷⁴P. Bradshaw, "Hippolytus Revisited: The Identity of the So-Called Apostolic Tradition," *Liturgy* 16 (2000), 9-10.

of Paul. However, as a composite document that underwent continuous revision it just is as possible that its text was adapted to then current NT texts. The other liturgical texts, aside from those that may lie behind brief citations in Justin and Origen, are too late to have influenced the earliest period of transmission. However, these may be based on earlier forms, thus making comparison to the readings now found in the NT manuscripts necessary. A final difficulty is technical. The Greek and Latin texts are usually published without a critical apparatus, though this is remedied in more recent editions of the most significant texts. Furthermore, many texts originally written in languages other than Greek or Latin have never been published except in translated form (usually Latin).⁷⁵

Before analyzing the liturgical texts we note the earlier patristic evidence. However, the usual difficulties in the use of patristic material are amplified here, especially since these earliest citations of the Lord's Supper narratives are invariably drawn from the synoptics. Justin Martyr's citation of the words spoken at the meal (*Apologia* 1,66,3) are explicitly attributed to the gospels: "For the apostles in the records composed by them, which are called gospels, in this way passed down what was commanded them." His citations, however, do not match a specific gospel writing. The words over the bread show some independence: τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου. τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. This is closest to the Lukan version, but the command to remembrance is spoken first, the phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον is absent, and the personal pronoun is modifies τὴν ἀνάμνησίν in place of the possessive adjective. The words over the cup, however, match Matthew and Mark: τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου.

⁷⁵On these difficulties cf. J. Duplacy, "A propos d'un lieu variant de 1 Co 11,24," in *Le Corps et le Corps du Christ dans la Première Épître aux Corinthiens. Congrès de l'ACFEB, Tarbes, 1981* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983), p. 34.

Origen (*In Jeremiam*, homilia 12,2) likewise shows adaptation from the synoptics, though again in a conflated form and with a few additions, one from 1 Cor. 11:25 and one unattested in the NT manuscripts:

λάβετε, πείτε, τοῦτό μου ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφρονας ἁμαρτιῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὅσάκις ἂν πίνετε, εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, καί· ἁμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, ἕως αὐτοῦ πίω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

These earlier “citations” are therefore of little assistance in identifying either second century liturgical texts or of specific readings in 1 Corinthians.

The earliest extant writing with liturgical elements is the *Didache*, which, whether dated to the late first or second century, falls within the period of the earliest transmission of the Pauline writings. While the document has a section that begins περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας (9,1), its prayers spoken over the cup and bread (in that sequence) do not include any words attributed to Jesus. It therefore cannot have influenced the transmission of 1 Cor. 11:23-25, though the use of the word “eucharist” is significant for the variation at 10:16.

The *Anaphora of Mark*, used in the patriarchate of Alexandria, is preserved in fragments dated as early as the fourth century. The earliest of these, P. Strasbourg gr. 254, does not preserve the historical narrative section. But the Dêr-Balizeh fragment (4th-5th cen.) and P. Ryl. 465⁷⁶ (6th cen.) both preserve this section with nearly identical wording. In this document, the sayings over the bread and cup are based primarily on Matthew. Some additions are made, however, from 1 Cor./Luke: where Matthew uses εὐλογησας and 1 Cor. εὐχαριστήσας, this liturgy reads εὐχαριστήσας εὐλογησας. Other evidence of conflation

⁷⁶C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester* vol. 3: Theological and Literary Texts (Manchester: University Press, 1938), pp. 25-28.

is the addition 1 Cor. 11:26 after the cup saying. There are also conflation made in this text which are not found in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians, for example εἰς ἀφῆσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is added to the words over the bread and λαβετε πιετε is added to the words over the cup. Of particular importance for one place of variation is the presence of το ὑπερ ὑμῶν διδομενον after το σῶμα in the Dêr-Balizeh fragment.⁷⁷ The use of διδομενον shows, however, that the passage has been adopted from Luke and not 1 Corinthians.

One strain of the liturgical tradition, however, does use significant portions of the narrative in 1 Corinthians. The *Anaphora of Serapion* was identified by Lietzmann as the “oldest admittedly Egyptian text,” dated to c. 360.⁷⁸ The saying over the bread begins with the introductory of 1 Cor. 11:23, but quickly resorts to conflation, with the result that the sources of only individual phrases can be identified:

ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐν ἡ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἑαυτοῦ λεγῶν· λάβετε καὶ φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλῶμενον εἰς ἄφῆσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

The text begins with the 1 Corinthians narrative; every word from ὅτι to ἄρτον is found in the NT manuscripts (though it matches perfectly no single manuscript). However, after dropping καὶ εὐχαριστήσας this liturgy shifts to the synoptic wording, with the addition of a form of δίδωμι⁷⁹ and τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἑαυτοῦ.⁸⁰ This continues with λάβετε καὶ φάγετε, found (without καὶ) in Matthew and in manuscripts of Mark, though also in manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. The word order τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου, also drawn from the synoptics, is absent from the Pauline witnesses. The phrase εἰς ἄφῆσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is also from the

⁷⁷There is a lacuna for this portion of P. Ryl. 465.

