

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

**Volume II**

**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**

## Notes on Chapter 12

## 12:1.1

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

Both positions have limited support from Pauline parallels. Οὐ θελω (θελομεν) υμας αγνοειν ἀδελφοί also occurs at Rom. 1:13 (οὐκ οιομαι D<sup>\*2</sup> G), 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; 2 Cor. 1:8 (omit ἀδελφοί ℘<sup>46</sup> vid); and 1 Thes. 4:13. In each of these cases, however, an object or object clause follows αγνοειν so that ἀδελφοί does not end the sentence. Support for the earlier position is also found in the parallel at 1 Thes. 5:1, where ἀδελφοί stands immediately after the genitive substantives governed by περὶ (1 Thes. 5:1: Περὶ δὲ τῶν

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Weiss (p. 294 n. 1) suggests that it is a gloss; the lack of ἀδελφοί at either position in 247 is unlikely to be traceable to the archetypal text, even if von Soden's citation is correct.

<sup>2</sup>Zuntz does not notice the agreement of D F G with 1739 in his discussion of the "Western" text and agreements with B or 1739 on pp. 100-103.

χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί). Given the more common usage of *ου θελω* (*θελομεν*) *υμας αγνοειν αδελφοι*, it is more likely that scribes would move the noun to the later position than that it would have been moved to the earlier position from the later. This wording at 1 Cor. 10:1 may have had a distant influence as well. An interpolation is unlikely, for it would require that a single insertion had been misread in order to result in these two readings. Given that there are seventeen letters separating the two potential positions, it is doubtful that such a correction could have been so badly misread.

12:1.2

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

12:2.3; 12:2.5

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

---

<sup>3</sup>Thiselton, p. 911.

<sup>4</sup>These difficulties are outlined by B. Weiss, p. 294.



an indicative verb.<sup>5</sup> While most commentators understand ὡς ἄν as having iterative force, this would be unique to Paul (though Acts 2:45; 4:35).<sup>6</sup> In the NT (including Paul) ὡς ἄν is typically used as a temporal conjunction similar to ὅταν.<sup>7</sup> The grammarians have noted that amending the printed text to ὡσαν (see below) may be preferable.<sup>8</sup>

Even assuming that these difficulties do not make this form of the text impossible, it is still not clear how best to understand its syntax. There are at least two solutions. The first (until recently the most common) assumes anacoluthon: ὡς must refer back to ὅτι after the sentence had abruptly ended.<sup>9</sup> This would be rendered “You know that, when you were Gentiles – how you were led astray [and] carried away by mute idols” or, moving the prepositional phrase, “You know that, when you were Gentiles – how you were led astray to mute idols [and/being] carried away.” The need to insert an assumed conjunction, such as καί<sup>10</sup> shows the difficulty of this interpretation.

The second solution is adopted by the Peshitta and virtually all recent commentaries.<sup>11</sup>

---

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


<sup>6</sup>Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 167; BDR §367<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>7</sup>BDR §455(2).

<sup>8</sup>BDR §§367<sup>3</sup>, 453<sup>6</sup>.

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

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

<sup>11</sup>W. A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Washington: University Press of America, 1982), p. 156 n. 69; Fee, pp. 576-7; Schrage III, pp. 114, 120; Thiselton (p. 911) goes so far as to claim that “alternative hypotheses seem unnecessary.” The Peshitta uses  both at the beginning of the sentence and as a periphrastic at the end:



ως αν ηγεσθε is understood as relative clause, which requires an assumed ητε for the clause with απαγομενοι. This would be rendered, “You know that, when you were gentiles, you were carried away, as you were continually being led about to mute idols” or, moving the prepositional phrase, “You know that, when you were gentiles, you were carried away to mute idols, [as/however] you were continually being led about.” Héring, however, notes that an assumed ητε is “rather clumsy.”<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, this solution does not deal with all of the objections raised above.

A third solution is to recall that word division and accent did not exist in the earliest manuscripts (cf. Ɱ B C D). There was not any visual distinction between ΩCΔN ΗΓΕCΘΕ, ΩC ΔN ΗΓΕCΘΕ, or (as is assumed in the solutions above) ΩC ΔN ΗΓΕCΘΕ.<sup>13</sup> One may therefore read ὡσάν as a single word, understanding it as an adverb: “you were, so to speak, led away.” The attachment of ὡσάν to a verb in this way, however, would be unattested. Another alternative is to read ἀνήγεσθε as a single word.<sup>14</sup> This removes the difficulty of ἄν followed by the indicative ηγεσθε. A few witnesses divide the words in just this way (B<sup>2</sup> F G<sup>c</sup> 1241<sup>s</sup>). The congruence of F G<sup>c</sup> show that this is the reading of their shared immediate

---

𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁 𐤒𐤁𐤕𐤁𐤁. (“you have been led.” It renders ως αν ηγεσθε with, apparently 𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤁 𐤒𐤁𐤕𐤁𐤁 (“without distinction”), its resulting text translating as (beginning at 12:1b): “I want you to know that you have been gentiles and have been led, without distinction, to idols who do not have voices.”

<sup>12</sup>J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. from the second French edition by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Epworth Press, 1962), p. 123; this is also rejected by Conzelmann, p. 204 n. 2.

<sup>13</sup>For this reason ωσ ανηγεσθε is not a conjecture, as is stated in the apparatus of NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>14</sup>J. Weiss, p. 294; Héring, p. 124.

predecessor.<sup>15</sup> In addition, two patristic citations support this reading: a catena attributed to Severian of Gabala (discussed below), and Augustine's *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 21,8 (*quomodo ascendebatis*).<sup>16</sup>

One difficulty with resorting to an alternative word division is the meaning of ἀναγω in this context. Héring notes that in the NT the word “seems to be a technical term for snatching away into the world of invisible powers.” This is rejected by Schrage, who notes that elsewhere it is used of animals brought up for sacrifice (Acts 7:41) and even in a positive way of Christ (Rom. 10:7).<sup>17</sup> While no example of the word used in a similar context by a patristic writer is cited by Lampe, BDAG discusses the possibility of this reading without noting any particular difficulty in meaning.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, the interpretation attributed to Severian, which uses ἀνάγονται, fits the context quite well:

But because he says “you are led up to the idols” (πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα ἀνήγεσθε) he makes clear the great corruption of prophecy and divination. For those possessed by an unclean spirit are not going to the idols sober-minded, rather they are led up (ἀνάγονται) by the unclean spirit, not by a self-chosen will. For this is shown by the ἀνήγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι. Therefore it means: you know the working of the unclean spirit because of which you used to suffer, but the things of the Holy Spirit have a pure working. For the one who practices divination darkens the soul and he does not know what he says, but the soul of the prophet becomes a brighter light and what it had not known – what was made clear to it – it speaks.<sup>19</sup>

ἀνήγεσθε, according to Severian, implies what Héring suggests: that the person is brought

---

<sup>15</sup>The parent text is preserved in F: F: ΩC•ΔN ΗΓΕCΘΔΙ. G\*, which is full of incorrect word divisions, reads ΩCΔN • ΗΓΕCΘΔΙ. This was corrected with punctuation: ΩC,ΔN\_ΗΓΕCΘΔΙ.

<sup>16</sup>Augustine's citation occurs in a block of text; since he does not comment on this portion of the citation it is impossible to determine how he understood *ascendebatis*.

<sup>17</sup>Schrage III, p. 120 n. 38.

<sup>18</sup>BDAG, s.v. ἀνάγω (1).

<sup>19</sup>Translated from the text in Staab, *Pauluskommentar*, p. 262.



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

The manuscripts resolved this difficulty in various ways. Some witnesses omit οτι (K<sup>2</sup> 0150 1 69 2464 *pc*). This removes a major difficulty with οτι οτε, since ὡς would attach directly to οἶδατε. The conjunction may have been added in order to supply an object for οἶδατε, not realizing that the distant ὡς could fulfill the same function. The insertion of οτι could easily be accounted for as an addition based on the frequent Pauline use of οἶδατε οτι. While it seems unlikely that a scribe would have added οτι immediately before οτε, it is possible that the reading οτι οτε may be the result of a correction which was intended to replace οτε with οτι. Subsequent users of the text misinterpreted the notation and wrote both. This form of the text is adopted by both Héring and J. Weiss, the latter of whom concludes that “only [οἶδατε, ὅτε . . ., ὡς] can seriously be possible, not because of its weak attestation, but for internal reasons.”<sup>20</sup> That the text reads more smoothly with οτε than with οτι οτε is shown by a paraphrase in Chrysostom which omits οτι (also altering ὡς to

---

<sup>20</sup>J. Weiss, p. 204; cf. Héring, p. 124, both of whom also adopt ὡς ἀνηγεσθε. Both also claim, however, that οἶδατε οτε is the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, which is in error (instead reading οἶδατε οτι).



πως) even though the lemma reads **οτι οτε**.<sup>21</sup> This indicates that he also saw the **οτι** as superfluous.

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

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

The difficulties of the text as found in the “best witnesses” and the fact that the seemingly best text is found in “poor witnesses” has led some commentators to emend the text. Westcott and Hort, who rarely resorted to conjecture, proposed that **ΟΤΙΠΟΤΕ** was corrupted to **ΟΤΙΟΤΕ** due to the similarity of letters.<sup>22</sup> This is an attractive solution, for it

---

<sup>21</sup> **καὶ γὰρ οἶδατε ὅτε Ἕλληνες ἦτε, πῶς ἀπήγεσθε ἐλκόμενοι τότε** = “for you also know, when you were Gentiles, how you were pulled, at that time being dragged away.” This passage is discussed by Héring, p. 125 n. 7.

<sup>22</sup> Westcott and Hort, Appendix, p. 116, with comparison to **οτι ποτε** at Eph. 2:11 and **ποτε** at Rom. 11:30; Eph. 2:13; 5:8; Tit 3:3. This is accepted by Robertson and Plummer, p.

resolves the difficulty of the  $\sigma\tau\iota$ , although it does not address the unusual  $\alpha\nu \eta\gamma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ . It also has a near parallel at Eph. 2:11. The resultant rendering would be: “You know that once you were gentiles, carried away by mute idols as you were led.” It is not clear, however, how  $\Pi$  would simply have dropped out rather than been confused with other letters.

Given the dissatisfaction with all these solutions, another conjecture may be hazarded.  $\text{ΟΤΙΟΤΕ}$  may have been corrupted from  $\text{ΟΠΟΤΕ}$ , a change that would have resulted from the misreading of a single pen stroke. Gregory cites two examples of the confusion of  $\Pi$  and  $\text{ΤΙ}$  in NT manuscripts:  $\text{ΜΗΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ}$  written as  $\text{ΜΗΤΙΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ}$  (John 7:31) and  $\text{ΠΕΜΟΙ}$  written for  $\text{ΤΙΕΜΟΙ}$  (037 at Mark 5:7).<sup>23</sup> The error is possible also in the book hand script of the first century.<sup>24</sup> While  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$  does not occur elsewhere in Paul, and in the NT potentially only at Luke 6:5 (where the alternative is  $\sigma\tau\epsilon$ ), it should not for this reason alone be dismissed. It is found in the papyri, frequently with  $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu$  but also with the indicative and specifically, as potentially at 1 Cor. 12:2, the imperfect:<sup>25</sup>

“... would the daughter have pledged herself to the State by another deed when she was liable to be deprived of the property whenever he chose? ( $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega \acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ )” (P.Oxy. 472,2,40; AD 130)

“... in accordance with the disposition made by Papontos in his lifetime ( $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$

---

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

<sup>23</sup>C. R. Gregory, *Prolegomena* (vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum Graece*; ed. C. Tischendorf; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894), p. 57.

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

<sup>25</sup>Mayser II,1, p. 273, who cites P.Teb. 72,240 as an example of  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$  used with the imperfect. BDAG (s.v.  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$ ) cites P.Oxy 243 (AD 79) and P.Ryl 245 (III cen.).



περιῆν).” (P.Oxy. 1282,26-27; also l. 20; AD 83)

This adverb also occurs with the imperfect in literary texts: “But you turn it [i.e., ability] aside just then, when you ought (οὔποτε ἔδει) to keep it open and seen.” (Arrian, *Epicteti dissertationes* I,12,31).<sup>26</sup> This text is comparable to the NT in date and style, showing that such usage would not be impossible for the Pauline epistles.

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

It is likewise clear that **αν ηγεσθε** is incorrect. The use of **αν** in this way would be unparalleled in Paul. Here manuscript “weight” or “authority” is of no value since the early manuscripts do not employ word division. All difficulties are cleared up, however, if the text is read as **ανηγεσθε**. The resultant text would be either **οιδατε οτε εθνη ητε προς τα ειδωλα τα αφωνα ως ανηγεσθε απαγομενοι**<sup>27</sup> or **οιδατε οποτε εθνη ητε προς τα ειδωλα τα αφωνα ως ανηγεσθε απαγομενοι**: “You recall how you were led up when you

---

<sup>26</sup>See also IV,1,160. An additional example, though in an interrogative, is used following a form of **οἶδα**: “Which of them knows when it ought (οὔποτε δεῖ) to be used and when not (πόποτε μή)?” (II,23,9).

<sup>27</sup>This is the solution adopted by J. Weiss, p. 294 and Héring, p. 124.



were gentiles, being led away to mute idols.”

#### 12:2.4

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

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

---

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

<sup>29</sup>The NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus inaccurately displays this evidence: “(ar b; Ambst) Pel.” In fact, VL 61 (= ar) matches the reading of Pelagius, VL 89 (= b) differs from any Latin witness in reading the plural *formae*, and all Latin witnesses should be enclosed in parentheses since none read anything corresponding to the alpha privative in F G.

<sup>30</sup>*Commentarius in epistulas Pauli*, on 1 Cor. 12:2.

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

The original D-text reading can be reconstructed as either *idolorum forma* or *idolorum formae*. The latter is the reading of VL 89, but the plural *formae*, formed from the singular by the addition of a single letter, may be an adaptation to the number of *gentes*. *Idolorum*, however, is firm since it is present in both VL 75 and 89. This is also confirmed by VL 77, which has partially adapted his Latin text based on the Vulgate to the Greek: *ad simulacrorum* is a unique reading that combines the Vulgate’s *ad simulacra* and the D-Text’s *idolorum*. Further adaptations are seen in VL 77, where *formationes* is an attempt to bring the Latin of Claromontanus into correspondence with the Greek, though this unique rendering is based on μορφα, not the αμορφα of F G. VL 75 also goes its own way, reading the genitive *idolorum* that it found in its predecessor but altering *forma(e)* to *sine voce* in order to match the Greek equivalent that it read (αφωνα). This suggests that the reading of D is again adapted from witnesses outside the bilingual tradition. When the attempt was made to bring the Latin into line with the Greek, a translation found nowhere else in the Latin tradition of this passage resulted.<sup>31</sup> The Greek of the predecessor of D F G cannot be reconstructed with certainty, since (as discussed below) it is likely that an error in transcription is involved. τα ειδωλα is firm in D F G, but τα αφωνα (D) was not the reading of the shared ancestor since it is attested neither in F G nor any Latin D-Text witnesses. F G’s τα αμορφα<sup>32</sup> may also

---

<sup>31</sup>Similar unique readings occur in VL 75 at Rom. 16:25-27. [Discussed in chapter on D F G].

<sup>32</sup>G evidences its typical difficulty with word division. Written in the manuscript is: ειδωλατα • αμορφα, with the article assumed to be attached to the preceding noun. F divides the words: ειδωλα • τα • αμορφα.



reflect an early error, one which these manuscripts make elsewhere (see τιμια for ατιμια at 11:14.58) Upon finding it in their source manuscripts, the various scribes and translators repaired the difficult reading in different ways. D resorted to replacing it with a reading from a second Greek witness, then altering its Latin text to match. The D-Text reviser may have assumed that αμορφα was simply an error for μορφα and used *forma*, much as the editor of the *ad hoc* Latin translation in VL 77's did by creating the reading *formationes*, which ignores the alpha privative. Though unattested, the Latin equivalent to the presumed τα ειδωλα τα μορφα would have been *ad idola forma* (with *forma* construed as an accusative). From this text *idolorum forma* could easily have arisen (with *forma* construed as a nominative), particularly given the difficult syntax of this sentence, as discussed at 12:2.3. From this reading, ultimately, the various permutations of the D-Text witnesses which were outlined above can all be explained.

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

12:3.7; 12:21.89; 12:27.114; 12:31.127

---

<sup>33</sup>J. Weiss, p. 294 n. 3.



Further examples υμ-/ημ- variation in 1241.

## 12:3.9

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

## 12:3.10

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

## 12:3.11 [discussed at 7:8.28]

## 12:3.12; 12:3.13; 12:3.14

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

---

<sup>34</sup>Zuntz, p. 141; followed by Fee p. 574, n. 24. For this interpretation of v. 3 see Schrage III, p. 124.

<sup>35</sup>BDAG, s.v. λέγω (4). Cf. the KJV: "Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord . . ."

example, which also uses δύναμαι + infinitive of λέγω, occurs later in the chapter (12:21).<sup>36</sup>

The first statement, one would therefore assume, would likewise be in direct speech. There are no grammatical features to *require* it,<sup>37</sup> and in fact P<sup>46</sup> and a manuscript of Pelagius<sup>38</sup> read the accusative in the first statement and the nominative in the second. The contrast between the first and second statement, however, requires that both be either direct or indirect speech. Since the latter is virtually certain to be direct speech, the former should be also. The shift to the accusative and indirect speech could have resulted simply from an unintentional incorporation of the statements into the syntax of the main clause, a change that required only a single letter.

12:4.15

δε is used here as a discourse marker to set off the introduction of the issue from the argument itself, not with contrastive force.<sup>39</sup> Several witnesses make this clear by altering the conjunction to γαρ (385) or adding και (1311).

12:4.16; 12:5.19; 12:6.21; 12:7.25

---

<sup>36</sup>Also Luke 6:42; without δυναμαι also Rom. 3:8. See BDAG s.v. λέγω (1aβ).

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

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

<sup>39</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. δέ (2).



The repetition of the comparison/contrast between “distinctions” and “the same Spirit/Lord/God” has led to assimilation throughout the tradition, but especially in B and its relatives. At 12:4, the δε in the first clause is not contrastive but marks of the beginning of the unit. This δε is repeated in the subsequent clause, το δε αυτο πνευμα. One manuscript, 424<sup>c</sup>, alters this to και το αυτο πνευμα.<sup>40</sup> This may have been in the interest of conformity to και ο αυτος κυριος at 12:5. It is also possible that the correction was written in at the wrong location, for at 12:6 the manuscript leaves uncorrected ο δε αυτος where its sister witnesses (P<sup>46</sup> B 1739) all read και ο αυτος. A second clear example of assimilation is found at 12:5, where και ο αυτος κυριος is assimilated to the preceding δε αυτος (even though και stands at the beginning of the sentence) by a handful of witnesses (33 57 103 218 256 441 1827 1831 1926).

The situation at 12:6 is more complex. The first two contrastive sentences use the same conjunctions to introduce the clauses: δε . . . δε at 12:4 and και . . . και at 12:5. Since και introduces the first clause of 12:6, one should expect και in the second clause as in P<sup>46</sup> B C 0201<sup>vid41</sup> 81 1175 1611 1739 *pc*. However, assimilation to either the και at the beginning of 12:6 or the και ο αυτος κυριος at 12:5 (or to both) is more likely than that ο δε αυτος κυριος (or ο αυτος δε κυριος; see below) was added from 12:4.<sup>42</sup> Zuntz notes that the breaking of the και . . . και pattern here serves to conclude this series of parallel

---

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

<sup>41</sup>0201: [ . . . ] και . . . τα . . | ο ενλεργωγ εστιγ. The final α cited in line 33 in the *edition princeps* appears to be a misreading for ο in αυτος.

<sup>42</sup>Lietzmann, p. 61; Güting, “Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente,” p. 108.



sentences.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, this is another example of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B suffering from assimilation to the near context.

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

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

---

<sup>43</sup>Zuntz, p. 203.

<sup>44</sup>Lietzmann, p. 61.

<sup>45</sup>Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 185-9.

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

<sup>47</sup>Paul does place δέ after a pronoun being governed by a preposition: εξ αυτου δε (1 Cor. 1:30); προς υμασ δε (1 Cor. 16:6); εν ω δ' αν (2 Cor. 11:21 omit δ' D\*); κατ' ιδιαν δε (Gal. 2:2). But notice also επι δε σε (Rom. 11:22; επι σε 1646); περι δε ων (1 Cor. 7:1). There is also one example involving the articular infinitive, which occasioned much difficulty in the manuscripts: Gal. 3:23 προ του γαρ ελθειν 489 927; προ δε του ελθειν 547 945 1611 1827; προ του ελθειν 104 205 460\* 614 1315 2412; προ του δε ελθειν *rell.*

places δέ between the preposition and the noun at 1 Cor. 7:15 (εν δε ειρηνη; εν ειρηνη δε 629; εν ειρηνη 796) and 1 Cor. 16:12 (περι δε απολλω). In two situations, however, Paul does postpone δέ. First, he consistently postpones δέ when it would follow immediately after the negative particle.<sup>48</sup> Second, he occasionally places δέ after an arthrous noun or participle at the beginning of a clause, though far more frequently δέ follows that article.<sup>49</sup> While δέ is found in the third position without variation at 1 Cor. 3:8 (ο φυτευων δε), it has frequently been altered:<sup>50</sup>

1 Cor. 10:4 η πετρα δε  $\aleph$  B D<sup>\*2</sup> 330 629 1739  
 πετρα δε F G  
 η δε πετρα *rell*

1 Cor. 11:7 η γυνη δε  $\aleph^2$  A B D<sup>\*</sup> F G P  $\Psi$  330 927 941 1175  
 η δε γυνη 441 463 1108 1611  
 γυναικι δε 614  
 γυνη δε *rell* This has frequently invited alteration

We have already argued that δε should be read after the noun in each of these cases. What is significant is that D F G has preserved the original word order in each case.<sup>51</sup>

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

---

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

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

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

<sup>51</sup>F G lose the article at 10:4, a frequent occurrence in these witnesses.



however, we find a consistent usage: δε is always placed between the article and the pronoun (in addition to 1 Cor. 12:4 see 2 Cor. 6:13 την δε αυτην αντιμισθιαν and Phil. 2:18 το δε αυτο.<sup>52</sup> Only D F G read a different position at 12:6: ο αυτος δε. Based on Pauline style, this reading has little claim to being the source reading.

To dismiss the D F G reading as secondary, however, does not account for its rise. Lietzmann, as we noted, sees it as a stylistic improvement. Denniston notes, however, that both positions are common in classical writers.<sup>53</sup> Might the Latin text have influenced the Greek? It seems unlikely, for although D F G's ο αυτος δε θεος at 12:6 matches the Latin tradition's *idem vero deus* VL 75 77 89 Vg (also *idem autem deus* VL 78 Vg<sup>mss</sup>), the same word order in the Latin of 12:4 (*idem autem spiritus* VL 75 77 78 89 Vg; *idem autem et spiritus* VL 61; *idem vero spiritus* Spe Amst(A)) did not lead to the alteration of το δε αυτο πνευμα in D F G. Similarly at 2 Cor. 6:13 and Phil. 2:18 the Latin word order differs, but the Greek of D F G was not altered.<sup>54</sup> Influence from the Latin therefore seems unlikely at 12:6.

#### 12:6.20

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

---

<sup>52</sup>Elsewhere in the NT only Matt. 27:44 το δε[ε] αυτο, without variation.

<sup>53</sup>Denniston, p. 186.

<sup>54</sup>The Latin interlinear in G reflects the difficulty of matching the Latin to the Greek word order. At 12:4 *idem* is written above το δε and a ligature for *autem* squeezed in tight so that αυτο does not have any Latin above it, whereas at 12:6 *idem* stands above αυτος and a ligature for *vero* above δε. Cf. 2 Cor. 6:13, where *eandem autem* is centered above την δε αυτην, even though the sequence does not match. At Phil 2:16, improper word division and the end of a line produced the confused το δαυ | το (*sic*) in G, with *id ipsum* on the one line and *autem* above the orphaned το.

12:6.23; 15:17.73; 15:56.222

The addition of the copula is common in the tradition. It is seen in the “Byzantine” witnesses at 1 Cor. 3:22; 7:8; and Eph. 5:23; in D F G at 1 Cor. 7:26; in B D\* at 1 Cor. 15:17,<sup>55</sup> and in A Ψ at 1 Cor. 15:56.<sup>56</sup> Further calling into question its presence at 12:6 is the fact that it appears both before θεος and after ενεργων.<sup>57</sup> The unique reading of B 0201 and 1739 shows the special relationship among these witnesses.

12:6.24 [discussed at 12:19.80]

12:8.27

Among the Greek witnesses, Ϟ<sup>46</sup> is alone in reading the word order διδοται δια του πνευματος, though a large number of Latin witness reflect the same order (*datur per spiritum*).<sup>58</sup> Either reading may have been caused by an accidental leap, either from Δ|Δ to Δ|ΔΟΜΔ| or Δ|ΔΟΜΔ| to Δ|Δ, with the missing text filled in after prepositional phrase or verb, respectively, was written.<sup>59</sup> If not accidental, the variation may have resulted from assimilation to the word order of nearby clauses. As we have already seen, the parallelism

---

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Zuntz, p. 187.

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

<sup>57</sup>J. Weiss, p. 298 n. 2.

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

<sup>59</sup>Royse (p. 261) sees this as the cause of what he considered a singular reading in Ϟ<sup>46</sup>, but the Latin witnesses, whose shorter reading could not have been caused by an accidental leap, also attest this word order.



that runs throughout this section has caused numerous cases of assimilation. In this case, it is more likely that the verb *διδοται* has been moved to the position after the conjunction, the position in which it stands in the preceding sentence. However, the context would seem to favor having the prepositional phrase in a more prominent position, since Paul's argument through 12:11 is that the various gifts come "through the Spirit." Final judgment is not yet possible.

12.9.29; 12:9.31; 12:10.37; 12:10.39; 12:10.41; 12:10.44; 12:10.47

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

---

<sup>60</sup>*ᾤ*<sup>46</sup> reads *ετερω* in the last clause (12:10), assimilating to the previous clause.

		℘ <sup>46</sup>	ℵ*	A C Ψ	B 6 424 <sup>c</sup> 1739 Cl	D* latt	F G VL 77	P	0201	1881
12:9a	ετερω	δε		δε				δε	?	δε
12:9b	αλλω	δε	δε	δε	δε			δε	?	δε
12:10a	αλλω	δε	δε	δε	δε			δε	δε	δε
12:10b	αλλω		δε	δε				δε		δε
12:10c	αλλω		δε	δε				δε		
12:10d	ετερω			δε						
12:10e	αλλω	δε <sup>61</sup>	δε	δε	δε <sup>62</sup>		δε		δε	hom

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

---

<sup>61</sup>℘<sup>46</sup> reads ετερω δε here.

<sup>62</sup>B omits due to an accidental leap: ΓΛΩCCΩΝΑΛΛΩΔΕΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΔΓΛΩCCΩΝ.



unlikely is the set of readings in B 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739<sup>63</sup> Clement (*Stromata* 4,21,132), for while the use of  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$  . . .  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$   $\delta\epsilon$  at the beginning and end of the list provides symmetry, the  $\delta\epsilon$  in 12:10a would certainly be secondary. Nevertheless, this set of readings firmly binds these witnesses (including  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ) together.

This leave three viable sets of readings. First,  $\aleph^*$  alone reads  $\delta\epsilon$  after every occurrence of  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$  but not after  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$ . Fee argues that this provides a “subtle” clue as to how the list is to be grouped.<sup>64</sup> However this grouping has already been accomplished by the use of  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$  and  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ , and it is more likely that  $\delta\epsilon$  has been added to  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$  and not  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$  under the influence of  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$   $\delta\epsilon$  at 12:8. A second set of readings is found in F G, which read  $\delta\epsilon$  only in the last clause. While this is not supported by D or the Latin tradition (apart from VL 77, which has again been adapted to the Greek of G), all other witnesses read a  $\delta\epsilon$  in the final clause in the series. This  $\delta\epsilon$  would then signal the end of series. However, elsewhere Paul frequently structures an asyndetic series without attaching a conjunction to the last element. Examples include Rom. 2:19-21; 13:7, 13; 1 Cor. 9:20-22;<sup>65</sup> 12:29-30; 14:26; 15:52, 58;<sup>66</sup> 2 Cor. 6:4-10; 7:7; 11:20; 13:11.<sup>67</sup> This makes  $\delta\epsilon$  unlikely in the final clause. The

---

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

<sup>64</sup>Fee, p. 584-5, n. 9.

<sup>65</sup>F G add  $\delta\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$  to  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\eta\nu$  and harmonize  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\alpha$  to  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ .

<sup>66</sup>A adds  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  before  $\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\eta\tau\omicron\iota$ .

<sup>67</sup>List adapted from Güting and Mealand, p. 59.

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

12:9.32; 12:25.103; 12:25.104; 12:25.105; 12:28.119 [also 1:10.32; 6:7.29; 6:19.63]

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

---

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

<sup>69</sup>Zuntz, p. 105-107; Güting and Mealand, p. 62; Güting, "Neuedition der Papyrusfragmente," p. 110.

<sup>70</sup>G\* divides the words as χαρισματα ταιαματων. Tischendorf cites F\* and G\* as reading χαρισματα τα ιαματων. However, there is no correction in F and it is not clear that the two small marks above the initial τα indicate a correction in G. If they do, G<sup>c</sup> would read: χαρισμα ταιαματων. Of course this reading is nonsense and simply mistaken word division, for the Latin equivalent *dona vel grati[a]e* requires the plural χαρισματα.

<sup>71</sup>The Latin tradition has had difficulty with these forms as well. Although *gratia* (10:9) may simply be a corruption of *gratiae*, especially in the D-text witnesses (VL 75 Amst), *donum* cannot be so easily explained and must be derived from a witness that read χαρισμα. At 12:28, 0151 is the only Greek witness to read the singular, but only Ambrosiaster and Ambrose read *gratiam*, a corruption of *gratias*. At 12:30, however, many Vulgate witnesses read the singular *gratiam* where the Greek tradition unanimously preserves χαρισματα, although Vg<sup>0.5</sup> read *gratias* and the D-text *donationes*.

<sup>72</sup>Though see the separate discussion of ενεργεια in D F G at 12:10.38.



“gifts” in the section are in the plural. Given this usage, the plural form should also be read at 12:9, even though *χαρίσματα* is paired with the singular *πιστις* earlier in the sentence. Nevertheless, the wide range of Latin witnesses with the singular there points to an early corruption, which is preserved in Greek now only in an eleventh century minuscule. This again reminds us that some early readings preserved in the versions have been repaired – and at times perhaps corrupted – in the bulk of the Greek tradition.

The same difficulties are to be found with *σχίσμα*. The plural is unanimously attested at 1 Cor. 11:18, but at 1:10  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  33 69 read the singular. The singular is in error there, likely the result of assimilation to the number of the verb ( $\eta$ ). At 12:25 D F G is joined by  $\aleph$  and witnesses that typically align with the “Byzantine” tradition in reading the plural. An immediate difficulty with the singular is that it is the only time that *σχίσμα* occurs in the singular in Paul. Again, assimilation to the number of the verb is likely,<sup>73</sup> with the identical verb form used here as at 1:10. In fact, 1:10 ( $\mu\eta\ \eta\ \epsilon\nu\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ ) shows that Paul elsewhere uses this neuter noun in the plural with the singular of *εἰμί*. It is, however, too remote and too small a change (comprising only two letters) to have been the cause of a shift to the plural.

A similar assimilation to the near context takes place in the following clause of 12:25. Here virtually the entire Greek tradition uses the plural verb *μεριμνῶσιν* with the neuter plural noun *τὰ μέλη*. However, elsewhere Paul uses the singular verb with this plural noun form (Rom. 12:4; 1 Cor. 12:26). D F G read the singular verb *μεριμνα*, which, though not

---

<sup>73</sup>Fee (p. 608 n. 3) argues that “some manuscripts anticipate the application to the church and make this singular plural.” Why this should have taken place here and not at 1:10 is not explained. Moreover, given the frequent interchange of the singular and plural forms of *-ματ* stem nouns, it is more likely that the context influenced the alteration in the opposite direction than that theological editing is involved.

attested elsewhere<sup>74</sup> is likely the archetypal reading.

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

12:9.35

Assimilation to the near context likely explains the reading εν τω αυτω πνευματι, for the phrase occurs twice previously (12:8b; 12:9).<sup>75</sup> Neither αυτω nor the text of P<sup>46</sup> can give rise to ενι. P<sup>46</sup> alone lacks any modifier while retaining the article, but this shorter reading is easily explained as omission of αυτω by leap (TΩΔΥTΩ), a common error in this manuscript.<sup>76</sup> This is one example of P<sup>46</sup> matching D F G, here joined by 6 424<sup>c</sup>, yet departing from B 1739.<sup>77</sup>

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

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

---

<sup>74</sup>Though the Latin does not follow the Greek convention of using singular verbs with neuter plural subjects; cf. *conpatiuntur omnia membra* at 12:26, where the Greek unanimously reads συμπάσχει πάντα τὰ μέλη.

<sup>75</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 497; Fee, p. 584 n. 4; Thiselton, p. 944.

<sup>76</sup>Royse, p. 258.

<sup>77</sup>Though 1739 reads ενι without the article.



three places. In the other lists of “gifts” in the epistles, only the singular or only the plural form is used. For example, the list at 1 Cor. 12:28 is similar in content to that of 12:8-10, but in the later passage the plural form is used for each of the χαρισματα since more than one example of each is “placed” in the “church.” For this reason the use of the plural in this passage does not require the plural at 12:9-10, even for items repeated from 12:8-10 (χαρισματα ιαματων and δυναμεις). Conversely at Rom. 12:6-7 the singular form is used for both of the χαρισματα which are “given” (προφητεια and διακονια; cf. the singular προφητεια at 1 Cor. 12:10). Again at 1 Cor. 14:26 all the gifts that “each person has” (εκαστος εχει; cf. ετερω and αλλω at 12:8-10) at the assembly are listed in the singular. However, at 12:8-10 at least one item is firm in the textual tradition as a plural: γενη γλωσσων. This makes the mixture of singular and plural forms unique in the list of χαρισματα at 1 Cor. 12:8-10. But what of the other three items?

The use of the plural form γενη γλωσσων may help to determine whether or not the plural should be read for the other nouns. Thiselton shows the need to take seriously the plural form γενη. It indicates that there are several “types” or “species of tongues,” which manifest themselves differently (unintelligible, 1 Cor. 14:2, 7-9; perhaps angelic, 13:1; benefits the speaker, 14:4, 5) but share the common characteristic of being given “by the Spirit.” “Prophecy” (12:10) on the other hand, is expressed in the singular because there is only one source, type, and goal.<sup>78</sup> Therefore the plural “types of tongues” at 12:10 encompasses the several different examples that are described in the succeeding chapters of the letter.

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

---

<sup>78</sup>Thiselton, pp. 970-988, esp. pp. 970-72.

discussed earlier. There is no variation involving *ιαματων*. In this case the use of the plural matches that of *γενη γλωσσων*: “the plural denotes various kinds of healings enacted in a diversity of ways to address a variety of conditions.”<sup>79</sup> Both transcriptional and internal grounds confirm that *χαρισματα ιαματων* is the archetypical reading.

Is the plural also necessary for *διακρισεις πνευματων*? There are different types of “spirits” that are to be distinguished,<sup>80</sup> thus requiring the plural *πνευματων* (for which there is no variation). But are there different “distinctions” or “discernings” (*διακρισεις*)? The decision between the singular and the plural must rest exclusively on internal grounds, since the interchange of *ει* and *Ι* is far too common to allow the “worth of the manuscripts” to be decisive. In addition, while the singular form may have arisen from assimilation to the singular form *προφητεια*,<sup>81</sup> it is also possible that the plural is adapted to the previous two plural forms that were also modified by a genitive or even to the three occurrences of the similar-sounding *διαρεσεις* earlier in the chapter (12:4-6). The singular is most likely in that there are not different kinds of “distinctions.”<sup>82</sup>

The most difficult unit of variation to resolve is the first “gift” described at 12:10a. Transcriptional probability weighs heavily against the reading *ενεργηματα δυναμεων* since it matches the *χαρισματα ιαματων* which is almost universally attested at 12:9.<sup>83</sup> Furthermore, assimilation or other transcriptional causes cannot account for the alteration of

<sup>79</sup>See Thiselton, p. 948, within the larger discussion provided on pp. 947-50.

<sup>80</sup>This likely refers to distinguishing the Holy Spirit’s action from human action that claims to be from God’s Spirit. See Thiselton, p. 967-8.

<sup>81</sup>Schrage III, p. 156 n. 235.

<sup>82</sup>Conzelmann, p. 209 adopts the singular without comment.

<sup>83</sup>Zuntz, p. 100.



ενεργηματα δυναμεων to the other known readings. Assuming the reading found in  $\aleph$  B 1739 Byz requires that any change must have been deliberate. Fee argues that the readings of both  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and D F G are “an attempt to ‘improve’ a difficult plural that seemed tautologous.”<sup>84</sup> However, this does not account for the D F G reading in which both nouns are written in the singular. Furthermore, the similarly “tautologous” διακρισεις δυναμεων of Rom. 14:1 was not altered in either the Greek or the Latin. Finally, the singular of either noun alone would have resolved such perceived difficulty, as in ενεργημα δυναμεων (056 0142) or *operatio virtutum* (VL 78 Vg Amst) as well as the reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ . This makes it unlikely that the intentional editing assumed by Fee has taken place.

The D F G reading (ενεργεια δυναμεως) has much to commend it. It uses a common Pauline word (ἐνέργεια), though it is not used in the *Hauptbriefe*.<sup>85</sup> Ἐνέργημα, on the other hand, occurs only at 1 Cor. 12:6, which may have led to its introduction here a few lines later. It is also difficult to account for the use of ενεργεια as an intentional alteration, for if the singular was desired, ενεργηματα would have easily been altered to ενεργημα (as in 056 0142).

However, all these potential strengths of the reading ενεργεια δυναμεως are undone by the close relationship of D F G with the Latin tradition. At 1 Cor. 12:8-10 the Latin tradition writes each “gift” in the singular form, apart from *genera linguarum* (12:10). This indicates intentional editing.<sup>86</sup> However, this editing is limited to the Latin tradition.

---

<sup>84</sup>Fee, p. 584 n. 5.

<sup>85</sup>Eph. 1:19; 3:7; 4:16; Phil. 3:21; Col. 1:29; 2:12; 2 Thess. 2:9, 11.

<sup>86</sup>As noted by Zuntz, p. 100. Note that also at Rom. 14:1, where there is another use of unusual use of the genitive plural modifying a plural head noun (διακρισεις διαλογισμων), the Latin tradition does not alter to the singular (though D\* alone reads διακρισις)

Furthermore, it is not attested by the earliest Latin witness, Tertullian. His adaptation of this passage to Isaiah 11:2 in *Adversus Marcionem* 5,8,7 results in some uncertainty as to his text.<sup>87</sup> Where the Greek reads *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* (or one of the other readings) Tertullian reads only *virtutum*. This plural genitive form assumes a head noun, so it could render either *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* or *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεως*. However, the reading of D F G (*ἐνεργεία δυνάμεως*), in which both nouns occur in the singular, cannot be the Greek basis for Tertullian's reading. Likewise the Peshitta, which typically matches the "Western Text," does not support it here.<sup>88</sup> The reading of D F G is therefore likely to be adaptation to an edited Latin text, with *ἐνεργεία* adopted as the more likely equivalent for *operatio*.<sup>89</sup>

This leaves the reading of  $\Phi^{46}$  (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεως*). On internal grounds this reading has much to commend it. It can serve as the source reading for all other readings, with *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* adapted to the preceding *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* either an intentional or unintentional loss of the final *-τα*, and *ἐνεργεία δυνάμεως* an adaptation to the edited Latin text, though retaining the singular *δυνάμεως*. It can also be the base of the readings preserved in Tertullian and the Peshitta, as described above. It also matches the use of the genitives elsewhere in this list (12:8-10). Reading *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* one must assume an attributive genitive ("miraculous powers").<sup>90</sup>

---

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

<sup>88</sup>The Peshitta's  $\text{ܩܘܿܠܘܿܐ}$  ("mighty works") is a similar simplification, which may also support either *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* or *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεως*. The same form is used by the Peshitta at 12:28, 29 to render only *δυνάμεις*.

<sup>89</sup>In every place that the Greek text of Paul uses *ἐνεργεία* the Latin tradition uses *operatio*.

<sup>90</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. *ἐνέργημα*. Fee (p. 584 n. 5) asserts that "miraculous powers" must render the  $\Phi^{46}$  text, but BDAG provides this gloss for *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*.



This, however, would be the only attributive genitive in a list (12:8-10) where all the other genitive forms are descriptive. The singular genitive would then indicate that while there are many “workings” or examples (cf. ἐνέργηματων at 12:6), they are all from the same “power” (the Spirit).

12:10.48; 14:26.122; 14:28.132

The addition/omission of the prefixes of compounds is discussed at 7:13.47. Paul's use of the prefix for the verb διερμηνεω is consistent (12:30; 14:5, 13,<sup>91</sup> 27). On the other hand, the nouns based on [δι]ερμηνεω lack the prefix. At 12:10 A D<sup>\*1</sup> read διερμην[ε]ια, another reading which ties these witnesses together. At 14:26 D F G read διερμηνειαν, influenced by the compound verb at 14:5, 13, 27. Finally at 14:28 B D<sup>\*</sup> F G *pc* avoid the same influence by reading ερμηνευτης.

12:10.49

D<sup>\*</sup> has added γενη under the influence of the γενη γλωσσων in the preceding clause.

12:11.50 [discussed at 10:11.46]

12:11.51

The omission of the article is made likely by its distance from its head noun (το εν και το αυτο πνευμα), which would account for its loss in Ps-Ignatius, *Epistula ad Philipenses recensio longior* 2,3 and some citations of Chrysostom.<sup>92</sup> This, and the fact that

---

<sup>91</sup>104 reads διερμηνευη.

<sup>92</sup>*In epistulam ad Romanos* MPG 60, pp. 533; 602; *In epistulam I ad Corinthios* MPG 61, pp. 244; 245; 246; 249; 252; 266. But the citations at *De Anna* MPG 54, p. 653; *De sancta pentecoste* MPG 50, p. 464 (*bis*); and *In epistulam ii ad Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 608 read the article.

omission of the article is frequent in D F G make it more likely that the article has been lost than that it has been added.

12:11.52

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

12:11.53

According to Zuntz, ἰδίᾳ with ἕκαστος is “typically Attic.” He suggests, however, that at 1 Cor. 12:11 ἰδιᾳ was intentionally deleted (Ϟ<sup>46</sup> D\*.c F G 0201<sup>vid</sup>1175 sy<sup>p</sup>) due to “aversion against an expression of literary flavour.”<sup>93</sup> This begs the question, however, of whether scribes typically added or avoided stylistic improvements. However, the phrase occurs nowhere else in Paul, in similar situations elsewhere Paul uses a preposition phrase (κατ’ ἰδίαν; Gal. 2:2; 2 Tim. 1:9), and no obvious motivation for its deletion is evident. Instead, the witnesses that read ἰδιᾳ frequently polish Paul's Greek, especially A B and the “Byzantine” witnesses.

12:12.56

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

---

<sup>93</sup>Zuntz, p. 98.



12:12.57

The loss of the adjectival phrase  $\text{C}\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  may be an example of parablepsis. However, it is more likely that the phrase was added ( $\aleph^2$  K  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 6 424) in conformity to the use of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  with the two other occurrences of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  at 12:12.<sup>94</sup>

12:13.60 [also discussed in the chapter on D F G]

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

12:13.62 [discussed in the chapter on D F G]

12:13.63; 12:13.64

Assimilation to the near context is responsible for several adaptations at the end of 12:13.<sup>95</sup> Several witnesses add  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  to  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  ( $D^2$  K L 0150 0151 88 424 *pm*) in order to match the  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu$  of the previous clause. Other witnesses alter  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  to  $\epsilon\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  (L *pc*), which are similar in sight and sound, to match better the subject ( $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ). Still other

---

<sup>94</sup>Fee (p. 600 n. 2) rejects  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  as secondary without explanation.

<sup>95</sup>In addition, A alone reads  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$  in place of  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\omicron\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ . This matches precisely Rom. 12:5, usually too distant a parallel to be considered as a cause of corruption. However, since the context and language of Rom. 12 is very similar to that of 1 Cor. 12, intentional harmonization is not unlikely – perhaps the result of a marginal note later adopted in the text of a predecessor witness.

witnesses assimilate the noun to the verb, writing πομα (056 0142 *pc*) for the *nomen sacrum* of πνευμα.<sup>96</sup>

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

---

<sup>96</sup>This reading resulted in various conflation: εν πομα εποτισθημεν εις εν πνευμα (35\* 101<sup>c</sup> 242 385 1905 1927); εις εν πνευμα εν πομα εποτισθημεν (1982); and εις εν πνευμα εποτισθημεν εις εν πομα (629<sup>c</sup>).

<sup>97</sup>See A. H. R. E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.* Papyrologica Lugduno-Batavia 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), pp. 82-83; 102-13; and L. Traube, *Nomina sacra. Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 2. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1907), 93-5. Traube cites only the Greek portion of a Coptic manuscript as using π̄ΜΔ and D<sup>absq</sup> (Codex Sangermanensis) as using π̄ΜΙ where D 05 (Codex Bezae) uses π̄ΝΙ. For this reason the solution to the textual problem at 1 Cor. 12:13 proposed by Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, Third, Enlarged Edition (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 187, which claims that π̄ΜΔ is the “usual contraction of the word πνεῦμα”, is only partially correct since it must instead be a corruption of π̄ΝΔ.



of Thomas of Harkel's revision of the Syriac text in the early 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>98</sup> This visual error, in addition to having been influenced by the verb, may also have recalled the text of 1 Cor. 10:4: πομα πνευματικον επιον (in most witnesses).

Recognizing that this error is far more likely in minuscule script than in uncial helps to explain a reading that had been ascribed to Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogus* 1,6,31,1). Tischendorf cites his text here as reading ενι ποματι επιομεν, but this is drawn from the edition of Heinsius and Sylburgius as cited by Griesbach's *Symbolae criticae*.<sup>99</sup> No modern editor cites this reading, nor is it found in any NT manuscript. Modern editors of Clement's text also have puzzled over this reading. The edition of Stählin and Treu as well as that of Marrou and Harl print εν πόμα έποτίσθημεν. In fact, no manuscript of *Paedagogus* reads this. A single manuscript, designated M, reads εν πομα εκοτισ], at which point the manuscript has a gap. The confusion of κ for π in the verb sparks little confidence in its having read properly the noun, particularly in a 12<sup>th</sup> cen. minuscule manuscript that is a poor copy of the best manuscript of *Paedagogus*.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, the context of the citation

---

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

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

<sup>100</sup>M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. ix-xi describes the three witnesses to the text. The best manuscript (P) begins only at 1,11,96,1. The other two witnesses are derived from P: M (11<sup>th</sup> cen.) and F (12<sup>th</sup> cen.). According to Marcovich: "F was copied not directly from P, but from an intermediary apograph of P which occasionally offered *variae lectiones* independent of P."

suggests that πνεῦμα is the intended reading, for he is discussing the need for instruction by the Spirit: “For instruction leads to faith, and faith with baptism is trained by the Holy Spirit.” (1,6,30,2). As evidence for his argument he then cites Gal. 3:23-28 followed by 1 Cor. 12:13. Marcovich, breaking from previous editors, prints πνευμα in his text supported by M (noting it as the NT reading).<sup>101</sup> In addition, Mees’ study of Clement’s citations also accepts πνευμα as Clement’s text.<sup>102</sup> While Mees does not discuss the passage, he does note that this is the reading of P<sup>46</sup>. The text of this manuscript, as his study clearly demonstrates, shows close similarity to Clement’s citations.<sup>103</sup> Clement should therefore no longer be cited as supporting the reading πομα.<sup>104</sup>

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

Specifically, Schrage notes that the reading πομα may have arisen from making a connection to 1 Cor. 10:2-4, where Christian baptism and the Eucharist (“spiritual food” and “spiritual drink”) was read into the text.<sup>105</sup> However, no clear connection between 12:13 and the Eucharist is to be found before at least John of Damascus (8<sup>th</sup> cen.), and even here it is not clearly derived from 12:13b.<sup>106</sup> The only pre-Reformation interpretation to discuss the

---

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

<sup>102</sup>Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandria*, p. II,165.

<sup>103</sup>Further evidence that the mss. of *Paedagogus* had the same difficulties that the NT scribes had is that a corrector of M writes φω above πο in εποτισθημεν.

<sup>104</sup>As is done by Tischendorf, von Soden, and NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>105</sup>Schrage III, 218.

<sup>106</sup>Cf. the examples of this interpretation listed in Schrage III, p. 218 n. 617, of which only Theophylact and John of Damascus are cited from the pre-Reformation period. John of Damascus, however, cites 12:13a, but skips over the “Eucharistic” 12:13b to 12:14 before commenting: “That is, we enter by means of the same initiation, we have the benefit of the



Eucharist based on this passage is Theophylact in the 11<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>107</sup> This, however, is too late to serve as evidence for a “Eucharistic reading” of the passage which would have led to its alteration by the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, while the alteration makes a Eucharistic reading possible,<sup>109</sup> no patristic citation reads πομα and then connects it to the Eucharist.

Since this variant arose from a sight error, the passage was read eucharistically only after the first millennium, and no discussion can be found that sees πομα at 12:13 as explicitly Eucharistic, evidence that would allow one to claim that theological alteration has taken place is nonexistent. As in the other alterations in this passage, this sight error was made more likely by similar items in the near context as well as perhaps the distant recall of 1 Cor. 10:4.

12:15.65[discussed at 7:8.29]

---

same table. If therefore one Spirit prepares us, and in the Spirit we were also baptized into the body, and he provides one table for us, why do you bring up to me a distinction, when it is like the [metaphor] about the tree, that from the same stream all the branches are watered?” (*Commentarii in epistulas Pauli* MPG 95, p. 669).

<sup>107</sup>Theophylact writes: “‘And all were given to drink into one Spirit.’ He appears to speak about the spiritual table, that of bread and wine. For by his saying, ‘the Spirit which gave us to drink,’ he indicates both the bread and the wine. More than this it is true that he speaks of the coming of the Spirit, who came to us after our baptism and before the sacraments. ‘But we were given to drink’ he says, through the metaphor of the trees which are nourished from the same stream. Therefore, one Spirit gives us to drink and nourishes us and makes us one body.” (*Epistulae Primae Divi Pauli ad Corinthios expositio*, MPG 124, p. 716).

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

<sup>109</sup>According to Fee (p. 600 n. 4), the reading makes this passage “a reference to the Lord’s Supper”.

12:16.69; 12:21.88

Two Greek manuscripts (D\* K\*) lack *καί* at the beginning of the clause. The addition of the conjunction may have taken place in order to avoid asyndeton.<sup>110</sup> However, it is more likely that the *καί* has been deleted. A direct parallel occurs at 12:21, where the same imagery is used in another pair of sentences. Because 12:21 uses a conjunction (*ἤ*),<sup>111</sup> it is likely that a conjunction would have been used at 12:16. The reading in D\* may again be attributed to the tendency in this manuscript to bring its sense-lines into parallel. A lack of access to a photograph of K prevents one from determining whether its correction is an immediate repair to a mistake or a later addition.

12:16.70

Ⓟ<sup>46</sup> assimilates *το οὐς* to the similar sounding *ο πους* of 12:15.

12:16.71 [also discussed at 7:8.29]

A skip from the first *οὐκ εἰμι* of the verse to the second *οὐκ εἰμι* resulted in *οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος* being copied after *οτι* in 88. Upon recognizing the error, the scribe repaired the text by adding *εἰ* to *ο οφθαλμος* and continuing with the rest of the sentence.

12:16.73 [discussed at 7:8.29]

12:18.75 [discussed at 5.11.30]

---

<sup>110</sup>Güting and Mealand, pp. 50, 62, and 101. They also note that this occurs in a “series” of asyndetic clauses, though in fact it is only a pair (12:15-16) and so different from, e.g., 12:8-10.

<sup>111</sup>0151 writes *καί* in place of *ἤ*, likely a harmonization to 12:16.



12:18.76; 12:24.99 [also 2:10.35; 10:5.14; 11:10.41]

There are several examples of the subject being moved to the position prior to the verb:

2:10 απεκαλυψεν ο θεος ] 2,3,1 L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 6 104 614 sy<sup>p</sup>  
 10:5 ευδοκησεν θ θεος ] 2,3,1 547 1311  
 11:10 οφειλει η γυνη ] 2,3,1 H 33 69 pc

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

This evidence can be brought to bear in two more difficult cases. At 12:18 only a handful of witnesses, but included among them ℘<sup>46</sup> and Origen,<sup>112</sup> place ο θεος after the verb. This is the more likely word order, particularly in view of the same word order at 12:28. This parallel, however, is too remote and of so small a significance that one can hardly claim 12:18 as an adaptation to the later passage. Another variation involving ο θεος takes place at 12:24, where A alone reads συνεκερασεν ο θεος. Given the shift tendency in the tradition and the lack of any obvious reason for an alteration to the verb-subject word order, A may be the only witness to preserve the original word order.

12:18.77

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

12:18.78

---

<sup>112</sup>*Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 14,1.

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

12:19.80 [also 2:15.66; 8:6.22; 9:22.89; 11:2.4; 12:6.24; 15:27.105; 15:27.108 15:28.112; 15:28.120]

The presence of  $\tau\alpha$  before  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  is in question at twenty places in the *Corpus Paulinum*, ten of which occur in 1 Corinthians. This variation often has significant exegetical and theological implications. In two cases (1 Cor. 2:15; 15:28 (3)) NA<sup>27</sup> brackets the article. The inconsistency of the more “important” witnesses has likely caused this uncertainty. Instead of relying on certain witnesses, a more helpful approach is to analyze Paul’s use of  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  as substantives in order to determine which reading is most suitable in each place. Only then is one able to evaluate the witnesses to see if they fall into any patterns.

Paul’s use of the neuter of  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  as a substantive without the article is consistent.

Paralleling his use of the masculine of  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  (“everyone”), the neuter form refers to “everything,”<sup>113</sup> though some examples may be uses of the accusative of general reference.<sup>114</sup> His use of  $\tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ <sup>115</sup>, however, falls into three specific categories<sup>116</sup>: First, and most

---

<sup>113</sup>BDAG, s.v.  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  (1d $\beta$ ). Pauline examples without variation are: Rom. 8:28; 14:2, 20; 1 Cor. 2:10; 3:21, 22; 6:12 (3x); 9:12, 25; 10:23 (4x), 31, 33; 13:7 (4x) 14:26, 40; 15:27 (1); 16:14; 2 Cor. 2:9; 6:10; Phil. 2:14; 4:13, 18; Col. 4:9; 1 Thes. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:10; Tit. 1:15.

<sup>114</sup>E.g., 1 Cor. 11:2 where P reads instead  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ , and 2 Cor. 7:14 where C F G reads  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ . Cf. BDR §154<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>115</sup>The singular  $\tau\omicron \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  never occurs in Paul.

<sup>116</sup>All of these are grouped into one entry in BDAG, s.v.  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  (4d $\beta$ ).



commonly, τὰ πάντα refers to “all created things,”<sup>117</sup> which in the firm examples does not include actions, emotions, or feelings but does appear to include creatures, created things, and even creation itself. Second, τὰ πάντα is used in a demonstrative manner (“all these”).<sup>118</sup> In each case the adjective refers to items previously mentioned in the context, usually when Paul is concluding a discussion. Third, τὰ πάντα is used adverbially. This usage is rare, and limited to writings outside the *Hauptbriefe*.<sup>119</sup>

The care with which Paul distinguishes πάντα and τὰ πάντα can be demonstrated from two passages where the adjective is used both with and without the article. At 1 Cor. 15:27-28 πάντα occurs five times. The first of these is a citation from Ps. 8:7, “For he will subject everything (παντα) under his feet.” The second example is in the succeeding clause, where Paul begins to explain the referent of παντα. This likewise occurs without the article,<sup>120</sup> for Paul is referring back to the παντα from the Psalm text. These two examples, because they are citations, should not be expected to reflect Pauline style. At the end of 15:27, however, Paul reflects his own usage when he explains that παντα refers to “all created things” (τα παντα), i.e., everything except the “God and Father” (15:24): “But when he says that he subjected παντα, it is evident that it is apart from the one who subjected τα

---

<sup>117</sup>Examples without variation are Rom. 8:32; 1 Cor. 15:28 (2); Eph. 1:10; Eph. 1:23; 4:10; Phil. 3:21; Col. 1:20; 1 Tim. 6:13.

<sup>118</sup>Without variation at 2 Cor. 5:18; 12:19; Phil. 3:8b; Col. 3:8b; Eph. 5:13.

<sup>119</sup>Only Eph. 4:15 without variation. See BDR §160<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>120</sup>⋈ 1270 add τα before the second παντα of 15:27. This addition is likely the result of assimilation to the near context, since τα παντα occurs several times in this context. It cannot be determined if ⋈ also read τα παντα in the first occurrence at 15:27 since the text was lost due to an accidental leap (ΤΟΥΣΠΟΔΔΣΔΥΤΟΥ [v. 25] . . . ΤΟΥΣΠΟΔΔΣΔΥΤΟΥ [v. 27]).

παντα to him.” This example of τα παντα is certain,<sup>121</sup> as also are the first two of 15:28.<sup>122</sup> At the end of 15:28, however, the presence of the article is in question. Whereas the previous three examples of τα παντα referred to “all created things,” it is clear that this cannot be the case for the final example, “That God may be all in all ([τα] παντα εν πασιν,” since God cannot be included among “all created things.” However, reading παντα without the article matches the Pauline usage described above. The addition of the article is easily explained as assimilation to the previous three example of τα παντα; only A B D\* 0243 6 33 81 547 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739 preserve the archetypal text for this final unit of variation.<sup>123</sup>

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

With the distinction between τὰ πάντα and πάντα now clear, we may assess passages where the presence of the article is in question. At Col. 1:16 the context requires that τα παντα (“all created things”) be read twice. In the first example K 0151 omit the article and in the second ℘<sup>46</sup> alters it to οτι. At Col. 3:11, τα παντα would properly convey the sense of “all these” with reference to “Jew and Greek, circumcised and uncircumcised.”

---

<sup>121</sup>It is omitted by F alone. Because it departs from G, it is an error unique to this manuscript.

<sup>122</sup>0243 omits the first τα at 15:28, again by assimilation to the near context.

<sup>123</sup>Though ℘<sup>46</sup> I are not extant here.



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

Turning to the *Hauptbriefe*, the article is lost by F G K  $\Psi$  at Gal. 3:22 in a context where “all created things” is needed. Likewise, B alone omits the article at 2 Cor. 4:15. Since “everything” is too general for this context, it is likely that  $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  in this summarizing sentence refers to “all these things” that Paul endured for his preaching, which are described in 4:8-14. At Rom. 8:32b,  $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  most likely refers to “all these things” that God gives – the freeing of the children of God, the aid of the Spirit, the working of good by God, and glorifying those whom he has called (8:18-30). The loss of the article in D F G may be attributed to the lack of an article before  $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \eta\mu\omega\nu \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$  earlier in the verse.

Assimilation to the near context has also impacted the text at Rom. 11:32. At issue is whether God imprisoned “all creation” ( $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ ) or “all mankind” ( $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ) in disobedience. The presence of  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  at the end of the verse has no doubt led to its replacing  $\tau\alpha \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  earlier in the verse. It also resolves a superficial difficulty, for why would God

imprison all creation so that he might be merciful to mankind? However, Paul also speaks of creation being “under bondage” and “subject to decay” at Rom. 8:19-22, and, as at 11:32, this is followed (8:23-24) by a statement that mankind would be saved.<sup>124</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  vid D\* preserve the original τα παντα, supported by the entire Latin tradition, including Irenaeus, apart from Jerome and Augustine. F G preserve only παντα.

The majority of the variation involving τα before παντα takes place in 1 Corinthians. At 2:15 the article is read by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A C D\* P 6 33 88 1739 *pc*. This is likely an addition made to clarify that all *things* are to be judged, not all *people*.<sup>125</sup> The use of παντα without the article here parallels the same at 2:10, where the Spirit “searches out everything.” Zuntz argues that the omission of the article is the result of assimilation to the example in 2:10, which bears, he claims, only a “superficial” similarity to 2:15.<sup>126</sup> This line of argumentation is problematic for two reasons. First, assimilation to the near context usually results in addition, not omission. This is particularly true when a large amount of text intervenes, as it does here. Second, the similarity between 2:10 and 2:15 is quite significant. Just as the “Spirit” searches out everything (2:10), so the “spiritual person” evaluates everything (2:15).<sup>127</sup> This requires the reading παντα. The addition is avoided by  $\aleph$  B F G and the “Byzantine” witnesses. D differs from its sister witnesses not because F G have deviated from D (as Zuntz describes), but because an addition was made to D based on a manuscript similar to  $\aleph$  A, which share the addition here. Furthermore, twice in 1 Corinthians D\* departs from F G and all other

---

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

<sup>125</sup>Schrage I, p. 265; Thiselton p. 271.

<sup>126</sup>Zuntz, p. 109.

<sup>127</sup>Thiselton, p. 272. Conzelmann, p. 57 n. 8 also argues for not reading the article.



witnesses in omitting the  $\tau\alpha$ . At 8:6  $\tau\alpha$  πάντα is required since Paul is identifying the source of “all creation.” It is also required by the parallel in the fourth colon. Again at 12:6 D\* is alone. The  $\tau\alpha$  πάντα refers to all the things (described in 12:4-6) that “God works.” This parallels the  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  δε ταυτα at 12:11.<sup>128</sup>

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

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

---

<sup>128</sup>Schrage III, p. 142.

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

<sup>130</sup>Cf. Thiselton, p. 706.

(8:6<sup>131</sup>; 12:6). He further argues that D F G typically omit the article before παντα, a phenomenon “which may be connected with the inability of the Latin to render the Greek article.” He cites Eph. 1:11; 3:9 and Col. 1:17 as examples where these witnesses alone omit the article, and indeed in each case the common Pauline usage of τὰ πάντα to refer to “all creation” or “all these things” requires the article. He does not also point out the F G are alone in omitting the article at Rom. 11:32 and F alone at 1 Cor. 15:28(3). Furthermore, the tendency in the other manuscripts is to add, not remove, the article. This is seen at 1 Cor. 2:15; 9:22; 15:27(2); and 15:28(3). Indeed, no witness avoids adding the article in at least one of these passages. That D F G omit but do not add the article does therefore indicate that a unique influence is at work in these witnesses. Almost certainly it is influence from the Latin.

12:20.81 [discussed at 5:11.30]

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

At 2:15 μεν is almost certainly secondary. Nothing can account for its omission, while its addition can be explained as an attempt to balance δε in the following clause.<sup>132</sup> Its addition, however, must be early. While appearing in the “Byzantine” text, it is also found in B<sup>133</sup>, Irenaeus<sup>134</sup> and the entire Latin tradition.<sup>135</sup> P<sup>46</sup> appears to have lost μέν at several

---

<sup>131</sup>Güting (“Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente,” p. 101) reconstructs 0201 without the article: παν[τα] εν πασι. The *editio princeps*, followed by NTaP, reconstructs it as: τα παν[τα] εν πασι. If 0201 joins D\* here, as Güting argues (p. 108), it must be due to independent error.

<sup>132</sup>Zuntz, p. 198; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 482.

<sup>133</sup>Though neither Origen *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 10,7,28 nor Clement *Stromata* 1,11,50.

<sup>134</sup>*Adversus Haereses* 1,8,3, both the Greek and Latin texts.

<sup>135</sup>One of the few places where D F G split from the Latin tradition.



places: Heb. 7:18 (joined only by 1241); 2 Cor. 10:10; and 1 Cor. 1:18. The last example is the only which has additional early support. Several Latin witnesses lack an equivalent particle (VL 64 75\* 89 Cyprian<sup>136</sup>). However, the use of γάρ earlier in the clause may have made the μεν seem superfluous, leading to its omission by P<sup>46</sup> and its not being translated in some Latin witnesses. The fact that the Greek text of Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1,3,5 reads μέν but no equivalent is found in the corresponding Latin supports this conclusion.

“Weighty” witnesses also lack μεν at 1 Cor. 12:20, among them again P<sup>46\*</sup> <sup>137</sup> However, as at 1:18 the use of a conjunction (δέ) earlier in the clause may have made the μεν seem awkward, leading to its omission. Parablepsis may have also occurred.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore, D may have been influenced by the lack of the particle in the Latin text, though as noted above the absence of an equivalent to μεν in the Latin is the result of translation choice, not textual differences. D also loses μεν where F G retain it at 2 Cor. 10:1, where the D-text (VL 75 89 Amst Sedul) lacks an equivalent. Other secondary additions of μεν, always to balance a subsequent δε, are found at Rom. 6:21<sup>139</sup> (P<sup>94</sup> B D F G); 7:25 (avoided by N F G); 1 Cor. 2:15<sup>140</sup> (avoided by P<sup>46</sup> A C D\* F G); and 1 Cor. 15:50 (avoided by P<sup>46</sup> B C\* D\* 0243\* 38\* 1739).

12:21.84

---

<sup>136</sup>Cyprian’s citation is found at *Ad Quirinium* 3,69.

<sup>137</sup>The identity of the corrector who added μεν in a cursive hand is unclear. NTaP suggests only a “user” of the manuscript.

<sup>138</sup>Zuntz, p. 198; B. Weiss, p. 117.

<sup>139</sup>B. Weiss, p. 117.

<sup>140</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 482.

The δε at 12:21 was bracketed by Westcott and Hort but dismissed by most commentators due to the “exceedingly strong” evidence.<sup>141</sup> Zuntz claims that a scribe who misunderstood v. 21 as a conclusion rather than a continuation of the argument intentionally removed the conjunction. However, The fact that δε occurs four times in the preceding three sentences may have prompted its addition here. Furthermore, the argumentation and structure of 12:20-21 is very similar to that of 12:14-16. Both 12:20 and 12:14 use a conjunction to introduce a sentence which asserts that there is one body even though there are many parts. At 12:15, no conjunction is used to introduce the supporting statement, which in both places (12:15-16; 12:20) is an imagined “discussion” among the parts. A δε at 12:21 turns the supporting statement into one of contrast, thereby disrupting the flow of argument.<sup>142</sup> Aside from A C F G and part of the “Byzantine” tradition, the absence of a conjunction is supported by the D-text<sup>143</sup> and a united Syriac tradition.

#### 12:21.85

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

#### 12:21.87 [discussed at 12:26.107]

#### 12:21.88 [discussed at 12:16.69]

---

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

<sup>142</sup>That δε is a poor choice to indicate the continuation of the argument is shown by the secondary addition of και – not δε – in some witnesses.

<sup>143</sup>The presence of δε / *autem* in D and VL 75 against all their typical supporting witnesses (including the Peshitta) is again likely from a Greek witness that is similar to A.



12:23.91

F G read the singular ο for α. This must be an accidental confusion of the vowels, for its equivalent is not attested in the Latin tradition and the plural is required by ατιμοτερα.

12:23.92

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

12:23.94 [discussed at 7:13.47]

12:23.96

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

12:24.98

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

12:24.99 [discussed at 12:18.76]

12:24.101; 12:24.102

An understanding of Paul's argument is necessary in order to decide between the





υστερουμενω.<sup>149</sup>

12:25.103; 12:25.104; 12:25.105 [discussed at 12:9.32]

12:26.107; 12:26.109; 12:31.126 [also 12:21.87]

At 12:26, the εἶτε has been corrupted twice. In the first clause, the similarity of sight and sound led to εἰ τι (B F G Ψ 1175 1739), εἶτι (P<sup>46</sup>), and ἡτι (915). The reading of 915 is nonsense as it stands, and although εἰ could function to create the protasis of a conditional sentence, τι (another nominative) would be superfluous since ἔν μέλος must be the subject of the clause.<sup>150</sup> The reading εἶτι (P<sup>46</sup>) is a legitimate form, but does not construe in this context. P<sup>46</sup> makes a similar error involving the same vowels at 12:21, where εἶπεν is written for εἶπειν in a clause where the infinitive is required. One further corruption is found in 1739. The reading εἰ τι in the second clause is the result of assimilation to this manuscript's reading in the first clause.

Similar vowel confusion takes place at 12:31. before the prepositional phrase καθ' υπερβολην is found εἶτι (most witnesses), εἰ τι (P<sup>46</sup> D\*), εἶτει (F), and εἶτει (G). The latter two readings, being nonsense, must be derived from either εἶτι or εἰ τι.<sup>151</sup> F's εἶτει is likely

---

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

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

<sup>151</sup>While F G make very numerous spelling errors, the confusion of εἰ for I (and the reverse) is extremely common not only in these witnesses but in all early witnesses. Examples in this chapter alone are found at 1 Cor. 12:4 εἰσειν F G; 12:6 εἰσειν F G (yet 12:5 εἰσιν preserved in F G!); 12:23 αἰμιωτερα P<sup>46</sup> D; 12:10 ερμηνια F G; 12:24 εχει ] + τειμης D (+ τιμης G; + τημης F); τειμην P<sup>46</sup> D; 12:28 εἰπειτα F G; αντειλημψεις F

the result of confusion similar to that at 12:26 (see above), so that ετι should be understood as the reading of F G. But what of their shared ancestor D? The Latin equivalent is *adhuc* (= ετι), and this is matched by Peshitta's ܐܢܬܝ, which is significant because this witness frequently agrees with the archetype of D F G. The reading in D is therefore likely a simple vowel interchange. The same should be concluded with regard to Ϟ<sup>46</sup>. We have already seen this manuscript twice exchange ε for ει; ει is written for ε also at 14:9 (εισεσθε).<sup>152</sup> Furthermore, the iota in the immediately preceding και may have influenced the addition of the same letter to the epsilon in ετι. While the reading ει τι construes (“And if there is anything else, I will show you the more excellent way”),<sup>153</sup> it is more likely independent unintentional error rather than an indication of consanguinity and still less likely the archetypal reading. Adjectival ετι should therefore be understood as strengthening the comparative καθ’ υπερβολην, not in a temporal or adverbial sense.<sup>154</sup> D adds και from other Greek witnesses, an addition which disrupted its sense-line format (see the chapter on D F G).

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

---

G; 12:30 δυναμις F G; λαλουσιν F G; διερμηνευουσιν F G; 12:31 κρισσωνα F G; δικνυμι F G; υμειν Ϟ<sup>46</sup>.

<sup>152</sup>See Royse, p. 245. Examples of the these interchanges in the Roman papyri are cited by Gignac, vol. 1, pp. 257-259.

<sup>153</sup>BDR §272<sup>2</sup>. Zuntz, p. 90, hesitatingly thinks that this reading is at least partially correct, though he seems to think that the end of the verse is corrupt as well.

<sup>154</sup>Lietzmann, p. 65; Schrage III, p. 281. Examples of this usage are provided in Liddell and Scott, s.v. ἔτι (II,2)



more closely connected to 13:1.<sup>155</sup> Suggestively, the earliest witnesses to physically divide the two halves of the sentence also read *καὶ*. *ℵ* and B both make a division at 12:31b by means of indentation (A begins the section at 12:31). On the other hand, witnesses that do not read *καὶ* (notably F G) do not show signs of marking a new unit of thought at either 12:31b or 13:1, though because these witnesses break the text into sense lines, 12:31a and 12:31b stand on separate lines.<sup>156</sup> Given that 12:31b likely introduces the material in chapter 13,<sup>157</sup> it is more likely that the *καὶ* was removed in order to make clear that a new discussion was beginning rather than being grammatically connected to 12:31a.

12:26.108; 12:26.111

The numeral *ἕν* is used twice at 12:26, but omitted both times in A and the second time by *℘*<sup>46</sup> *ℵ*\* A B<sup>158</sup> 1611 1739. No obvious motivation for its omission can be identified, particularly since it was not omitted in the previous two examples in chapter 12 (12:14, 19). Furthermore, assimilation to the near context would be possible, particularly for the second example. However, this chapter consistently uses the numeral with the singular of *μέλος* (12:14, 19). Furthermore, the numeral is needed in both examples to contrast with the two occurrences of *τὰ πάντα μέλη*. While no cause for the omission can be clearly identified,

---

<sup>155</sup>Other issues which may be relevant are whether *ζηλοῦτε* is indicative or imperative; the possibility that *τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα* may be sarcastic; and whether *καθ' ὑπερβολὴν* is adverbial (modifying *δείκνυμι*) or adjectival (modifying *ὁδόν*).

<sup>156</sup>F uses a large initial letter at 12:31 *ζελοῦται* (sic) and 13:1 *εἰν*, though these are so common throughout the manuscript that it is not clear that indicate paragraphing or sense units. Any divisions that may have been present in *℘*<sup>46</sup> are no longer visible since *καὶ* begins the line and the end of the column is missing.

<sup>157</sup>So Lietzmann, p. 65; Schrage III, p. 281, etc.

<sup>158</sup>Swanson sees a correction in B which adds *εν*, but this could not be discerned from the facsimile.

the context and author's usage requires that it be read in both places.

12:27.114

F G read the accusative  $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$  for the nominative  $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . The former does not construe in the context, and is likely simply the result of vowel confusion.

12:27.116

A few witnesses (D\* Ψ; perhaps *ex membro* VL 75; *de membro* VL 78 Vg) write  $\epsilon\kappa\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  under the influence of the immediately preceding  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta$ .<sup>159</sup>

12:28.117

The list of “gifts” in 12:28 is compiled asyndetically. Two witnesses add conjunctions, however, both for the third item: D\* adds  $\delta\epsilon$  after  $\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\nu$  and 69 adds  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  prior to it. Why only this element in the list should receive such additions is not obvious, though in the case of D it may be an example of dittography ( $\Delta\ \epsilon\Delta\ \text{I}\ \text{C}\ \kappa\Delta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ). Nevertheless, it shows again the tendency of the tradition to add conjunctions that was seen at 12:8-10, where, ironically, D alone avoids such additions.

12:28.118; 15:5.22; 15:6.24; 15:7.29; 15:7.30

Paul most frequently uses  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\tau\alpha$  and  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$  in temporal contexts, but occasionally they stand in lists as simple transition markers.<sup>160</sup> A sequential list appears at 12:28 that begins with three “offices” concludes with five “gifts.” That Paul is in fact making a distinction between the “offices” and “gifts” is shown by the enumeration of the first three

---

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

<sup>160</sup>BDAG, s.v.  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\tau\alpha$ .



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

D F G preserve this structure by reading *επειτα* before *δυναμεις* but not reading any adverb before *χαρισματα*. The  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B C 1739 group, here joined by a few other witnesses, read *επειτα* before *χαρισματα*. This destroys the structure of 12:28 and is easily explained as an addition based on the preceding *επειτα*. Most witnesses read *ειτα*, producing an alternation of *επειτα* and *ειτα* which is likely a stylistic improvement.<sup>161</sup> A few later manuscripts then assimilate *ειτα* to the preceding *επειτα*, hence the unusual agreement of late witnesses with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B C 1739.

Similar use of *ειτα* and *επειτα* to indicate structure occurs at 15:5-7. *επειτα* is firm at 15:6<sup>162</sup> and 15:23, both places where a new element is introduced. This would suggest that *επειτα* should be read at the beginning of 15:7 (only D reads *ειτα*), and that *ειτα* should be read at 15:5b and 15:7b, both introducing elements which are thematically and even temporally connected with the previous clause. *επειτα* at 15:7b ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  A F G *pm*) is easily explained as assimilation to the same word at 15:7a, while many of the same witnesses make the same alteration at 15:5b ( $\aleph$  A 049 0151 33 *pm*). This connection between the appearance to Cephas and to the Twelve (which *ειτα* indicates) caused problems for some scribes (see the discussion at 15:5).

---

<sup>161</sup>For examples see Liddell and Scott, s.v. *εἶτα* (I,1).

<sup>162</sup>The minuscules related to the Harklean Syriac edition (1505 1611 2495) read *ειτα*.

12:28.120

ℵ\* alone omits γενη, either due accidental leap (ΓΕΝΗΓΛΩCCΩΝ) or because the γενη is somewhat superfluous with the plural γλωσσων.

12:28.121

Ερμηνεια γλωσσων has been added from the parallel list at 12:10. Only a narrow band of witnesses attests the addition: 1505 1611 1295 and the Harklean, all of which are related,<sup>163</sup> and Ambrosiaster.

12:31.125

The decision to accept μειζονα is often based, aside from the “value” of its supporting witnesses, on two arguments: First, that the usage of κρεῖσσον here would be non-Pauline. Second, that κρεῖσσον is incorrect because Paul’s arguing that some gifts are merely “better” than others is a mere truism; he in fact argues that some gifts are “greater” because they benefit the community.<sup>164</sup> The first argument is only partially correct. While κρεῖσσων is not used as an attributive elsewhere in Paul, the same could be said of μείζων, which likewise never occurs as an attributive adjective in Paul. In fact, μείζων occurs only as a substantive (Rom. 9:12; cf. κρεῖσσον at 1 Cor. 11:17) and in predicate constructions (1 Cor. 13:13; 14:5; cf. κρεῖσσον at 1 Cor. 7:9<sup>165</sup>; Phil. 1:23). Second, it is doubtful that a

---

<sup>163</sup>See NTSU, pp. 22-27.

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

<sup>165</sup>Here the NA<sup>27</sup> text departs from its usual orthography and prints κρειπτον, apparently because this spelling is found in B.



semantic distinction between can be made between κρείσσον and μείζων, at least not one that bears the weight that Zuntz, et al., place on the words. The Louw-Nida lexicon, for example, places κρείσσον and μείζων in the same entry and suggests the same glosses for each: “pertaining to or having a higher status in comparison to something else – ‘better, greater, superior to.’”<sup>166</sup> While these two comparatives cannot be significantly distinguished in meaning in the way that some do, most commentators understand the force of μείζονα in this context to be equivalent to a superlative.<sup>167</sup> This is based on Pauline usage elsewhere, in particular 1 Cor. 13:13.

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

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

Origen draws a contrast between the “better” gifts, presumably those mentioned by Paul, and what he sees as the “greater” gifts, namely wisdom and knowledge. This makes clear that Origen’s text read τὰ κρείττονα.<sup>168</sup> Elsewhere, Origen only alludes to this passage and since

---

<sup>166</sup>J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), §87.28.

<sup>167</sup>Thiselton, p. 1025-26; Schrage III, p. 240; J. F. M. Smit, “Two Puzzles: 1 Corinthians 12.31 and 13.3. A Rhetorical Solution,” *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 246-264, esp. p. 247. Smit provides further references to grammars which adopt this understanding.

<sup>168</sup>Hannah, p. 129 n. 233 dismisses this citation: “The allusions seem to indicate that the κρείττονα of the citation is a scribal harmonization to the majority text.” It must be pointed out, however, that this is not a mere allusion since Origen cites it as coming from Paul and his comments play on the difference between κρείττων and μείζων. This makes assimilation to the majority text unlikely.

the allusions vary as to the use of articles and word order, the fact that he uses *μειζων* in these cases is not decisive.<sup>169</sup>

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

---

<sup>169</sup>*Exhortatio ad matryrium* 15: *ζηλῶν χάρισμα τὰ μείζονα* (not cited by Hannah) *Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 14,23: *ζηλοῦν τὰ χάρισμα τὰ μείζονα*; *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 32,9: *ζηλοῦντες τὰ μείζονα χάρισμα*. This allusion differs from the citation earlier in the commentary, though the fact that the it took Origen thirteen years to write the commentary may account for the difference.