⁷⁸Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, p. 29.

⁷⁹ἐδίδου is found in manuscripts of both Matthew and Mark.

⁸⁰αὐτοῦ is found in only a few manuscripts of Matthew.

synoptics and not Paul, but has been added here from the saying over the cup. The phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον, however, is absent from Matthew and Mark but clearly Pauline; κλώμενον is found in most witnesses where Luke uses διδόμενον. If Lietzmann's identification of the provenance of this text is correct, it is striking that the wording adopted from 1 Corinthians is, with one exception (ἐν ἡ νυκτὶ) adopted from "Byzantine" witnesses and not those often regarded as "Egyptian."

The saying over the cup in the *Anaphora of Serapion* is likewise conflationary. The introduction is Lukan (though conformed to the saying over the bread) but the words of Jesus are a conflation of the synoptic accounts with additional expansion:

ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ἔλεγεν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς· λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

The *Anaphora of Serapion* is not unique in its eschewing the Pauline formulations. G. Dix notes in a discussion of the institution narrative in the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*,

But one notices that though in later times most rites incorporate other details of S. Paul's wording, no known rite has the words of institution over the chalice in quite his primitive form, 'This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood'. It looks as though all the institution narratives have been *suggested* by the gospels, even though they fuse them with matter from S. Paul, and treat them in other ways with great independence.⁸¹

Since the Pauline form of the narrative had so little contact with the formulations used in worship, it is not surprising that the extant liturgical forms have not directly impacted the transmission of the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. This is most clearly shown by the numerous smaller additions/alterations to the wording of the narrative that appear in patristic citations and the earliest liturgical texts but are not present in any manuscripts of 1

⁸¹Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press, 1945), p. 233. Emphasis original.

Corinthians. These are presented below, with the text of 1 Corinthians given in the first line of each example:⁸²

11:23 παρεδιδото AC AS AI / παρεδιδετο
παρεδιδου εαυτον . . . AM(Ro) AM(Ry) ACh AB

11:23 αρτον
αρτον ταις αγιαις και αμωμοις αυτου χερσιν και αναβλεψας προς σε,
τον θεον αυτου και πατερα, και κλασας εδωκεν τοις μαθηταις
αυτου ειπων τουτο το μυστηριον της καινης διαθηκης AC
AM(Ro)

Other lengthy additions: AM(Ry) AI
Based on Matthew: SC ACh

11:24 ευχαριστησας AT(E)
ευχαριστησας σοι AT(L)
ευχαριστησας ευλογησας AM(Ro) AM(Ry) AB AI
ευχαριστησας και ευλογησας ACh

11:24 αιματι μου / εμην αιματι
+ εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων AC AS AM(Ro) AM(DB) AB AI

11:25 τουτο Cyp
λαβετε πιετε τουτο Or AS CyJ

11:26 του κυριου Cyp
εμον AC AM(Ro) AM(Ry) AM(DB)
του υιου του ανθρωπου AI

The obvious expansionistic passages, such as the additions to Jesus' actions with the bread, would have required an intentional addition, such as a marginal note, in order to have entered the NT manuscripts. The fact that such examples are not found indicates both that they tend to reflect later developments (though some are found in *Apostolic Constitutions*) and, more significantly for our purposes, that this type of overt interpolation was not carried out at any

⁸²Abbreviations for this table are as follows: AB = *Anaphora Basili Caesariensis*; AI = *Anaphora Iacobi*; AS = *Anaphora Serapion*; AT(L) = *Apostolic Tradition*, Latin text; AT(E) = *Apostolic Tradition*, Ethiopic text; AC = *Constitutiones Apostolorum*; ACh = *Anaphora Ioannis Chrysostomi*; AM(DB) = *Anaphora Marci* (Dêr-Balyzeh fragment); AM(Ro) = *Anaphora Marci* (Codex Rossanensis); AM(Ry) = *Anaphora Marci* (Papyrus J. Rylands); Cyp = Cyprian, *Epistula* 63; JM = Justin Martyr; OR = *In Jeremiam*, homilia 12,2.

stage of the transmission. In addition, the significant interpretative alterations are completely absent from manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. This in spite of the fact that alterations such as the use of the active for the middle/passive of παραδιδώμι and the use of the first person for the third at 11:26 (thus making the verse into words of Jesus rather than interpretation of Paul) are not untypical of alterations made elsewhere in Paul's letters. Most strikingly, no manuscripts add either the imperative πιετε or the prepositional phrase εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων to the saying over the cup. These are not only common in the liturgical forms but also found in the synoptics. That the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians avoid several types of potential alterations indicates that the liturgical forms that have been preserved have not been a major cause of alteration in the manuscripts of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

11:23.92

εν τη νυκτι η AM(Ry) AB AI
 εν η νυκτι AC AS Cyp
 τη νυκτι η AM(Ro) ACh
 lac AM(DB)

There are two possible positions of the relative pronoun when that pronoun modifies a noun in a prepositional phrase. The pronoun may be placed either between the preposition and the noun⁸³ or after the prepositional phrase.⁸⁴ However, in temporal contexts the NT uses only the former position (John 9:14; Acts 7:20; Col. 1:6, 9), once with variation:

John 9:14 εν η ημερα P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ K B L W 33 579 al
 οτε A D K M N U Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ pm
 εν τη ημερα οτε 0141 vg^{mss} sy^{h mg}

⁸³Five times in the *Corpus Paulinum*, but only using two phrases: ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας (Col. 1:6 (ἡς ημερας F G), 9) and δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (2 Tim 1:6, 12; Tit. 1:13).

⁸⁴Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 7:20 (εν τη κλησει εν η P¹⁵) 2 Cor. 1:4; 7:7; 13:10; 2 Thes. 3:6.

In the same contexts the LXX shows both sequences in roughly equal numbers,⁸⁵ though again the textual tradition shows difficulty with the sequence *εν η ημερα*.⁸⁶

At 1 Cor. 11:23, the only Greek witnesses attesting the reading *εν η νυκτη* are D* F G 1912. However, the entire Latin tradition⁸⁷ and the Peshitta also support this sequence,⁸⁸ as well as two liturgical texts (*Apostolic Constitution, Anaphora of James*).

The phrase *εν τη νυκτι η* is more stylistically elegant than *εν η νυκτι*. A search using TLG found only one example⁸⁹ prior to the 1st cen. AD of the relative preceding *ημερα*⁹⁰ (Aeschines Socraticus, *Fragmenta* 8). At the same time, *οτ η ημερα η* and *εν τη*

⁸⁵Preposition-relative pronoun-noun 39 times; preposition-article-noun-relative pronoun 35 times.

⁸⁶The phrase is altered to *εν ημερα η* by various witnesses at Ex. 38:26; Lev. 7:15. 35; Ez. 16:4, 5; 31:15; to *εν η αν ημερα* at Num. 3:1, 13; and to *εν ημερα* at Num. 3:1, 13; Ez. 16:4, 5; 31:15. Some examples may have been influenced by the presence of the relative in Hebrew, e.g., *למִן־הַיּוֹם אַשֶׁר* at Ez. 31:15.

⁸⁷The Latin nearly always matches whatever word order is found in the Greek. The only variations are found at 1 Cor. 7:20, where VL 77 78 read *in vocatione qua* against the rest of the tradition's *in qua vocatione*; Col 1:6, where VL 75 77 89 read *ex qua die* (= *αφ' ης ημερας*) against the Vulgate's *ex ea die qua*; 2 Tim. 1:6, 12, where Ambrosiaster reads *qua de causa* and *quam ob causum* against the rest of the tradition's *propter quam causam* and *ob quam causum* (both = *δι' ην αιτιαν*); and Tit. 1:13, where *ob quam causam* departs from *δι' ην αιτιαν*.

⁸⁸In the *Corpus Paulinum* the Peshitta does not always attempt a one-to-one correspondence between the Greek parts of speech and the Syriac. For example, when the Greek word order is preposition-article-noun-pronoun, three times the Syriac does not use a distinct pronoun (Rom. 16:17; 2 Cor. 13:10; 2 Thes. 3:6). Once the pronoun is placed before the noun (2 Cor. 1:4) and twice the word order is parallel (1 Cor. 7:20; 2 Cor. 7:7). When the Greek sequence is preposition-pronoun-noun the Syriac either does not use a pronoun X (Col. 1:6, 9) or it matches the Greek sequence (2 Tim. 1:6, 12; 2 Tim. 1:13). This last sequence is that of the Peshitta at 1 Cor. 11:23, the basis for which must have been *εν η νυκτη*.

⁸⁹LXX and NT examples, as well as *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* 7,6,4 and Philo, *De opificio mundi* 129; *De sacrificiis Abeli et Caini* 118; *De posteritate Caini* 65 were excluded because of the likelihood of semitic influence.

⁹⁰No examples of either word order were found with *νύκτι*.

ἡμέρα ἦ are not uncommon.⁹¹ On the other hand, the reading εν η ημερα is more in keeping with the NT and LXX usage, and should be considered archetypal, with εν τη νυκτι η a stylistic improvement.