<sup>170</sup>See esp. Smit, "Two Puzzles" and Thiselton, pp. 1024-26.

<sup>171</sup>Schrage III, p. 239.



introduces the “way” which is even more superior (ἔτι καθ’ ὑπερβολήν) to the seeking of gifts. Chrysostom’s exegesis shows this understanding:

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

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

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

---

<sup>172</sup>Chrysostom, *In epistulam I ad Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 267.

<sup>173</sup>As Schrage III, p. 240 n. 757 acknowledges.

<sup>174</sup>Schrage III, pp. 320-24, esp. p. 321.

verse with chapter 13. In these witnesses the problem of Paul saying that “the greater things” are surpassed by a “more excellent way” is removed, for 12:31b is not read in light of 12:31a. Furthermore, 12:31 now ends the unit. “Seek the greatest gifts” would serve as an appropriate conclusion, comparable to 13:13. Such delineation of the structure of the letter clearly shows careful attention to the beginning and ending of the major portions of text. It is not unreasonable to conclude that *μειζονα* was noticed by a reader or user at the end of chapter 13 and deemed to be more appropriate than *κρεισσονα* at the end of what was made the end of the unit in chapter 12. Significantly, the witnesses that set themselves off from the rest of the tradition here ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B 1739 *pc*) assimilate to both near and distant passages at 2:4; 11:4; etc.

12:31.126 [discussed at 12:26.107]



### Notes on Chapter 13

13:1.1 [discussed at 9:1.1]

13:1.2; 13:2.8

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

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

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

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

The manuscript testimony is most easily digested in table format:

---

<sup>1</sup>Though of course 1739 was not known to them.

<sup>2</sup>Presuming that the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\nu$  for the final example at 13:3 is a corruption of  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\alpha\nu$ ; the identical error occurs in B at Gal. 1:8.

	13:2 (1)	13:2 (2)	13:3 (1)	13:3 (2)
καὶ εἰν	B D F G 6 Byz (latt?)	C D F G 6 Byz (latt?)	ⲛ D F G 6 Byz (latt?)	ⲛ D F G 6 Byz (VL 77 78 Vg?)
καὶν	ⲡ <sup>46</sup> A C 33 1739 (latt?)	ⲡ <sup>46</sup> A B 33 1739 (latt?)	ⲡ <sup>46</sup> A B C 33 1739 (latt?)	A C 1739 (VL 77 78 Vg?)
καὶ ἄν	K 048			B
καὶ		467 1908		ⲡ <sup>46</sup> VL 75 89

The tradition behind ⲡ<sup>46</sup> B is unreliable for this type of variation. At Gal. 1:8 B alone reads καὶν for καὶ εἰν; ⲡ<sup>46\*</sup> alone make the same alteration at Heb. 10:38, but also stands alone in writing καὶ ἐκεῖνοι for κακενοὶ at 1 Cor. 10:27.<sup>3</sup> Rather than relying on these “best witnesses,” other considerations should prevail. While B. Weiss argues that it unlikely that the different forms would have arisen if all the forms had been identical in the archetype,<sup>4</sup> a single contraction in an early witness would account for all the variation. Because such contractions regularly take place in ⲡ<sup>46</sup> B, their readings, and those of their successors, are cast into doubt. Furthermore, there is no firm example of καὶν meaning “and if” in the *Corpus Paulinum*.<sup>5</sup> Καὶ εἰν, by contrast, is found (in addition to the examples listed above) at 1 Cor. 7:28<sup>6</sup> and 12:16.<sup>7</sup> Both B and C preserve καὶ εἰν at least once in 13:2, further demonstrating that the direction of alteration is typically from καὶ εἰν to καὶν.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also John 8:16, where ⲛ alone reads καὶν, likely under the influence of καὶν at 8:14.

<sup>4</sup>B. Weiss, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Κᾶν at 2 Cor. 11:16 (ⲡ<sup>46</sup> καὶ) is a particle meaning “at least” and is not an example of crasis. See BDAG, s.v. κᾶν (3); BDR §§ 18<sup>2</sup>; 374<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>6</sup>209 630 *pc* read καὶ ἄν, which is identical to the error of B at 13:3 (2) and K 048 at 13:2 (1).

<sup>7</sup>D\* K\* read καὶ, matched by *et* VL 75 *vg*<sup>ms</sup>: A Ambrose Ambrosiaster.



Therefore, *καὶ εἰν* is the most likely reading for the first three occurrences at 13:2-3.

The final occurrence, however, presents a different issue. The reading *καὶ / et* without the conditional particle is attested by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  VL 75 89, a combination which may point to an early reading, not a mere error in transcription. However, 467 and other Latin witnesses (VL 78 Vg) lose the second *εἰν* at 13:2, and  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  frequently loses text when the result produces good sense.<sup>8</sup> It is most likely that these witnesses share a common error.

13:2.8 [discussed at 13:1.2]

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

Similarity in the pronunciation of diphthongs led to the readings *εἰδω, ἰδω* (A D\*) 0150 33 *pc*) and *οἰδα* (F G). Caragounis shows that already in classical antiquity the pronunciation of diphthongs that were accented on the second vowel were pronounced as the second vowel, hence *εἰ-* *οἰ-* and *οἰ-* would sound like simple *ι-*.<sup>9</sup> Similar confusion occurs at 2:9 (*οἰδεν* 216 423 1518); 2:11 (*εἰδεν* 6 330 1831); and 2:12 (*ἰδωμεν*  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G).

13:2.10

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

13:2.14

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

---

<sup>8</sup>Royse, p. 258.

<sup>9</sup>Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, pp. 359-61, 365-66, and 369-70.

taking place already in the classical period.<sup>10</sup> This practice is condemned by Moeris.<sup>11</sup> Of the twenty-six occurrences in the *Corpus Paulinum* of the infinitive form of verbs based on the athematic stems,<sup>12</sup> twenty-four use the athematic stem without variation.<sup>13</sup> This is strikingly different from the situation involving the participle forms of -ιστημι, where six of thirteen occurrences involve the same type of variation (discussed below). The two passages where variation of stem occurs are:

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 1 Cor. 13:2 | συνισταναι Ϝ <sup>46</sup> B D F G 33 1739(μεθίστημι)      |
|             | συνιστανειν A C K L <i>etc</i> (μεταιστάνω; ϝ parablepsis) |
| 2 Cor. 3:1  | συνιστανειν ϝ A C K L P <i>etc</i> (συνιστάνω)             |
|             | συνισταναι F G; (συνίστημι)                                |
|             | συνισταν Ϝ <sup>46</sup> B D* 33 (συνιστάω)                |

Atticism may be suspected to have created the reading συνισταναι in both passages.

However, two factors argue against this. First, Paul nowhere else uses the thematic stem for the infinitive. Second, the manuscripts behave similarly when participle forms of -ιστημι are involved. The -ιστημι stem is firm in six passages.<sup>14</sup> Where there is variation, some

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

<sup>11</sup>*Atticista* ι 17: ἰστάναι ᾿Αττικοί· ἰστάνειν Ἑλληνες.

<sup>12</sup>The stems used in the Pauline epistles are δίδωμι, ἴστημι, ἴημι, and τίθημι; approximately fifty compounds based on these stems that occur in the NT. These are listed in William D. Mounce, *The Morphology of Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), pp. 314-315.

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

<sup>14</sup>Rom. 8:38 ενεστωτα (ενίστημι); 13:2 ανθεσθηκοτες (ανθίστημι); 15:12 ανισταμενος (ανίστημι); 1 Cor. 3:22 ενεστωτα (ενίστημι); 7:26 ενεστωσαν (ενίστημι); 1 Tim. 3:12 προισταμενοι (προίστημι).



witnesses fare better than others.<sup>15</sup>  $\aleph$  reads the thematic stem in four of six places, three alone or nearly alone; A is legible for only four passages, but reads the thematic stem twice (see also 7:3.9), which is similar to the “Byzantine” witnesses (K L *etc*) and B, which read the thematic stem three times in six passages. The witnesses that most frequently preserve the athematic stem for the participle are  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  C D,<sup>16</sup> in five of six passages, and F G in four of six.<sup>17</sup> Therefore,  $\aleph$  A K L and even B should be considered unreliable for variation involving the thematic stem both for participles and infinitives. Given the proclivity away from the athematic toward the thematic stem, the reading  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$  at 1 Cor. 13:2 should be considered to be an alteration prompted by increasing use of the thematic stem in Greek.

This leaves the reading  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu$  at 2 Cor. 3:1. Moulton and Howard suggest that it “has good claim.”<sup>18</sup> However, while the  $-\alpha\nu$  termination is common in the LXX,<sup>19</sup> it occurs

---

<sup>15</sup>Rom. 12:8  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  ( $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ );  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\aleph$  ( $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ); 2 Cor. 4:2  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\aleph$  C D\* F G ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B P 075 0243 ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  K L  $\Psi$  ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ ); 6:4  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  C D\* F G 0225 0243 ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  K L  $\Psi$  048 ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  B P ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ); 2 Cor. 10:12  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu$  ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  0243 ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ ); 10:18  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omega\nu$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  B D\* F G H I<sup>vid</sup> P 0121 0150 0243 ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ );  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\omega\nu$  K L  $\Psi$  *etc* ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ ); 1 The. 5:12  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ );  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\aleph$  A ( $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ); 1 Tim. 3:4  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  ( $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ );  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  F G ( $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ );  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$   $\aleph$  ( $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ). It may be observed that in three places  $\aleph$  alters to the  $-\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omega$  stem, as with the infinitive at 2 Cor. 3:1.

<sup>16</sup>For this reason, at 2 Cor. 10:12  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$  ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  0243) may be correct.

<sup>17</sup> $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  at 1 Tim. 3:4 may simply be an error for  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ , influenced by the Latin equivalent *praepositum*. Such alteration is not equivalent to the intentional shift to  $\pi\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  by  $\aleph$  in the same place.

<sup>18</sup>Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 205.

<sup>19</sup>BDR §93<sup>3</sup>.

nowhere else in Paul. The fact that several early fathers read the same for at 1 Cor. 13:11,<sup>20</sup> without any manuscript support, suggests that the use of this thematic form is also influenced by the development of the Greek language itself.

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

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

### 13:2.16

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

---

<sup>20</sup>μεθισταν in Methodius, *Symposium* 9,4,249; Basil, *Epistulae* 204,1; Ephraem *Institutio ad monachos* 320; *Sermones paraeneticus ad monachos Aegypti* 26; 46 (both in Greek).



intentional editing or correction, not merely accidental error.<sup>21</sup>

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

13:3.22

Did Paul favor “love” over giving oneself to “boasting” or to “burning”? This is one of the most well-known and much-discussed textual problems in the *Corpus Paulinum*.<sup>22</sup> The manuscript and versional evidence is easily ascertained. Only  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B 0150 33 296 425\* 1739\* read *καυχησῶμαι*, with a handful of related witnesses (048 1175\* 1985\*) attesting the phonological alternative *καυχησομαι*. These are joined by the Coptic. All other manuscripts and versions read some form of *καίω*. The derivation of all these readings from *καυθησομαι* is quickly described. *Καυθησεται*, read by six minuscules, is an adaptation to the implied subject of the verb (*τὸ σῶμα*). *Καυθη* does the same in the active voice, read by seven minuscules and the Syriac versions. *Καυθησῶμαι* is the most widely attested reading, though it is the result of a development in the Greek language, as described below.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, the source for all the readings based on *καίω* is *καυθησομαι* (C<sup>24</sup> D F G L 056 0142 6 *pm*).

---

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

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

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

<sup>24</sup>The evidence of C is not firm; von Soden, Lyon and NA<sup>27</sup> cite it as reading *καυθησομαι* while Tischendorf and TuT cite its reading as *καυθησῶμαι*.

Some of the patristic evidence has been debated. The earliest potential reference to 1 Cor. 13:3 is Clement of Rome's *Epistula ad Corinthios* 55. In a context which points out the sacrificial actions of "Gentiles" (55,1) and "women" (Judith and Esther; 55,3-4), Clement writes that "many among us have had themselves imprisoned, that they might ransom others. Many have had themselves sold into slavery, and with the price received for themselves have fed others." Some have pointed to this passage as support for the reading *καυχῆσθαι* at 1 Cor. 13:3, for while it uses a form of *παράδιδωμι* (*ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν*) it does not mention "burning."<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, the actions described there clearly benefit others, and would presumably give the person who takes this action a "boast." However, a direct reference to 1 Corinthians is not likely. First, no reference to anything in the context of 1 Cor. 13 is mentioned by Clement. Second, *παράδιδωμι* is used several times in section 55: Rulers *παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θάνατον* (55,1); "Many among us" gave themselves into "imprisonment" or "slavery" (55,2); and Judith gave herself into "peril" (55,4). The use of *παράδιδωμι* thus reflects general usage, and nothing specific to 1 Cor. 13. Third, the phrase "among us" (*ἐν ἡμῖν*) never refers specifically to the Corinthians, but makes either general reference to Christians (6,1) or more specifically to Christians in Rome sent from Clement to the Corinthians (63,3). However, when Clement refers to Paul's letter to the Corinthians, he uses the second person pronoun: "He wrote to you in the Spirit about himself and Cephas and Apollos . . ." (47,3). It is therefore more likely a reference to the actions of Christians beyond

---

<sup>25</sup>Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 116. A. Harnack (*Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe (I Kor. 13) und seine religions-geschichtliche Bedeutung*, Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1911), p. 140) argues: "It is probably not to be denied that Clement our has our passage in mind, but nothing is read in it of death by fire. He combines *παράδιδοναι* with *εἰς θάνατον*, *εἰς δεσμά*, *εἰς δουλείαν*, But he passes over death by fire, because he was not led to do so by 1 Cor. 13:3. He cannot have intentionally omitted it, therefore he did not read it."



Corinth, not an allusion anything in 1 Corinthians 13. Clement's comments cannot be attributed to dependence on 1 Cor. 13:3, and therefore cannot be cited as evidence that Clement knew the reading *καυχῆσθαι*.<sup>26</sup> We may now move on to firm evidence of the use of 1 Cor. 13:3.

The patristic evidence for a form of *καίω* is just as overwhelming as the manuscript evidence, both in terms of numbers and date. In a discussion of the value of "love," Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 4,18,1-2) paraphrases 1 Cor. 13:1-3: "For example, the apostle Paul says, 'If I give my body (*τὸ σῶμα ἐπίδω*) but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal.'" A few lines later he alludes specifically to 13:3: "For there is a people who love with the lips, and there is another that gives the body to be burned." There can be no question that Clement's text read a form of *καίω*.<sup>27</sup> That he departs from  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B here is significant, since Clement shares an almost unique textual relationship especially with the papyrus.<sup>28</sup>

Origen, who likewise shares affinities with the text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B, also attests to a form of *καίω*, though some have called this into question.<sup>29</sup> The Latin translation evidence is firm (Rufinus, *Origenes in Leviticum homiliae* 9,9) for the discussion in the context presumes a form of *καίω*. However, whether or not this reflects Origen's or Rufinus' thinking cannot be known. The only Greek evidence is from catenae manuscripts, and here the evidence has

---

<sup>26</sup>The same conclusion is reached by Lindemann, p. 285 and Caragounis, p. 548. There is no reference to Clement in the NA<sup>27</sup> at 1 Cor. 13:3.

<sup>27</sup>Harnack, *Das hohe Lied*, p. 140.

<sup>28</sup>See the concluding chapter on the "Alexandrian" witnesses.

<sup>29</sup>See esp. the appendix to Westcott and Hort, *The Text of the New Testament in the Original Greek*, p. 116-7 and the severe critique of their conclusions regarding Origen's evidence by Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, p. 35, n. 6 and p. 36, n. 5.

been disputed. Cramer<sup>30</sup> prints the text of a manuscript in Paris (Regius 227) in which both the text of 1 Cor. and the comment by Origen read καθήσωμαι. This is followed by Tischendorf in his apparatus. Jenkins later edited Vatican manuscript gr 762, which he believed was the exemplar for the Paris manuscript.<sup>31</sup> This manuscript also read καθήσωμαι both in the lemma and in Origen's comments. Hort conjectures that the Paris manuscript has been corrupted on the basis of the comments Origen makes immediately following his citation, so that Origen's original text read καυχήσωμαι.<sup>32</sup> Jenkins, though not citing Hort, makes the same conjecture.<sup>33</sup> Hannah accepts Jenkins' judgment, though as he relegates the catenae material to secondary authority he does not attempt a reconstruction of Origen's text for this passage.<sup>34</sup> Zuntz argues that the conjecture of Hort and Jenkins, which argues that Origen's reading is the opposite of what is actually in the available manuscripts of Origen, is not likely. The comments made by Origen do not require καυχήσωμαι and in fact can be best understood as explaining καίω.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, while there is the possibility of Origen's comments having been altered to match the scriptural text as written, it should be noted that the citation begins with και εαν, whereas Origen's comments are preserved as καν. This reading agrees with P<sup>46</sup> A B C against the "Byzantine" text, thus suggesting that the adaptation claimed by Hort is unlikely. While both the Latin and the catenae evidence is not

---

<sup>30</sup>*Catena graecorum patrum in novum testamentum*, tomus V, Oxford, 1844, p. 252.

<sup>31</sup>C. Jenkins, "Origen on 1 Corinthians," *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908), pp. 231-247, 353-72, 500-14; 10 (1909), pp. 29-51.

<sup>32</sup>*Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, New York, 1882, Appendix, p. 117.

<sup>33</sup>Jenkins (1909), p. 34.

<sup>34</sup>Hannah, p. 250.

<sup>35</sup>Zuntz, pp. 35 n.6 and 36 n.5.



finally decisive, the fact that both support the same reading gives stronger (though not decisive) support to Origen's text having read *καυθήσωμαι* (or some other form of *καίω*) rather than *καυχῆσωμαι*. This conclusion becomes even more firm when compared with Clement's evidence, who uses a text of the epistles very similar to that of Origen.

Beyond Clement and Origen, the patristic support is nearly universal. In the late second and early third century a form of *καίω* is presumed by Tertullian (*Adversus Praxean* 1,4,20), Cyprian (*De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* 14,343; *Ad Quirinum* 3,3), a paraphrase by Methodius (*πυρὶ παραδώσω*; *Symposium* 9,4,249), and slightly later the Syriac fathers Aphraat and Severian.<sup>36</sup> The later fathers, who typically read with the "Byzantine" text, unanimously do so here as well.

Only two fathers attest a form of *καυχᾶμαι*. Jerome's evidence has been known for some time. He cites 1 Cor. 13:3 twice, both times noting the variation. In *Commentarii in iv epistulas Paulinas, Ad Galatas* 3,453,14 he sides with his "Greek" witnesses but in *Commentarii in Isaiam* 16,58,3 he simply notes the two readings.<sup>37</sup> More recently available evidence is found in Didymus, whose *Commentarii in Psalmos 35-39* was recovered at Tura. As with Clement, Didymus paraphrases the passage (fol. 281) but clearly presumes one form of the text, in this case the reading *καυχῆσωμαι* (the passage is translated and discussed below). There is a tantalizing personal connection between Jerome and Didymus, though of

---

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

<sup>37</sup>Jerome also cites the reading *ardeam* without comment, though this in a translation of a letter of Theophilus (*Epistulae* 98,6).

course this is insufficient to establish Didymus as the source for Jerome's reading.<sup>38</sup>

The "external evidence" – apart from the alleged "excellent quality of the Alexandrian witnesses"<sup>39</sup> – decisively attests a form of καίω. Only Didymus and the Coptic version, both of which routinely match the text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  & A B, support the small handful of manuscripts that read a form of καυχάομαι. Yet even Clement and Origen, who also typically read with the "Alexandrian witnesses," depart from them here. Nonetheless, external evidence is never decisive, particularly for a problem as challenging as this. Therefore, in attempting to assess the direction and causes of corruption two questions must be answered: Which reading best suits the context? And which reading is more likely to have been altered in the manuscript tradition?

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

---

<sup>38</sup>See R. A. Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria: Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2004), p. 6.

<sup>39</sup>Fee, p. 629 n. 18. J. H. Petzer, after a lengthy discussion of the internal evidence, virtually dismisses it at the conclusion of his essay: "What remains to be considered is the external evidence. Not much needs to be discussed, since it is rather obvious that καυχῆσομαι has by far the best attestation . . . This evidence speaks for itself." ("Contextual Evidence in Favour of καυθησωμαι in 1 Corinthians 13.3," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 229-53; citation from p. 251); Clark, *Textual Criticism and Doctrine* (p. 61) summarizes: "Now the additional witness of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  strengthens the case for καυχῆσομαι so that the textual evidence would seem conclusive."

<sup>40</sup>Fee, p. 629 n. 18; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, pp. 497-98291.



reflexive, so that passage may be understood to say, “If I give myself to be burned. . .”<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, Caragounis vigorously denies any argument that *καυθησώμαι* is “ungreek” in any way, noting that writers such as Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom have no difficulty with the form.<sup>42</sup> He demonstrates that the form is not, as it has been labeled, a “future subjunctive,” but a “future indicative (*καυθησόμεαι*) which under the inroads and influence of the subjunctive has come to be spelt with the thematic vowel (*ω*) of the subjunctive as *καυθησώμαι*.” This development had previously been noted by grammarians such as Hatzidakis, Sophocles, and Jannaris, but not recognized in the standard NT Greek grammars.<sup>43</sup> Caragounis shows, therefore, that *καυθησώμαι* and *καυθησόμεαι* are grammatically equivalent, the latter being the form to which later scribes altered the earlier form.<sup>44</sup> The textual decision must therefore be made on grounds other than “poor Greek.”

A second contextual issue is whether or not it would have been possible for Paul to make reference to martyrdom by burning.<sup>45</sup> Typically appeal is made to Daniel 3 as the source for this idea; other potential sources have been identified, such as 2 Macc. 7:5 and 4 Macc. 6:26; 7:12.<sup>46</sup> Paul is not making reference to specific events in 13:1-3 (such as moving mountains), so a direct dependence by Paul on these LXX examples is not likely. However,

---

<sup>41</sup>J. K. Elliott, “In Favour of *καυθήσωμαι* at I Corinthians 13,3,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971): 297-98.

<sup>42</sup>Caragounis, p. 553.

<sup>43</sup>Caragounis, pp. 556-8.

<sup>44</sup>The same argument is made for the derivation of *καυθησώμαι* from *καυθησόμεαι* by Elliott, “In Favour of *καυθήσωμαι*,” p. 298.

<sup>45</sup>E.g., Clark (p. 61), who claims that *καυθήσωμαι* “does not suit well the primitive Christian era when burning was neither a form of execution nor of torture nor of personal purification.” Cf. also Barrett, p. 302.

<sup>46</sup>Schrage III, p. 291 and notes 80 and 81.

these passages do elevate martyrdom by fire as a pre-eminent sacrifice: “The king commanded that he be taken, still breathing, to the fire and to fry. But as the smoke spread around from the fry-pan, they with their mother encouraged one another to die nobly, saying, ‘The Lord God is looking on.’” Likewise, writers contemporary with Paul speak positively about martyrdom by fire, both within Judaism (Heb. 11:34; Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 17,167) and outside. Tertullian (*Ad martyras* 4), for example, refers to both Romans (Mucius, Dido, and the wife of Hasdrubal) and Greeks (Heraclitus and Empedocles) as well-known, positive examples of suffering by fire, all accounts and descriptions that predate Paul.<sup>47</sup>

Third, Pauline usage of *καίω* and *καυχάομαι* must be considered. The latter is common in Paul, with thirty-two occurrences (aside from 13:3) in the *Hauptbriefe* and four previously in 1 Corinthians. The word is used positively by Paul (2 Cor. 5:12; 9:2; 10:8-17; Phil 2:16<sup>48</sup>), though in 1 Corinthians it is otherwise only censured (1 Cor. 3:21; 4:7). On the other hand, *καίω* is nowhere else used in Paul. In 13:1-3, however, several Pauline *hapax legomenon* are present *χαλκός*, *κύμβαλον*, and *αλαλαζω*.<sup>49</sup> Paul may simply never have had need to discuss clanging symbols and burning, so the usage here should not be considered secondary on this basis alone. The evidence of vocabulary usage is therefore not decisive in this passage.

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

---

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

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

<sup>49</sup>In addition, *μεθίστημι* occurs only at Col. 1:14 and *ἄροσ* at Gal. 4:24-25.



can hardly be held up as the greatest virtue which is surpassed by “love.”<sup>50</sup> This requires that the *ἵνα καυχῶμαι* be understood to indicate the purpose or motivation for the self-sacrifice. However, some have argued that boasting can be viewed positively by Paul,<sup>51</sup> an argument based on the development of the argument in 13:1-3. Petzer, in the most thorough attempt to evaluate the readings on the basis of the context, carefully describes the syntactic and thematic structure of 13:1-3. He notes the three sections, equivalent to the modern verse divisions, which use conditional sentences to contrast “love” with several of the “gifts” valued in Corinth.<sup>52</sup> Petzer claims to recognize a previously unnoticed literary feature, that of “defamiliarization,” where an author presents “familiar, ordinary objects . . . in an unfamiliar, or defamiliarized way” so as to force a re-reading of the text and reconsideration of previous held values. This takes place in 1 Cor. 13:1-3, according to Petzer, through building up to a climax from the least to the most important “gift.” In each section the protasis is divided into two parts, with the second half of the protasis (introduced with *καί* in v. 1 and *καὶ ἕάν* in vv. 2, 3) serving to “extend or exaggerate the issue posed [in the first half of the protasis] and to put it beyond the reach of ordinary human beings.”<sup>53</sup> This is a key statement in Petzer’s argument in favor of the reading *καυχῶμαι*, for, as he argues, “the notion of self-burning is very much achievable by human beings”<sup>54</sup> while “boasting” in giving up one’s body is –

---

<sup>50</sup>Zuntz, p. 36; Barrett, p. 302.

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

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

<sup>53</sup>Petzer, p. 239; cf. Also p. 243, 246.

<sup>54</sup>Petzer, p. 241.

like speaking in the tongues of angels and moving mountains – “out of human reach.” It is out of reach, Petzer argues, because παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου should be connected directly to Jesus’ words in Luke 22:19: “The giving up of one’s body in the same way that Jesus did can be understood as an act that represents the highest form of giving one’s belongings for his neighbor . . . since it resembles the highest proof of Jesus’ love for mankind.”<sup>55</sup> According to Petzer, the reading καθησ[ω/ο]μαι would break this pattern of denigrating human action.

Petzer’s interpretation requires two further specific arguments against καθη-. First, that ἵνα καθησομαι, which must be taken as “completing the meaning of the παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου” breaks the parallel syntax of ὥστε μεθιστάναί, a result clause.<sup>56</sup> Second, that “The alleged relation between giving up one’s belongings for the poor and self-martyrdom in this context is not very clear to me. How could someone else benefit from the death of a martyr?”<sup>57</sup>

While Petzer’s essay is admirably detailed and closely argued, and some, such as Thiselton, find it persuasive (with qualification),<sup>58</sup> several insurmountable difficulties prevent his conclusions from being accepted. First, the proposed connection between παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου at 1 Cor. 13:3 and Luke 22:19 is unlikely. This is not a mere guess that is tangential to Petzer’s argument, as Thiselton believes, for Petzer repeats the claim (p. 243)

---

<sup>55</sup>Petzer, p. 242.

<sup>56</sup>Petzer, p. 243.

<sup>57</sup>Petzer, p. 247.

<sup>58</sup>However, although Thiselton accepts what he sees as the main points of Petzer’s argument regarding “defamiliarization,” he dismisses the key move that Petzer makes in viewing “that I may boast” as a divine action: “But such an interpretation of ‘that I may glory’ is unnecessary and misleading” (p. 1043) and “it is not necessary to endorse of all Petzer’s proposals . . .” (p. 1044). Thiselton adopts Petzer’s structural arguments and the manner in which the structure creates meaning without accepting the exegesis that Petzer then draws from these own arguments.



and uses it to refute other arguments (e.g., 246). However, Petzer fails to appreciate that the phrase is common in martyrological contexts. Even in non-biblical literature παραδειν το σωμα typically makes reference to self-sacrifice. This occurs in the context of death in battle (Alciphron, *Epistulae* 14,3), surrender to enemies (Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Antiquitates Romanae* 6,47,3; Josephus, *De bello Judaico* 6,350) or even suicide to avoid shame (Chariton, *De Chaerea et Callirhoe* 3,1,6). In the post NT period, the *Acta Petri* 37 (Ὡρα δὲ σοι, Πέτρε, παραδοῦναι τὸ σῶμα τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν) and the Pseudo-Ignatian *Ad Heronem diaconum ecclesiae Antiochenae* 2 use the phrase in the context of martyrdom, the former by crucifixion and the latter by burning (κἄν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμα εἰς καῦσιν). Therefore, παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου at Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 13:3 are similar because they share the same linguistic background, not because Paul is dependent on a tradition preserved by Luke.

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

---

<sup>59</sup>E.g., Origen, *Exhortatio ad martyrum* 41: "Let us, then, lay down our lives, not I shall say for Him, but for ourselves—and, I think it may be also, for those who will be built up by our martyrdom;" cf. also 30 and 51. A larger discussion, with examples, is provided by B. Dehandschutter ("Example and Discipleship. Some Comments on the Biblical Background of the Early Christian Theology of Martyrdom." pp. 20-26 in *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*, ed. J. den Boeft and M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk, *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1999): "The function of those people as *exempla* needs to be looked at more closely. Their exemplary character is not only related to the understanding of martyrdom in the sense that they persevered in persecution and suffering until death. The example of the Old Testament 'precursors' implies at the same time more ethical qualities. They are models of *perseverantia* in their 'daily' lives, apart from the specific situation of persecution. In other words, they are models of the 'martyr quotidien'. *Patientia* is also a

there is no evidence that “faith that can move mountains” (13:2) inevitably benefits others. More likely, the three “gifts” listed in 13:1-3 (speaking in tongues, faith, and martyrdom) are cited because they were viewed as supreme examples of spirituality. All could potentially, but not inevitably, benefit others. But “love” will always benefit others. Interpreted in this way, *καίω* would function within the structure of 1 Cor. 13:1-3 in the same way that Petzer proposes that *καυχάομαι* does: It is a positive action that is “defamiliarized” so that the behavior of the Corinthians would be altered.

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

In fact, quite the opposite must be the case. *Παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου* when used with reference to physical suffering *requires* a complement. Although pointed out by previous

---

quality of the whole life of these ‘martyrs.’ This idea was applied at a very early states to the Christian martyrs themselves.” (citation from p. 22).

<sup>60</sup>Cf. also Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 233 “But if we are not persuasive, we give ourselves to destruction, lest by (*παραδίδομεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἵνα μὴ*) living we see something more terrible and evil than death.” A complement is provided for *παραδίδομι*, with the *ἵνα* clause indicating motivation.

<sup>61</sup>Commenting on 1 Cor. 5:5 in *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam ad Corinthios* 24 .



commentators,<sup>62</sup> this fact is ignored by Petzer. Hort had recognized the problem, but claimed that the “unfamiliar absolute use of παραδίδωμι” led scribes to make the alteration to καθήσομαι in order to supply the necessary complement. He cites a passage from Plutarch in support of this absolute usage,<sup>63</sup> but as Caragounis demonstrates, this passage is not parallel because a complement is unnecessary in that context.<sup>64</sup> The need for a complement with παραδίδωμι when used in the sense of “deliver someone/someth. into someone’s hands”<sup>65</sup> is shown by numerous examples in the LXX and NT as well as non-biblical writers. For example, Deut. 1:27 uses the simple infinitive as a complement (παραδοῦναι ἡμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας Αμορραίων ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς; also *Testamentum Jobi* 20,5) even though it is clear from the context that the “delivering” would entail a physical punishment. The articular infinitive is used in the same way at Jer. 33:24.

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

---

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

<sup>63</sup>Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 117.

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

<sup>65</sup>BDAG, s.v. παραδίδωμι (1b), where this usage is labelled a “semitic construction, but paralleled in Latin.”

over there is no need to supply the complement (Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25).

However, when no complement is used and the action of “handing over” is not clear from the context, bare παραδίδωμι does not *necessarily* entail death. It could simply refer to a handing over to authorities or in betrayal (Judith 6:25; Matt. 17:22; 26:25; Mark 9:31; 14:41; Luke 9:44; 24:7). Other examples where the context supplies nothing are ambiguous as to what the “handing over” entails. For example, at Sir. 11:6 no complement is present (παρεδόθησαν εἰς χεῖρας ἑτέρων). The reader is therefore left in the dark regarding what those “held in esteem” will suffer.<sup>66</sup> Basic principles of Hebrew poetry require that this colon be understood in light of the previous colon: “Many rulers have been greatly dishonored.” To whatever παρεδόθησαν εἰς χεῖρας ἑτέρων refers in Sir. 11:6, it does not refer to any sort of suffering or death.<sup>67</sup> Thus, without the complement, παραδῶ τό σῶμά μου at 1 Cor. 13:3 would be unclear, not necessarily indicating that suffering, let alone death, was in view.

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

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

---

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

<sup>67</sup>The addition of εἰς κρίσιν in the “Western Text” of Acts 3:13 may be an example of removing the ambiguity of παρεδώκατε – was Jesus simply “handed over”? Was he betrayed? Or was he condemned? Cf. the discussion of the meaning of παρεδώκατε in this passage in BDAG, s.v. παραδίδωμι (1b).



strong possibility, particularly since both consonants are voiceless.<sup>68</sup> The direction of error could have taken place in either direction. Nevertheless, the identical error is made – from *καυθ* to *καυχ* – by one of these same “reliable” uncials at LXX 2 Kings 23:7 (*καὶ ἐν πυρὶ καύσει καυθήσονται αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν*). For *καυθησονται* (*καυθησεται* A; *θησονται* B) *ℵ* reads *καυχησονται*. The reading of *ℵ* is clearly in error, and should have been protected by *ἐν πυρὶ καύσει* in the preceding clause.<sup>69</sup> Nevertheless, the direction of error is from *καυθ-* to *καυχ-*, the same as that proposed at 1 Cor. 13:3.

Some authors cite assimilation to a specific phrase at Daniel 3:95 LXX (*παρέδωκαν τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν εἰς πῦρ*).<sup>70</sup> However, strict assimilation is unlikely. First, because in the complement to *παραδίδωμι* in Daniel is *εἰς πῦρ*, while at 1 Cor. 13:3 it is quite different: *ἵνα καυθησομαι*. On the other hand, a recollection of the familiar account in Daniel may have prompted the shift to *καυθησομαι* at 1 Cor. 13. Such a possibility cannot, strictly speaking, be ruled out. However, there may be other influences that have impacted the transmission of the passage.

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

---

<sup>68</sup>Caragounis, p. 564; this possibility is expressed by nearly every commentator, dating back to Jerome, *Commentarii in iv epistulas Paulinas, Ad Galatas* 3,453,14: “*καυθήσομαι et καυχήσομαι una litterae parte distinguitur.*”

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

<sup>70</sup>Westcott and Hort, appendix, p. 117.

view of the growing urge toward Christian martyrdom in the second century.<sup>71</sup> Such an argument, of course, presumes that *καυχησομαι* is contextually suitable and grammatically appropriate. However, it would be a strong argument only if martyrdom by fire were actually encouraged by Paul in this passage. In fact, his argument denigrates martyrdom in favor of “love,” as early commentators noted. This forces Didymus, the only early father to read *καυχησομαι*, to read “boasting” as a negative action – which, as seen above, it cannot be if it is the correct reading – since martyrdom in itself could not possibly be negative:

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

Likewise Basil (*Epistulae* 204,1), who read *καυθησομαι*, takes pains to point out that *with* love, the speaking in tongues, faith, and martyrdom are able to be done: “Not that each of the enumerated items are able to be accomplished apart from love, rather the saint wishes, as he himself says, to confirm the far-surpassing greatness of the commandment in a hyperbolic manner (τῷ καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν τρόπῳ).” Of course, in 1 Cor. 13:1-3 Paul does not encourage any of the actions, even with “love,” but the ideal of martyrdom is so great that it must be “rescued” from Paul by the early fathers.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, when martyrdom is explicitly

---

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

<sup>72</sup>Though he does not cite *παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου*, Origen (*Commentarium in Mathaeum* 12,28) views the previous clause of 1 Cor. 13:3 (“giving his whole substance, that his possessions may feed the poor”) as spoken of negatively, parallel to “What can a man give in exchange for his life” (Matt. 16:21). It is reasonable to assume that he also would read



encouraged by the fathers, this passage is completely ignored. It is absent, for example, from Tertullian's *Ad martyras* and Origen's *Exhortatio ad martyriam*. It seems unlikely that second-century scribes would intentionally change a reading that denigrates boasting to one that denigrates martyrdom, particularly when Paul earlier in the letter spoke against the Corinthians' "boast" (5:6; also Rom. 4:2).

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

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

---

the next clause negatively.

<sup>73</sup>Elliott, "In Favour of *καυθησομαι* at 1 Corinthians 13:3," p. 298.

<sup>74</sup>Harnack claims that the motivation for alteration away from *καυχωμαι* is that Paul uses *καυχασθαι* in an "unusual way." Hellenistic writers viewed "boasting" as wicked, but the Pharisaic upbringing of Paul, "not only took no offense at demands, legal titles, glorific titles in relation to God, but demanded them" (pp. 144-45). However, recent research into Palestinian Judaism (cf. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977)) at the time of Paul has shown that these understandings of a legalistic "Judaism" or "Pharisaism" are not borne out by the evidence. Furthermore, a glance at the patristic use of *καυχασθαι* and *καύχημα*, etc. in Lampe shows that early Christian writers did not have difficulty with the idea of "boasting" before the Lord, when properly understood.

13:4.24; 13:4.25; 13:4.26 [see also the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

It was probably too much to ask scribes to successfully negotiate 13:4-6 without dropping, adding, or moving at least one of the occurrences of *η αγαπη*. Because the second *η αγαπη* could serve as the subject for either *χρηστεύεται* or *ου ζηλοϊ*, all subsequent verbs were liable to having a subject shifted or added. Even D F G, which share the same text, show by their different sense-line divisions that they read *η αγαπη* with different verbs:

F G VL 89

Η ΔΓΔΠΗ ΜΑΚΡΟΘΥΜΕΙ  
ΧΡΣΤΕΥΕΤΑΙ  
Η ΔΓΔΠΗ ΟΥ ΖΗΛΟΙ  
Η ΔΓΔΠΗ ΟΥ ΠΕΡΠΕΡΕΥΕΤΑΙ  
ΟΥ ΦΥΣΙΟΥΤΑΙ

D VL 75

Η ΔΓΔΠΗ ΜΑΚΡΟΘΥΜΕΙ  
ΧΡΣΤΕΥΕΤΑΙ Η ΔΓΔΠΗ  
ΟΥ ΖΗΛΟΙ Η ΔΓΔΠΗ  
ΟΥ ΠΕΡΠΕΡΕΥΕΤΑΙ  
ΟΥ ΦΥΣΙΟΥΤΑΙ

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

Can the original wording be determined? The main textual problem is the whether *ου φυσιουται* is preceded by *η αγαπη* (most manuscripts), followed by *η αγαπη* (P<sup>46</sup> only), or has no expressed subject (B 33 104).<sup>75</sup> This also makes the patristic evidence unusable here.<sup>76</sup>

---

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

<sup>76</sup>For example, Cyprian (*Ad Quirinum* 3,3,21) and Cyril of Alexandria (*Epistulae of paschales sive Homiliae of paschales* MPG 77, p. 541) add *η αγαπη* before *χρηστευεται*, without any manuscript support. Neither Tertullian, (*De patientia* 12,9) nor Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogus* 3,1,3,1) can be cited for any position of *η αγαπη* since they never use the noun in their citation.