11:23.93

παρεδιδото AC AS AI
 παρεδιδετο
 παρεδιδου εαυτον . . . AM(Ro) AM(Ry) ACh AB
 lac AM(DB)

In the post-Attic period, -μι class verbs were assimilated to -ω class terminations.⁹²

One such example is παρεδιδετο, which many witnesses (B² L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739) restore to its “proper” form: παρεδιδото. It is striking that παρεδιδετο is not found in any liturgical texts. This again indicates, as we saw in the reading εν τη νυκτι η, that these texts favored a more classical style of Greek.

11:24.95

ειπεν Cyp
 ειπεν λαβετε φαγετε AT ACh AM(Ro) AB AI
 ειπεν λαβετε και φαγετε AS
 ειπων λαβετε εξ αυτου φαγετε AC
 ειπεν λαβετε φαγετε . . . AM(Ry)

The imperatives are limited to manuscripts of the Byzantine type and the Syriac tradition. There is no obvious reason for mechanical or accidental loss. Neither, clearly, is there any theological motivation for omission, since the words are found in every liturgical text. A similar addition took place in the manuscripts of Mark, where φαγετε was added to

⁹¹E.g., Thucydides *Historiae* 4,78,5; Antiphon 21,3; Plato, *Phaedo* 57,a; Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5,7,17.

⁹²BDF §94(1); Jannaris §775.

λαβετε (Byz^{f13}).⁹³ The shared origins of the Lukan and Pauline accounts and the absence of the words in Luke also argues that this is a secondary addition. The only question is whether the addition is from liturgical texts or from the text of Matthew. Because the same additions were made to the other synoptics, and because no other reading in 11:23-25 is adopted from liturgical forms, it is more likely that this reading has been assimilated to the Matthean account (Matt. 26:26).⁹⁴ Such additions are not infrequent in the “Byzantine” witnesses, as discussed in the concluding chapter.

11:24.96

ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ AM(DB) AB AI
 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΜΟΥ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ
 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ AT AC AM(Ro) sy^p Cyp ACh

The Synoptic parallels all read, without variation of word order,⁹⁵ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19). No manuscript of 1 Corinthians adapts to this word order. This shift of the pronoun in \mathfrak{P}^{46} (μου το σωμα) is an attempt to place it near the noun it modifies and not harmonization to the parallels.⁹⁶ Neither the liturgical texts nor the synoptic parallels have affected this unit of variation.

11:24.97

ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΚΛΩΜΕΝΟΝ AS AB

⁹³At Luke 22:19, A (apparently alone) adds λαβετε.

⁹⁴Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 116; Zuntz, p. 165; Fee p. 545 n. 1; Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, p. 57.

⁹⁵W omits εστιν at Mark 14:22.

⁹⁶Royse (p. 263) considers the reading of \mathfrak{P}^{46} harmonization to the synoptics because it shares the reading τουτο εστιν. However, if harmonization to a specific passage had been the cause, one would have expected the pronoun to stand after σωμα, as it does in the synoptics.

ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΘΡΥΠΤΟΜΕΝΟΝ AC AT? (*confringitur*)
 ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ Cyp ACh
 ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΚΛΩΜΕΝΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΟΝ AM(Ro) AI
 ΤΟ ΥΠΕΡ ΥΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΟΝ AM(DB)

This addition/omission of the participle is the most difficult textual problem of this section. The available evidence shows that both readings existed in the tradition by around 200; Cyprian has the earliest citation with the shorter reading, and \mathfrak{P}^{46} attests a corruption of it. At the same time the rest of the Latin tradition, the Peshitta, and perhaps the *Apostolic Tradition*—in addition to all but a handful of Greek manuscripts—show the early origin of the longer reading.

The Greek manuscript tradition does not provide decisive evidence. The “weight” of the manuscripts attesting the shorter reading is impressive (\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* A B C* 6 33 424^c 1739*), but because all closely related, the shared reading immediately raises suspicion of a single error. However, Cyprian of Carthage also shows the shorter text (*quod pro vobis est; Epistula* 63,10,1) without variation in that manuscript tradition. This reading in Cyprian’s text cannot be dismissed as a theological adaptation due to distaste for the identification of the eucharistic bread as the “body of Christ,” for he makes this connection several times in this letter (e.g., 63,4,1; 63,13,4-5) The Latin commentary tradition is another potential witness to the shorter text. The important Amiens manuscript of Ambrosiaster’s commentary matches Cyprian⁹⁷ (the rest of that tradition reads the Old Latin *frangitur*) as well as the commentary of Pelagius. The shorter text is also found in a liturgical text, the *Anaphora of Chrysostom*. Its origins are nearly impossible to define,⁹⁸ yet the liturgy that became predominant in Eastern

⁹⁷Ambrosiaster’s commentary on the text does not provide a clue as to whether or not the participle was present.

⁹⁸R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (New York: Pueblo, 1980), pp. 129-30.

Orthodoxy has the shorter το υπερ υμων in its statement over the cup. The presence of this reading is surprising here given the conflatory nature of the rest of the narrative. But is the reading traceable to the Greek manuscript tradition, or to some other source? One liturgical scholar suggests an ecclesial compromise: “the unsatisfactory ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν steers a middle course between the expressions adopted at Antioch and (as we have suggested) at Ephesus, and may therefore well be a later compromise.”⁹⁹ It appears, however, the “compromise” more typically resulted in conflation, not omission; one may compare the το υπερ υμων κλωμενον και διαδιδομενον found in the *Anaphora of Mark*, the *Anaphora of James*, and the Syriac *Anaphora of Peter the Apostle*.

Indirect evidence for the shorter reading may be found in the reading of several early versions (Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian¹⁰⁰) and the Vulgate, all of which read the equivalent of Luke’s διδομενον. While substitution for κλωμενον is a possibility, it is more likely that the Greek texts upon which these translations were based lacked any participle and that the “missing” element was supplied from Luke.

All other witnesses, apart from D*’s θρυπτομενον (see below) attest to κλωμενον.¹⁰¹ This includes the rest of the Latin tradition, though no evidence prior to Cyprian is available, and the Syriac. The evidence of the liturgical documents is discussed below.

The text with κλωμενον is well-suited to the context. It matches the statement at 10:16 (τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλωμεν) and the action described earlier in the passage (ἔκλασεν).

⁹⁹Robert Douglas Richardson, “A Further Inquiry into Eucharistic Origins,” in H. Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord’s Supper* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), p. 259.

¹⁰⁰If Tischendorf’s citation of “Euthalius” (=1834) in his apparatus is reliable, then a single NT manuscript also has this reading.

¹⁰¹The citation of Cyril of Alexandria, which lacks το υπερ υμων as well as any participle, should not be traced to a Pauline manuscript. Duplacy, noting other omissions in Cyril’s citation, labels it a “Phantom Variant.” Cf. also Tischendorf’s apparatus, *ad loc.*

However, this evidence cuts both ways, for assimilation to these examples of the verb is a strong possibility. At the same time, however, the synoptics unanimously read ἔκλασεν but no manuscript adapts the subsequent wording to that verb, even manuscripts of Luke, which (with one exception, see below) read διδομενον.

On the other hand, the shorter reading may also have been influenced by the context. Most obviously, its loss may have been a simple error of parablepsis (ΥΜΩΝΚΛΩΜΕΝΟΝ). Duplacy discounted this possibility,¹⁰² but since the shorter reading is found only in a cluster of closely related Greek manuscripts this argument does have merit. Intentional omission is also a possibility. The loss of the participle may have resulted from a desire to bring the statement over the bread into parallel with the statement over the cup: ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. By omitting the article following σῶμα, P⁴⁶ both removes the difficulty of the article without a head noun or participle¹⁰³ and brings the two prepositional phrases into closer harmony. This again shows that P⁴⁶ cannot be considered the best witness of this strain of the text, but often shows corruptions of readings found in N^a A B 6 424^c 1739.

Within the larger context of the *Corpus Paulinum*, affinity with Pauline style has been cited as a key argument in favor of the shorter reading.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the use of the article as a relative followed by a prepositional phrase is not uncommon in Paul. The prepositional phrase functions adverbially to modify an assumed verb, which in most cases would be a form of εἶμι (Rom. 3:24; 16:1; 1 Cor. 2:12; 1 Cor. 16:1; 2 Cor. 9:1). These is not precisely

¹⁰²“Une disparition accidentelle par homoioteleuton n’est guère vraisemblable.” Duplacy, p. 42.

¹⁰³P⁴⁶ also drops the relative pronoun before καὶ at 11:23.

¹⁰⁴Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 496.

parallel to the shorter reading at 1 Cor. 11:24. However, a similar example may be found at Rom. 4:11: καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ. Here the assumed verb would be a form of λαμβάνω, which occurs earlier in the sentence, whereas at 1 Cor. 11:24 the assumed verb would be a form of the κλάω that had already been used. Yet this appears to be the only strong parallel, and at Rom. 4:11 no manuscript saw the need to fill in the assumed verb. In addition, the longer reading also has Pauline parallels at Rom. 14:20 and, though outside the *Hauptbriefe*, Eph. 4:24. An argument that one reading or the other matches “Pauline style” cannot contribute to the resolution of the problem at 11:24.

1 Cor. 11:23 makes clear that Paul is citing material that is familiar to the Corinthians and likely used in a worship context. This material is also similar to the narratives in the gospel texts. The possibility of assimilation to some form of this material from outside 1 Corinthians must therefore be considered.

It is perhaps surprising, given the amount of harmonization between the synoptic accounts of this episode, that no Greek manuscript has assimilated the Pauline text to the gospels. The most obvious source would have been the similar wording in Luke (ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον). Yet no potential adaptation, such as the addition of καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, the word order τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, nor the addition (assuming the shorter text) or substitution (assuming the longer text) of διδόμενον has found its way into the manuscript tradition at 1 Cor. 11:23-25. Assimilation to the gospels must therefore be dismissed as a cause of corruption here.