The issue has often been determined on the basis of the “music” or “beauty” of a given reading,<sup>77</sup> although, as Fee points out, “it is also possible that Paul was not thinking rhythm.”<sup>78</sup> Furthermore, there is no “control” for such criteria, since the passage does not match any Greek poetic meter. Furthermore, even those who employ this argument differ as to which is more elegant.<sup>79</sup> It may be that the question is irresolvable.<sup>80</sup> However, we shall see B alone have difficulty with word order at 13:11, and  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  makes numerous similar transpositions without the support of any other witnesses.<sup>81</sup>

13:5.27

$\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota$  for  $\alpha\sigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota$  in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  is a nonsense reading,<sup>82</sup> for why would Paul argue that love does not behave decorously? Since there does not appear to be any likelihood of simple vocalic interchange, it is unlikely to be a simple blunder.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>The former by Zuntz, p. 68; the latter by Harnack, *Das hohe Lied*, p. 145 n. 1.

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

<sup>79</sup>Zuntz favors the reading of B (though citing it incorrectly, as described above); Harnack favors the reading of  $\aleph$  C D F G K L  $\Psi$  etc.

<sup>80</sup>So Fee, p. 635 n. 1.

<sup>81</sup>Royse, pp. 260-61.

<sup>82</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 499.

<sup>83</sup>Particularly in light of Caragounis’ work, which argues that the diphthongs  $\alpha\upsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\upsilon$ , and  $\eta\upsilon$  would have typically been produced with the u sounding like the consonant  $\nu$  or  $f$ . See pp. 375-77. Gignac (I, p. 226) also notes that in the Roman period papyri “ $\alpha\upsilon$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon$  are frequently written simply  $\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$ .” Had the exemplar of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  written  $\epsilon\sigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota$ , the

13:5.28

The variation between τὰ and τὸ μὴ (P<sup>46c</sup> B Clement) can only be the result of intentional editing. Even though both addition/omission of the negative particle and change in the number of the article are not unusual in the manuscripts,<sup>84</sup> the combination of the two here cannot be attributed to mere oversight. The reading τὰ ἐαυτῆς fits best in the context, since seeking one's own gain is "the very definition of the factionalist."<sup>85</sup> It has the additional advantage of having parallels in similar phrases at 1 Cor. 10:24 and 33<sup>86</sup> without being so identical that assimilation is a possibility. The resultant meanings are shown in two citations by Clement of Alexandria, one of each form of the text:

But learn the "most excellent way" which Paul shows about salvation: "Love does not seek its own things" (τὰ ἐαυτῆς οὐ ζητεῖ) but is poured out on the brother. About that brother it is passionately excited, about that brother it is wisely driven mad. (*Quis dives salvetur* 38,1)<sup>87</sup>

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

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

---

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

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

<sup>85</sup>Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 169 n. 33.

<sup>86</sup>Cited by Schrage III, p. 298 n. 118.

<sup>87</sup>A catena attributed to Origen cites the passage as τὰ ἐαυτῆς and argues that the kind of love may be compared to that of a mother or father for a child, or for the self-sacrificing love of Christ, which is described in a paraphrase of Phil. 2:6ff. Cited from Jenkins, p. 51.



The reading το μη εαυτης introduces a foreign element into the context, that of avoiding seeking after something that is not one's own. While such encouragement reflects pious thinking, e.g. in the Ten Commandments, it does not focus directly on the good of the other person, which is Paul's objective in this context.<sup>88</sup>

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

13:7.33

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

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

13:8.36

℘<sup>46</sup> and B frequently drop the compound from verbs (see discussion at 7:13.47). Here they are joined by several witnesses that typically align with them (ℵ\* A C\* 048 0151 0243 33 424<sup>c</sup> 436 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739). That Clement of Alexandria, who frequently agrees with these witnesses, reads εκπιπτει (*Qui dives salvetur* 38,2) points to scribal difficulty unique to the NT manuscripts. Fee adopts πιπτει on the basis of a strong semantic differentiation between two words, arguing that εκπιπτω means "comes to an end."<sup>89</sup> However, Paul uses εκπιπτω

---

<sup>88</sup>B. Weiss (p. 103) dismisses the ℘<sup>46</sup> B reading as "completely arbitrary" and an "impossible reading."

<sup>89</sup>Fee, p. 641 n. 1.

in the sense of “fail” also at Rom. 9:6,<sup>90</sup> as is required by this context.<sup>91</sup>

13:8.37

δε is lost in several witnesses, including  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  C\* D\* F G K P, the D-text, and the Vulgate. It is necessary in the context since a contrast is being drawn between ἀγάπη, which “does not fail,” and various “gifts” held up by the Corinthians, which do fail. Its loss can be attributed, as at 13:11 and 13:12, to an accidental leap (ΕΙΤΕΔΕ).<sup>92</sup>

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

13:9.42

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

13:10.43

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

---

<sup>90</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἐκπίπτω (4).

<sup>91</sup>Harnack (*Das hohe Lied*, p. 148 n. 1) accepts εκπιπτει as the “better attested and more difficult reading.”

<sup>92</sup>This unit of variation is not discussed by Zuntz, even though it is shared by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D\* F G with only a few other witnesses. Güting and Mealand also overlooks this potential case of asyndeton in their *Asyndeton in Paul*.



missing from the entire Latin tradition, the early fathers (in particular Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4,9,2),<sup>93</sup> and all Greek witnesses save those related to the “Byzantine text” (K L 049 *etc*), While the adverb (ܦܘܪܝܢܐ) is present in both the Peshitta and Harklean, it is absent from the Syriac church fathers.<sup>94</sup> The use of ὅταν without a succeeding τότε is not common, but does occur elsewhere in 1 Corinthians (14:26; 16:3). Assimilation to the near context is a trait of the “Byzantine” witnesses, and appears to have been at work here.<sup>95</sup>

13:10.44; 13:11.49

In the section 13:8-11, which is rife with parallelism and the assimilation which results in the manuscripts, two variations in word order are attested by D F G *pc* (13:10, 11). In such situations, assimilation to the word order of the near context would be considered the most likely cause of corruption, especially in these witnesses which frequently make similar alterations. However, in this context any of the potential readings may have arisen by assimilation. At 13:10 the verb stands first in the immediately preceding clause (13:10a), but εκ μερους begins the two preceding clauses in 13:9. Here D F G are joined by the Peshitta and Titus of Bostra<sup>96</sup> in reading the verb at the beginning of the clause. Irenaeus (*Adversus*

---

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

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

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

<sup>96</sup>*Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, p. 353.

*haereses* 4,9,2)<sup>97</sup> is the only Latin evidence prior to Augustine and Jerome to read the verb at the end of the clause. This again shows the close relationship among D F G, the Latin tradition, and the old Syriac. Nevertheless, in this case these witnesses are in error. The placement of the verb in the initial position appears to best match Pauline usage elsewhere. After a temporal clause which uses either ὅταν or ὅτε, the next clause typically uses the subject-verb (S-V) word order (Rom. 2:14; 6:20; 7:5; 1 Cor. 14:26; 15:28; 16:2; 2 Cor. 13:9<sup>98</sup>). The reading καταργηθησεται το εκ μερους has been assimilated to ελθη το τελειον. Lineation may have played a role here, as elsewhere. The predecessor of D F G read:

ΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΛΘΗ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ  
ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΤΟ ΕΚ ΜΕΡΟΥΣ

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

ΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΛΘΗ  
ΤΟ ΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ  
ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ  
ΤΟ ΕΚ ΜΕΡΟΥΣ

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

---

<sup>97</sup>Both the Greek and the Latin are extant for this section; both agree in reading the plural τα / *quae* with F G and most of the rest of the Latin tradition.

<sup>98</sup>Two passages use the V-S word order: Gal 4:4 and 1 Cor. 15:54, which introduces the second clause with τότε. Gal. 2:12, 14 have the verb in the initial position, but the subject is entailed in the verb form. 2 Cor. 12:12 places the predicate in the initial position, with the subject entailed in the verb. It should also be noted that Paul also typically uses object-verb word order, not verb-object (1 Cor. 16:3; 16:5; Gal. 2:11).



knowledge will continue, though made perfect, when the “in part” passes away (13:12). It is unlikely that F G have simply made an error, comparable to τα αυτα for το αυτο at 12:25 without any Latin support, for the Latin tradition uses both the plural pronoun and the plural verb form (*quae ex parte sunt*). Nor is it likely that the plural τα has been assimilated to τα του νηπιου at 13:11, for it seems unlikely that F G would assimilate the number of the verb without also assimilating the word order. Instead, assimilation likely took place in the Latin. *Quae parvuli erant* (13:11) either produced *quae ex parte sunt* at 13:11 or, perhaps more likely, an error in the Greek *Vorlage* of the Latin translation had the error τα for το (as in Irenaeus, which is an independent error) and translated the plural. The Greek predecessor of D F G and the Peshitta both avoid the same error, but F G take it up again by assimilation to the Latin.

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

Δε is either added or omitted twice in 13:11. D\* alone adds δε after the first οτε, likely by assimilation to οταν δε in the preceding sentence. However, addition by assimilation is not as certain after the second οτε (lacking only in ℵ\* A B D\* 048 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739), especially since such a narrow band of closely related witnesses attest the reading. Contextual and transcriptional probabilities further call the shorter text into doubt. In 13:9-12, Paul draws contrasts between former and present circumstances. Three of these four use δε to introduce the clause that describes the present condition.<sup>99</sup> This leaves only the contrast made in 13:11 without δε. The highlighting that would result from this asyndeton, however, serves no purpose in this context, for why would attention be drawn only to this contrast? A more likely scenario is the δε has been accidentally lost after οτε (ΟΤΕΔΕ). This is identical to the error made by ℵ\* at 13:12. Without any contextual or transcriptional argument in support of the shorter text, appeals made to the excellence of the witnesses that lack δε appear to be special pleading.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, D should not be relied upon when analyzing this type of variation, for it is unique in either adding or omitting δε is several places. It reads δε for αλλ' at 10:20, omits δε (with some Latin support) at 12:10, adds δε at 12:28, and, as noted above, adds δε earlier in 13:11. Its agreement with the “good Alexandrians” here may simply be a shared error, or perhaps another example of the correction toward “Alexandrian” witnesses which so frequently takes place in the Greek text of D.

## 13:11.46

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

---

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

<sup>100</sup>Eg., Zuntz, p. 189 n. 8; Fee, p. 641 n. 6; Güting and Mealand, p. 58.



5 33 69 88 104 436 623 1739) places the verb before  $\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in each clause. This is likely an accidental error in which the first  $\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  was skipped, the verb connected with the  $\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  that follows, and then the missing words written at the end.<sup>101</sup> The argument of the passage supports the alternative reading, for the emphasis gained by standing in the first position belongs to  $\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , not the verb. Comparison may be made to 13:9-10, where  $\epsilon\kappa$   $\mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma$  likewise stands before the verb in consecutive clauses.

13:11.48 [see 13:8.38]

13:12.50, 13:12.51

As Zuntz notes, asyndeton is “indeed suitable.”<sup>102</sup> However, he explains the shorter text as haplography,<sup>103</sup> noting that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  retains  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  but omits  $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$ , as he argues, also an example of haplography. However, the mistakes typical of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  should not be attributed to D F G, the entire Latin tradition (here including the Vulgate), and the Peshitta. Furthermore, the omission of  $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$  is more likely than that of  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , since both by sight and by sound  $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$  is easily lost ( $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\rho\tau\iota\delta\iota$ ). In addition, while  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  is occasionally lost by D\* alone (1:19; 3:19), there is no example in 1 Corinthians of the conjunction being omitted by D F G and the Latin tradition against the other witnesses. Neither does haplography occur in D F G or in the Latin witnesses in other examples of  $\Gamma\Delta\rho\Delta\rho$  . . . (Rom. 13:3; Heb. 5:1; 8:3). In this case, however, the fact that  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  is unemphatic has likely led to its omission, much like the

---

<sup>101</sup>Zuntz, pp. 128-9; followed by Fee, p. 641 n. 5. A similar case of variation is the shifting position of  $\eta$   $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$  at 13:4.

<sup>102</sup>Zuntz, p. 193, noting also Mill’s similar argument in n. 193.

<sup>103</sup>Followed by Güting and Mealand, p. 36 n. 45.

omission of ὅτι.<sup>104</sup> There is no reason to add this conjunction when in this context it would not have its typical causative force. As Güting and Mealand (p. 97) note, “The manuscripts generally don’t add γάρ very much,” likely precisely because it would introduce a logical relationship between clauses that would be foreign to the context.

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

The early versional and patristic evidence is split. The bulk of the Latin tradition, including VL 75, lacks the particle. This is followed by F G as well as virtually all the patristic evidence, including Origen<sup>105</sup> and Didymus.<sup>106</sup> However, ὡς is widely attested. It is firm in Clement’s text<sup>107</sup> as well as that of Tertullian (*Adversus Praxean* 14,8) and Methodius (*Symposium* 9,2,241).<sup>108</sup> Among Greek manuscripts the particle is found prior to δι εσοπτρου in D 0243, the “Western minuscules” 88 915, and several later witnesses that typically follow the  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B line of transmission, including 1175 1881 and, most significantly, 1739. The presence of ὡς following δι εσοπτρου in a few witnesses (0150 5 33) may suggest that the particle is a secondary correction that was added in different locations. Because of the lack of cohesiveness and relatively late date of the witnesses that read ὡς in this location, it is better to interpret this reading as either shared error or correction, not access to an

---

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

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

<sup>106</sup>*Commentarii in Ecclesiasten* fol. 171; *Commentarii in Zacchariam* 1,196.

<sup>107</sup>Ὠς is read at *Stromateis* 1,19,94,2; 5,1,7,5; 5,11,74,1; only *Excerpta Theodoti* 1,15,2 lacks it.

<sup>108</sup>Likely also an allusion by Basil, *De fide* MPG 31, p. 681.



extremely early form of the text. The addition of  $\omega\varsigma$  is therefore likely secondary, an attempt to soften the non-literal image of seeing “through a mirror.” Under similar circumstances,  $\omega\varsigma$  was added at 9:20 and 9:22 (though there it also stands in the near context; see the discussion *ad loc.*).

## 13:12.53

The omission of the second  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  is a nonsense reading that is further evidence of the close relationship between 056 and 0142.

## 13:12.55

The combination of similar sounds in  $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\Delta\epsilon$  led to the accidental omission of either  $\tau\epsilon$  ( $\aleph^*$ ) or  $\Delta\epsilon$  (81 205 1243\*).  $G^*$  alone repeats  $\epsilon\kappa$   $\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  following  $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$   $\delta\epsilon$ , perhaps by dittography (from  $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\nu\omega\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  back to  $\epsilon\kappa$ ). The Latin interlinear (*ex parte*) was added, upon which point the scribe apparently noticed the error and wrote a line through  $\epsilon\kappa$   $\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ . There is no indication in F of any difficulty here, so the error is limited to the copyist of G.

## 13:12.56 [discussed at 7:13.48]

## 13.12.57

The readings of several witnesses is uncertain here. D is damaged. Tischendorf, followed by Vogels,<sup>109</sup> cites it as reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota\omega$ ; NTaP cites its reading as  $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega$ . Examination of photographs is inconclusive; given the reading of F G and the D-text, it is likely that  $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega$  is the proper reconstruction. Cyprian’s text (*Ad Quirinium* 3,53) is equally uncertain. The

---

<sup>109</sup>“Codex Claromontanus,” p. 278.

critical edition prints *sicuti ego*, but several manuscripts read *sicut et*, others *sicut et ego*, and two simply *sicut*.

Nonetheless, there is little question as to which reading is secondary. Paul rarely uses unemphatic nominative *εγω*, a usage which is similar to the Ptolemaic papyri.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, accidental omission is possible (ΕΓΩΕΠΙΓ), but loss of the pronoun does not take place in similar examples elsewhere (e.g., Rom. 11:19 *ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθω*). At the same time, however, there is no apparent motive for the addition, since *εγω* does not appear in the context.

The reading *εγω / ego* (without *καί*) is found only in VL 75 and some manuscripts of Cyprian.<sup>111</sup> It must be an error, since Paul regularly uses adverbial *καί* immediately after *καθώς* if the same verb is present in the two clauses which are being compared (see 10:7.23).

13:13.59

A transposition is shared by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ , Clement (*Quis dives salvetur* 38,2 and *Stromateis* 4,7,54,1) and the early Syriac tradition (Peshitta and Aphraat, *Dem* 1/33,4), which places *τα τρια ταυτα* prior to *πιστις ελπις αγαπη*. This is likely simply accidental error, one that is common in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ .<sup>112</sup> Many fathers omit the adjectival phrase altogether,<sup>113</sup> indicating that it may have been accidentally passed over and then reinserted after the nouns independently in

---

<sup>110</sup>Mayser II,1 p. 63.

<sup>111</sup>The Vulgate manuscripts F and R omit *et* and *ego*.

<sup>112</sup>Royse, pp. 261-2 and 320.

<sup>113</sup>E.g., Rufinus, *Origenis in librum Numeri* 14,4; Tertullianus, *De patientia* 12; Didymus, *Fragmenta in Job* 306.



several witnesses.<sup>114</sup>

13:13.61

A few witnesses (6 255 2298) substitute παντων for τουτων. Since this substitution is common in the fathers,<sup>115</sup> the alteration may have been directly influenced by familiarity with patristic texts or, more likely, a simple intensification of the comparative.

---

<sup>114</sup>Metzger (*Textual Commentary* p. 499) attributes the sequence of ϖ<sup>46</sup> to intentional conformity to “a much more commonplace sequence,” though it must be noted that no precise parallel to this use of the demonstrative could be located in the NT.

<sup>115</sup>E.g., Basilius, *De fide* MPG 31, p. 688; Joannes Chrysostomus, *Contra Anomoeos* 1; *Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum* MPG 60, p. 285; Theodoretus, *Commentarius in Daniele* MPG 81, p. 1313. Cf. Schrage III, p. 359 n. 521.

## Notes on Chapter 14

14:1.1 [discussed at 12:4.16]

14:1.2

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup>B. Weiss, p. 16.



Latin witnesses. The singular may have been introduced based on the examples at 14:13, 14,<sup>2</sup> or by assimilation to the singular subject (λαλω). While the “Byzantine” witnesses here preserve γλωσσαις, they assimilate λαλω to the more common λαλων (14:2, 4, 6, 13). Assimilation to the singular verb (ελθω) is also the likely cause of the singular γλωσση at 14:6 (1448 Sedulius Scottus) since the two examples of γλωσσαις at 14:5 should have protected the plural.<sup>3</sup> Hence the assimilation to the context for this type of variation was caused either by the same form in the context or by the number of the subject. Finally, at 14:27 the plural is read by 0150. Since the singular is necessary given Pauline usage, 0150's reading is probably a simple slip in conformity to the numerous occurrences of the plural in the chapter.

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

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

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

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

14:4.12 [discussed at 14:2.3]

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup>B. Weiss, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup>Sedulius Scottus makes the same change by reading the singular *lingua* at 14:5b; he does not cite 14:5a.

drop the article before εκκλησια, as they do before πατηρ at 8:6 and with a few others before ετερου at 10:29. Lack of care in copying seems to be a trait of the shared predecessor of these witnesses.

F G add θεου after εκκλησιαν, an assimilation to other examples of εκκλησια [του] θεου in the letter (1 Cor. 1:2; 10:32; 11:16, 22; 15:9; all without variation involving θεου). The unique addition in F G, however, may stem from the Latin. The addition of θεου is not paralleled in the D-text, nor is *dei* found in VL 78. It is found, however, in two Vulgate mss.: S and V, the former of which is closely related to the local Vulgate text of St. Gall from this period and which formed the basis of the Latin text of VL 77.<sup>4</sup> While this source is not certain, it does account for the addition in F G as well as the lack of the addition in VL 78.

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

#### 14:5.15

Among several minor variations at this place are two which are either early or cannot be dismissed as insignificant. First,  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  loses of the final sigma from παντας, which, though it construes, does not suit the argument of this section (“I desire that you speak all things in tongues”). Second, A 547 read υμας παντας for παντας υμας. The former word order is

---

<sup>4</sup>Frede, *Altlateinischen Paulus-Handschriften*, pp. 54-59. Another manuscript related to this local text ( $\Phi^T$ ), however, does not have the addition.



never found in Paul, while the latter is firm in seventeen places in the *Corpus Paulinum*,<sup>5</sup> with only B at Phil. 2:26 reading the pronoun prior to the adjective. The alteration in A was likely caused by a leap, with παντας initially skipped but then immediately added after υμας. Another word order variation occurs in A (joined by 547) with the next words: γλωσσαις λαλειν is written for λαλειν γλωσσαις. The scribe of A has frequently shown difficulty with word order.<sup>6</sup>

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

14:5.17 [discussed at 12:31.125]

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

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

14:5.19

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

---

<sup>5</sup>Rom. 1:8; 15:33; 1 Cor. 14:18; 16:24; 2 Cor. 2:3, 5; 7:13, 15 (υμων  $\aleph^*$ ); 13:13; Gal. 3:28 (απαντες  $\aleph$  A B<sup>2</sup>); Phil. 1:4, 7, 8, 25; 2:17, 26 (υμας παντας B; πεμψαι προς υμας  $\wp^{46 \text{ vid}}$ ); 1 Thes. 1:2 (υμων K); 5:5; 2 Thes. 1:3 (παντων  $\aleph^*$ ; υμων 0278); 3:16, 18; Tit. 3:15.

<sup>6</sup>Further examples are provided at 14:33.148.

reads τῷ) and the shift to the participle (διερμηνευων D\* (ἢ ο διερμηνευων F G) both, in their own way, create a different description of what is entailed in “speaking in tongues” and “interpreting.”<sup>7</sup> In the standard text, the one who speaks in tongues is also the one who interprets. This is the way the situation is described by Origen (in catena): “But if the one who speaks in tongues also has the act of interpretation for the building up of the church, the one who prophesies is no longer greater.”<sup>8</sup> This understanding of the situation coheres with the description in 14:13 (where there is no variation). There is a *prima facie* contradiction with other passages in this context. At 12:30 a distinction is made: “not everyone” speaks in tongues and “not everyone” interprets. Again at 14:28 there is an “interpreter” of the speaking, though the passage does not explicitly state that the speaker and the interpreter must be two different people. In light of 14:13, where the one speaking in tongues is encouraged to pray for the gift of interpreting what that same person has spoken,<sup>9</sup> the conclusion that the interpreters in 12:30 and 14:28 are *necessarily* different from the one speaking in tongues cannot be sustained.<sup>10</sup>

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

---

<sup>7</sup>Schrage III, p. 389 n. 72.

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

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

<sup>10</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 659 n. 39; Conzelmann, p. 235.



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

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

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

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

---

<sup>11</sup>Theodoret, *Interpretationes in Pauli epistulas* MPG 82, p. 325.

<sup>12</sup>Thiselton, pp. 974-5.

<sup>13</sup>Though separated by only two lines, “Iso” is spelled ΓΥCΩ at 12:28 and ΓICΩ at 12:30, further evidence of the inconsistency of spelling in G.

<sup>14</sup>Bernice M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1988), p. 17.

as to suggest that Iso was responsible for a Greek-Latin Psalter produced at St. Gall, ms. 17.<sup>15</sup>

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

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

14:6.21 [discussed at 5:11.30]

14:6.22 [discussed at 6:5.15]

14:6.23 [discussed at 14:2.3]

14:6.24

A narrow band of witnesses (ⱼ 0243 6 33 424<sup>c</sup> 1739; P<sup>46</sup> *lac*) lacks the first particle in a series of contrasted elements. This, however, matches typical Pauline usage (Rom. 8:35; 1 Cor. 5:10; Eph. 5:5, 27; Col. 2:16; 1The. 2:19 and likely 1 Cor. 5:11<sup>16</sup>). When the first contrasted element is marked with a particle, Paul uses either ἤτοι . . . ἢ (Rom.6:16) or εἴτε . . . εἴτε (1 Cor. 3:22; 10:31; 12:13; Col. 2:16). The addition of η before εν αποκαλυψει has probably been prompted by the use of the particle in the following elements. At Eph. 5:4, the same witnesses (A D F G *etc*) alter και . . . και . . . η to η . . . η . . . η, which again changes

---

<sup>15</sup>Frede, *Allateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, pp. 78-9.

<sup>16</sup>The η preceding πορνός could be either the verb ἦ or the particle ἢ; NA<sup>27</sup> and the Latin tradition (which does not translate it) understand it as the verb, which is likely correct.



first particle to match those that follow.

#### 14:6.26

The  $\epsilon\nu$  was likely added before  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta$ , as B. Weiss, describes, as the result of “mechanical conformity” to the preceding three examples in the sentence.<sup>17</sup> In addition, it removes the potential ambiguity of the use of the dative, a cause of the addition of  $\epsilon\nu$  at 14:11 (see below). Only a handful of witnesses avoid the insertion:  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and relatives  $\aleph^*$  0243 216 630 1739 1881, but also D\* F G. The Latin tradition, however, adds the preposition,<sup>18</sup> which the predecessor of D F G managed to avoid bringing into the Greek.

#### 14:7.27

B alone frequently alters the number of substantives. This has already been observed at 13:5 ( $\tau\omicron$   $\mu\eta$   $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ ; with Clement) and 13:8 ( $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ).<sup>19</sup> At 1 Cor. 14:7, Weiss notes also that the singular “gives the same thought as  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\phi\theta\omicron\gamma\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , but overlooks that it not dealing with the tone intervals at all, but the distinction which is given to the tones brought out by the instrument through the intervals.”<sup>20</sup>

This is not the only place that B F G virtually alone omit the article. They do so in error before  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  (with also 33) at 12:19 (see discussion *ad loc*), and almost certainly in error at 11:3. Because D reads the article, it is likely that F G lose the article and hence

---

<sup>17</sup>B. Weiss, p. 108.

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

<sup>19</sup>B. Weiss (p. 17) notes two other singular readings in B: Heb. 1:14 ( $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ) and 8:9 ( $\epsilon\nu$   $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$ ).

<sup>20</sup>B. Weiss, p. 17.

independently produced an error also found in B, rather than the combination of B F G reaches back to an early point in the tradition. Finally, the loss of the final -ν of διατολην by F G is an error common in the papyri<sup>21</sup> and, given the frequent misspellings in these witnesses, likely accidental.

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

14:7.28; 14:7.29; 14:9.37; 14:16.72; 15:22.87; 15:24.92; 15:29.120

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

---

<sup>21</sup>Gignac I, pp. 111-12; Mayser 1,1, pp. 169-71.

<sup>22</sup>The reading εαν μη is apparently supported also by 1424; 2400 reads μη both after εαν and before δω.

<sup>23</sup>1424 shifts μη to the position prior to the verb: εαν υμιν μη λαλησω.

<sup>24</sup>B D avoid the addition here, as do also P<sup>46</sup> N A C 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 pc; F G are not extant here.



G alone reading the aorist γνωσθη in place of the future γνωσθησεται / *scietur*. While the aorist is common in deliberative questions, the future is typically used with πῶς.<sup>25</sup> The reading of D\* F G may be explained as assimilation to the aorist δω in the preceding clause, perhaps made more likely by the fact the γνωσθησεται is easily shortened to γνωσθη.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, the loss of the termination is likely to explain the shortening of the second person δωτε (14:9) to the third person δω in L, a form found also at 14:8.

The variation between εὐλογησῆς and εὐλογῆς at 14:16 presents a more difficult problem. As at 14:7, there is confusion of similar verb forms. Further examples are seen at 2:8 (εἰγνώκεν / εἰγνώ ϩ<sup>46</sup>); 8:2 (εἰγνώ / εἰγνώκεν D<sup>2</sup> K L 056 0142 0151), 13:3 (παραδῶ / παραδῶσω F G); 15:29 (ποιήσουσιν / ποιουσιν F G); 15:22 (ζωοποιηθησονται / ζωοποιησονται A<sup>\*vid</sup>); 15:24 (παραδιδῶ / παραδῶ K L 0243 1739\*) and 15:57 (διδόντι / δόντι ϩ<sup>46</sup> D 049 056 0142 6 424 *pc*). Assimilation to the same tense in the near context is the usual cause of corruption in these examples, an error to which ϩ<sup>46</sup> D F G appear to be prone. At 14:16 ϩ<sup>46</sup> D F G K L Ψ *pm*, supported by the Latin tradition, read the aorist εὐλογησῆς. However, apart from the concluding clause of 14:19, only present tense verbs are used in 14:12-19. On this basis the present form εὐλογῆς may be considered secondary, especially when noting, as described above, that the aorist is typical in deliberative questions. However, the parallel at 14:14 (εἰαν προσευχομαι) uses the present tense, which would make the present more likely at 14:16.<sup>27</sup> Comparison may also be made to alteration of the tense in deliberative questions elsewhere in 1 Cor. 14. At 14:14 Chrysostom writes the aorist

---

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

<sup>26</sup>Cf. εἰγνώ (F G) for εἰγνώκεν at 2:11.

<sup>27</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 667 n. 2.

προσευξωμαι<sup>28</sup> and at 14:24 a few witnesses (0150 *pc*) write the aorist προφητευσωσιν in place of the present forms.

14:7.30; 14:9.38

0243 1739 are joined by 33 614 999 1424 in altering αυλομενον to the λαλουμενον of 14:9, while  $\mathfrak{P}^{46*29}$  and 0150 read αυλουμενον at 14:9. The first must have been an intentional alteration, bringing the earlier passage into harmony with the second. Both alterations, however, are clearly secondary in context, for a flute does not “speak,” nor does a voice “pipe.”  $\Psi$  at 14:9 has a further assimilation to 14:7, adding the phrase η το κιθαριζομενον to το λαλουμενον.

14:8.33

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

14:9.35; 14:18.82; 14:37.167

All further examples of plural pronouns written for the singular in 1241<sup>s</sup>.

14:9.37 [discussed at 14:7.28]

---

<sup>28</sup>Joannes Chrysostomus, *Homiliae in i Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 147.

<sup>29</sup>The reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  is corrected by the first hand.

<sup>30</sup>B. Weiss, p. 130.



14:9.38 [discussed at 14:7.30]

14:10.39; 14:10.43 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

14:10.43; 14:11.50; 14:16.73

There is a marked tendency to the addition of prepositions, and of ἐν in particular:

1:5 ἐν παση 33 103 162 ] παση *cett*  
 2:3 ἐν φοβω *cett* ] φοβω F G 614 1812 2147 2412  
 2:3 ἐν τρομω *cett* ] τρομω D F G 1827  
 2:3 ἐν πολλω  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  ] πολλω *cett*  
 9:18 ἐν τη εξουσια  $\aleph^*$  ] τη εξουσια *cett*  
 9:19 ἐν πασιν D VL 75 ] πασιν  
 10:8 ἐν μια *cett* ] μια  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  B D\* F G  
 14:6 ἐν διδαχη *cett* ] διδαχη  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  D\* F G 0243 1739  
 14:10 ἐν τω κοσμω D\* F G K *pc* ] τω κοσμω *cett*  
 14:11 ἐν εμοι *cett* ] εμοι  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G 049 0150 0243 5 6 88 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 *pc*  
 14:16 ἐν πνευματι  $\aleph^2$  B D<sup>s</sup> P *pc* ] K L Ψ 1739 *pm* ]  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  A F G 0150 0243 0289<sup>vid</sup>

Since  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G frequently add the preposition, it is striking that they avoid the additions at 10:8, 14:6, 11, 16 (in the latter three passages joined by 0243). Zuntz claims that the omission at 14:11 is the result of assimilation the lack of a preposition before τω λαλουντι in the previous clause. The parallelism of the two passages is obvious, as Chrysostom (who does not read ἐν) points out.<sup>31</sup> However, assimilation by excision is not typical of scribes; the examples pointed out above bear this out.<sup>32</sup> Instead, another motive is likely involved. BDR suggests that the addition of ἐν was made to prevent εμοι from being construed with ο λαλων.<sup>33</sup> This matches Pauline usage in that the indirect object of λαλέω is always a dative

---

<sup>31</sup>After citing 14:11a, he writes: “Next, that he may not render the charge grievous, he makes equal the complaint . . .” and then cites 14:11b. Joannes Chrysostomus, *Homiliae in i Corinthios* MPG 61, p. 299.

<sup>32</sup>The only clear example found in 1 Corinthians of assimilation by omission of ἐν is 9:18 τω ευαγγελιω (81 614).

<sup>33</sup>BDR § 220<sup>1</sup>.

without ἐν,<sup>34</sup> hence the presence of ἐν before ἐμοί prevents it from being wrongly construed. It is more likely an addition to example made to prevent ambiguity rather than an omission which creates it. Similar motivation may be found for the addition at 14:6. The only reading which can serve as the source for the other two is πνευματι (P<sup>46</sup> N<sup>\*</sup> A F G 0150 0243 0289<sup>vid</sup>). Τω πνευματι (K L Ψ pm) is based on the same form at 14:15,<sup>35</sup> while the addition of ἐν (N<sup>2</sup> B D<sup>s</sup> P pc) makes certain that the dative is understood as instrumental, perhaps influenced by the examples in chapter 12 (12:3, 9, 13).

14:10.44; 14:26.120

The οὐδεν at 14:10 is left ambiguous; it may refer either to languages, none of which are unintelligible, or to people, none of whom do not have a language. In this context the latter is more likely.<sup>36</sup> The addition of αὐτων (N<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 88 pm) supplies the implied referent, so that Paul's argument is to be understood to say that all people speak.<sup>37</sup> Schrage observes that the Vulgate's *nihil sine voce est* (followed also by the Latin fathers) assumes this interpretation as well.<sup>38</sup> The ambiguity of the bare οὐδεν makes it more likely that αὐτων was added than that it was accidentally omitted.

Likewise at 14:26, bare ἐκαστος could be interpreted to include τις ἄπιστος ἢ

---

<sup>34</sup>E.g., 1 Cor. 3:1; 14:3, 6, 28; 15:34; 2 Cor. 7:14; 12:4. No examples of ἐν + dative as indirect object of λαλέω have been located in Paul. The addition of μοι to τω λαλουντι at 14:11a in several minuscules, including 104 365 1611, shows this same usage.

<sup>35</sup>Compare also the addition of τω before both θεω and πνευματι (N<sup>2</sup> A D<sup>2</sup> Ψ 0243 pm) at 14:2.

<sup>36</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 665, n. 37; Schrage III, p. 395.

<sup>37</sup>Schrage III, p. 395, n. 115.

<sup>38</sup>Schrage III, p. 395 n. 114.



ιδιώτης (14:24-25). The addition of *ουων* is attested by the entire Latin tradition, the bilinguals, and the “Byzantine” text. However, because it also removes the ambiguity of the word it modifies it is likely secondary.

14:11.46

*Ei* in P alone is the result of assimilation to the same word at 14:10.

14:11.46

*Ϟ*<sup>46</sup> loses *ουν*, as Royse notes probably by a leap.<sup>39</sup>

14:11.48 [discussed at 8:2.4]

14:12.53; 14:32.145

Paul occasionally uses *πνεῦμα* as metonymy to describe the manifestations of the activity of the Spirit among the Corinthians (5:3-4; 14:14). The plural form caused particular difficulty. At 14:12 P 1175 *sy*<sup>p</sup> alter *πνευματων* to the literal *πνευματικων*, while Amst(A) writes the singular *spiritus*. The move to the singular is made again at 14:32 by D F G Ψ 424<sup>c</sup> and much of the Latin tradition,<sup>40</sup> making clear that only one Spirit is able to produce such manifestations. Other examples of the confusion of the singular and plural of neuter nouns are discussed at 12:9.32.

14:12.56

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

---

<sup>39</sup>Royse, p. 258. Güting and Mealand (p. 141) mark the omission as secondary without comment.

<sup>40</sup>D F G and the Latin tradition at 14:32 are further discussed in the chapter on D F G.

this context of encouraging προφητεία rather than λαλεῖν γλωσσαίς, it is not surprising that scribes made the shift from περισσευητε to the similar-sounding προφητευητε (A I pc).<sup>41</sup>

Ambrosiaster makes the same alteration, though the phonological similarity does not exist in Latin (*prophetetis* for *abundetis*).

14:13.57

Διόπερ is firm in the *Corpus Paulinum* only at 1 Cor. 8:13. At 10:14, 440 and 547 read διο (omit 1898) and at 14:13 primarily “Byzantine” witnesses read διοπερ.<sup>42</sup> By the Hellenistic period both διο and διοπερ function as a particle and no longer as a relative.<sup>43</sup> The two certain examples of διοπερ function to introduce major concluding statements, while at 14:13 διο would suit the flow of argument better, since it has less an inferential than a transitional force than does διοπερ.

14:13.59 [noted at 8:9.39]

14:14.60

B Weiss argues that γάρ is frequently accidentally lost, citing Phil. 1:23 and 1 Cor. 14:14 as specific examples where it was lost due to scribal carelessness.<sup>44</sup> However, in both places the γάρ removes ambiguity by creating a logical relationship with the previous

---

<sup>41</sup>Zuntz, p. 113, n. 3.

<sup>42</sup>Although here the “Family 1739” witnesses split: 6 424 read διοπερ, 0243 1739 read διο.

<sup>43</sup>J. Blomquist, *Particles in Hellenistic Greek* (Lund: Gleerup, 1969), p. 136.

<sup>44</sup>B. Weiss, p. 120.



clause.<sup>45</sup> This took place in similar witnesses at 1 Cor. 14:5 (γὰρ for δε), and γὰρ has been added by ℵ at 4:4 and 11:14.<sup>46</sup>

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

14:15.68; 14:15.71; 14:23.104; 15:6.28 ; 15:14.61; 15:15.63

Variation involving δε και is common in the *Corpus Paulinum*:

- Rom. 3:29 δε και L P Ψ 049 056 6 33 88 424 ] και ℵ A B D F G K  
 Rom. 8:34 δε και ℘<sup>46</sup> D F G K 049 056 Ψ 88 424 1739 ] δε ℵ A B C 489  
 1 Cor. 1:22 επειδη δε και 0150 ] επει F G ] επειδη ℘<sup>46</sup> ] επειδη και *cett*  
 1 Cor. 14:15 δε και (1) ℵ A B D<sup>s</sup> L Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0243 1739 ] και F G K P 0151  
 1 Cor. 14:15 δε και (2) ℵ A D<sup>s</sup> K L P 048 049 056 0142 6 424 1739 ] και B F G 0150 0151\*  
 1 Cor. 14:23 δε και ℘<sup>46</sup> 0150 0201 88 915 *pc Vg<sup>mss</sup>* ] και *cett*  
 1 Cor. 15:6 τινες δε και ℵ<sup>2</sup> A<sup>c</sup> D<sup>2</sup> L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 33 88 ] τινες δε ℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ\* A<sup>vid</sup> B D\* F G 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 ] τινες δε εξ αυτων και K  
 1 Cor. 15:14 κενη δε και D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 0151 6 424 489 *pm* ] κενη και ℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ A B D\* F G P 0150 0243 0270 ] κενη δε 056 0142  
 1 Cor. 15:15 δε και *cett* ] και D\* 2495  
 2 Cor. 5:16 ει δε και ℵ<sup>2</sup> C<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> Ψ *pm* ] ει δε K ] ει και ℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ\* A B D\* 0225 0243 33 1739 ] και ει F G  
 2 Cor. 13:9 δε και ℵ<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0151 ] και ℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ\* A B D\* F G

Where δε is in question, the issue is whether or not there is a contrast being drawn, in which case the δε should be read. It appears to be secondary at Rom. 3:29;<sup>47</sup> 2 Cor. 3:16; and 13:9.