Much more difficult to assess is the potential influence of liturgical formulae on the text of 1 Corinthians. In one case, however, liturgical influence is undeniable. A singular reading, θρυπτομενον, is preserved in D*. The reading is also found in one strain of the

liturgical tradition. The *Apostolic Tradition* (4, preserved only in Latin) uses *confringitur* while the Greek text of the same,¹⁰⁵ as preserved in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (8,12,36), uses θρυπτομενον.¹⁰⁶ The word is undoubtedly a liturgical adaptation; Jesus' body being "broken into fragments" matches well the action of the breaking of the bread in the Eucharist. However, it makes little sense on the lips of Jesus "on the night he was betrayed." Further evidence of liturgical origin is the fact that both the *Apostolic Tradition* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* use the Matthean word order immediately prior to this word (ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΜΟΥ). Therefore the *Apostolic Tradition* is not based on the Pauline version of the narrative, but produced its version based on the synoptics with other adaptations. Its presence in this form of the liturgy led to its insertion in D. Had we more certain information regarding the date, provenance, and locales which used the liturgical forms found in *Apostolic Tradition*, we would be able to rather confidently locate the origins of our unique Pauline manuscript. However, as described above, the uncertainty regarding almost every aspect of the origins and the development of this text precludes any firm conclusions. What is significant, however, is that this is the first, and as we will see only, reading to have clearly moved from the liturgical forms into the Pauline manuscript tradition.

Did κλωμενον also creep into the Pauline manuscripts from liturgical sources? As observed above, three liturgical forms use the Pauline word order ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ

¹⁰⁵W. E. Pitt, "The Anamneses and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of *Apostolic Constitutions* Book VIII," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9 (1958): pp. 1-7 argues (p. 6) that θρυπτομενον was the reading of the Greek version of the *Apostolic Tradition*.

¹⁰⁶The D-text uses *frangitur* (VL 77^c 78 write *frangetur* in order to move closer to the Greek) while VL 89 reads *confringitur*. Both *frangitur* and *confringitur* may be based on either θρυπτομενον or κλωμενον, and given the relationship between D F G and the D-text it is more likely that *frangitur* presumes κλωμενον. Cf. Duplacy, p. 33. *Confringitur* in VL 89 is likely an independent corruption of *frangitur*, much like Bede's making the same alteration same centuries later (*In Lucae Evangelium expositio* 6).

σωμα (Dêr-Balyzeh fragment, *Anaphora of Basil*, and *Anaphora of James*). Two of these also read κλωμενον (*Anaphora of Basil*; *Anaphora of James* read κλωμενον και διαδομενον) while the Dêr-Balyzeh fragment switches to the Lukan διδομενον. Influence from liturgical texts is a possibility here as it was in the singular reading θρυπτομενον. However, several factors argue against a similar influence in the addition of κλωμενον. First, only one manuscript has been clearly impacted by liturgical texts for the entire section of 11:23-25. None of the expansionistic wording has crept into the Pauline manuscripts. Second, κλωμενον did not find its way from the liturgical forms into the text of Luke, where it could have replaced διδομενον.¹⁰⁷ Finally, the widespread use of κλωμενον in the liturgical texts makes it more likely that the participle found its way into the liturgical texts from manuscripts of 1 Corinthians than that the influence moved in the other direction.¹⁰⁸

Adaptation to a specific written text or remembrances of the performance of the liturgy is unlikely to have led to either the addition or omission of the participle. However, the influence of Eucharistic terminology and thinking must certainly have played a role, for the text with κλωμενον results in the “body” being easily identified with the “broken” bread.

“Breaking of Bread” is used with likely reference to a eucharistic meal in the NT (Acts 2:42; 20:7, 11; 27:35)¹⁰⁹ and other early Christian literature.¹¹⁰ It is also found in early liturgical prayers. For example, the prayer over the bread at *Didache* 9,3 is introduced with

¹⁰⁷The reading κλωμενον is found at Luke 22:19 only in 1071.

¹⁰⁸This is also the conclusion of Duplacy (p. 37), who adds the helpful caveat, “Mais c’est une simple possibilité qu’il serait de toute évidence imprudent de transformer en donnée.”

¹⁰⁹Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 191.

¹¹⁰E.g., *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 5; see further Lampe, s.v. κλάσμα 1.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος (parallel with περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου at 9.2). The prayer which follows also uses the noun, drawing upon the image of harvested grain being brought together: “Just as this broken bread [κλάσμα] was scattered upon the mountains and then was gathered together and became one.” The Dêr-Balyzeh has very similar wording, though using *αρτος* in place of *κλασμα*: “As this bread was scattered on the mountains and hills, and was mixed together and became one body . . .” This image of broken bread, however, may have been drawn from the verb *εκλασεν*, which is an action of Jesus found in all the synoptic accounts as well as 1 Cor. 11:24, and not specifically from the *κλωμενον* of 1 Cor. 11:25.

Speaking of “broken bread” in a sacramental meal is different, however, from speaking of a “broken body,” particularly in the context of 1 Cor. 11. Spoken by Jesus “on the night he was betrayed” the words are particularly difficult, for how might they refer to his suffering on the cross? Clearly his “body” was not “broken.” Indeed, John 6:36 sees the unbroken broken bones as the fulfillment of prophecy. Was *κλωμενον* omitted from 1 Cor. 11:24 in order to match the Johannine account?¹¹¹ This is unlikely, since the allusion, based on either Ex. 12:10, 36 or Ps. 33:21 uses a form of *συντρίβω*, not the *κλάω* of 1 Cor. 11. The Latin tradition resolves the difficulty of the time reference, while retaining a translation of *κλωμενον*, by using the future form *frangetur* (VL 77 78^c) or *confringetur* (VL 89),¹¹² and *tradetur* in the Vulgate (though adapted from Luke).

¹¹¹Richardson (“A Further Inquiry into Eucharistic Origins,” p. 413 n. 4) claims, in a discussion of the Roman Canon: “In finally rejecting the word “broken”, the Roman church was governed not only by compromise but by care not to violate the words of Scripture: cf. “Not a bone of his shall be broken”. I was not able, however, to locate an argument which produces evidence for this statement.

¹¹²VL 75 reads the present form *frangitur*; since -i- and -e- are easily confused, one cannot be certain as to which form originally stood in the D-text, though the fact that the Greek counterpart of VL 75 (D) also makes an alteration here speaks against the testimony of this manuscript.

There may have been greater difficulty with κλωμενον than merely sorting out the time reference. Duplacy argues that the Eucharistic celebrations of early Christians were equated by opponents with rituals of the mystery religions. Minicius Felix (*Octavius* 9), for example, recounts that Christians were charged with deceiving unsuspecting neophytes so that they would participate in cannibalistic ritual infanticides, thereby guaranteeing their participation and silence since they would be associated with the vile crime. The deliberate suppression of κλωμενον, according to Duplacy, would make less likely such misunderstandings of the Christian rituals.¹¹³ This, for Duplacy, is the main argument for accepting κλωμενον as the archetypal text.

While arguments alleging the need for a *disciplina arcana* in order to hide key practices from outsiders are occasionally invoked in the resolution of textual problems,¹¹⁴ there are difficulties with regarding this as a regular practice of the scribes/readers of the manuscripts of the gospels and epistles. First, it is doubtful that the intentional omission of κλωμενον would, in itself, remove potential misunderstanding. 1 Cor. 10:16 was not altered for these reasons, yet was certainly capable of being understood in a sacrificial manner, particularly when discussed in the context of “the eating of sacrifices” (10:18). In addition, the imperatives λαβετε φαγετε were added to many witnesses of 1 Corinthians (11:24) and the synoptic narratives. The command to “eat my body” would certainly be open to similar misunderstandings. Second, early apologists, such as Justin Martyr, spoke freely about

¹¹³Duplacy, “A propos d’un lieu variant de 1 Co 11,24,” pp. 42-3.

¹¹⁴E.g., Acts 8:37 in W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts*, SNTSMS 71 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 69-77, esp. 69-71; Luke 22:19b-20 in Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp. 132-6 and 156-9. Were the arguments in these two cases accepted, one would have the same manuscript, Codex Bezae (and its direct descendant Codex Laudianus), concealing a Eucharistic text but revealing a baptismal confession.

Christian rites – even revealing the words of Jesus over the bread and cup (*Apologia* 1,66,3; discussed above). That the omission of κλωμενον alone single word can be attributed to a desire to conceal Christian rites is unlikely.

The widespread use of κλάω in Eucharistic prayers and in discussions about the significance of the Eucharist make more it likely that the word was added to the context than that it was removed. This was prompted by the difficulty of the το υπερ υμων and the εκλασεν which preceded it. Though not a direct insertion from a liturgical text, when the passage is understood as a Eucharistic text the addition is natural, even necessary. Furthermore, no clear basis for its omission can be identified, whether intentional or accidental.

11:25.102

εμω αιματι Cyp
 αιματι μου
 ο εστιν το αιμα μου AS
 τουτο εστι το αιμα μου AM JM AM(Ro) AM(Ry) ACh AB
 τουτο μου εστι το αιμα AM(DB) CyJ AI
 AS reworks, removing reference to cup, based on Matt

Either εμω αιματι or αιματι μου may have resulted from assimilation. τω αιματι μου parallels Luke 22:20, but there is no evidence of influence from Luke's account in 1 Cor. 11. The personal pronoun is also found at Matt. 26:27, though αιμα is in the dative case there. Finally, the parallel saying over the bread uses μου, though as we saw above in a different position. The reading τω εμω αιματι is therefore unique in the transmission history of the eucharistic narratives. It may have been influenced by την εμην αναμνησιν at the end of both 11:24 and 25. It is more likely, however, that the statements over the bread and the cup were brought into congruence, particularly when the synoptic accounts use the personal pronoun in both statements. Assimilation to the near context produced a shift in the

opposite direction - from the pronoun to the adjective – at 1 Cor. 9:2, where \mathfrak{P}^{46} D F G K L Ψ *pm* shift from μου της αποστολης to της εμης αποστολης.