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

---

<sup>45</sup>Zuntz, p. 194.

<sup>46</sup>Güting and Mealand (p. 141) list the addition of γὰρ at 14:14 as secondary without comment.

<sup>47</sup>At Rom. 3:29, the first question does not contrast with the first, but builds upon it; ει και at 2 Cor. 3:16 provides the necessary concessive force; and at 2 Cor. 13:9 it may have been added to match δε in the preceding clause.

fourth and final clause in the series (ος και εντυχανει υπερ ημων). B lacks και in the second clause (before εγερθεις) but reads it before εστιν. Although this is the reading of the NA<sup>27</sup> text, it is unlikely to be original, for why would the second clause only lack the ascensive και? B's text is more likely the result of conflation.  $\aleph$  A C 0289 have made several clarifying alterations to the passage, adding εκ νεκρων after εγερθεις and deleting και in the second and third clauses (before εγερθεις and εστιν). On the other hand,  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G and the "Byzantine" text read και in all three places, which corresponds to the same use of και in a similar series of clauses at 1 Cor. 15:4-5. The reading of B, then, can be attributed either to simple blunder or to a partial correction from the  $\aleph$  A C text back to the  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G text. This handling of the text by B is paralleled at 1 Cor. 14:15, where δε και is read at 14:15b but και only at 14:15c – and again here B alone attests this combination of readings.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, the witness of 0151 here shows what probably took place in B: The original hand of 0151 accidentally drops the second δε, which is added back in the correction.<sup>49</sup> Because B betrays the same alteration both at 1 Cor. 14:15 and at Rom. 8:34, it cannot be correct in either place.

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

---

<sup>48</sup>B. Weiss attributes B's loss of δε at 1 Cor. 14:15 to scribal blunder (p. 118), but accepts its readings at Rom. 8:34 as the only possible source for both the  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G and  $\aleph$  A C 0289 readings (p. 111). However, Weiss does not notice the intentional alteration shown by  $\aleph$  A C 0289 elsewhere in this passage.

<sup>49</sup>Accidental loss of και after δε takes place in D\* at 1 Cor. 15:15.



singing with the spirit and doing the same with the mind or both encouraged activities, but removes the contrast placed on “with my mind,” a contrast that the context requires (cf. *ἀλλά* at 14:19).

At 1 Cor. 15:14, the addition of *καί* after *ἀρα* (*ℵ*<sup>\*</sup> A D F G K P 049 0151) creates a “both . . . and” relationship between 15:14b 15:14c, so that both are “empty” if “Christ is not raised.” The conclusion of this section (15:18) provides the only other example of *ἀρα* *καί* in Paul, which may have suggested the addition at 15:14. The *δε* *καί* following *κενή* at 15:14c (D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 0151; *δε* 056 0142), likely suggested by *δε* *καί* in the next clause (15:15), makes clear that this clause is logically dependant on the preceding, a relationship that had been lost with the addition of *καί* after *ἀρα*.

The “Byzantine” witnesses add *καί* after *δε* at 1 Cor. 15:6. The result is an emphasis on the statement that “even” (or “also”) some eyewitnesses of the resurrection have fallen asleep. While the emphasis on the final clause may anticipate the argument that begins at 15:12, such an emphasis is not in view in the immediate context, which focuses on the “objective reality” of Christ’s resurrection.<sup>50</sup> There does not appear to be any obvious motivation for its deletion. However, its insertion can be attributed either to a preference for *δε* *καί*, which is found four other times in Byzantine witnesses against all others, or to an attempt to clarify Paul’s argument. *καί* is also secondary at 1 Cor. 14:23 (*℞*<sup>46</sup> 0150 0201 88 915 *pc*; several Vulgate mss.), for it clarifies the logical relationship between 14:23a and 14:23b. Bare *δε* could be misunderstood as contrastive.

14:16.72 [discussed at 14:7.28]

---

<sup>50</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, pp. 731-31.





witness, attests a reading that is three or four steps removed from the archetype.<sup>51</sup> His argument is based on Marcion's reading, *δια τον νομον*, which he claims (as did Mill) is a corruption of *δια του νοος μου*. In this reconstruction, an intermediary witness wrote *δια του νομου*. The genitive, however, does not construe in this context, so this was corrected to the reading now attested only by Marcion. This reconstruction gains additional support in TuT, which happily cites 1107 with this precise reading (*δια του νομου*). Whether a late corruption or a vestige of a previously lost reading, 1107 at least shows that such a corruption is possible. According to Zuntz, then, *τω νοι μου* (ⲛ A B D<sup>s</sup> P Ψ 0150 0243 1739 sy<sup>p</sup>) is a secondary assimilation to 14:15, with the addition of *εν* (Ϡ<sup>46</sup>) a further assimilation to *εν γλωσση* in the final clause of 14:19. However, Zuntz is misled in some of his data, which impacts his analysis of this unit.

Based on Holl's edition of Epiphanius' *Panarion*, Zuntz argues that Marcion's text (*δια τον νομον*) is a conflation of the ⲛ B reading and the Byzantine reading. This would place Marcion's text at least two steps removed from the archetype. However, Schmid has shown that Holl misunderstood the passage in Epiphanius and inserted both *μετα το* and *προσεθετο* (as well as *λαλησαι*) to make it appear that Epiphanius reads *δια τον νομον* "after" (as an addition to) rather than as a replacement for *τω νοι μου*.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, Marcion's reading cannot provide evidence for what Zuntz describes as "the collation of

---

<sup>51</sup>Zuntz, p. 230.

<sup>52</sup>Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos* p. 189. Clabeaux, *Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul* (pp. 111, 136, and 155) accepts Holl's reconstruction; however, Schmid is certainly correct here. The conflation is actually found in the Book of Armagh (VL 61), two manuscripts of another Irish witness, Pelagius, and perhaps the Vulgate witness Z\* (a corrector erases *per legem*). The role of the Latin witnesses is discussed below.

different manuscripts before Marcion's time."<sup>53</sup> Instead, Marcion's reading ΔΙΔΤΟΝΝΟΜΟΝ is simply a scribal corruption of ΔΙΔΤΟΥΝΟΟCΜΟΥ.<sup>54</sup>

In addition to the corruption attested by Marcion, the early origin of the reading δια του νοος μου is demonstrated in the Latin tradition. Most significantly, the reading of VL 75, *loqui per sensum meum*, can only be a rendering of δια του νοος μου λαλησαι. In 1 Corinthians, 75 renders every example of δια + genitive with *per* + accusative,<sup>55</sup> while every example of δια + accusative is always rendered with *propter* + accusative.<sup>56</sup> Examples of *dativus instrumentalis* are rare in the NT.<sup>57</sup> However all the examples of γλωσση / ταις γλωσσαις in 1 Cor. 14:1-13 are rendered by 75 with the simple dative.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, other Latin witnesses also read a form of *lex*. Ambrosiaster and VL 89, both of which but especially the latter show close affinities to the text of 75, read *loqui per legem*. This reading can only be based on the Greek corruption now attested only in Marcion<sup>E</sup>, for it is impossible to see *per legem* as a corruption of *per sensum meum*. Paulinus of Nola (†431) has a slightly different form: *in lege*.<sup>59</sup> This may be either the vestige of a corruption of εν τω νοι (perhaps

---

<sup>53</sup>Zuntz, p. 231.

<sup>54</sup>Clabeaux (*Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul*, p. 111) cites a conversation with H. J. Frede in which the latter saw δια τον νομον as a corruption of τω νοι μοι.

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

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

<sup>57</sup>BDR §195.

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

<sup>59</sup>*Epistula* 23,36.



missing the μου) rather than δια του νοος μου, or simply a paraphrase of the passage.<sup>60</sup> In addition, several Latin witnesses do attest the conflation that has been shown to be wrongly attributed to Marcion.<sup>61</sup> Now that Marcion's text is properly reconstructed, several Latin witnesses can be added to his evidence for an early corruption. The reading δια του νοος μου is not, therefore, speaking, an exclusively "Byzantine" reading.

But is it the archetypal reading, as Zuntz argued? At the outset it must be observed that confusion of ω and ου is common in the papyri.<sup>62</sup> Examples may also be found among early NT papyri. P<sup>46</sup> writes κοπιουσας for κοπιωσας and P<sup>45</sup> writes δωναι for δουναι.<sup>63</sup> The corruption could have gone in either direction. However, it is more likely that ΤΩΝΟΙ was corrupted to ΤΟΥΝΟΟC than that ΔΙΔΤΟΥΝΟΟC was corrupted to ΤΩΝΟΙ, for the first involves only vowel confusion while the second require deletion of the preposition in addition to the vowel shift. Subsequent to the vowel confusion, which changed the case to genitive, a preposition (δια) was needed in order to construe. This reconstruction is made more likely by noting that 1) λαλέω + διά to express means is found nowhere else in Paul;<sup>64</sup> 2) post-classical Greek preferred for δια + genitive over the simple dative (or ἐν + dative) to

---

<sup>60</sup>Strikingly, neither Ambrosiaster nor Paulinus mention anything about the "law" in their comments.

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

<sup>62</sup>Mayser, I,1 pp. 78-79 (ω in place of ου) and pp. 76-77 (ου in place of ω); Gignac I, pp. 208-11. Perhaps the most ironic shift is διορθουσιν for διορθωσιν (POxy. 2005, line 5) though in reference to building a wall, not correcting a manuscript.

<sup>63</sup>Royse, pp. 245 and 120.

<sup>64</sup>But is used elsewhere in the NT: Luke 1:70; John 7:13; 15:3; Acts 3:21; 28:25; Heb 2:2, 3; 11:4.

express means;<sup>65</sup> 3) the “Byzantine” witnesses (N<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K L pm) make a similar shift at 2 Thes.

3:12: δια του κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου for εν κυριω ιησου χριστω.

14:19.86

ⲑ<sup>46</sup> and some minuscules (547 614 1896 2147 pc) lose λογους due to a leap: Η ΜΥΡΙΟΥC ΛΟΓΟΥC. Because the noun (λογους) stands in the previous clause its presence is not necessary to understand the passage, thus making its loss more likely.

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

14:21.89; 14:21.91

Although damaged, 0201<sup>66</sup> now supports a reading previously only attested by F G and the entire Latin tradition. The Latin’s *aliis linguis* cannot be attributed exclusively to F G’s ετεραις γλωσσαις, since Latin apparently did not have an equivalent term for ετερογλωσσοις.<sup>67</sup> The evidence for Marcion’s text confirms this, with Epiphanius citing his text as ετερογλωσσοις and Tertullian as *aliis linguis*.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, the support of 0201 prevents attributing the reading solely to influence from the Latin. However, 0201 may have arrived at the reading independent of F G. These witnesses may have later been adapted to the Latin.

---

<sup>65</sup>Jannaris, §§ 1381 and 1531-32.

<sup>66</sup>The reconstructions of both Crum and Güting are identical: |[ε]γ[ετ]ερ[αιςγλ]ωσ|σαις και εν χει| except that Crum lacks a dot under the first ν. The reading is made certain both by the available space and the feminine termination.

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

<sup>68</sup>Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,11,8 and 42,12,3; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,8,10.



The second major unit of variation in this “citation” is whether *ετερων* (Ⲛ A B Ψ 0201<sup>vid</sup> 0243 6 33 81 424<sup>c</sup> 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739 *pc*) or *ετεροις* (*cett*) follows *χειλεσιν*. Assimilation to *ετεραις γλωσσαις* or *ετερογλωσσοις* is the most likely led to the alteration to *ετεροις*. It is also possible that influence from the LXX has occurred in both cases. According to the *Philocalia* of Origen,<sup>69</sup> Aquila’s translation of Is. 28:11 (which Paul here paraphrases) reads *ετερογλωσσοις* and *ετεροις*.

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

14:23.101

The reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  may be either *εαν συνελθη* or *εαν ουν ελθη*,<sup>70</sup> matching B. If the latter, it matches the tendency of both  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and B to omit the prefix of compound verbs, as has already been noted (7:13.47). This tendency contributed to reading CYN as OYN, creating a syndetic relationship with the preceding result (*ὥστε*) clause. However, nowhere else in 1 Corinthians does a clause introduced by *οὖν* follow a clause introduced by *ὥστε*. In fact, six times the following clause is asyndetic.<sup>71</sup> Either dittography or conflation produced the most widely attested reading, *εαν ουν συνελθη*, which also stands opposed to the tendency toward asyndeton after a *ὥστε* clause. The archetypical reading is preserved by F G<sup>72</sup> and

---

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

<sup>70</sup> $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  reads:  $\epsilon\Delta\text{N } \overline{\text{O}}\text{IYN}|\text{I } \epsilon\lambda\theta\text{H}$ .

<sup>71</sup>5:1; 5:8; 7:38; 10:12; 11:33; 15:58. A *ὥστε* clause is followed syndetically by *καί* at 1:7; 4:5; *δέ* at 3:7; 11:27; 13:2; 14:39; and *γάρ* at 3:21. Güting and Mealand (p. 43) compare 14:22 with examples of “Pauline instructions referring to alternatives,” but here the *οὖν* would connect logically with the preceding *ὥστε* clause.

<sup>72</sup>In G *ουν* is written with cramped letters into the space between *εαν* and *ελθη* by the original hand. Its loss may be an example of parablepsis, but the reading of the immediate

much of the Latin tradition,<sup>73</sup> joined here by a group which typically aligns with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B: 0243 5 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1245 1739 1881.

14:23.102

Paul consistently places the adjective in the position before an arthrous noun.<sup>74</sup> The adjective in the position after the noun is found only in two places, both with variation. At Romans 16:23 L  $\Psi$  Maj read της εκκλησιας ολης, and at 1 Cor. 14:23 all Greek witnesses apart from D F G 629 read η εκκλησια ολη. In both cases the position of the adjective runs counter to typical Pauline usage, but the usage is not so prominent that scribes would assimilate to the regular Pauline word order. Furthermore, in both passages the Peshitta and the Latin tradition<sup>75</sup> read the adjective before the noun, thereby extending the support for the D F G reading<sup>76</sup> at 1 Cor. 14:23. The placement of the adjective after the arthrous noun is

---

shared predecessor of F G is shown by F.

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

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

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

<sup>76</sup>The singular reading in 629 (πασα η εκκλησια) is simply another Latinism in this witness.



found elsewhere in the NT, perhaps accounting for the shift here.<sup>77</sup>

14:23.103; 14:24.106

Several witnesses have assimilated the tenses of the verbs of 14:23-24. The aorist, which here is a background tense, describes the action which must precede: ελθη / συνελθη (14:23; see above), εισελθωσιν (14:23), and εισελθη (14:24). The “speaking” or “prophesying” is expressed in the present, which foregrounds these verbs so that attention is drawn to the actions about which Paul is concerned.<sup>78</sup> At 14:23,  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G have assimilated the present tense λαλωσιν to the aorist λαλησωσιν.<sup>79</sup> While an attractive group of witnesses, the parallel present tense προφητευσωσιν at 14:24 requires the present λαλωσιν. Some witnesses make the same alteration to the aorist at 14:24 (προφητευσωσιν 0150 *pc*), but since no witnesses read both λαλησωσιν and προφητευσωσιν, it is likely that both readings are independent assimilations to the preceding aorist verb form.<sup>80</sup> This is further evidence of a close relationship between  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and F G which, though attesting to early forms of the text, both show alterations to make the use of the verb in this section more consistent.

14:23.105

The loss of η απιστοι in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  vid B VL 89 may have been lost either by accidental leap

---

<sup>77</sup>The adjective follows the noun outside *Corpus Paulinum*: Matt 16:26; 22:49; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25; Acts 11:26; 21:30; 28:30; 1 John 5:19; Rev. 3:10; 6:12; 12:9; 16:14.

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

<sup>79</sup>F has blundered with λαλησωσιν.

<sup>80</sup>A few witnesses read the future προφητεουσιν at 14:24 (33 88 102 464 915), which is similar to the subjunctive both in form and meaning.

or simple carelessness,<sup>81</sup> perhaps induced by the similarity of the two terms. B makes a similar omission at Rom 14:23: το μη τιθεναι τω αδελφω σκανδαλον for το μη τιθεναι προσκομμα τω αδελφω η σκανδαλον. Both here and at 1 Cor. 14:23 the particle and one of the nouns are omitted,<sup>82</sup> though in Romans the omission can hardly be accidental. Zuntz suggests – without ultimately defending – that the longer reading has been assimilated to απιστος η ιδιωτης at 14:24. However, one might expect the assimilated reading to match the word order to which it has been assimilated. Furthermore, 14:16 uses ιδιωτης without any attempt at assimilation.

## 14:24.107

The difficulty of two consecutive clauses that employ δέ is resolved by either replacing with the similar sounding τε (A<sup>83</sup>) or removing it altogether (1845). Similar difficulties with conjunctions affect the text also at 14:21 (see above).

## 14:25.112

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

---

<sup>81</sup>B. Weiss, p. 125 with further examples in B.

<sup>82</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἦ (1β). The loss of η σκανδαλιζεται η ασθενει in ℵ\* A C 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1506 1739 seems an obvious case of *homoeoteleuton*, but nonetheless adopted by NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>83</sup>Both von Soden and Tischendorf cite the Peshitta as matching the reading of A, but because it uses the prefix α (“and”) at both 14:24a and 24b it is more likely that the same conjunction was read in both places.



“Byzantine” reading, for different conjunctions are used at 14:25a and 25b: VL 75 89 read *etiam . . . tunc*; Amst(A) *quoque . . . tunc*; VL 77 78 Vg read only *tunc* at 14:25b, all of which understand 14:25a to connect with 14:24 and 25b serving as the conclusion. Because this is the way the clauses must be related in the  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B D\* F G *pm* reading, the Latin tradition is attempting to render that form of the text, not the “Byzantine” form, and therefore is evidence for the shorter reading even though it reads a conjunction. While the Latin tradition cannot be cited as support for the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$  . . .  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ , it does give evidence of a perceived need to clarify the relationship of the clauses which also resulted in the addition in the “Byzantine” text. Since the addition of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$  at 25a clarifies the relationship of the clauses, and was easily inserted from 25b, it must be secondary addition. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason for its loss, either intentionally or by accident.

## 14:25.113

$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  alone reads  $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$  for  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$ .<sup>84</sup> Zuntz<sup>85</sup> points to the same substitution at Eph. 1:18. This example, however, is found only in late witnesses<sup>86</sup> and not much help for assessing  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ . Of more significance is other evidence cited by Zuntz: the virtual interchange of  $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  and  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$  in the LXX and early Christian writers.<sup>87</sup> In fact, the similarity of the

---

<sup>84</sup>Gregory of Nyssa uses the phrase  $\tau\alpha$   $\kappa\rho\upsilon\pi\tau\alpha$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\delta\iota\omicron\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$  (*Contra Eunomium* 2,1,209), but in this context he is discussing the thinking hidden inside a person which is then able to be expressed in spoken words or written letters.

<sup>85</sup>Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, p. 19.

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

<sup>87</sup>Zuntz points to Clement of Rome (*To the Corinthians* 36,2) as an example of an early use of  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$  as equivalent to  $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ : “Through him the eyes of our heart are

two words is seen already in the NT at Eph. 4:18 and Heb. 8:10, the former especially referenced numerous times by Clement and Origen. This makes it difficult to sustain Royse's extension of Zuntz' argument, that the alteration in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  was made in order to remove a Semitism. It seems to have been simply a substitution with a virtually synonymous word, as this manuscript does also at 11:9 in replacing  $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha$  with  $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega$ .<sup>88</sup>

## 14:25.116

Whether  $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$  or  $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$  is the archetypal reading is of no consequence semantically, which may explain the common variation in the manuscripts between these verbs.

- Rom. 15:21  $\alpha\nu\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\eta$  ( $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta$   $\aleph$ ;  $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\eta$  F G) ]  $\alpha\pi\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\eta$  C;  $\alpha\nu\alpha\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$   $\Psi$  *est adnuntiam* VL 75 V; *est nuntiam* VL 61 77 78 89
- 1 Cor. 14:25  $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$  ]  $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$  F 90 635;  $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\omega\nu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$   $G^*$ ; *pronuntians* VL 61 77<sup>c</sup> 78 V Amst Amst(A); *adnuntians* VL 75 89; *annuntians* VL 77\*
- 2 Cor. 7:7  $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu$  ]  $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu$  489;  $\delta\iota\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu$  206 1758 *referens* VL 78 89 V *nuntians*; VL 61 75 77; *annuntians* Amst
- 1 Thes. 1:9  $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ ; *adnuntiant* VL 78 V; *renuntiant* VL 75 77 89

Because there is variation at every place where these verbs occur in Paul scarcely allows for any criteria on which to base a decision other than the vast numbers at each place.<sup>89</sup>

## 14:25.117

What can account for the shifting position of (ο)<sup>90</sup> θεος? The adverb  $\omicron\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$  is

---

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

<sup>88</sup>Though in later witnesses, cf. also the substitution of  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$  for  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta\nu$  at 14:26 by 323 1912.

<sup>89</sup>See the chapter on D F section for a discussion on the corrections in F G.

<sup>90</sup>Addition/omission of the article before a *nomen sacrum* is discussed at 1:17.55.



appropriately placed at the beginning of the clause (ℵ\* D\* F G 1739 0243 cf. Gal. 3:21), though some witnesses move θεος to the first position (K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0201 6 *pm*), likely for emphasis. However, the focus of this passage is not that God – as opposed to some other being – be recognized as present, but that he is truly present. ℘<sup>46</sup>, however, moves θεος to the end of the clause. Royse attributes this to loss by a leap (ONTΩC̄OΘC̄),<sup>91</sup> though it would seem that the presence of the *nomen sacrum* would make this unlikely. Influence from the LXX of Is. 45:14 (ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός ἐστιν) is unlikely, for although italicized as a direct citation in the NA<sup>27</sup> text, it is more accurately labeled an allusion. Paul adds οντως, uses a different prepositional phrase, and follows a different word order. None of these impact the manuscripts at 1 Cor. 14:25.

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

14:26.120 [discussed at 14:10.44]

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

---

<sup>91</sup>Royse, pp. 261-62.

The string of several short clauses ending in *εχει* was bound to produce problems for the scribes. A and several minuscules lose *διδαχην εχει*, a few minuscules (6 69 915 *pc*) lose *αποκαλυψιν εχει*, and K 0151 *pc* lose *[δι]ερμηνειαν εχει*. L and the “Byzantine” text read *γλωσσαν . . . αποκαλυψιν* where  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B D F G and the Latin tradition have the nouns *αποκαλυψιν . . . γλωσσαν*. Either reading may have been produced by the accidental omission of a clause, which was noticed and thereupon replaced after then next clause.

14:27.124 [discussed at 14:2.3]

14:28.132 [discussed at 12:10.48]

14:29.135; 14:29.137; 14:30.140

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

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

---

<sup>92</sup>Güting and Mealand, pp. 43-44.



interprets, while at 14:29 prophets speak and others evaluate. Güting and Mealand apparently accept *καί* at 14:27,<sup>93</sup> but for the identical structure at 14:29 they reject it.

It is more likely that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46*}$  has simply blundered here. Royse observes that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  alone omits *καί* eleven and *δε* ten times.<sup>94</sup> It is likely that the scribe of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  simply lost these conjunctions accidentally. This reconstruction is strengthened by noticing that both omissions were caught immediately by the original scribe, who then wrote both conjunctions supralinear. The same factors are not at work in the addition/omission of *δε* at 14:30, for neither does  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  add a correction nor is it a singular reading. *D\* F G* also lack the conjunction, though the Latin tradition (apart from VL 77) reads *et*. However, the structure described above requires the conjunction. We have already seen  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  *D\* F G* virtually alone, though at times also with the Latin tradition, lose conjunctions (11:20; 13:8).

#### 14:29.139

Either *διακρίνομαι* or *ανακρίνομαι* (*D\* F G*) are suitable in this context, both entailing the reaching of a judgment.<sup>95</sup> Influence from the Latin on *D F G* is unlikely here, given the fact that the Latin tradition (and the *D*-text in particular) uses several words to render the Greek verbs.<sup>96</sup> Instead, influence from *ανακρίνεται* at 14:24 may have led to the alteration.

---

<sup>93</sup>They do not note the omission by 104 *pc*.

<sup>94</sup>He fails to note, however, both singular readings of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46*}$  at 14:29.

<sup>95</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. *διακρίνομαι* (3) and *ανακρίνομαι* (1), esp. the parallels at 1 Cor. 10:25, 27.  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$  reads *ανακριναντα* for *διακριναντα* at Acts. 11:12.

<sup>96</sup>1 Cor. 10:25, 27 *interrogantes* = *ανακρίνοντες*; 11:29 *discernens* VL 75 77 89; *diiudicans* VL 78 V = *διακρίνων*; 11:31 *iudicaremur* = *διεκρίνομεν*; 14:24 *interrogatur* VL 75 77 89; *diiudicatur* VL 78 V = *ανακρίνεται*; 14:29 *diiudicent* VL 78 V; *examinent* VL 61 75 89; *deiudicent vel examinent* VL 77 = *ανακρινέτωσαν* *D\* F G* / *διακρινέτωσαν* *cett.*

14:30.140 [discussed at 14:29.135]

14:31.142

Ψ and, according to von Soden, 2004, add the negative particle οὐ at the beginning of the sentence. While occasional additions of the negative are scattered in the manuscripts, most frequently in questions (e.g., 9:11),<sup>97</sup> Ψ does not evidence any other unique readings in this section which would indicate discomfort with the argument, and nothing in the near context would give rise to the addition. It appears to be a random addition, possibly from the common use of οὐ with δύναμαι.<sup>98</sup>

14:31.143 [discussed in the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses]

14:32.145 [further discussed at 14:12.53 and in the chapter on D F G]

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

---

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

<sup>98</sup>Οὐ δυνασθε (10:21) and οὐ δυναται (12:21) are too distant to have directly caused the addition.



omission of the whole word. Other corruptions caused by corrections that affected 6 424 1739 have already been pointed out (e.g., 7:34; 12:4; 12:15; further discussed in the chapter on the “Alexandrian” witnesses).

14:33.146

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

---

<sup>99</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, pp. 696-97; Thiselton, pp. 1145-46.

<sup>100</sup>This textual problem is barely noticed in the commentaries. Schrage (III, p. 457 n. 537) notes the variant, but does not defend the longer reading. His reference to K. Maly, *Mündige Gemeinde. Untersuchungen zur pastoralen Führung des Apostels Paulus im 1. Korintherbrief* (Munich: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), p. 221 hardly settles the question, for while he notes the variant (although citing the evidence in Ambrosiaster incorrectly) his argument for its Pauline nature is that it conforms to the phrase “God of peace” in the

The reading in question is the presence or absence of (ο) θεος<sup>101</sup> at 33a. Harnack, followed by Zuntz, drew attention to the citation of this passage by Tertullian (though both attribute it to Marcion) and Ambrosiaster,<sup>102</sup> whose text they also incorrectly reconstruct. Nevertheless, in spite of these errors, Tertullian and Ambrosiaster can be cited as providing evidence for a textual tradition that lacked (ο) θεος.

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

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

Hence, this is not, as Harnack claimed, Marcion's text.<sup>103</sup> Nevertheless, as evidence for Tertullian's text it is no less significant. None of the passages cited here are mere allusions. This is true especially of his text of 1 Cor. 14:32-3: *et spiritus prophetarum prophetis erunt*

---

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

<sup>101</sup>The addition/omission of the article is discussed at 1:17.55.

<sup>102</sup>Adolf von Harnack, "Über I. Kor. 14,32ff. Und Röm. 16,25ff. Nach der ältesten Überlieferung und der Marcionitischen Bibel," in *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, pp. 180-90. Zuntz, p. 231 simply approves Harnack's discussion.

<sup>103</sup>The passage is rightly ignored by Schmid in *Marcion und sein Apostolos*. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul* cites this passage as evidence of Marcion's text, even indicating (by symbols) that it is the correct text (p. 164), but he offers no discussion of the passage.



*subditi non enim eversionis sunt sed pacis*, which matches the presumed Greek base text precisely, down to the word order and use of particles.<sup>104</sup> The form of the text is not mere adaptation to Tertullian's argument, but a verbatim application of a Pauline text directly to Marcion, as is also Gal. 1:8 and even more clearly 1 Cor. 15:11. Had θεός been present in his text, Tertullian could not have applied 14:33a to Marcion, for the passage would be making a point about the nature of God, not, as Tertullian reads it, about correct speech in the congregations.

Harnack also cites Ambrosiaster's commentary as preserving evidence of a text that did not read (ο) θεός. Because he (and Zuntz) had access only to an inaccurate pre-critical edition, they cite his reading as *auctor* where most NT witnesses have *deus* / θεός.<sup>105</sup> No manuscript of the commentary reads *auctor*, instead *res* is found at that place.<sup>106</sup>

Ambrosiaster's lemma text is therefore: *non est enim dissensiones res, sed pacis*. His commentary confirms that "God" is not the subject of the sentence:

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

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

---

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

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

<sup>106</sup>Amst(A,T), as they frequently do, adapt to the Vulgate by replacing *res* with *deus*.

as an addition to a text that did not read *deus* / *θεος*, a reading known to exist from Tertullian.<sup>107</sup> Ambrosiaster's text simply supplies the lack of the predicate for the verb *est*. Tertullian and Ambrosiaster therefore supply evidence of a text of 14:33 that lacked *ο θεος*.

Can this reading, however, be archetypal? The text with *θεος* has difficulties. First, because *ακαταστασιας* and *ειρηνης* are anarthrous it is difficult to construe them with *ο θεος*.<sup>108</sup> This difficulty is removed if *θεος* is read (Harnack, of course, does not have access to  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and generally mistrusts D F G).<sup>109</sup> Harnack's argument therefore supports either regarding *ο θεος* as secondary or reading *θεος* without the article. Second, Zuntz argues that the transposition *ο θεος ακαταστασιας* in A 218 is evidence for the interpolation of *ο θεος*. However, A creates several singular readings involving word order.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, the shift in position of *ο θεος* places the genitive after the nominative. This sequence is more common in Paul and places *ακαταστασιας* and *ειρηνης* into parallel position. It is therefore more likely that A has altered the word order than that it preserves otherwise lost evidence of the insertion.

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

---

<sup>107</sup>In the apparatus of his critical edition, Tischendorf also connected Ambrosiaster's *res* with Tertullian's text of 14:33.

<sup>108</sup>Harnack, "Über I. Kor. 14,32ff," p. 182, n. 6. Compare, however, 2 Thess. 3:3 *πιστος δε εστιν ο κυριος (εστιν ο θεος A D<sup>\*c</sup>; ο θεος F G)*.

<sup>109</sup>Cf. 2 Cor. 1:3 *θεος πάσης παρακλήσεως*. With the article: Rom. 15:5 *ο δε θεος της υπομονης και της παρακλήσεως*; 15:13 *ο δε θεος της ελπίδος*; 15:33 *ο δε θεος της ειρήνης*; 2 Cor. 13:1 *ο θεος της αγάπης και ειρήνης*.

<sup>110</sup>E.g., 12:24 *συνεκρασαν ο θεος*; 14:5 *υμας παντας*; Rom. 16:20 *εν ταχει υπο τους ποδας υμων*.



text of 1 Corinthians in at least two and perhaps three other passages.<sup>111</sup> At 8:3 we observed  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and Clement preserving the shorter text, and at 10:5 Marcion and again Clement do so. The conjecture of an insertion of ο θεος at 14:25 is discussed above. 14:33 lends further support to the conclusions reached in those places. In addition, the common phrase “God of peace” in the Pauline benedictions (Rom. 15:33; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9; 1 Thes. 5:23) may have played a role in suggesting the noun which would best fill the gap – note that at 2 Thes. 3:16 κυριος της ειρηνης is replaced in F G L with the stereotypical θεος της ειρηνης.

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

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

Πνευματα is now the subject of the verb εστιν,<sup>112</sup> so it is it is the prophets who are not to be “of disorder,” not God. This is precisely how Tertullian understood the passage, so that he could apply the passage his disorderly prophet, Marcion. While this suits the context well, it is difficult to imagine a scribe deleting θεος in order to smooth the text. The addition of θεος has caused great difficulty in deciding whether to read 14:33b with the first part of the verse or with the *mulier taceat*.<sup>113</sup> The ambiguity of the connection of “as in all the churches of the

---

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

<sup>112</sup>The variation between πνευμα and πνευματα ισ discussed at 14:32.145.

<sup>113</sup>In addition to the commentaries, see G. Clarke, “As in All the Churches of the Saints (1 Corinthians 14.33,” *Bible Translator* 52 (2001), pp. 144-47, who concludes that it should be read with 33a. See also the discussion below of the contextual suitability of 14:34-35.

saints” has led to its being connected to 14:34-35 instead of 14:33a. This connection between a proscription on women’s activity and the practice of “all the churches” may have contributed to the discomfort which led some witnesses to move 14:34-35 to the end of chapter 14 (see below).

14:34.149

The most debated textual problem in 1 Corinthians, and in recent times perhaps in the entire NT, is the authenticity of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Virtually every matter is under dispute, including the external evidence itself, the extent of the potentially secondary text, and what criteria should be used in evaluating the evidence. G. Fitzer observes that the evaluation of this passage requires the use of several methods: “Textkritik, Literarkritik, historische Kritik und theologische Kritik.”<sup>114</sup> Because of the complex nature of the problem and the amount of secondary literature, a more extensive discussion is required here than that provided for other problems in 1 Corinthians. An outline is provided to guide the reader:

## I. The Situation in the Manuscripts

- A. Codex Fuldensis
- B. Manuscript 88
- C. Codex Vaticanus
- D. Patristic Evidence

## II. The Extent of the Proposed Interpolation

## III. Internal Evidence

- A. Contextual Evidence
- B. Linguistic Evidence
- C. Ideational Evidence
- D. Situational Evidence

---

<sup>114</sup>G. Fitzer, “*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde.*” *Über den unpaulinischen Charakter der mulier-taceat-Verse in 1. Korinther 14*, *Theologische Existenz Heute* 100 (Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1963), p. 5.



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

#### IV. The “Marginal Gloss” Theory

#### V. Lengthy Insertions in the *Corpus Paulinum*

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

The arguments for the secondary nature of the *mulier taceat* (1 Cor. 14:34-35) are founded on different pieces of evidence. For example, a prominent feature in G. Fee’s proposal that this passage is a secondary gloss is the argument that “displacements of this kind do not occur anywhere else in the NT” and that “no *adequate* reason can be found for such a displacement were these words originally in the text after 14:33.”<sup>115</sup> On the other hand, those who argue that numerous interpolations have been introduced into the Pauline letters, such as W. Walker, do not require direct text-critical evidence in order to view the passage as a later addition.<sup>116</sup> Neither is the problem of the displacement a feature of P. Payne’s argument, who puts forth evidence of manuscripts that do not have the passage at all. Nevertheless, the argumentation overlaps. Both Fee and Payne, for example, use “internal evidence” arguments in ways that resemble those who discuss the passage alongside other potential interpolations. Moreover, those who focus on the interpolations in the epistles typically mention the problem presented by the manuscripts. But since these are separate arguments, we will consider, first, the manuscript evidence itself, primarily in interaction with Payne; next, the “internal evidence”; and finally, in view of Fee’s arguments, the

---

<sup>115</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 700.

<sup>116</sup>W. Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, JSNTSS 213 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) and “Interpolations in the Pauline Letters,” in *The Pauline Canon*, ed. S. E. Porter, Pauline Studies 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 189-235. There is significant overlap in the discussion of this passage between the monograph and the essay.

problem of the “displacement.”

### *I. The Situation in the Manuscripts*

The manuscripts provide direct evidence of two readings: Either 1 Cor. 14:34-35 appears after 14:33 or it appears after 14:40. *Text und Textwert*, an attempt to provide a basic analysis of every known Greek NT manuscript, uses this as one of its *Teststellen*; it cites only D F G 88\* 915 for the placement of 34-35 after v. 40.<sup>117</sup> While only a small number of Greek witnesses attest this reading, it is found in virtually the entire non-Vulgate Latin tradition: VL 61<sup>118</sup> 75 77 78 89 F<sup>c</sup> R Ambrosiaster and Sedulius Scottus. This study has already argued that D F G and the Latin tradition (with and without the Vulgate) often preserve the archetypal reading without the support of the manuscripts which are typically regarded as “better.”<sup>119</sup> Therefore, the placement of the passage after 14:40 should be not dismissed too quickly as secondary, and an explanation must be given which would account for this early form of the text.<sup>120</sup>

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

---

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

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

<sup>119</sup>See especially the chapter on D F G.

<sup>120</sup>Cf. Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 274.



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

### *I.A. Codex Fuldensis*

Codex Fuldensis (VL F) is a sixth century Latin manuscript that was corrected by Victor, Bishop of Capua.<sup>121</sup> It contains numerous corrections, one of which is the focus of Payne's analysis. This manuscript matches the Vulgate text in placing 1 Cor. 14:34-35 between 14:33 and 14:36, and vv. 36-40 are followed by 15:1 as is typical (fol. 246v).<sup>122</sup> However, at the end of 14:33 the symbol  $\overline{hd}$  is written, and at the foot of the leaf is written again 14:36-40, which concludes with the symbol  $\overline{hs}$ .<sup>123</sup> Payne lists three arguments for the conclusion that this marginal note intends to indicate awareness of manuscripts that did not have the *mulier taceat*. First, "it would not make sense that Victor intended to indicate that

---

<sup>121</sup>Description and transcription in E. Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis* (Marburg and Leipzig: Elwert, 1868).

<sup>122</sup>A photo of this page is provided on p. 261 of P. Payne, "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Codex Vaticanus, and 1 Cor. 14:34-35," *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995), pp. 240-62.

<sup>123</sup>Payne ("Fuldensis," pp. 241-2) notes that Metzger's *Textual Commentary* had incorrectly described which verses were in the margin. This had been correctly described in Ranke's edition, p. 485 (though his opinion as to the motivation for the correction is questionable). Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate simply reproduces Ranke's note for this passage, though inexplicably at 14:29. More recently, A. C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets. A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), p. 285 had already noted the error in Metzger and correctly described the situation in the manuscript. Payne does not note Wire's discussion.

14:36-40 should be read both before and after vv. 34-35;” second, no other witness reads 14:34-35 both after 14:33 and after 14:40; and third, *ordine* replaces *ordinem* (otherwise the text and margin are identical), a further example of “the nearly universal pattern in these corrections to bring Fuldensis into conformity with the standard Vulgate text.”<sup>124</sup> He then goes on to argue that the marginal text (14:36-40) is intended to *replace* all of 14:34-40, though this contradicts his previous observation that the corrections bring the text into conformity with the standard Vulgate text. He nevertheless concludes: “It is safe, therefore, to assume that Victor had what he believed to be sufficient manuscript evidence” for “removing” 14:34-35 from his text. Payne maintains his interpretation,<sup>125</sup> even after a response<sup>126</sup> that argued a different evaluation of the manuscript. None of Payne’s arguments attempt to decipher the  $\overline{hd}$  and  $\overline{hs}$  symbols themselves.

Shortly after Payne’s article appeared, Niccum responded to his interpretation of both Codex Fuldensis and Codex Vaticanus. With regard to Fuldensis, Niccum argued that the correction intended to indicate a knowledge of manuscripts that read 14:34-35 after 14:40.<sup>127</sup> This is based on the fact that “90% of the corrections in Fuldensis conform its text to that of

---

<sup>124</sup>Payne, “Fuldensis,” pp. 242-43.

<sup>125</sup>P. Payne, “The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Response to J. Edward Miller,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (2004), pp. 105-111 (Fuldensis discussed on p. 111).

<sup>126</sup>C. Niccum, “The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997), pp. 242-55.

<sup>127</sup>According to Niccum (“The Voice of the Manuscripts,” p. 246): “Victor . . . began to write the comparison reading at the point he realized the two texts differed, i.e., immediately following v. 33. He copied vv. 36-40 in the margin. When he then reached v. 34 in the comparison text [which in that text is after v. 40], he stopped since it [v.34] was already present.”



Reginensis" (R).<sup>128</sup> R is the only manuscript with a Vulgate text-form that reads 14:34-35 after 14:40.<sup>129</sup> Thus, where Payne argues based on what Victor might have or should have done, Niccum locates a specific textual source for the correction, one which did not omit the verses but read them after 14:40.

In addition, the meaning of the  $\overline{hd}$  and  $\overline{hs}$  symbols must be considered. There are seven  $\overline{hd}$  notations in Fuldensis:<sup>130</sup> One is in the *Evangelium* (the missing text is all of Matt. 20:10, in the section numbered CX) and another at 1 Pet. 3:14 (*propter . . . conturbemini*). The others are in the Pauline epistles, and, as Niccum indicated, the marginal text is indeed closely connected to Codex Reginensis.<sup>131</sup> The supplied text of 14:36-40 in F<sup>mg</sup> corresponds in even minor details to the text of R: The suspension of *itaque* (as *itaq:*) is identical in both,<sup>132</sup> and the medial points (likely marking sense-lines) correspond in all but one case (F<sup>mg</sup> lacks one break). Furthermore, in every example of the corrections using  $\overline{hd}$  and  $\overline{hs}$ , the former symbol marks a place where text is missing and the latter supplies the missing text in

---

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

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

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

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

<sup>132</sup>The same form of the suspension of *itaque* at 14:34 is found in VL 61, another Latin witness that reads 14:34-35 after v. 40.

the margin. The symbols never, as Payne proposes, indicate replacements for text. This corresponds to the meaning of the symbols themselves. Ranke had already identified these as abbreviations for *hic deest* (“here it is absent”) and *hoc supple* (“supply this”).<sup>133</sup> With this evidence, the situation in the manuscript is clear. The text in the margin is to be supplied where the  $\overline{hd}$  symbol stands in the text, so that 14:36-40 is to be understood as standing before 14:34-35 (as well as after). This, of course, creates an otherwise unattested form of the text. However, given that the textual basis from which these marginal notes are supplied has been identified (an ancestor of Codex Reginensis), its purpose is to match a manuscript that had 14:34-35 after 14:40.<sup>134</sup> Therefore, the marginal correction in Codex Fuldensis cannot be cited as evidence for a textual tradition that omits 1 Cor. 14:34-35.<sup>135</sup>

### *I.B. Manuscript 88*

Payne has also argued that 88, a twelfth-century minuscule, provides “[e]vidence for a text without 1 Cor. 14:34-35.”<sup>136</sup> As in the case of Codex Fuldensis, the interpretation of a correction is at issue. Payne acknowledges that 14:34-35 stand after 14:40 in this manuscript and sees the correction as indicating that the verses are to be read after v. 33. He goes on to

---

<sup>133</sup>Ranke (*Codex Fuldensis*, p. 472, at the first occurrence of the  $\overline{hd}$  and  $\overline{hs}$  symbols in the *commentarius diplomaticus*) labels the  $\overline{hs}$  symbol as “*hic supple*,” but given that the symbol stands in the margin the neuter accusative form *hoc* must be intended. This identification for these symbols is given in Adriano Capelli, *Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*, Quinta edizione (Milan: Hoepli, 1954), pp. 158 and 165.

<sup>134</sup>Also Niccum, “The Voice of the Manuscripts,” pp. 246-7.

<sup>135</sup>E. J. Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), pp. 14-20 accepts most of Payne’s conclusions regarding the umlauts in Codex Vaticanus but does not mention Payne’s work on Codex Fuldensis. It is therefore not clear whether Epp accepts Payne’s reconstruction of the witness of this manuscript.

<sup>136</sup>P. Payne, “MS. 88 as Evidence for a Text Without 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998), pp. 152-58. He repeats his conclusion in “Response to Miller,” pp. 105-112 (his earlier essay cited on p. 111).



argue that this is nonetheless evidence that 88 had access to a manuscript that did not have 14:34-35. He proceeds by rejecting alternative explanations, first ruling out, rightly in my opinion, the possibility that the scribe of 88 either intentionally or unintentionally moved the verses. He then also rules out, incorrectly (as we shall demonstrate), that the exemplar of 88 is derived from a manuscript that had vv. 34-35 after v. 40. He does so for two reasons. First, because 88 does not have a “Western” text; second, because a “Western” reading could not have been preserved in a “non-Western” manuscript.<sup>137</sup> He therefore sees himself with only one option: to conclude that 88 is derived “from a non-Western manuscript without vv. 34-35.” The scenario he adopts to explain the corrections in 88 is that its exemplar did not have vv. 34-35 at all. Before the scribe realized the problem, he had already written v. 36. So he continued writing through the end of v. 40, the next logical break. The scribe then left a large gap between words in order to indicate that a distinct unit was being added, placed a double slash in the text, then wrote vv. 34-35 in the text. This scenario is entirely dependent on two assumptions: 1) “There is no evidence from any other manuscript that a non-Western Greek manuscript ever existed with vv. 34-35 after v. 40.”<sup>138</sup> 2) There is evidence of manuscripts that do not read vv. 34-35 at all, and that 88 had access to them. We shall demonstrate that both assumptions are incorrect.

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

---

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

<sup>138</sup>Payne, “MS. 88,” pp. 155; this assumption is so essential to his argument that it is similarly stated on pp. 154 and 156.

had already noticed, apparently for the first time, that 915 also reads 14:34-35 after 14:40.<sup>139</sup> This volume appeared in 1991, in sufficient time for Payne's work on 88 (1998) to have taken it into account. He fails to do so, and so fails to recognize the close connection between 88 and 915. 915 evidences no discomfort with the passage – no corrections, spaces, or notations of any kind. It places a lectionary αρχη before v. 33 and a τέλος after v. 35 (immediately before 15:1), which indicates that these verses (14:33-40 and 34-35) are to be understood as a single unit. This in itself falsifies a key assumption in Payne's argument, that no "non-Western" manuscript reads 14:34-35 after 14:40. Even more, however, 88 and 915 are from the same textual tradition. This relationship is discussed more fully in the chapter on the "Byzantine" manuscripts, but at this place it is sufficient to note that they not only share numerous unique readings, they also share similar Euthalian material and, most relevant to the problem at 14:34-35, a series of alternative readings in the margins. However, 915, the more recent of the two, cannot be a copy of 88, for neither their texts nor all of their marginal notes and corrections are identical. 88, for example, makes corrections that 915 does not, indicating a more careful attention to wording of the text *per se*.

Additional evidence of the common ancestry of 88 and 915 is the use of medial points, a vestige of the sense-line divisions that were part of the Euthalian edition.<sup>140</sup> At 1

---

<sup>139</sup>The location and basic content of 915 had previously been identified: C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1909), p. 283 (his 231); von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, p. 231; K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 134, 162. Only von Soden gives analysis of the content of 915, with reference to 88 (pp. 677-8, discussed below). It is puzzling that even discussions of this passage that postdate the *Text und Textwert* volume on 1 Corinthians fail to notice that 88 and 915 agree here, e.g., P. Payne, "Response to Miller," p. 111; D. W. Odell-Scott, "Editorial Dilemma: The Interpolation of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and the Western Manuscripts of D, G, and 88," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 30 (2000), pp. 68-74.

<sup>140</sup>von Soden, p. 677. Payne ("MS. 88," p. 152 n. 2) incorrectly describes these "dots" as "marking punctuation." He finds significance in the fact that the "dot" marking the end of 14:35 is the "largest red spot on the page." Such large points are in evidence, however,



Cor. 14:34-35 these sense-line divisions are nearly identical. The text of 915 is laid out as follows:

| Θω · αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν · || Οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν · ἀλλὰ ὑπότάσ | σεσθαι · καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει · εἰ δέ τινα μαθεῖν θέ | λουσιν · ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν · | αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἔστιν γυναιξὶν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις λαλεῖν · ε/τ | Γνωρίζω . . .

88 has the identical Euthalian divisions, with an additional point placed before σιγάτωσαν.<sup>141</sup>

Textually, the two witnesses are also very similar – not identical – as is the case throughout 1 Corinthians (see discussion in chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses). The only difference in this passage is at 14:35, where 88 reads ἐκκλησια for ἐκκλησiais (D F G L 056 0142 915). Their shared textual base is seen, however, in the reading εἰ δε τινα at the beginning of the verse, which is otherwise attested only by 823 1243 2815. Therefore, not only is there at least one other extant “non-Western” manuscript that reads 14:34-35 after 14:40, that manuscript is from the same tradition as 88 and shows what the predecessor of 88 read – not an omission of 14:34-35, as Payne argues – but a reading already known in the tradition.

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

88 goes beyond 915, however, in making additional corrections that are not found in 915.<sup>142</sup>

This means that the predecessors of 88 915 placed the alternative readings which they

---

elsewhere in the ms., particularly in connection with the beginning and end of lectionary units.

<sup>141</sup>915's use of enlarged capital letters extended into the left margin to indicate paragraphing is not employed anywhere in 88; 915's unusual practice of capitalizing the initial letter of each page accounts for the large omicron of οὐ (14:34).

<sup>142</sup>These are discussed in the chapter on the “Byzantine” witnesses.

encountered in their margins rather than altering the text. This helps to explain how the unusual position of 14:34-35 could have been retained in these witnesses. The textual basis of 88 915 is to be found in much older traditions.<sup>143</sup> As their predecessors were copied, comparison was made to other witnesses. However, rather than consistently altering the text itself, some alternative readings were noted in the margins. By the twelfth century, the texts were adapted to the overwhelming force of the “Byzantine” text, yet the position of 14:34-35 after 14:40 escaped correction. Finally, the corrector of 88 brought 14:34-35 into the “correct” position, but 915 retains their shared ancestor’s placement of the passage.

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

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

---

<sup>143</sup>Which, as discussed above, are not “Western,” since they do not show patterns of readings that identify them specifically with D F G or the Latin or Syriac traditions.



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

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

---

<sup>144</sup>Payne, "MS. 88," p. 155.

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

<sup>146</sup>This accounts for the large gap between vv. 40 and 34, to which Payne draws attention ("MS. 88," p. 152).

could not have done<sup>147</sup> rather than on the specific evidence of the scribal activity in 88 and in the tradition that preceded it, made clear now by its sister 915. 88\* reads 1 Cor. 14:34-35 after v. 40, and the corrector moves them to after v. 33. This is the interpretation of the scribe's activity shown by every editor who has taken notice of the manuscript, from Tischendorf and von Soden to the recent editions of NA<sup>27</sup> and the *Text und Textwert* material.<sup>148</sup> A close analysis of 88 shows that they were correct, and Payne incorrect, on its witness to the text of 1 Cor. 14.<sup>149</sup>

### *I.C. Codex Vaticanus*

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

---

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

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

<sup>149</sup>Epp (*Junia*, p. 19) tepidly states only that "a case has been made" concerning Payne's conclusions on 88.

<sup>150</sup>P. Payne and P. Canart, "The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus," *Novum Testamentum* 42 (2000), pp. 105-13; citation on p. 113.



This discussion will focus only what these “umlauts” and other marks in Vaticanus, such as “bars,” tell us about the textual problem in 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Indeed, this passage has been the primary focus of Payne’s work, as is clear from the subtitles of his (and his respondents’) articles.

The relationship between the “umlauts” and the “bars” has not always been clearly defined (or perhaps described). Initially, Payne suggested that the two may function independently, with the bars perhaps reflecting “section breaks,” though he insisted that at least some function together to indicate knowledge of alternative readings. Niccum responded by completely distinguishing the umlauts from the bars. Based on a discussion of their development and use by E. M. Thompson,<sup>151</sup> Niccum argues that the bars merely represent the beginning of a παράγραφος.<sup>152</sup> Miller also attempted to demonstrate that the “bar” and the “bar and gap” function as a kind of textual division, at the same time attempting to categorize these divisions.<sup>153</sup> Unfortunately, Miller’s analysis relies heavily on comparison to paragraphing and textual divisions in modern editions, though he does note similarity between the divisions in Codex Alexandrinus and the bars in Codex Vaticanus in one passage. Finally, Payne responded to Miller’s conclusions regarding the relationship between the umlauts and bars. There Payne again acknowledges that “[a] fair number of the

---

<sup>151</sup>E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford: University Press, 1912), pp. 58-59.

<sup>152</sup>“The Voice of the Manuscripts,” pp. 244-5.

<sup>153</sup>J. E. Miller, “Scribal Sigla for Variant Readings in Vaticanus, With a Response to Philip Payne’s Conclusions in ‘Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants, in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor. 14.34-35” M.Th Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary (2000), pp. 27-40. See also his article “Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Cor. 14.34-35,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2003), pp. 217-36; esp. pp. 219-24.

bars following umlauts are probably just marking some kind of break in the text.”<sup>154</sup>

Nevertheless, Payne believes that at least some bar-umlaut combination may mark “interpolations,” and in particular that this is the function of the bar-umlaut between 1 Cor. 14:33 and 34.<sup>155</sup>

In order to determine whether or not the bars in Vaticanus mark παράγραφος divisions, I compared them with the paragraph divisions in two other manuscripts. Alexandrinus was selected because Miller had already noticed one series of breaks that are similar to the bars in Vaticanus; Sinaiticus was also selected because it may have been produced in the same scriptorium as Vaticanus.<sup>156</sup> As noted above, Thompson had described the παράγραφοι. N, A, and B each correspond to one of the systems of marking the beginning of a paragraph. The earliest form was a “short dividing stroke,” though other symbols were used as well. Eventually, the space left at the end of the preceding paragraph was filled in with the first words of the next paragraph. The sample specimen provided by Thompson (p. 59, top) matches those found in B precisely. Subsequent developments were “to draw back the first letter of the first full line of the new paragraph, and leave it slightly

---

<sup>154</sup>Payne, “Response to Miller,” p. 107.

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

<sup>156</sup>T. C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999), pp. 583-629. He concludes, based on shared “scribal tradition” and the colophons, that “both manuscripts are the work of the same scriptorium, and—which is just as important—were written at approximately the same time” (p. 603).



projecting into the margin, and lastly to enlarge it.” The former is often found in  $\aleph$ <sup>157</sup> (though usually the new paragraph begins on a new line); the latter precisely describes that of A. There appears to be little question that B (and  $\aleph$  A) are using a well-established system of text-divisions.

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

---

<sup>157</sup>There may be at least one example of a bar marking a paragraph in  $\aleph$ . At 1 Cor. 15:22, οὕτως και does not extend into the left margin. However, the preceding line ends with a space of two letters before the end of the column, and a line is placed above the omicron of οὕτως.

<sup>158</sup>They are located at 1 Cor. 1:9; 10:14, 19; and 15:21.

<sup>159</sup>An additional four agreements between  $\aleph$  and B could not be checked in A due to damage at the top inside corner of the manuscript.

<sup>160</sup>They may also share a break at 16:21, but this place in B has been obscured by a library stamp.

the bars may stem from the work of a later scribe.<sup>161</sup>

To this point we have confirmed only that the “bars” in Vaticanus are παράγραφος marks. Payne argues in addition that at least some “bar-umlaut” combinations are intended to mark the awareness of textual variation, specifically interpolations. He notes three in particular (Luke 14:25, John 7:53ff., and 1 Cor. 14:34-35) then cautiously concludes, “Whether this bar is intended by its scribe to mark the interface between the text and the interpolation, it has the effect of underlining the interface between the text of Vaticanus and the interpolation or the variant block of text.”<sup>162</sup> One might point out, however, that if the bar is not *intended* by the scribe to mark a textual variation, either alone or in combination with an umlaut, it has no significance (apart from the umlaut) for marking an alternative text. Comparison with  $\aleph$  and A is again instructive. At Luke 14:25 both  $\aleph$  and A have a paragraph, which the bar in B likely indicates. The umlauts on the previous lines in B may well mark the lengthy insertion found in some manuscripts, but the “bar” likely has a different function. Unfortunately, the same comparison cannot be made for John 7:53. A lacks John 6:50-8:52, and  $\aleph$  fails to mark any paragraphs in that column – not until halfway through the next column is a paragraph again marked (8:20). There is a space and a medial point before  $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$  (8:12), similar to one at 7:39 (where B has a bar). However, for whatever reason (perhaps awareness of the textual problem?), because  $\aleph$  does not mark any paragraphs, either here or nearby, comparison to the bar in B at that place cannot be made. Payne’s final example, the bar above the line that begins 1 Cor. 14:34, is matched by paragraph marks in both  $\aleph$  and A.

---

<sup>161</sup>While Payne and P. Canart (“The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus”) have demonstrated that the umlauts in B are written in the same ink as that used by the original hand, they have not decisively demonstrated that the bars are also linked to the original hand.

<sup>162</sup>Payne, “Response to Miller,” p. 108.



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

Turning to the "umlauts" at these three places, it is significant that in each case it does not stand on the line that begins the questionable text, but on the preceding line. For example, the umlaut is actually on the last line of John 7:52, not the line where the disputed John 7:53 would begin. What variant this marks is open to interpretation.<sup>163</sup> The "bar" is also on the line above the proposed interpolations at Luke 14:24 and 1 Cor. 14:33. Once the bar is disassociated from the umlaut, the variant being marked is more likely to be associated with the line on which umlaut stands rather than the line following. At 1 Cor. 14:33 the umlaut is placed to the left of the line that concludes the verse, which is also marked with a medial point. The next line begins with αἱ γυναῖκες (14:34), and, as noted above, a "bar" is placed above the line. A significant difference of interpretation of this umlaut exists between J. Miller and P. Payne. Miller holds that the umlaut functions independent of the bar, and because the umlaut stands on the line that ends v. 33 it is likely unconnected with the problem of 14:34-35. He suggests that it marks the insertion of διδασκω (F G pc VL 61 77 78 Vg<sup>mss</sup> Amst sy<sup>p</sup>), which would be placed immediately at the end of v. 33 in B. Payne, on the other hand, argues that the bar-umlaut functions to mark interpolations (a conclusion rejected above), and that "by far the most significant variant at this point is the disputed 14.34-35." Furthermore, he disputes Miller's assertion that "Since there remains enough space at the end of the line [of 1 Cor. 14:33] to begin another word, especially a long word,

---

<sup>163</sup>Payne sees it as marking the insertion of the *Pericope de adultera*, Miller as marking the reading εἰρηγερται for εἰρηρεται (Payne, "Response to Miller," p. 110).

the marginal notation [umlaut] is provided next to this line.”<sup>164</sup>

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

---

<sup>164</sup>Payne, “Response to Miller,” p. 110, citing Miller, “Observations,” p. 235. Payne’s consistent use of “interpolation” to describe places where other manuscripts have text that is not present in B unwarrantedly prejudices the text-critical decision.

<sup>165</sup>The umlauts occasionally indicate knowledge of less well-attested readings, including some now known only from the versions, most prominently at 1 Cor. 6:20 and 11:10.



“so minor that neither is listed in the NA<sup>27</sup>”<sup>166</sup> However, what is significant variant to one modern editor may not be the same as what was considered significant by a fourth-century scribe. Even a cursory review of the umlauts reveals that some relatively “unimportant” variants must have been marked, otherwise the thesis that the umlauts mark known variations would be called into question.<sup>167</sup>

A complete description of the “umlauts” in Vaticanus is still lacking.<sup>168</sup>

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

### *I.D. Patristic Evidence*

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

---

<sup>166</sup>Payne, “Response to Miller,” p. 110.

<sup>167</sup>To cite only one example, at 1 Cor. 15:48-49 (1475c l.30) an umlaut stands next to a line where the only known variants are οι ουρανοι (P<sup>46</sup> alone omits οι; D\* F G) for οι επουρανοι of B and the rest of the tradition; NA<sup>27</sup> takes no notice. The omission of και in G\* and its substitution with αρα in F G<sup>c</sup> is a Latinism unique to these witnesses; the reading did not exist when Codex Vaticanus was written.

<sup>168</sup>Miller’s M.Th thesis (“Scribal Sigla for Variant Readings in Vaticanus”) remains the most thorough study.

second century, when the proposed marginal gloss or interpolation would have taken place, is notoriously fragmentary. Nevertheless, Payne claims that there is evidence in the earliest fathers that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 was not present in some manuscripts.

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

Payne's second cited passage likewise fails to support his argument that Clement did not know 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Drawing from the conclusion of *Stromateis* 4,19 (at 124,1), Payne highlights Clement's positive view of women. Indeed, Clement does argue in 4,19 that women are equally capable of "perfection" (τελειότητος 4,19,118,1) as are men, citing numerous women from Greek literature as examples (Lysidica, Philotera, the daughters of Diodorus, etc.). But, as at *Paedagogus* 3,11,79,3-4, Clement is not here discussing appropriate behavior in worship. Instead, he encourages education, excellence, righteousness,



sobriety, etc. In spite of this, immediately before this citation given by Payne, Clement still reflects something of the cultural background that lies behind the *mulier taceat*. Payne also contrasts Tertullian's subordination of women (*De baptismo* 15,17) with Clement, but Clement himself later in 4.19 writes:

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

While Clement does not cite 1 Cor. 14:34-35, the reason may be that the topics he addresses and his style of argumentation did not make its use necessary for his purposes. Furthermore, his description of the relationship between husband and wife is not as sharply contrasted with 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and Tertullian as Payne implies. Given that it is at least as likely that Clement knew 14:34-35 but did not cite it than that his text of 1 Corinthians lacked the passage, Payne's *argumentum ex silentio*<sup>169</sup> does not demonstrate that Clement can be cited as evidence of manuscripts of 1 Corinthians that lacked 14:34-35.<sup>170</sup>

---

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

<sup>170</sup>The other ancient writers listed by Payne ("Codex Fuldensis," p. 247) as not having cited 1 Cor. 14:34-35 (the writings of the "Apostolic Fathers," Irenaeus, Tatian, Caius, Hippolytus) may all be explained on similar grounds: Some rarely cite Paul at all, others are addressing apologetic issues and not internal matters of worship practice, and the writings of all are a mere fragment of what they are known to have produced. An argument from silence based on the evidence of these writers is no more decisive than one based on Clement. Furthermore, there appear to be problems with Payne's evidence. He claims that Athenagoras cites 1 Cor. 14:32 and 14:37 (without providing a reference) but not 14:34-35. I was not able to verify either citation; in *Legatio* Athenagoras cites 1 Cor. 6:7 (1,4) and 15:32 (12,3) and in *De resurrectione* 15:32 (19,3) and 15:53 (3,2; 18,5). See the indices of W. Schoedel,

On the other hand, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is known and cited explicitly by several early fathers. The earliest firm evidence is Marcion, whose knowledge of the text is shown by Epiphanius (*Panarion* 42,11,8 42,12,3; cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,8,11), though whether he read the passage after 14:33 or after 14:40 cannot be determined.<sup>171</sup> Tertullian himself also uses the passage.<sup>172</sup> In the third century<sup>173</sup> it is found in Cyprian,<sup>174</sup> and most likely Origen.<sup>175</sup> Though somewhat later, the passage is also cited in the Armenian translation of Ephraem's commentary,<sup>176</sup> apparently the only Syriac father to cite the passage.<sup>177</sup>

---

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

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

<sup>172</sup>*De baptismo* 17,5; *De virginibus velandis* 9,1 and perhaps 3,2.

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

<sup>174</sup>*Ad Quirinium* 46.

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

<sup>176</sup>Molitor, *Paulustext der Hl. Ephräm*, p. 48.

<sup>177</sup>Cf. *NTSU* II,1, pp. 452-53.



Forty years ago Fitzer lamented that we do not yet have a Pauline manuscript that does for 1 Cor. 14:34-35 what  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$  did for John 7:53-8:11: provide incontrovertible evidence for the absence of a lengthy portion of text that, on internal grounds, was widely regarded as secondary.<sup>178</sup> Despite the sustained efforts of Payne, still today there is neither manuscript nor patristic evidence, direct or indirect, for the omission of 14:34-35 from any Pauline manuscript.

## II. *The Extent of the Proposed Interpolation*<sup>179</sup>

Determining whether or not any manuscripts lacks 14:34-35, or assessing whether the displacement of the text is an indication of the secondary nature of the passage, is significant only for those who limit the proposed interpolation to 14:34-35.<sup>180</sup> Others consider the passage secondary not on the basis of marginal notations in early manuscripts, but as only

---

<sup>178</sup>Fitzer, *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*, p. 8.

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

<sup>180</sup>Fitzer, *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*, p. 9; J. Murphy-O’Connor, “Interpolations in 1 Corinthians,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986), pp. 81-94 (esp. pp. 90-92); Fee, *First Corinthians*, pp. 699-708; Schrage III, pp. 481-92.

one example of extensive redactional activity that took place prior to the Pauline letter collection. W. Walker, in a series of articles and now a monograph, has argued that there is “*a priori* probability” for interpolations in the Pauline letters.<sup>181</sup> This is based on evidence of extensive editing in other ancient literature, including Jewish and Christian texts, the fact that the Pauline letters have been transmitted only in a single collection that likely underwent revision in the process of gathering the individual letters together,<sup>182</sup> and evidence of “short additions” in the subsequent manuscripts of this collection.<sup>183</sup> Walker discusses Fee’s arguments on 1 Cor. 14:34-35, but does not see the shifting position in the manuscripts in itself as decisive proof of interpolation.<sup>184</sup> This is not the place to interact with Walker’s theory of extensive interpolations in the epistles.<sup>185</sup> At this place it is necessary only to note

---

<sup>181</sup>Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*. Walker’s extensive research leading up to the publication of the monograph is listed in that book’s bibliography, pp. 254-55.

<sup>182</sup>Though this process would seem to fall into his category of “redaction” rather than, strictly speaking, “interpolation.”

<sup>183</sup>Walker, *Interpolation in the Pauline Letters*, pp. 26-43.

<sup>184</sup>“Fee’s third scenario—the original absence of 1 Cor. 14.34-35—is one possible explanation for the varied location of the passage in the surviving manuscripts, and as such it should be given serious consideration” and “the different locations in various witnesses does indeed constitute evidence, inconclusive though it may be, that the passage may be an interpolation.” Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, pp. 70-71. Cf. also E.g., C. Mount, “1 Corinthians 11:3-16: Spirit Possession and Authority in a Non-Pauline Interpolation,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005), pp. 313-40, who argues that in several apparently interpolated passages, “appeals to the manuscript tradition are of little value for reconstructing the redaction of the Corinthian correspondence.” (p. 316). Further, specifically regarding 1 Cor. 14:34-35 he notes that “some evidence of tampering exists in the manuscript tradition . . . In itself, however, this is very weak manuscript evidence for vv. 33b-46 as an interpolation.” (p. 316 n. 10); also J. Weiss, p. 342; Conzelmann, p. 246 n. 54.

<sup>185</sup>Walker (“Interpolations in the Pauline Letters,” pp. 215-6) describes Marcion’s text as one of two “significantly different versions of the Pauline corpus [that] circulate in the century: that accepted by Marcion (no longer extant) and that recognized by his opponents.” This, for him, is evidence that the “historical winners” suppressed his text. While he uses 1 Cor. 14:34-35 as a “test case” for recognizing interpolations, he apparently fails to notice that both Marcion’s and the alternative text contain 14:34-35. This fact would seem to rule out the



that for some who argue that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is non-Pauline, the fact that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 appears in different locations in the manuscripts is not decisive evidence of interpolation/redaction, but at best corroborative evidence. For them, its secondary nature is based on content and structure.

The differing proposals for the extent of the interpolation make clear the distinction between those who attempt to resolve the problem of the *mulier taceat* on the basis of text-critical principles and those who do so on the basis of arguments that take little notice of the manuscripts themselves. Zuntz, for example, apparently did not consider the evidence of the different locations in the manuscripts to be decisive, as is evident from that fact that he considers 14:33b-35 to be the marginal gloss, not 14:34-35. He stands in a long tradition of viewing the interpolation as encompassing 14:33b through 35 (or 36).<sup>186</sup> Others expand the proposed interpolation further. Dautzenberg argues that κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή at 14:37 cannot apply to all of 1 Cor. 12-14, but does refer specifically to 14:33b-36. V. 38 is clearly connected to v. 37, so the entire unit (33b-38) must represent an interpolation.<sup>187</sup> Munro is forced to conclude that the connections within 14:32-38 are so clear that the entire section must be post-Pauline.<sup>188</sup> When the issue is divorced from the witness of the manuscripts, the differing criteria make consensus regarding the extent of the proposed interpolation impossible. This study limits itself to the text-critical problem as presented in the

---

use of this passage as an example of such interpolations.

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

<sup>187</sup>G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie*. BWANT, 6. Folge, Heft 4 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1975), pp. 290-300.

<sup>188</sup>W. Munro, *Authority in Paul and Peter. The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter*, SNTSMS 45 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 68-69.

manuscripts. Therefore it will not directly interact with the theory that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is one of numerous examples of interpolations letter prior to their collection in the *Corpus Paulinum*.<sup>189</sup>

### III. Internal Evidence

The internal arguments against the authenticity of 14:34-35 (and surrounding material) do not differ significantly among those who argue against the authenticity of the *mulier taceat*. In order to ultimately settle the “internal evidence” question one would need to resolve every issue of language, rhetoric, and setting of 1 Cor. 14.<sup>190</sup> This is not possible here. Instead, it will be shown that the arguments against situating the *mulier taceat* after 1 Cor. 14:33 are not as decisive as is sometimes portrayed, and that other solutions are equally and at times even more convincing. The categorization of the types of argumentation follows that used by Walker in the discussion of interpolations in the epistles.<sup>191</sup>

#### III.A. Contextual Evidence

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

---

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

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

<sup>191</sup>Walker, “Interpolations in the Pauline Letters,” pp. 220-28, with application to 1 Cor. 14:34-35 on pp. 228-35. Walker’s first category, “Text-critical evidence,” has already been discussed under what is here labeled “The Situation in the Manuscripts.” The identical categories are used in his *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*, pp. 63-90 (with interspersed comments on 1 Cor. 14:34-35).



much better sense of the structure of Paul's argument without these intruding sentences."<sup>192</sup>

On the sentence level, it is claimed that with 14:34-35 removed, 14:33b completes the sentence begun in 14:33a.<sup>193</sup> Furthermore, the argument of 14:34-35 is seen to lack correspondence with the argument of the surrounding material. First, the command to silence is not made regarding an activity but is limited to only one group of people (women); this is done only here and at 14:29 with reference to prophets.<sup>194</sup> Second, the speech rebuked in 14:34-35 is not connected to the Spirit's activity, whereas all other instructions in 1 Cor. 14 center on speech in the community which has been given by the Spirit.<sup>195</sup>

This approach to the passage, however, falls short on two counts. First, the fact that there is no consensus over the extent of the proposed interpolation (as discussed above) indicates that the passage is not as out of place in the immediate context as is typically described.<sup>196</sup> Second, those who approach the epistle from the perspective of rhetorical analysis find that 14:34-35 is not out of place in the argument of 12-14. Some see the entire section as a carefully constructed argument that singles out a particular group of Corinthian women for rebuke, the point made most clearly at 14:34-35 itself.<sup>197</sup> Wire is able to conclude:

---

<sup>192</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 701; Cf. R. W. Allison, "Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14:33b-36): What Did Paul Really Say, and What Did It Mean?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988), pp. 27-60; esp. p. 39.

<sup>193</sup>Walker "Interpolations," p. 230; Fee, "Excursus on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35," p. 279; Schrage III, p. 483; Klauck, pp. 104-5; Fitzner, "*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*," pp. 9-10.

<sup>194</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 701; "Excursus," p. 280; cf. Schrage III, pp. 483-84.

<sup>195</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 701-02; Fitzner, "*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*," p. 13.

<sup>196</sup>C. Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives. Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1992), pp. 229-31.

<sup>197</sup>A. Eriksson, "'Women Tongue Speakers, Be Silent': A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric," *Biblical Interpretation* 6 (1998), pp. 80-104: "Throughout the

“Paul’s forcing a spiritual vote of confidence at exactly this point shows that the women’s silencing is not a parenthetical matter but the turning point in his argument concerning the spiritual. Once he has called for their silence he has done all he needs to do.”<sup>198</sup> It may therefore be safely concluded that 14:34-35 is suitable within the micro-structure of 14:26-36. This section is then followed by the *peroratio* of 14:37-40, an appropriate conclusion to the argument of 1 Cor. 12-14.<sup>199</sup> Not all who apply rhetorical analysis to 1 Corinthians see 14:34-35 as rhetorically appropriate.<sup>200</sup> However, at least one scholar who previously rejected the passage as post-Pauline later accepted it as authentic; in 1988 B. Witherington saw it as part of a later anti-feminist tendency, but in 1995 he is able to say that “Vv. 34f. Are, in any

---

argumentation of 1 Corinthians 12-14, Paul has been preoccupied with the two finite questions οἱ πνευματικοί and τὰ πνευματικά; the spiritual people and the spiritual gifts (notably glossolalia). These two themes have been subtly interwoven in his argumentation, but finally they are explicitly stated. There is a group among the spiritual people with whom Paul is especially concerned, a group of tongue speaking women. Paul’s solution to the disorder in the worship services is therefore that the women pneumatics should stop speaking in tongues in public” (p. 93). Cf. L. A. Jervis, “1 Corinthians 14:34-35: A Reconsideration of Paul’s Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 58 (1995), pp. 51-74 (esp. p. 71); Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, pp. 152-58.

<sup>198</sup>Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 155.

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

<sup>200</sup>J. Smit, “Argument and Genre of 1 Cor. 12-14,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, ed. S. A. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 211-30. On p. 219 n. 25 he argues that because the prohibition is not included in the *partitio* (14:1-5) it is not to be expected, and further “the conformity in the structure between 12:4-30 and 14:1-33a leaves no room for this prohibition.”



case definitely not a digression . . . The theory that vv. 34f. are, in fact, a post-Pauline interpolation should be rejected for several reasons."<sup>201</sup>

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

### III.B. Linguistic Evidence

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

---

<sup>201</sup>B. Witherington III, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, SNTSMS 59 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 90-104; *Conflict and Community in Corinth. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 287-88.

<sup>202</sup>Cf. Fitzer, “*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*,” p. 11.

<sup>203</sup>Schrage III, pp. 482-83. Fee also points to “the use of the plural ‘in the churches,’ which occurs nowhere else in Paul” (“Excursus on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35,” p. 279). By this he apparently means the use of the phrase without πᾶς (1 Cor. 7:17; 14:33). Nevertheless, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ (Gal. 1:22) and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ refers to groups of relatively unspecified assemblies and are not so different from 1 Cor. 14:34, where the Corinthians would presumably be able to understand that Paul is referring to their assemblies, not “all the assemblies” referenced in 14:33. Furthermore, the text is not firm, and the singular is more likely the archetypical reading, with the plural form assimilated to the form at 14:33 (see the discussion at 14:34.152).

<sup>204</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 230.

usage at 14:34 with that later in the chapter, claiming that “in vv. 28-30 it is of an otherwise legitimate activity that in some circumstances is being curtailed, whereas the injunction to silence is absolute.”<sup>205</sup> However, it is possible to view these injunctions not as “absolute,” but as response to specific situations in Corinth (see below). Third, ἐπιτρέπω is never elsewhere used in the passive, and does not refer to regulation regarding human conduct.<sup>206</sup> Fourth, the “absolute use” of λαλέω in both vv. 34 and 35 is described as foreign to 1 Cor. 14, where it is always connected with “tongues.”<sup>207</sup> However, as Keener notes, “Unless Paul changes the subject from women’s submissive silence (1 Cor. 14:34) to asking questions privately (1 Cor. 14:35) and back again to silence (1 Cor. 14:35), asking questions is at least a primary example of the sort of speech he seeks to forbid.”<sup>208</sup> Fifth, ὑποτάσσω refers to submission to humans only at Rom. 13:1; 1 Cor. 14:32; 1 Cor. 16:16.<sup>209</sup> This hardly seems problematic. Furthermore, the noun is so used at Gal. 2:5 and possibly 2 Cor. 9:13. Sixth, ἐπερωτάω is found only at Rom. 10:20, in a citation of Isa. 65:1.<sup>210</sup> However, it may simply reflect the fact that Paul simply does not have need to use the verb elsewhere; note that αἰτέω (1 Cor. 1:22) and ἐρωτάω (not used in the *Hauptbriefe*) are no more common. Seventh, αἰσχρός is found only at 11:6, “part of another suspected non-Pauline interpolation.”<sup>211</sup> This is the only other

---

<sup>205</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 702.

<sup>206</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 230; Conzelmann, p. 246 n. 53.

<sup>207</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 702.

<sup>208</sup>Keener, “Learning in the Assemblies,” p. 165. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, p. 233.

<sup>209</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 230-31.

<sup>210</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 231.

<sup>211</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 231.



occurrence of the adverbial form in the *Hauptbriefe*. However, the cognate verbs are common (αἰσχύνω 2 Cor. 10:8; Phil. 1:20; καταισχύνω Rom. 5:5; 9:33; 10:11; 1 Cor. 1:27; 11:4, 5, 22; 2 Cor. 7:14; 9:4; 10:8). Fee argues that the example at 1 Cor. 14:35 appeals to shame as “a general cultural matter,” unlike the usage at 11:5 (a verb, not an adjective).<sup>212</sup> However, this contrast depends on his interpretation that “shaming her head” (11:5) refers exclusively to her husband, an interpretation which too narrowly defines the referent.<sup>213</sup> Eighth, particular attention is given to the phrase καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει. This is regarded as unviable since νόμος is used “in the absolute sense, without quoting or referring to a specific passage—which is unknown in Paul.”<sup>214</sup> The phrase has been interpreted in various ways, however. Some note the similarity to 1 Cor. 7:19, where Paul appeals to “commandments of God” abstractly.<sup>215</sup> Others claim that the “law” referenced here is not the Scriptures but local customs or manners.<sup>216</sup> Furthermore, the Law’s “speaking” corresponds to similar Pauline expressions (1 Cor. 9:8; Rom. 3:19; 7:7).<sup>217</sup>

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

---

<sup>212</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 708; Fitzer, “*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*,” p. 36.

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

<sup>214</sup>Fee, “Excursus on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35,” p. 279; Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 231; Schrage III, p. 484; Fitzer, “*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*,” p. 11-12.

<sup>215</sup>Jervis, “A Reconsideration of Paul’s Limitation of the Free Speech,” p. 58.

<sup>216</sup>H. H. Hollander, “The Meaning of the Term ‘Law’ (NOMOS) in 1 Corinthians,” *Novum Testamentum* 40 (1998), pp. 117-35, esp. p. 130; Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, p. 231.

<sup>217</sup>Jervis, “A Reconsideration of Paul’s Limitation of the Free Speech,” p. 58.

unhelpful. The burden of proof is placed intolerably high if a word is secondary because it only occurs in the very same context (σιγάω), or if a word that Paul uses elsewhere in the same letter is suspect simply because only here is the passive form used (ἐπιτρέπω). By way of comparison, the analysis of the problems of linguistic usage in the clearly non-Pauline addition at Rom. 16:25-27 is much more decisive.<sup>218</sup> The linguistic arguments made in the case of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 are more tentative.

### *III.C. Ideational Evidence*

As with the linguistic criteria, there is an element of uncertainty with “Ideational Evidence” since it involves prejudgments on what an author could have written.<sup>219</sup> Nevertheless, this is often cited as a key argument against the authenticity of the *mulier taceat*. Fee sees “obvious contradiction” with 11:2-16,<sup>220</sup> but Walker claims that both passages are non-Pauline. Therefore, he contrasts the content of 14:34-35 with “Paul’s avowed egalitarianism as articulated in Gal. 3:27-28 . . . his surprisingly even-handed discussion of sex, marriage, and divorce in 1 Corinthians 7; and the very positive and non-discriminatory manner in which he speaks of women with whom he has been associated in

---

<sup>218</sup>J. K. Elliott, “The Language and Style of the Concluding Doxology to the Epistle to the Romans,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 72 (1981), pp. 124-30.