11:25.103

οσακις [ε]αν πινητε
omit AT AC AM(Ro) AM(Ry)
Not used AS AC

A leap from ποιειτε to πινητε caused the loss of these words (P 5^c 69 81 *al*).

Because this passage is not found in the synoptic accounts, harmonization is not a factor here.

Most liturgical texts omit the phrase. Its loss in these texts, however, is more likely the result of using the words as a command to observe the entire meal, not only the drinking of the cup.

A clear example is the *Anaphora of Mark*, where the τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν

ἀνάμνησιν is separated from the saying over the cup by a congregational response and

attached to a statement based on 1 Cor. 11:26.

11:26.108; 11:27.114

ποτηριον τουτο AC AM(Ro) AM(Ry)
ποτηριον
Not used AT AS AC

The reading το ποτηριον τουτο (\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^2 C³ D¹ K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 424 1739^{ms}) is based on the immediately preceding τον αρτον τουτον.¹¹⁵ The pronoun could not have been lost by accidental leap, and since τουτον was not dropped, either intentionally or accidentally, one may not postulate a distaste for the demonstrative. As in the previous unit of variation, harmonization to the synoptics is not a possibility since this passage is unique to 1 Corinthians. Since such assimilations to the near context are so common in the NT

¹¹⁵Fee, p. 545 n. 3.

manuscripts, it is more likely that the pronoun found its way into the liturgical texts from manuscripts of 1 Corinthians than that the influence was in the other direction.

Addition for the same reason occurs at 11:27, with many witnesses adding **τουτον** following **αρτον** and one (2815) after both **αρτον** and **ποτηριον**.

11:26.111; 15:25.99

Av is added after **αχρι(ς) ου** (**ℵ² D² I K L P 056 0142 0151 5 6 88 424 915 pm**) which balances with **οσακις γαρ αν** in earlier in the sentence. The same addition of **αν** following **αχρι(ς) ου** is made by virtually the same witnesses (**ℵ² D² K L Y 049 056 0142 0151 6 424**) at 15:25.

11:27.113; 11:27.116 [discussed in D F G section]

11:27.115

The disjunctive **η̃** in **εσθιη τον αρτον η πινη το ποτηριον** is altered to **και** (A 181 sy) under the influence of **εσθιητε τον αρτον τουτον και το ποτηριον πινητε** in the preceding sentence.

11:27.118

The addition of **του κυριου** to **αναξιως** (**ℵ D² L 056 326 1175 sy^h**) is an interpretive gloss based on the end of the following clause (**ε̃νοχος ε̃σται του̃ σ̃ωματος και του̃ αι̃ματος του̃ κυριου**). The addition clarifies the ambiguity of the adverb.¹¹⁶

11:28.122

¹¹⁶Fee, p. 558 n. 2.

The word order imperative - subject - object potentially occurs only here in the *Hauptbriefe*, but the word order imperative - object - subject occurs elsewhere only at Rom 15:11. Nevertheless, it is more likely that the subject has been moved closer to the verb than that the object has been moved closer, particularly given the unusual combination of witnesses with the reading *εαυτον ανθρωπος* (C D [+ ο] F G P 81 1241).

11:29.124; 11:29.127

Further assimilations to the near context are made at v. 29. The adverb *αναξιως* is added to the actions of eating and drinking, just as it stands at 11:27 (N² C² D F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 424.¹¹⁷ Likewise, *του κυριου* is added to *το σωμα* from 11:27 (*του σωματος και του αιματος του κυριου*).¹¹⁸ As Fee points out, this result of the additions is to have v. 29 make essentially the same argument as v. 27.¹¹⁹

11:32.135 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

11:34.139 [discussed at 6:12.46]

11:34.140

The subjunctive form *διαταξωμαι* (A D F G K Ψ *pc*) is likely simply the result of vowel confusion from *διαταξομαι*.¹²⁰ The range of witnesses supporting the reading is unusual, making it likely that the reading is the result of independent error.

¹¹⁷206* 429 1969 make another addition at 11:27 of *του κυριου*.

¹¹⁸Fee, p. 558 n. 3.

¹¹⁹Fee, p. 562.

¹²⁰The D-text reads the future tense *ordinabo*, preserving the original tense form since a similar vowel confusion cannot happen in Latin.