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

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



the work of the church.”<sup>221</sup>

The relationship to 11:2-16 is a critical issue. Lietzmann represents a more traditional approach, claiming that 11:2-16 is in fact arguing for appropriate women’s dress, not for their “right” to pray or prophecy. Paul does not bring up the issue of “silence” at that point because there he is dealing with a different matter. However, in chapter 14 the issue is proper and improper speech, so that “here the actual opinion of the Apostle comes to light,” that women should be “silent.”<sup>222</sup> Other plausible reconstructions are possible. T. Paige describes the situation as arising from the social interaction between men and women in Greco-Roman society:

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

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

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

---

<sup>221</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 232; contrast with Gal. 3:28 is also made by Fitzer (“*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*,” p. 27).

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

<sup>223</sup>T. Paige, “The Social Matrix of Women's Speech at Corinth. The Context and Meaning of the Command to Silence in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12 (2002), pp. 217-42; esp. pp. 241-42.

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

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

---

<sup>224</sup>Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, pp. 281-82.

<sup>225</sup>Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 154; also E. S. Fiorenza, “Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians,” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1997), pp. 386-403; see p. 395 and esp. 398. Similarly T. Paige: “Paul’s concluding admonition in 14:40, ‘Everything must be done in a respectable and in an orderly way,’ applies to the material of chap. 11 as well as that of chap. 14. It simply is not true to assert, as some do, that the words of 14:34-35 have no connection to their context.” T. Paige, “The Social Matrix of Women’s Speech at Corinth,” p. 225.

<sup>226</sup>J. Økland, *Women in Their Place. Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space*, JSNTS 269 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), pp. 149-52.

<sup>227</sup>Schüssler Fiorenza, “Rhetorical Situation,” pp. 397-400.



problems in Corinth, this is only one of several proposed settings which demonstrate that there is, in fact, correspondence, not tension, between 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and other passages in the *Corpus Paulinum* and 1 Corinthians 11 in particular.<sup>228</sup> The ideas expressed in the *mulier taceat* are not so unique that the only way to account for its presence in 1 Corinthians is to regard it as a post-Pauline interpolation.

### III.D. Situational Evidence

Here again, a key assumption is that Paul was “egalitarian” while those who later used his letters were not. It is claimed that apart from 1 Cor. 11:3-16 (which itself is often considered non-Pauline), there is no evidence in the undisputed letters to suggest that the activity of women was regarded as a problem by Paul.<sup>229</sup> Instead, the positive depiction of women, such as Prisca and Phoebe, indicates their important role in the Pauline communities.<sup>230</sup> However, as described under the heading “Ideational Evidence,” there are compelling descriptions of the situation and argument of 1 Cor. 12-14 which would see 14:34-35 as part of a larger argument dealing with specific problems in Corinth. Furthermore, the absence of evidence is only that. By the same argument, one could claim that there is no evidence that practices regarding the community meal were ever a problem apart from a single discussion in 1 Cor. 11:17-34, or that recourse to local courts was an issue apart from 1

---

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

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

<sup>230</sup>Fitzer, “*Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde*,” pp. 24-25.

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

### III.E. Source-Critical or Comparative Evidence

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

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

---

<sup>231</sup>The literature is immense, e.g., B. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth. The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

<sup>232</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 705: "one must assume that the words were first written as a gloss in the margin by someone who, probably in light of 1 Tim. 2:9-15, felt the need to qualify Paul's instructions even further." Cf. J. Weiss, p. 342.

<sup>233</sup>Schrage III, p. 486; J. Weiss, p. 342; Fitzner, "Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde," pp. 37-39.

<sup>234</sup>Cf. the discussion of σιγάω above; in 1 Tim 2:2 ἡσυχίος is also used also of men, and may not refer to absolute silence (Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἡσυχία and ἡσυχίος).

<sup>235</sup>Walker, "Interpolations," p. 233.



some significant differences between the passages. First, because the gloss is positioned in connection with prophecy, the interpolator's context would have to be identical to the experience of "gifts" and "prophecy" to that of Paul and Corinth. However, "the Pastoral letters give little evidence that the churches to which they were written experienced prophecy in a manner comparable to the Corinthian church." Second, Paul employs the concept of "shame" in another discussion involving women (1 Cor. 11:6), but this is not found in 1 Tim. 2 and occurs in the pastorals only at Tit. 1:11. Third, ἐπιτρέπω at 1 Tim. 2:12 is in the first person and "should be read as a personal opinion advising a temporary restriction," while at 1 Cor. 14:34 it is in the third person and "communicates not personal opinion but common custom."<sup>236</sup>

Moreover, key differences remain between 1 Tim. 2 and 1 Cor. 14:34-35. For example, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 limits "learning" to the home while in 1 Tim. 2 it takes place in the assembly.<sup>237</sup> Second, the concern in 1 Tim. 2 is that of teaching and authority, while the *mulier taceat* is concerned with asking questions and learning. Witherington is able to conclude that: "the text is not sufficiently close to 1 Tim. 2:11f. to warrant the argument that they were based on a scribe's editing of that text."<sup>238</sup>

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

---

<sup>236</sup>Jervis, "A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech," 54-58.

<sup>237</sup>Jervis, "A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech," pp. 53-54.

<sup>238</sup>Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, p. 288.

*Corpus* Marcion used and the thirteen (later fourteen) letter corpus is not clear,<sup>239</sup> the fact that Marcion knows 1 Cor. 14:34-35 but not the Pastorals should cause some hesitancy in proposing 1 Tim. 2 as a source for an interpolation into 1 Cor. 14.<sup>240</sup>

### *III.F. Motivational Evidence*

The motivation for the interpolation is typically described as loss of the egalitarian thinking of Paul in the post-Pauline Christian communities: "After the time of Paul, the status and role of women in the church apparently came to be regarded as something of a problem."<sup>241</sup> Schrage does not limit the origin of "androcentric-patriarchal" thinking to the post-Pauline church, noting parallels in Greco-Roman and Rabbinic literature. Nevertheless, its evident connection to 1 Tim. 2 marks it as deuterio- or even trito-Pauline in origin.<sup>242</sup>

Munro posits that "an extensive literary stratum" has been interpolated into the Pauline letters and 1 Peter which emphasizes apostolic authority and subjection to it. The Pastoral epistles in their entirety belong to this stratum, and evidence of "subjectionist teaching" regarding to "the subordinate place of women, the vast institution of slavery, and the imperial authority of Rome" is found in numerous places in the Pauline letters, especially 1 Cor. 11:2-16. Munro goes so far as to date this "Pastoral" revision of the Pauline letters to "the period before,

---

<sup>239</sup>See esp. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, pp. 297-98.

<sup>240</sup>Allison ("Let Women be Silent in the Churches," p. 43) notes that the "old thesis" that "the decree in 1 Timothy is based on the *Taceat* is not so easily discarded, either. . .the texts look like a very typical case of deuterio-Pauline extension of Paul's teaching."

<sup>241</sup>Walker, "Interpolations," p. 233.

<sup>242</sup>Schrage III, pp. 485-86; also Klauck, p. 106, to whom the only other alternative is to posit that the NT does not speak with a unified voice on the role of women in congregational life.



during, and after the second Jewish war of 133-135.”<sup>243</sup> Interaction with this wide-ranging thesis is impossible here. However, the fact that already Clement of Rome and 2 Peter know of collections of Paul’s letters, and that Marcion possessed a ten-letter corpus – which included 1 Cor. 14:34-35 – only a few years later, makes it unlikely that the previous collections would have been so completely supplanted in so short a time so as to result in a manuscript tradition which never lacks the *mulier taceat* (let alone 1 Cor. 14:32-38, as Munro posits).

The assumption of the abandonment of Pauline egalitarianism in the communities that continued to use his letters is difficult to prove apart from the proposed interpolated and pseudonymous texts. This assumption is by no means universally held. Økland, for example, writes: “I do not share many of the presuppositions concerning the unique early Christian egalitarianism that make the interpolation arguments work.”<sup>244</sup>

### *III.G. Locational Evidence*

This evidence attempts to explain why the interpolation was made at in this location. The putative interpolation was placed at the end of 1 Cor. 14 because of a loose connection to “speaking,” “being subject,” and that this is the practice of “all the churches.” However, while there are connections to the surrounding material, those who reject the passage as non-Pauline argue that they are present in 14:34-35 in a way that is completely different from the surrounding context.<sup>245</sup>

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

---

<sup>243</sup>Munro, *Authority in Paul and Peter*, pp. 148-50.

<sup>244</sup>Økland, *Women in Their Place*, p. 151.

<sup>245</sup>Walker, “Interpolations,” p. 234. Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 702.

arguments against the authenticity of this passage are not as strong as they are in other interpolations in the NT manuscripts, notably the *Pericope de adultera*, the ending of Mark, and the doxology in Romans.<sup>246</sup> Furthermore, all these passages have unambiguous evidence for their omission in the manuscripts, evidence which does not exist in the case of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. Finally, it is frequently difficult to disentangle the arguments made for or against the authenticity of this passage from a given researcher's theological concerns, regardless of that researcher's theological viewpoint. This warning is well expressed by J. Delobel:

The present concern for the situation of man and woman in the church has greatly stimulated the proliferation of literature on this passage. In principle, this interest is positive, so long as it does not become an anachronistic bias hampering objective exegesis. Contemporary concern should not decide whether or not a statement *can* be Pauline.<sup>247</sup>

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

#### *IV. The "Marginal Gloss" Theory*

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

---

<sup>246</sup>See, respectively, Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, pp. 95-102 and 124-47; J. K. Elliott, "The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 27 (1971), pp. 255-62 and "The Language and Style of the Concluding Doxology to the Epistle to the Romans."

<sup>247</sup>Delobel, "Textual Criticism and Exegesis," p. 110 n. 40; Cf. Epp, *Junia*, p. 15.



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

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

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

Fee concludes that the third scenario best accounts for the textual situation. He finds no parallel in the manuscript tradition which would explain either the first or second scenario.<sup>250</sup>

His argument hinges on this statement:

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

---

<sup>248</sup>He labels this “Bengel’s first principle” (*First Corinthians*, p. 699; repeated in “Excursus on the Text of 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 272), though Epp labels “the harder reading is to be preferred” as Bengel’s “leading and classic canon” which was formulated in response to “his own urgent question as to which reading (in a given case) is likely to have arisen out of the others.” E. J. Epp, “The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom,” *Harvard Theological Review* 69 (1976), pp. 219-20.

<sup>249</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 699.

<sup>250</sup>Also J. Weiss, p. 342.

of course, that the scribe left out a considerable portion and then reinserted it at a convenient place. But that is merely a *possible* solution without an ounce of historical probability. We are talking about dropping several lines of text (seven in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ), which could hardly be counted for as a copying error per se.<sup>251</sup>

At 1 Cor. 14:34-35, movement of the passage as the result of repairing an unintentional omission caused by a leap is only a very remote possibility. Both homoioteleuton from the end of v. 33 (ΔΓΙΩΝ or ΔΙΔΔCKΩ) to the end of v. 35 (ΕΚΚΛΗCΙΔ or ΕΚΚΛΕCΙΔΙC) and homoiarcton from the beginning of v. 34 (ΔΙ ΓΥΝΔΙΚΕC) to the beginning of v. 36 (Η ΔΦ ΥΜΩΝ) are very unlikely.<sup>252</sup> Efforts to explain the displacement (it is always described as displacement from after v. 33 to after v. 40) based on scribal discomfort with the passage have, to this point, been unconvincing.<sup>253</sup> However, Fee's assertion that parallels for this type of displacement are found nowhere else in the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum* remains to be tested.

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

---

<sup>251</sup>Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 277.

<sup>252</sup>What would be entirely expected is the leap from εκκλησιας (v. 33) to εκκλησιας (v. 34) in 2138. See *Text und Textwert* II.2, p. 301. I am not aware of anyone suggesting an accidental leap from one paragraph to the next (v. 34 and 36 begin paragraphs in A, for example), though the possibility exists.

<sup>253</sup>D. W. Bryce, “‘As in All the Churches of the Saints.’ A Text-Critical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:34,35,” *Lutheran Theological Journal* 31 (1987), pp. 31-39 proposes that Marcion omitted the verses because of the Judaic flavor, and the placement of the passage after 1 Cor. 14:40 is the result of its reintroduction in some witnesses. He appears to be unaware, however, that Marcion in fact read the passage (as discussed above under “Patristic Evidence”).



he proposes in 1 Corinthians.<sup>254</sup> John 5:3b-4 differs from 1 Cor. 14:34-5 in that it provides further information on the preceding material, not (as Fee proposes for the *mulier taceat*) a corrective to what precedes. 1 John 5:7 is even less comparable, for it is adopted into Latin manuscripts from a fourth century Latin commentary, then very late in the tradition translated from Latin and added to a handful of Greek minuscules<sup>255</sup> – hardly similar circumstance to what Fee proposes for 1 Cor. 14:34-35.

Zuntz, with whom Fee regularly interacts in his commentary but does not cite here, does propose several passages “which must at one time have been written in the margin of the text [of an early copy of the *Corpus Paulinum*] and must have penetrated into it, either when the archetype was edited or even earlier.”<sup>256</sup> Rom. 7:25b “may be an addition by Paul himself of a summing up by some early reader”; 1 Cor. 1:16 “looks like a marginal addition by Paul himself;” Phlm. 19a is likely added from elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum*; 1 Cor. 10:29b-30 does not conform to “the manner of the diatribe”; and 1 Cor. 14:33b-35 “interrupts the evident connection between vv. 33a and 36. Some scholars regard it as a Pauline addition, but the material contradiction with 11:2ff. lends probability to the view that the passage is not original.” None of these, strictly speaking, involve textual variation in the manuscripts. For example it is 14:34-35, not 14:33b-35, that is in a different location. However, where Zuntz finds interruption and interpolation, recent scholars have found methods of argumentation that conform to Greco-Roman rhetoric. We have already discussed 1 Cor. 14:34-35 above. The other passages cited by Zuntz have also been studied within their context and found to be

---

<sup>254</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 705.

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

<sup>256</sup>Zuntz, pp. 16-17.

less problematic than Zuntz suggests. For example, on 1 Cor. 1:16 Margaret Mitchell notes

1:14-17 presents a brief narration which serves to refute Paul's own rhetorical question which combats their factionalism directly: μή . . . εἰς τὸ ἔμδὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε. He dismisses this possible false impression immediately by a brief narration of his baptismal activities in Corinth in the past (the proper time frame for narration). But this is not a major concern. After this brief treatment, v. 17 provides a smooth transition into the *Proof* section, and introduces the first two topics, wisdom and the cross. This too conforms to rhetorical practice.<sup>257</sup>

Similar conclusions have been reached regarding Zuntz's other proposed interpolations.<sup>258</sup> 1

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

Several other challenges confront the marginal gloss theory. First, it is unlikely that a gloss would be added which contradicts Paul's teaching. For this reason a common alternative proposal is that Paul himself added a marginal comment to the letter as something of an afterthought to the argument.<sup>259</sup> Second, one must presume an "anti-feminist" tendency in second century Christianity<sup>260</sup> which was pronounced enough to have led to insertions and alterations in the manuscripts – again in order to undermine Paul's instruction. Typically

---

<sup>257</sup>Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, pp. 201-2.

<sup>258</sup>E.g., see the discussion of 1 Cor. 10:29b-30 see Duane F. Watson, "1 Cor. 10:23-11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1999), pp. 301-18, esp. pp. 310-12.

<sup>259</sup>Jervis, "A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech," p. 53; Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 159; E. E. Ellis, "The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor. 14:34-35)," pp. 213-20 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Epp (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 213-20; R. W. Allison ("Let Women be Silent in the Churches") proposes a novel solution: That 14:33b-36 is a fragment of an earlier Pauline letter, perhaps in response to the report from "Chloe's people" (1 Cor. 1:11).

<sup>260</sup>Which must be contrasted with a presumed "egalitarian Paul." The difficulties of this reconstruction has already been discussed under "Ideational Evidence."



argued as a feature of the “Western” text of Acts, the alterations that are found result in “some loss of emphasis on women of leadership or prominence in Acts.”<sup>261</sup> While the textual alterations that produce this effect are not to be minimized, at the same time it must be noted that none involve a lengthy insertion, as is proposed for the *mulier taceat*. Third, there is no attempt in any manuscript to downplay or excise women “praying or prophesying” in chapter 11.<sup>262</sup> Presumably, it would have been much easier to alter or remove a few words there than to add several lines of text in a place that is typically described as unsuitable for such instructions.

Despite the lack of evidence in the manuscripts of the *Corpus Paulinum* of an attempt to make alterations in order to counter Paul’s egalitarianism, the gloss theory remains prominent. Fee, in response to specific criticism of his theory, develops an argument that turns less on style and content than on disarming arguments that intentional alteration could have produced “displacement.” He argues that neither location can be original because in both places the passage disrupts the flow of the argument, but at the same time the disruption is not so extreme that it would prompt a scribe to move the passage from one location to the other.<sup>263</sup> He then concludes: “one can scarcely find a viable reason for such a total disruption

---

<sup>261</sup>M. W. Holmes, “Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts,” pp. 183-203 in *The Book of Acts as Church History. Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte*, ed. T. Nicklas and M. Tilly (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), p. 203. Similarly, in the same volume, A. G. Brock concludes that the alterations to the text of Acts in Codex Bezae have the effect of “conventionalizing the portrayals of women’s roles, even removing or changing the order of names if need be.” “Appeasement, Authority, and the Role of Women in the D-Text of Acts,” pp. 205-24 (citation on p. 224).

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

<sup>263</sup>Fee’s argument initially sounds tautologous: “Likewise, if [both locations] can be shown to ‘fit’ reasonably well in either place, they can both be shown equally as well *not* to

of Paul's argument, if either of the early texts were original; by the same token, one can give perfectly good reasons for the double interpolation, since the argument can be made to work equally well in either location."<sup>264</sup> The rest of this discussion will demonstrate that displacements similar to that found in 1 Cor. 14 have taken place in the *Corpus Paulinum*, then seek to identify a motive for the displacement of the verses to the position after v. 40.

#### *V. Lengthy Insertions in the Corpus Paulinum*

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

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

---

fit in either place." Fee, "Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35," p. 275.

<sup>264</sup>Fee, "Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35," p. 276.

<sup>265</sup>A search of TLG yielded some examples similar to ζεοντα τω πνευματι, though these did not use the other words in the near context.

<sup>266</sup>I do not have access to images of 075.



that Marcion had reworked the passage himself.<sup>267</sup> Both Clabeaux and Schmid point out, however, that the readings are found also in the Armenian translation of Ephraem, thus making it unlikely that Marcion is the source. Rather, a pre-Marcionite form of the text has been edited and used by both.<sup>268</sup> The editing is extensive.<sup>269</sup> At 4:23 there is a substitution/addition: “. . . one people of the Jews, according to the law begotten unto slavery” in place of “one from Mount Sinai, begetting into slavery” (Ephraem), or, in Marcion’s text, “one from Mount Sinai in the synagogue of the Jews, begetting into slavery.” At 4:26 two additions take place, the first of which is based on Eph. 1:21. After “the Jerusalem from above is free,” Ephraem adds, “just as Sara, and it is above all powers and principalities;”<sup>270</sup> and again after “our mother” he adds, “the holy church, which we confess.” Tertullian’s citation of Marcion reveals a much lengthier insertion from Eph. 1:21. After “the other” (the referent being the “Jerusalem from above”) is found, “begetting above every principality, power, dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the one which is to come;” and following “which is our mother” Marcion reads “in which we have the promise of the holy church.” Schmid’s detailed analysis demonstrates that both writers are working from the same textual basis, with Ephraem incorporating the glosses more carefully into the passage. Schmid’s source-critical analysis is strengthened by his

---

<sup>267</sup>Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2. Auflage (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1924), pp. 46-47.

<sup>268</sup>Clabeaux, *Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul*, pp. 118-19; Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, pp. 125-29.

<sup>269</sup>The discussion of this passage is based on Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 128.

<sup>270</sup>Schmid (*Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 129 n. 228) points out that Molitor’s reconstruction of Ephraem’s text of Eph. 1:21 also ends, as does his additional text at Gal. 4:26, after the first two elements. This is unlikely to be mere coincidence.

observation that the editing reflects an enhancement of the latent anti-judaic sentiment of the passage, a sentiment which is known to exist in Christian circles of the late-first and early-second centuries (and later).<sup>271</sup>

It must be concluded, therefore, that additions and interpolations took place in the *Corpus Paulinum* after the initial formation of the *Apostolos*. Only if Ephesians and Galatians were considered of equal “value” (and likely present in the same codex) would one be used to supply a perceived lack in the other. This extremely early editing – which must have taken place prior to Marcion – has had no impact on the transmission of the Greek text.<sup>272</sup> The only reading that may conceivably be connected is the addition of παντων after μητηρ at 4:26 (N<sup>c</sup> A K L 056 075 *cet*). This is more likely, however, a typical addition, and not related by either theme or textual consanguinity to Ephraem or Marcion.

While this editing involves the insertion of a passage from one letter of the *Corpus Paulinum* into another, it does not mirror what is frequently proposed for the origin of 1 Cor. 14:34-35: that a marginal gloss, based on 1 Tim. 2:12ff., was written into the margin of an early (indeed, usually the earliest) manuscript of 1 Cor. 14. First, the added text in Galatians matches precisely the wording of the source text in Ephesians. This does not match what the putative interpolator of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 has done with his proposed source, 1 Tim. 2:9ff. Second, the elements that are not adopted from Ephesians are seamlessly incorporated into the structure of the sentences in Gal. 4:22-26, while the material from Ephesians is kept whole. Such is not the case in 1 Cor. 14:34-35, where the proposed gloss itself would be a

---

<sup>271</sup>See in particular Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 129 and his conclusion (p. 311) that the *Vorlage* of Marcion’s *Apostolos* already contained anti-Judaic elements.

<sup>272</sup>Aside from the typical addition/omission of articles and prepositions in some minuscules, the only textual problems are examples of parablepsis at v. 25 (αγαρ . . . αγαρ) and v. 26 (εστιν . . . εστιν N<sup>c</sup>).



mixture of themes from 1 Tim. 2 as well as foreign elements, so that the “source” is not immediately obvious apart from one or two vocables.

The comparison of the transmissional histories of these passages does shed light on the problem. While 1 Cor. 14:34-35 is read in every witness, including Marcion and Ephraem, the edited form of Gal. 4:22-26 exists only in those two writers. Yet both readings undeniably existed prior to the middle of the second century. What transmission process can account for this, if the “gloss theory” were accepted? 1 Cor. 14:34-35 must have been written into the margin of a manuscript. Next, a subsequent copy placed the gloss in the text itself. In what is now at least the third generation, a copy of one of these manuscripts underwent extensive revision at Gal. 4:22-26. Then copies of this edited manuscript were disseminated widely enough to be used by Marcion, likely in Rome by 144,<sup>273</sup> and still in existence at the time of Ephraem in the fourth century. This edited version of Eph. 4:22-26 then disappeared from the manuscript tradition, but 1 Cor. 14:34-35 persisted. One must therefore posit at least four generations of manuscripts between the initial *Corpus* and Marcion, with both glosses taking hold in the tradition virtually immediately, then one of them disappearing. In this reconstruction, it seems that only Zuntz’s or Ellis’ proposals are viable, that the gloss was placed in the margin of the first copy of the *Corpus Paulinum*. To posit anything other, such as simply a “very early marginal gloss”<sup>274</sup> are likely ruled out by the larger picture of the development of Ephraem’s and Marcion’s text. One must compress the period in which the *mulier taceat* was added to the *Corpus Paulinum* and gained a foothold into an extremely

---

<sup>273</sup>Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 25-26, proposes that Marcion’s produced his New Testament and his *Antitheses* in Rome between 139 and 144. A native of Pontus on the Black Sea, it is of course possible that Marcion brought an *Apostolos* text with him. This might account the similarity of Marcion’s text to the early Syriac tradition described by Schmid, in *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 311 and Ephraem in particular on pp. 278-79.

<sup>274</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 699.

brief period. The later one dates the origins of the gloss, the less likely it is that the “gloss theory” can explain the shift of the passage from after 14:33 to after 14:40.

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

The “gloss theory” becomes unnecessary when it is recognized that the editorial activity seen in 1 Cor. 14 in D F G and the Latin tradition takes place elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum* text of those same witnesses. D F G and the Latin tradition attest five other textual additions or displacements in the *Corpus Paulinum*.<sup>275</sup> These indicate intentional textual displacements, similar to what took place at 1 Cor. 14. Furthermore, several of them, combined with other evidence, indicate a particular awareness of the book of Acts and the role of Prisc(ill)a<sup>276</sup> with respect to what happens “in all the churches.”

Three displacements occur in Romans 16. First, at Rom. 16:3 after *ιησου* is read *και την κατ οικιαν αυτων εκκλησιαν*, having been moved there from 16:5, where it follows *πασαι αι εκκλησιαι των εθνων*. The shift is attested by D F G<sup>277</sup> and VL 61 75 77 78 86  $\Gamma^B$ <sup>278</sup> but not 89 (which in Rom. 15-16 derives from a Latin tradition unconnected to the D-

---

<sup>275</sup>F G alone shifts clause-length text at Rom. 15:23 and adds text at Gal. 5:10. These are discussed in the chapter on D F G.

<sup>276</sup>Acts consistently uses *πρίσκιλλα*; the variation in the manuscripts of the *Corpus Paulinum* will be discussed at 1 Cor. 16:19 below.

<sup>277</sup>P omits *και την κατ οικιαν αυτων εκκλησιαν* from 16:5 but does not add it at 16:3; parablepsis is not an obvious reason for the omission, and may indicate that the alteration influenced Greek manuscripts outside the narrow bilingual tradition, as did the shift of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 in 88\* 915.

<sup>278</sup> $\Gamma^B$  is the leading witness of a cluster of Vetus Latina witnesses labeled the  $\Gamma$  group (also  $\Gamma^A$  and  $\Gamma^C$ ). All the witnesses of this group share the readings discussed here in 1 Corinthians, but only  $\Gamma^B$  has been checked for its readings in Rom. 16 and Gal. 4.



text<sup>279</sup>), Ambrosiaster, or Pelagius. Because the passage is moved from the later location to the earlier it cannot have been caused by accidental omission which was later noticed and added in the wrong place. Furthermore, it moves the phrase “the church in their house” closer to the referent of the pronoun, so that it is now clear that the church being greeted is the one at Prisc(ill)a’s and Aquila’s house. In so doing, however, the two relative clauses that modify Prisc(ill)a and Aquila (16:4) are separated from their referent. This myopic shift therefore disrupts the flow of the passage.

A second shift takes place at Rom. 16:16, from which the phrase *και αι εκκλησιαι πασαι του χριστου* is shifted to a position after *μου* at 16:21. Virtually the same witnesses attest this alteration: D F G and VL 75 77 78 86. The reading of 61 Γ<sup>B</sup> shows the process by which most of these displacements were removed by comparison to other witnesses: The phrase is read both at 16:16 and 16:21.<sup>280</sup> Subsequent manuscripts would likely have removed the repeated text. This is not surprising in these I-text witnesses, which have been influenced by D-text readings. As at 16:3, this shift appears to be the result of intentional editing, for the verb and its object (*ασπαζονται υμας / salutant vos*) are omitted from 16:16 but not added at 16:21, where the noun phrase is incorporated into the syntax. In contrast to 16:3, however, there does not appear to be a significant advantage to the shift. It moves the greeting from “all the churches” away from the command to “greet with a holy kiss” to the position among several personal greetings. It may be that, as at 16:3, the greeting from “all the churches” was

---

<sup>279</sup>Frede, *Neuer Paulustext* I, 91-123, who concludes on p. 122: “Wir kommen zu dem Ergebnis, daß Budapest auch in den Schlußkapiteln des Römerbriefs einen altlateinischen Text bietet, allerdings von anderer Art. Er ist nicht mehr im wesentlichen dem D-Typ zuzuweisen.”

<sup>280</sup>According to Frede’s table in *Neuer Pauluskommentar*, p. 109, Γ<sup>B</sup> shares the reading of 61 here, though since I do not have access to images of this witness for Romans I cannot verify its text.

felt to be more appropriate in a different location, though again there does not appear to be an obvious benefit to its new position.

A third shift is the removal of the benediction of 16:20 to the end of 16:24. Again, this is attested by D F G P and VL 61 75 77 78 86 Γ<sup>B</sup> (*om* ιησου χριστω F G 77 78). This also is evidence of editing since it moves the benediction to what in the bilingual and D-text witnesses is the conclusion of the letter. The textual problem of the conclusion of Romans is a complex issue beyond the scope of this project.<sup>281</sup> Nonetheless, as in the other examples of displacement, a perceived problem with the position of an entire sentence led to its shift. This alteration appears to have produced in the Greek tradition a larger echo than the previous two, perhaps because it does serve as an apt conclusion to the letter. Several Greek manuscripts read the benediction at both 16:20 and 16:24 (Ψ 049 056 6 88 69 *pc*), while others – notably including P, which showed possible influence from the “Western” reading at Rom. 16:5<sup>282</sup> – reads the benediction both at 16:20 and after the doxology (also 33 *pc*).

Next, these same witnesses attest two clause-length additions. At 1 Cor. 16:19 the role of Prisc(ill)a is again involved. An explanatory gloss, following the greeting from σὺν τῇ κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ, explains that Paul stayed with them: παρ οὖς και

---

<sup>281</sup>Helpful discussions are: H. J. Gamble, Jr., *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*; J. K. Elliott, “The Language and Style of the Concluding Doxology to the Epistle to the Romans”; H. J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, Bd. 1, VL 7 (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), pp. 91-123; *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, VL 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1964), pp. 152-58; K. Aland, “Der Schluß und die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Römerbriefes,” pp. 284-301 in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1979); P. Lampe, “Zur Textgeschichte des Römerbriefes,” *Novum Testamentum* 27 (1985), pp. 273-77.

<sup>282</sup>The readings of P in these examples (Rom. 16:5, 24) should be compared to that of 88 915 at 1 Cor. 14. In all these cases, manuscripts which are not “Western” nevertheless attest displacements which are otherwise attested only in “Western” witnesses.



ξενίζομαι D (ξενζομαι F G).<sup>283</sup> This insertion draws upon to the account of Acts 18, particularly v. 3, since this is the only passage where Paul is described as staying with the couple. However, direct literary dependence is not likely, since Acts 18:3 uses the verb μένω<sup>284</sup> while the insertion uses ξενίζω,<sup>285</sup> to describe Paul's having stayed with Prisc(ill)a and Aquila.<sup>286</sup> Acquaintance with Acts is further demonstrated by the use of the spelling πρισκιλλα by much of the Latin tradition, C D F G K L Ψ, and the "Byzantine" tradition.<sup>287</sup> The insertion is clearly secondary.<sup>288</sup> It should not be overlooked, however, that the only detail imported from Acts into the Latin/bilingual manuscripts of Paul is connected to Prisc(ill)a and, as in two of the displacements in Rom. 16, the phrase "all the churches."

The second clause-length addition attested by the Latin tradition and the bilinguals differs from the previous four examples in that it involves the insertion of a sentence from

---

<sup>283</sup>*apud quos et hospitor 77 78; apud quos etiam hospitor Γ<sup>B</sup> Pel<sup>B</sup>; apud aliter quos etiam hospitor 89.*

<sup>284</sup>Acts 18:3 reads: καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι ἔμενεν παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἠργάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ; Codex Bezae reads πρὸς αὐτούς for παρ' αὐτοῖς and omits ἦσαν . . . τέχνη.

<sup>285</sup>ξενίζω occurs seven times in Acts, but not in chapter 18.

<sup>286</sup>Acts 18 in the "Western" text of Acts has been the subject of study as to whether or not it reflects "anti-feminist" revision. Holmes concludes: "This evidence, though hardly inconsequential, seems hardly sufficient to justify the degree of assurance that has been accorded the hypothesis of deliberate 'anti-feminist' alteration to the 'Western' text of Acts." ("Women and the 'Western' Text of Acts," p. 202). He discusses five variants at Acts 18:2-3, noting that only one (the addition of Aquila without mention of Priscilla) shows any – albeit minimal – potential evidence of concern over the role of women.

<sup>287</sup>At both Rom. 16:3 and 2 Tim. 4:19 some two dozen miniscules (also 075 at 2 Tim. 4:19) use πρισκιλλαν. *Priscilla* is much more common in the Latin witnesses, read at Rom 16:3 by 61 Vg<sup>mss</sup> Amst Pel and at 2 Tim. 4:19 by 61 78 Vg<sup>mss</sup> Amst Pel<sup>B</sup>.

<sup>288</sup>ξενίζω is found nowhere else in the *Corpus Paulinum*; there is no motive for the deletion of this clause.

one Pauline letter into another. Again, the same witnesses are involved, here joined by 89<sup>289</sup> and virtually the entire Latin commentary tradition (Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Sedulius Scottus, and the B recension of Pelagius). Indeed, this reading is the only form of Gal. 4:17 known to either the D-text or the I-text. Its origins are obvious. Paul warns the Galatians that his opponents want them to “be zealous for them” (i.e., their opponents). Following this warning, and keying on the imperative *ζηλουτε* / *aemulamini*, these witnesses add a positive command: *ζηλουτε δε τα κριττω χαρισματα* D (F G *ζελουται*) / *aemulamini autem meliora dona*. While the Latin form of the insertion closely parallels 1 Cor. 12:31 (*aemulamini autem dona meliora* 61 75 77 78 89),<sup>290</sup> the Greek text found at Gal. 4:17 is significantly different from the Greek of D F G at 1 Cor. 12:31: *ζηλουτε δε τα χαρισματα τα κρεισσονα*. This reading cannot be derived from the Greek of D F G for three reasons. First, as discussed at 11:17, the archetype of D F G never uses the spelling -ττ-, only -σσ-. This indicates an insertion that postdates that archetype. Second, the form *κριττω*, which uses the Attic termination, is found nowhere else either in Paul or the bilinguals. Third, a different attributive position is used for the adjective at Gal. 4:17 than at 1 Cor. 12:31, one which is not found at that place in any Greek manuscript. Since the addition at Gal. 4:17 cannot be attributed to an insertion by the creator of the archetype of D F G, it can only be derived from three sources: 1) it was added prior to that archetype in Greek, independent of the Latin; 2) it was added to a predecessor of that Greek archetype based on the Latin; or 3) it was added to the Greek text of that archetype as an adaptation to the Latin. The first proposal is ruled out by the forms found in the insertion, while the third is made more likely by

---

<sup>289</sup>86 is not extant here.

<sup>290</sup>The Vulgate of 1 Cor. 12:31 reads *aemulamini autem charismata maiora*, which cannot have been the source for the insertion in Galatians.



recalling that the archetype of D F G has made adaptations to the Latin in numerous places, as described in the chapter on D F G.

Before turning to 1 Cor. 14:34-35, it is helpful to make clear that there is a core group of Latin witnesses that share most of these alterations with the bilinguals:

	D*	FG	88	915	61	75	77	78	86	89	Γ <sup>B</sup>	F	R	AMst	CY	MAR	PEL <sup>B</sup>	SED-S
Rom 16:3	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X				-	-		-
Rom 16:21	X	X			(X)	X	X	X	(X)		X				-	-		-
Rom 16:24	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X				-	-	X	X
1 Cor 14:41	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X		X	X	X	-	-		X
1 Cor 16:19	X	X			X	X	X	X	-	X	X				-	-	X	-
Gal 4:17	X	X			X	X	X	X	-	X				X	X	X	X	X

At least five of these alterations, perhaps excluding Rom. 16:24, must have been the work of a single editor. First, because none of these alterations can be attributed to accidental causes or copyist activity, all must have been intentional. Second, the displacements and additions are all made on the basis of a single key word: At Rom. 16:3 and 1 Cor. 16:19 it is the reference to Prisc(ill)a and Aquila; at Gal. 4:17 it is the word ζηλουτε; at Rom. 16:21, ασπαζονται; 1 Cor. 14:40 ends with κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω (the cognate verb ὑποτάσσω occurs at 14:34). Only Rom. 16:24 is not attributable to connection by key word. Third, because the alterations are based on keywords and not the larger context, several alterations disrupt the flow of the argument. This is most obvious at Gal. 4:17, and to a lesser degree Rom. 16:3 and 1 Cor. 14. At Rom. 16:21 the displacement is not obviously superior to the original form of the text. The motivation for the shift made at Rom. 16:24, however, is much more obvious. Fourth, every alteration involves the insertion or displacement of material from texts that were viewed as authoritative, perhaps even canonical. All three in Rom. 16 and that in 1 Cor. 14 simply move text, though in each case by several verses. At Gal. 4 it is the addition of material from 1 Corinthians, and at 1 Cor. 16:19 the addition of material that

is derived from, though not a verbatim citation of, Acts 18. The similar editorial method indicates that the alterations at Rom. 16:3, 21, 24; 1 Cor. 14; and Gal. 4:17 are the work of a single individual.

In addition, the consistently unique witnesses that attest these alterations indicate that they were all produced at the same time. The possibility that all six took place independently before being gathered together in virtually the identical witnesses is so unlikely that it must be ruled out. Furthermore, there is no documentary evidence that any one alteration is chronologically prior to any other. In fact, the addition at Gal. 4:17 is found already in Cyprian and has wider attestation than the shift of 1 Cor. 14:34-35, which is avoided by Pelagius. One question that cannot be definitively answered yet is the question of whether these alterations were made in the Latin text and then brought into the Greek, or the reverse. Because Gal. 4:17 could not have been in the Greek exemplar of the ancestor of D F G (as described above), that alteration is likely to have originated in the Latin tradition. This may indicate that the editor is to be sought in the Latin tradition rather than the Greek. In any case, the alterations do not go back to what Fee describes as a very early copy of the collection, but to a later period.

Nevertheless, the displacement of the *mulier taceat* may now be studied in light of the intentional editing seen elsewhere in these same witnesses. Four alterations cluster around references to women and in particular Prisc(ill)a, what took place in her “house church,” and “all the churches” (Rom. 16:3, 21; 1 Cor. 14:34-35; 16:19). It is clear that the editor was able to compare Paul’s references to Prisc(ill)a and Aquila with those found in Acts, even making reference to the Acts narrative with the insertion at 1 Cor. 16:19. The alterations do not in any way minimize Prisc(ill)a or her role. However, this knowledge of and interest in Prisc(ill)a and her role in “the church in her house” may have raised concerns. Ambrosiaster,



who is among the witnesses to the position of the *mulier taceat* after 1 Cor. 14:40, explains at 1 Cor. 16:19 that Prisc(ill)a could not possibly have had a role equivalent to what he knew as a “presbyter”:

He recalls two churches, the public and the domestic. He calls one public, where they all come together; domestic, the one into which he is gathered through friendship. That alone is called “church,” where the presbyter celebrates the solemn observances.<sup>291</sup>

Prisc(ill)a’s activity in the “church in their house” is not at all being addressed in 1 Cor. 12-14. However, it may have been of interest to the reviser of the Latin/bilingual text of the *Corpus*. 1 Cor. 14:34-35, where women are commanded to be “silent,” follows the injunction to conform to the practice of what Paul “teaches” in “all the churches.” This would appear to contradict what was taking place in Prisc(ill)a’s “house church.” By shifting 14:34-35 to the position after v. 40, however, the injunction to “silence” is disassociated from the practice of “all the churches” and connected to the command to do things “decently and in order.” In this way, women in general, perhaps with a view toward Prisc(ill)a in particular, are protected from contradicting Paul’s teaching on the universal practice of the church (1 Cor. 14:33), or, stated another way, brought under apostolic authority and “order.”

Any proposed motive for an alteration must, however, remain tentative. Even if a clear motive cannot be identified, however, these six alterations in the bilingual/Latin

---

<sup>291</sup>At Rom. 16:3 Ambrosiaster reflects a similar understanding of “house church”: “He [Paul] greets also their household and household servants, which he calls ‘church,’ because they were disciples of holy men in respect to faith.” At Rom. 16:7, where the proper understanding of the phrase οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (with reference to Andronicus and Iulia) is in question, Ambrosiaster does not interpret the phrase as implying that Iulia (as he knows her) was an apostle: “These are relatives both according to the flesh and the spirit, in the same way that the angel also spoke to Mary: “And behold! Your relative Elisabeth, etc.” Whom [Andronicus and Iulia] he also declared to be favorable to the earlier apostles with his own testimony, and with them suffered captivity for the cause of the faith; on that account those were fully worthy of honor.”

tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum* provide direct evidence to disprove a key argument for the secondary nature of 1 Cor. 14:34-35: “There is no precedent for their [copyists] becoming redactors of this particular kind, at least not in the Pauline corpus.”<sup>292</sup> In fact, the very manuscripts that move 1 Cor. 14:34-35 to the position after v. 40 make three other identical displacements as well as two insertions of material based on parallel texts. Furthermore, not only do these witnesses make the very types of displacements that Fee argues never occur, the content of the edited material evidences an awareness of Prisc(ill)a’s house church. Previous researchers have tentatively proposed that discomfort over a “command” to “silence women” in the assemblies may have led to their displacement.<sup>293</sup> It may have been that discomfort over what one woman, Prisc(ill)a, did in her house church that was the concern. The fact that her activities – well-known to the editor – were problematic compared to what took place “in all the churches of the saints” led to the displacement. By moving the passage, Prisc(ill)a’s actions could be distanced from the “all the churches” and brought under the “order” that was desired by Paul in 1 Cor. 14. While a direct connection to the editorial activity seen in the text of Codex Bezae in Acts 18 is not likely, this scenario does match what has been observed in the way that the alterations there affect women’s roles. If there is not an “anti-feminist” tendency, there is a concern that the description of women’s activities be in correspondence with apostolic order, and results in a “loss of emphasis on women of leadership or prominence.”<sup>294</sup> This description of scribal activity also coheres with a suggestion of Delobel, that “scribes sometimes acted as (re-)interpreters, and that they

---

<sup>292</sup>Fee, “Excursus on 1 Cor. 14:34-35,” p. 278.

<sup>293</sup>Niccum, “The Voice of the Manuscripts,” p. 255; Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, p. 288; Odell-Scott, “Editorial Dilemma,” pp. 68-74.

<sup>294</sup>Holmes, “Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts,” p. 203; similarly Brock, “Appeasement, Authority, and the Role of Women,” p. 224.



performed their exegesis by ‘surgical’ intervention, which was their privilege, at least for some time.”<sup>295</sup>

As a result, 1) there is no evidence of a text of 1 Corinthians that lacked 1 Cor. 14:34-35; 2) the internal evidence that is used to argue that the passage (and often the surrounding sentences) are secondary is not as decisive as is often portrayed; and 3) the “gloss theory” to explain the displacement is shown to be unnecessary for two reasons: First, the same witnesses that displace 1 Cor. 14:34-35 do the same thing in the same way elsewhere in the *Corpus Paulinum*; second, a potential motivation for the displacement of the *mulier taceat* has been identified: a concern over the role of Prisc(ill)a in her house church, which is consistent with scribal activity seen in the “Western” text of Acts. The conclusion that the differing locations of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 requires the conjecture of a post-Pauline insertion is unnecessary. If the passage is to be viewed as post-Pauline, the displacement of the passage in D F G and the Latin tradition cannot be used as part of the argument.

14:37.166 [noted at 7:13.47]

14:37.167 [discussed at 14:9.35]

14:37.168

The shifting location of εντολη / εντολαι bespeaks its secondary nature. It is placed before (ℵ\* pc) and after (256 263 pc) κυριου and after εστιν /εισιν (℞<sup>46</sup> ℵ<sup>2</sup> B D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 048 0243 33 263 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739\* pm). The only reading that can account for this is found D\* F G, the non-Vulgate Latin tradition, and Origen<sup>296</sup> which lacks the noun. Without the noun the

---

<sup>295</sup>Delobel, “Textual Criticism and Exegesis,” p. 111. He makes this suggestion after his discussion of 1 Cor. 14:34-35, which he considers authentic.

<sup>296</sup>*Fragmenta in evangelium Joannis*, fr. 83.

text is clear, the addition simply supplies the predicate. It does so, however, using a non-Pauline word; ἐντολή is found nowhere else in Paul (ἐπιτάγη at 1 Cor. 7:25).<sup>297</sup> It also creates a non-Pauline word order, for the sequence genitive noun-copulative-head noun is unique. The consistent sequence is instead head noun-genitive noun-copulative (Rom.1:16; 2:2; 1 Cor. 1:18; 6:15; 11:7). In the end, no motive for its omission can be given, but its insertion clarifies the text by supplying the implied noun.

Unconnected to the question of ἐντολη the reading θεου for κυριου in A 1739<sup>c</sup> and Origen. The correction in 1739 is adopted from the marginal note, which contains the citation from Origen.<sup>298</sup> The source of the reading in A, however, is unlikely to be Origen, but does reflect its tendency to replace *nomen sacrum* with a form of θεος (see discussion at 10:9).

14:37.167 [discussed at 14:9.35]

14:38.170

Whether one reads the indicative αγνοειται or the imperative αγνοειτω, significant exegetical issues remain.<sup>299</sup> Parallels can be given for both; Zuntz cites 7:15 as a parallel for the imperative (εἰ δὲ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται, χωριζέσθω),<sup>300</sup> but there is also a parallel also

---

<sup>297</sup>Fee (*First Corinthians*, p. 700, n. 3) rejects Zuntz's conclusion, arguing that a scribe would not use a non-Pauline word. This does not make ἐντολή any more Pauline, nor does it account for the word order variation or explain why manuscripts would have omitted the word. Lietzmann (p. 75) rejects the noun, Schrage (III, p. 460 n. 558) accepts it, but Thiselton (p. 1163) does make a decision.

<sup>298</sup>Zuntz, p. 77; Birdsall, "A Study of MS. 1739," p. 57.

<sup>299</sup>See the summary by Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," pp. 62-63 as well as the commentaries (Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 712; Schrage III, pp. 460-61; Thiselton (pp. 1162-6) is the most complete, recognizing that the typical distinction between being "ignored" by men or by God is a false one. All these writers adopt αγνοειται.

<sup>300</sup>Zuntz, p. 107.



for the indicative passive form in the archetypal text of 8:3 (εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ, οὗτος ἔγνωσται). The imperative, easily altered from δι to Ω, may have been influenced by the imperative in the previous sentence. Furthermore, the variation should not be considered in isolation from the addition of εντολη at 14:37. The imperative command to “ignore” those who themselves ignore is more suitable when Paul’s instructions are called a “command of the Lord.” D F G and some of the Latin tradition, the same witnesses that avoid the insertion at 14:37, all read the indicative at 14:38.

14:39.171

While the vocative ἀδελφοί is frequently a secondary addition in the *Corpus Paulinum* (see 11:2.3), where ἀδελφοί is firm μου is more frequently omitted than added (see 6:12.46). Zuntz also recognizes this fact, yet considers the presence of μου to be secondary at 14:39, this in spite of the tendency of both ℘<sup>46</sup> and D F G to omit frequently the pronoun in such cases.

14:39.172; 14:39.173

Zuntz correctly points out that the addition/omission of the article before λαλεῖν is tied to the addition/omission of the preposition, while the displacement of γλώσσαις is a secondary, but related, issue.<sup>301</sup> He fails to note, however, that the article is omitted before προφητεύειν in F G, a significant element which will be discussed later. In one of the lengthiest discussions of any single unit of variation in his study, Zuntz argues that the omission of ἐν is due to the stock phrase, λαλεῖν γλώσσαις<sup>302</sup>, which would also cause the

---

<sup>301</sup>Zuntz, pp. 29-31.

<sup>302</sup>Though it must be pointed out that because the “stock phrase” occurs only in the “Byzantine” text, it is less likely to account for its omission in 1739 than in 5 442.

shift of γλώσσαις. This is the most likely explanation for alterations at the end of 14:39. Μη κωλυετε εν γλωσσαις (P<sup>46</sup> B) was altered to εν γλωσσαις μη κωλυετε (D\* F G lat sy<sup>p</sup>). Subsequently, the εν was dropped: by ⋈ A P<sup>vid</sup> 048<sup>vid</sup> 0150 0243 1739 pc with the P<sup>46</sup> B word order, and by “Byzantine” text with the D\* F G lat sy<sup>p</sup> word order.

More difficult however, is the presence or absence of the article. Zuntz argues that “the parallel with the first half of the verse (ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν) would cause the article to be added before λαλεῖν,”<sup>303</sup> with context requiring the wording of P<sup>46</sup> B:

Paul could see good reason for not using the article again before λαλεῖν, for its addition, while compulsory after ζηλοῦτε, was at best optional after κωλύετε and its absence before λαλεῖν stresses the accessory character of glossolaly. The spurious additional article has a parallel in ix. 13, where τὰ has been added before ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ on the model of the preceding τὰ ἱερά. The wording, then, which we commend would convey the meaning: ‘Concentrate upon prophecy, even though (some) glossolaly should not be prevented. The nuancy of the phrase squares with the tendency of the whole chapter and thus vindicates the reading of P<sup>46</sup> B.

Perhaps Zuntz recognizes the weakness of his arguments here in the statement: “Why should a most outstanding group of manuscripts (P<sup>46</sup> B 1739) have omitted the article which was protected by a parallel in the same sentence?”<sup>304</sup> As we have seen, Zuntz elsewhere denies that arguing on the basis of the “best manuscript(s)” is valid in the NT.

Can other explanations be sought for the addition or omission of the article? The variant cited from 1 Cor. 9:13 is not a true parallel, for it involves adding an article used as a substantive for clarification of the object. Indeed, there are very few examples in the NT that parallel this construction in 14:39, where two clauses, each with imperatives and infinitives, are joined by a conjunction. The closest is 2 Cor. 8:10-11, where the first clause (with an

---

<sup>303</sup>Zuntz, 30.

<sup>304</sup>Zuntz, 30.



indicative verb): οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι<sup>305</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι is connected by νυνὶ δὲ καὶ with τὸ ποιῆσαι ἐπιτελέσατε. The rarity of this construction may have contributed to the attempts to modify in 1 Cor. 14:39.

A helpful line of inquiry is to examine Paul's use of the infinitive. There are 10 examples of the substantival infinitive in the NT (in NA<sup>27</sup>) of which 8 occur in the Pauline epistles.<sup>306</sup> In Paul its usage is generally anaphoric, i.e., it refers to something previously mentioned or well known.<sup>307</sup> This is born out by the context of 1 Cor. 14. "Prophets" and "prophecy" have been part of the ongoing discussion in 1 Cor. 11, 12, and 13, and in chapter 14 it is mentioned in vv. 1, 3, 4-6, 22, 24, 29, 31, 32, and 37. "Speaking" and "speaking in tongues" is a topic raised less frequently earlier in the epistle, but is the heart of the matter in chapter 14. It is also clear from 14:2-5 that προφητεύειν and λαλεῖν are distinct activities. Verse 39 serves as a summary to the rest of the chapter, and aptly summarizes the argument, much as Zuntz describes: "Be zealous to prophecy and do not hinder speaking in tongues." The relative value that Paul places on these two activities is not defined, as Zuntz implies, by the presence or absence of the article, but by the imperative used to exhort "prophecy," where "speaking" is merely to be "not prevented." The use of the article before both verbs is in line with the Paul's anaphoric usage of it elsewhere.

Furthermore, in the five cases where Paul connects two infinitives with a conjunction, the first is arthrous but the second anarthrous when the two activities are closely identified:

1 Cor. 11:6 εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν γυναικὶ τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ ξυρᾶσθαι,  
κατακαλυπτέσθω.

1 Cor. 11:22 μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν;

---

<sup>305</sup>According to von Soden, in v. 10 of 216 440 ποιῆσαι is read, without the article.

<sup>306</sup>Mk 10:40; Ac 25:11; 1 Cor. 14:39 (2); 2 Cor. 8:10-11 (3); Phil 2:6, 13(2).

<sup>307</sup>BDR §399.

2 Cor. 7:3 προείρηκα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐστε εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζῆν.

1 Thes. 3:2 εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν

1 Thes. 4:6 τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ

Given these examples, the lack of the article before λαλεῖν would require that προφητεῦειν and λαλεῖν be viewed as closely related activities. The article before λαλεῖν, however, would make clear that these are two distinct activities,<sup>308</sup> just as the presence of the article before each of the infinitive at 2 Cor. 8:10-11. At 1 Cor. 14:39, Paul is distinguishing the two activities and encouraged prophesying (cf. also 14:5). Furthermore, there are no omissions or additions of the articles in the examples cited above, which should warn us that the claim of addition by assimilation in 1 Cor. 14:39 is not seen elsewhere in very similar situations. In addition the witnesses that lack the article (P<sup>46</sup> B 0243 630 1739 1881) frequently err in omitting it. Royse finds thirty-two cases where P<sup>46</sup> loses the article,<sup>309</sup> and B. Weiss (before the recovery of P<sup>46</sup>) cites this passage as one example of B's characteristic omission of articles.<sup>310</sup>

14:40.174

Güting and Mealand's explanation for the loss of δε seems reasonable:

On some occasions sentences are severed from their context and are given prominence and particular attention. They become quotable. This development leads into an attitude which drops particles as superfluous, particles with served to mark context. 1 Cor. 14:40 is an instance.<sup>311</sup>

While a few more examples would make the argument more firm, no obvious motivation

---

<sup>308</sup>See also B. Weiss, p. 75.

<sup>309</sup>Royse, 258.

<sup>310</sup>B. Weiss, p. 75.

<sup>311</sup>Güting and Mealand, p. 31.



exists for the creation of asyndeton in witnesses that typically avoid it.

## Notes on Chapter 15

15:1.1; 15:1.3; 15:2.9; 15:17.72; 15:17.75 15:34.138 15:58.230

Ἀδελφοὶ is frequently added (see 11:2.6), including under influence from the lectionary (see 1:10.29). Here its shift to the initial position in some minuscules is likely also due to influence from the lectionary, which typically adds ἀδελφοὶ at the beginning of a reading.

In addition, here 1241<sup>s</sup> makes one of its numerous shifts in the person of the pronoun from ὑμ- to ἡμ-.

15:1.2

Μου is a frequent addition. It is added after εὐαγγελιον at 1 Cor. 9:18 (D\*) and 9:23 (69) and is found in the spurious doxology of Romans (16:25). The addition here is a family 1739 reading, attested by 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 *pc*.

15:1.6

D\* F G read the present στήκετε against the rest of the tradition, including the Latin tradition's *statis*, a perfect form. Avoidance of hiatus may have prompted the alteration.

15:2.8; 15:2.11

The syntax of 15:2 presents several difficulties, so much so that some have posited a corruption of the entire tradition.<sup>1</sup> The difficulties can be resolved, however, by regarding τινι λογῶ εὐαγγελισαμην as a parenthetical statement that modifies δι ου και σωζεσθε.

---

<sup>1</sup>The editions preceding BDR (§478<sup>1</sup>; also the English translation) argued that both εἰ and οφειλετε are secondary, with τινι λογῶ εὐαγγελισαμην functioning as object to κατεχετε. The most recent edition, however, specifically rejects this proposal. See also Fee, pp. 718-19.



The use of a parenthetical statement, however, caused disruption in the manuscripts. Most significantly, D F G and the Latin D-text replace the conditional clause *εἰ κατέχετε* with an indicative + infinitive, *οφείλετε κατεχειν* / *debetis tenere*. This alteration forces *τινι λογω* / *qua ratione* to begin a new sentence, as is demonstrated by the lineation of G and VL 89. D\* takes the additional step of adding *καὶ* / *et* after *λογω* / *ratione*, an addition which, as in other places (discussed in the chapter on D F G), disrupts its sense line format by separating the adverb from the verb:

ΤΙΝΙ ΛΟΓΩ ΚΑΙ	<i>qua ratione et</i>
ΕΥΗΓΓΕΛΙΣΑΜΗΝΥΜΕΙΝ	<i>euangelizavivobis</i>

℘<sup>46</sup> also indirectly attests this reading. The line that contains *υμειν* ends with a gap of about twelve letters. The next line begins with *οφείλετε*, but points placed over this word mark it for deletion. The standard reading, *εἰ οφείλετε*, then follows. Zuntz suggests that *οφείλετε κατεχειν* was a marginal reading or correction which had been marked out for deletion.<sup>2</sup> It was not clear, however, to the scribe of ℘<sup>46</sup> what the correction intended to indicate, which resulted in the unusual formatting and resultant reading. Since *οφείλετε* is written and then marked out, however, it is also possible that *οφείλετε κατεχειν* stood in the exemplar of ℘<sup>46</sup>, with *εἰ οφείλετε* written as a correction or marginal note. In either case, ℘<sup>46</sup> reflects here a partial conflation. It's scribe has both readings in front of him, and in the act of selecting which reading to reproduce gives evidence of both. This parallels other examples in ℘<sup>46</sup> of conflations between readings found in F G and readings found in other witnesses, for example at Rom. 16:19 and Phil. 1:11 (discussed below on pp. 613-14).

The combined attestation of ℘<sup>46</sup> D F G and D-text conclusively demonstrate the second century origin of this reading. However, although *ὀφείλω* + infinitive is common in

---

<sup>2</sup>Zuntz, pp. 254-5; surprisingly, Royse does not discuss this correction.

Paul (Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 5:10; 7:36; 11:7, 10; 2 Cor. 12:14), it must be secondary here since it removes the difficulty of the parenthetical statement.

15:3.14; 15:4.21

Harnack attributed three tendentious omissions to Marcion: the loss of ο και παρελαβον and κατα τας γραφας at both 15:3 and 4.<sup>3</sup> The first potential omission, however, is widely attested in the early Latin fathers<sup>4</sup> and now in VL 89, while the first omission of κατα τας γραφας is nowhere else attested and the same words in v. 4 are missing only in two minuscules (216 440). This makes it unlikely that the readings should be grouped together as a tendentious alteration by Marcion. It is more likely that the omissions of κατα τας γραφας may be Marcionite, but that a text without ο και παρελαβον preceded Marcion.<sup>5</sup>

15:4.19 [discussed at 7:8.28]

15:4.20

The word order τη τριτη ημερα (F G K L P Ψ 049 0150 0151 6 424) is likely the result of adaptation to the identical phrase elsewhere in the NT.<sup>6</sup> The same alteration, which

---

<sup>3</sup>Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 47; he is followed by Zuntz, p. 226.

<sup>4</sup>Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3,18,3; Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 10,173; Ambrosiaster; Hilary, *De trinitate* 10,67; Rufinus, *Libri Admantii Origenis adversus haereticos* 79,5; Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3,8.

<sup>5</sup>Clabeaux, pp. 119-120.

<sup>6</sup>Τη τριτη ημερα occurs without variation at Matt 20:19; Luke 24:7; 24:46; at Matt 16:21; 17:23; at Luke 9:22 D alone reads instead μετα τρεις ημερας, and at Acts 10:40 D\* alone reads μετα την τριτην ημεραν D\*.



moves away from the more Semitic word order, is made elsewhere in the manuscripts:<sup>7</sup>

Luke 18:33 τη ημερα τη τριτη B D L W Θ ] τη τριτη ημερα Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>

John 2:1 τη ημερα τη τριτη Ϝ<sup>66</sup> Ϝ<sup>75</sup> Ⲙ A K L Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> ] τη τριτη ημερα B U Θ f<sup>13</sup>

This assimilation was made more likely by the context of 1 Cor. 15, which discusses the resurrection of Jesus. Further influence may have come from creedal statements, which likewise use the word order τη τριτη ημερα.

D and VL 75 depart from F G and the rest of the Latin tradition by reading τη ημερα τη τριτη / *die tertia*, most likely an adaptation to a Greek text similar to Ⲙ A (cf. similar examples in the chapter on D F G).

15:5.22; 15:5.23 15:7.29; 15:7.30 [also discussed at 12:28.118]

At 15:5b, D F G read και μετα ταυτα for ειτα/επειτα. Zuntz attributes this reading to a Latinism based on *postea*. This, however, does not account for the addition of και/*et*. Furthermore, at the second occurrence of ειτα/επειτα at 15:7, the Latin witnesses read either *postmodum* (VL 75 77 89) or *postea* (Amst), neither of which led to alteration in D F G. A more likely explanation than Latinism is that the alteration to ενδεκα/*illis undecim* (*undecim* VL 77 78\* V) prompted the alteration to και μετα ταυτα. The interest in the number of disciples present in the post-resurrection narratives of Luke 24 and John 20 led the scribe/editor to distance those events from the previous appearances. As at 14:34-35, this demonstrates intentional editorial revision in D F G and the D-text toward accounts from other canonical writings.

15:6.24 [discussed at 12:28.118]

---

<sup>7</sup>Cf. also Eph. 4:30 το αγιον πνευμα D F G and 1 Tim. 5:25 τα καλα εργα K L 056 075 0142 0151 *pm*.

15:6.27

The Atticist Moeris (π 8) rejects πλέονες, the non-contracted comparative form of πολύς, as a Hellenism. He also rejects other non-contracted forms, such as ἁμείνονα, βελτίονες, and ἥσσονα. As Kilpatrick points out, most manuscripts move to the Hellenistic form at John 4:41 (πλειον only Ϝ<sup>75</sup>).<sup>8</sup> The Hellenistic form is otherwise consistent in Paul (1 Cor. 9:19; 10:5; 2 Cor. 2:6; 4:15; Phil. 1:14), the only other place where the Attic spelling replaces it is 2 Cor. 9:2 (πλειους 919). Pauline usage suggests that πλειονες is archetypal, with πλειους (K L P Ψ 6 424) an Atticizing replacement.

15:6.28 [discussed at 14:15.68]

15:7.29; 15:7.30 [discussed at 15:5.22 and 12:28.118]

15:9.38 [discussed at 8:9.39]

15:10.39; 15:10.44

The early witnesses frequently omit the article when it is used as resumptive personal pronoun:

Rom. 7:10	η εις ζωην ] εις ζωην L
Rom. 9:6	το κατα σαρκα ] κατα σαρκα F G
Rom. 11:24	οι κατα φυσιν ] κατα φυσιν Ϝ <sup>46</sup>
Rom. 12:18	το εξ υμων ] εξ υμων 049
Rom. 15:26	των εν ιερουσαλημ ] των αγιων εν ιερουσαλημ Ϝ <sup>46*</sup>
Rom. 15:31	η εις ιερουσαλημ ] εις ιερουσαλημ L P 049
1 Cor. 11:24	το υπερ υμων ] υπερ υμων Ϝ <sup>46</sup>
1 Cor. 13:10	το εκ μερους ] εκ μερους 0142
2 Cor. 1:16	ο προς υμας ] προς υμας Ϝ <sup>46</sup> D*
2 Cor. 7:14	η επι τιτου ] επι τιτου X* B
Gal. 2:3	ο συν εμοι ] συν εμοι B; omit Ϝ <sup>46</sup>
Gal. 3:7	οι εκ πιστεως ] εκ μερους C* <sup>vid</sup>

<sup>8</sup>See G. D. Kilpatrick, "John iv. 41 ΠΛΕΙΟΝ or ΠΛΕΙΟΥΣ," *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1976), pp. 131-32.



Gal. 4:21	οι υπο νομον ] υπο νομον 0151
Phil. 1:29	το υπερ χριστου ] υπερ χριστου F G
1 Thes. 2:1	την προς υμας ] προς υμας F G
1 Tim. 1:4	την εν πιστει ] εν πιστει F G
1 Tim.1:14	της εν χριστω ιησου ] εν χριστω ιησου 075
2 Tim. 2:1	τη εν χριστω ιησου ] εν χριστω ιησου 075
2 Tim. 3:15	της εν χριστω ιησου ] εν ιησου χριστω 075
Phlm. 6	του εν υμιν ] εν υμιν $\Phi^{61}$ A C 048

In addition, D F G frequently lose the article when it functions as a relative and exhibit a general tendency to lose articles [see chapter on D F G]. As in these other examples, the two omissions at 15:10 may have been prompted by the fact that the Latin witnesses (apart from Jerome) do not render them.<sup>9</sup> There are more examples of this alteration in F G than D; that a predecessor of these manuscripts underwent additional influence from the Latin in similar cases is seen also by the unique addition of the article as relative at Col. 4:15: την κατ οικον αυτης εκκλησιαν ] την οι κατ οικον αυτης εκκλησιαν F G = *qui in domo eius est ecclesiam* (VL 75 77 vg<sup>mss</sup> Amst).

The core witnesses of family 1739 (0243 6 1739, though not 424<sup>c</sup>) along with  $\aleph^*$  B 0270\* join D\* F G in omitting the article before συν εμοι. While addition by assimilation to η εις εμε is a possibility, it is more likely, given the propensity toward omission in the early manuscripts when dealing with this type of construction, that the article was unintentionally dropped.

6\* also omits η before εις εμε. This may reflect another misread correction (see also 4:6) in a predecessor, whereby the first η at 15:10 was initially omitted in error, then replaced and the second η omitted in conformity to its sister witnesses.

15:10.40

---

<sup>9</sup>J. Weiss, p. 352 n. 3 also suggests that the omission is caused by conformity to the Latin.

As Zuntz argues, the reading πτωχη (D\* F G; *paupera* VL 75 77 89 Amst), can hardly have derived from κενη,<sup>10</sup> whereas κενη as a substitution for πτωχη could have been drawn from the near context (15:14).<sup>11</sup>

The shift in word order furthermore suggests that the D\* F G reading is archetypical, here joined by P<sup>46</sup> in placing the negative particle between the adjective and verb. In predicate constructions, the negative particle always stands directly before the verb.<sup>12</sup> Since the shift of the particle places the emphasis on the adjective, it is unlikely that scribes would shift the particle to the less emphatic position. The shift in tense from εγενηθη to γεγονεν in F G simply reflects a tendency to such alterations (also εγενομην 9:22; κατελαβη 10:13; φαγειν 11:22)

15:10.41

The shift in word order to παντων αυτων (0243 6 206 1739 *pc*) places the genitive pronoun in the more familiar position. D\* L\* omit αυτων by accidental leap (ΠΑΝΤΩΝΑΥΤΩΝ).

15:10.42

At 15:10, 1739 and its relatives attest three “family” readings. The third of these, the

---

<sup>10</sup>Latinism is not an issue here, for the D-text consistently translates πτωχος with either *pauper* (Rom. 15:26; Gal. 2:10) or *egenus* (2 Cor. 6:10; Gal. 4:9; 1 Cor. 15:10 in Amst(A)) while translating κενη with *vacuus* (1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 6:1; Gal. 2:2; Eph. 5:6; Phil. 2:16 *bis*; Col. 2:8; 1 The. 3:5) or *inanis* (1 Cor. 15:14 *bis*, 58). Therefore at 1 Cor. 15:10, *paupera* is rendering πτωχη, not the reverse.

<sup>11</sup>Zuntz, p. 90.

<sup>12</sup>Except in direct commands (1 Cor. 14:20) or questions (1 Cor. 3:4; 10:22). Similar word order appears at 2 Cor. 1:18 (ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν) and Gal. 1:10 (Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην).



addition of *μονος* after *εγω δε*, is found only in 0243 1739. The addition prevents *εγω δε* from being contrasted with *η χαρις του θεου* and conforms to the *συν εμοι* at the end of the sentence. As with other alterations, this minor insertion served to enhance or protect Paul's status and authority (see 9:20-21).

15:11.45 [discussed at 8:4.9]

15:12.50

The reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D<sup>\*2</sup> F G 0270<sup>vid</sup> and Origen,<sup>13</sup> which places *οτι* between *εκ νεκρων* and *εγεγερται*, would result in a usage which is nowhere else attested in Paul. In every other case where *οτι* is used as a marker of discourse content, it is placed at the beginning of the discourse. The reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  *pc*, however, would force *εκ νεκρων* to modify *κηρυσσεται*.<sup>14</sup> There is no obvious motivation for the shift. Given the numerous examples of accidental omission of explanatory *οτι*,<sup>15</sup> it may have been added in the wrong location after having been unintentionally omitted. It is unlikely that the error would have been repeated independently in these early witnesses. Instead, the impossible reading is further evidence of a shared provenance of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D F G 0270 and Origen.

15:12.52 [discussed at 7:8.28]

---

<sup>13</sup>*Commentarii in evangelium Matthei* 13,2; *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam i ad Corinthios* fr. 84.

<sup>14</sup>As is the case with the other eleven examples of prepositional phrases following verbs that introduce discourse (Rom. 4:23; 10:9; 14:14; 1 Cor. 15:12b (omit *οτι*  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ); 15:15; 2 Cor. 2:3; 11:10; Gal. 1:11 (omit *οτι* 0278); 5:10; Phil, 2:24; 4:10).

<sup>15</sup>See  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  at 15:12.52 and full discussion at 7:8.28. This accounts for 0142's loss of *οτι*.

15:13.56; 15:14.57

D\* skips from ΟΥΔΕΧ̄C of v. 13 to Χ̄C of v. 14, then continues with ΟΥΚΕΓΗΓΕΡΤΑΙ, thereby omitting εγηγερται ει δε χριστος. The resultant text is nonsense, which D's Latin counterpart VL 75 softens by not adding an equivalent *non* (*nec x̄ps resurrexit*). This reading is repeated in the Vulgate witness S, which may simply share the accidental error or, given the close relationship between the D-text and S, may derive a shared tradition.

15:14.59

Adverbial καί following an inferential particle is not uncommon in Paul (διὸ καί Rom. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:20; 4:13; 5:9; Phil. 2:9; οὖν καί Rom. 11:5; ἄρα καί 1 Cor. 15:18). It is clearly secondary, however, at 2 Cor. 4:13, where ℵ F G 0186 add και under the influence of διὸ και later in the sentence. It may also be secondary at Rom. 4:22, where και is lacking after οὖν in B D\* F G. At 15:14 the addition may have been made in order to balance κενη και in the following clause<sup>16</sup> or the distant influence of ἀρα και at 15:18. Notably, in each place B preserves the shorter reading, whereas ℵ adds secondary και.

15:14.61; 15:15.63 [discussed at 14:15.68]

15:14.62

Ηωμν (B D\* 049 0243 0270\* 5 6 33 424<sup>c</sup> 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739 ) is the result of assimilation to the same word in the previous clause.

15:15.66

---

<sup>16</sup>B. Weiss, p. 113.



With  $\epsilon\gamma\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu$  F G confuse  $\Gamma$  for  $\rho$ . The scribe of G made no attempt to conform the Latin text to this impossible form, retaining *suscitaverit*.

15:15.67

$\aleph^*$  adds  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  after  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , a phrase found nowhere in Paul but twice each in Acts (3:18; 4:26) and Revelation (11:15; 12:10). Because it is also common in the early fathers,<sup>17</sup> the addition of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  may be an example of a stereotypical phrase rather than assimilation to other NT examples, particularly since those examples are not used in contexts with  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omega$ .

15:15.68

D VL 64 78 89 sy<sup>p</sup> and some early Latin fathers (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Ambrosiaster), in addition to thirteen minuscules otherwise unrelated to D and the Latin tradition,<sup>18</sup> lack the clause  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\rho \alpha\rho\alpha \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota \omicron\upsilon\kappa \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ . The most obvious explanation for the missing text would be parablepsis  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\rho \dots \epsilon\iota\Gamma\Delta\rho$ . B. Ehrman argues, however, that the clause is an addition made by proto-orthodox scribes in order to counter Gnostic belief that Jesus – not the Christ – was raised from the dead. He supports his argument with internal evidence, arguing that  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\rho \alpha\rho\alpha$  never occurs together in Paul and further that because the shorter text would say, in effect, that “God did not raise Christ from the dead,” it is the more difficult reading.<sup>19</sup> One must ask, however, how such a text would suit Paul’s argument, or why Paul

---

<sup>17</sup>E.g., Justin Martyr, *Apologia* 40,11; *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 7,3; 28,4; 39,2, 5; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4,6, 28; 7, 13; etc.

<sup>18</sup>TuT lists 43 327 606 886<sup>c</sup> 1852 1929 1939 1945 1963 1996 1999 2912 for this reading. Ehrman (see next note) does not note that the same omission occurs in these witnesses.

<sup>19</sup>Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, pp. 157-58. On p. 178 n. 177 he claims that there is no possibility of accidental loss.

would state that he is a false witness of God if he claims that “he [God] raised Christ, whom he did not raise.” Indeed, as Ehrman notes, the longer reading suits the context perfectly (cf. 15:12-13).

Furthermore, the patristic evidence is not as unambiguous as Ehrman indicates. The use of the passage by Tertullian and Ambrosiaster suggest a secondary adaptation made in order to resolve the nonsensical statement. Both use the future tense in place of the first occurrence of *εγειρεν*: “For we will be discovered as false teachers of God, who will speak testimony that he will raise ((*re*)*suscitaverit*) Christ, whom he did not raise ((*re*)*suscitavit*) .”<sup>20</sup> That Tertullian sees the contrast being drawn as between saying that he *will be* raised and *was* raised is again made clear at *Adversus Marcionem* 3,8: “as if Christ will be raised, whom he did not raise.”<sup>21</sup> This shift in verb tense is unlikely to be derived from Greek, for *εγειρε(ν)* would have to have been corrupted into *εγερει*, a reading unattested in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. Instead, it is likely that both Tertullian and Ambrosiaster altered the first verb to the present in order to resolve the contextually nonsensical reading. Irenaeus, on the other hand, does preserve *εγειρεν* . . . *εγειρεν* and the equivalent *suscitavit* . . . *suscitavit*. In the context in which he uses the citation, Irenaeus is combating the very argument which Ehrman claims led to the addition – that this and the others he cites “clearly preaches the resurrection and imperishability of the flesh.” He passes over the difficulty of his shorter text of 15:15, but does comment that “in all these [passages] those men, as I said before, either say that the apostle contradicts himself . . . or again they compel wicked and perverse interpretations to be made of all the passages in order to overturn and change the sense of what was said.”

---

<sup>20</sup>*Inveniemur etiam falsi testes dei, qui testimonium dixerimus, quod resuscitaverit Christum, quem non resuscitavit (De resurrectione mortuorum 48,4). Ambrosiaster’s text (1 Cor. 15:15 *ad loc*) is identical apart from the use of *αυτεμ ετ* in place of *etiam*.*

<sup>21</sup> . . . *quasi resuscitaverit Christum, quem non resuscitavit.*



Hence, according to Irenaeus, however one reads 15:15, the two statements “he raised Christ” and “whom he did not raise” cannot contradict each other.

Just as the patristic evidence is indecisive, neither does the internal evidence convincingly demonstrate that the clause is an intentional addition. While the combination of *ειπερ αρα* never occurs elsewhere in Paul, similar unique usages of particles are found elsewhere in the epistles without any textual uncertainty in the manuscripts (e.g., Rom. 6:16 *ἦτοι*; 1 Cor. 6:20 *δή*; 10:29 *ἵνατί γάρ*; 2 Cor. 3:5-6 *ἤνίκα*; Phil. 3:4 *καίπερ*). In addition, the fact that an unrelated group of minuscules omit the clause make *parablepsis* the only possible explanation for the shorter reading in these witnesses. It should be further noted that D\* and much of the Latin tradition omit an entire clause by accidental leap at 15:64 (D\* VL 75 89 Vg Amst). It is therefore more likely that an accidental omission (as described above) created the reading than that an addition was made – apparently only here in the entire book – in order to counter a very specific theological emphasis.

15:17.72 [discussed at 15:1.1]

15:17.73 [discussed at 12:6.23]

15:17.75 [discussed at 15:1.1]

15:19.78 [discussed at 6:1.2]

15:20.80 [discussed at 5:11.30]

15:20.83

A form of *γίνομαι* never follows a predicate position participle in the perfect tense.

The addition of *εγενετο* (D<sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 5 88 915 *pm*) balances

ηλπικοτες εσμεν and ελεινοτεροι εσμεν at 15:19.

15:22.87 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:23.88

Paul frequently uses ἕκαστος to begin a clause in which he makes a conclusion that is applicable to “each.” The beginning of this concluding clause is most frequently asyndetic (Rom. 12:3; 14:5; 15:2; 1 Cor. 3:13, 7:20, 24; 2 Cor. 9:7). The only textually firm place that such a clause is marked with δέ is at 1 Cor. 3:10. Textually variation occurs at 1 Cor. 3:8 (omit δε C), 12:7 (omit δε L), and 15:23 (omit δε N). Each of these three cases should receive consideration, 15:23 in particular, since N (along with B) are among the least likely witnesses to lose δέ.<sup>22</sup>

15:23.90

F G follow some of the Latin tradition (VL 61 77 78 F R S Pel) in adding a clarifying participle: οι εν τη παρουσια αυτου ελπισαντες. This addition is likely adapted from a secondary Latin addition (*qui . . . crediderunt*). Because the main D-text witnesses (VL 75 89) lack the longer reading, and there is no motive for its omission, the addition is likely a typical addition made to the Latin for clarification, and subsequently brought into F G from either Pelagius or the local St. Gall Vulgate text, here attested by S.

15:24.92 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:25.99 [discussed at 11:26.111]

---

<sup>22</sup>Güting and Mealand, p. 104. N never loses δε without support, though most would consider insignificant the support at 15:27 (201 915).

15:25.100; 15:25.101

Although an allusion to Ps. 109:1 LXX, several adaptations made by Paul make his use of the passage distinctive enough that it is unlikely that the alterations at 1 Cor. 15:25 have been caused by assimilation to the LXX.<sup>23</sup> First, the verb in the LXX is in the first person (θῶ), where Paul writes it in the third person (θῆ). Second, the pronouns are in the second person (σοῦ), not third (αὐτοῦ). Finally, the LXX uses ὑποπόδιαν τῶν ποδῶν where Paul uses ὑπό τοὺς πόδας. None of these were adapted to the LXX in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. Instead, the alterations are typical harmonizations to the near context. The addition of αὐτου after εχθρους matches τους ποδας αὐτου (found already in Irenaeus and Tertullian<sup>24</sup>).

The singular reading of F G, which reads αὐτου after τους εχθρους but not after τους ποδας, may be the result of a misread marginal correction in a predecessor, which had lost αὐτου after ποδας. Instead of placing αὐτου in the correct location, it was added after εχθρους. This accounts for the *eius* of VL 77 above αὐτου instead of the *suos* of VL 78, for all Latin manuscripts apart from the unrelated VL 64 read *pedibus eius*.

15:27.104 [discussed at 7:8.28]

15:27.105 [discussed at 12:19.80]

15:27.106

The addition of αὐτω after υποτετακται (F G VL 77 78 Vg sy<sup>p</sup>) matches the

---

<sup>23</sup>Contra Zuntz, p. 173. He cites the omission of παντας as Marcion's reading, but this conclusion is rejected by Schmid (p. 33) as one based on unreliable sources.

<sup>24</sup>Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 5,36,2; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,9; *Adversus Praxean* 4.



υποταξαντος αυτω at the end of the sentence.

15:27.108 [discussed at 12:19.80]

15:28.112 [discussed at 12:19.80]

Because αυτω υποταγη (D Ψ Ir) does not conform to the word order found in this context (15:27 υποτετακται αυτω F G and υποταξαντος αυτω; 15:28 υποταξαντι αυτω), it may have been altered to υποταγη αυτω in order to match the other examples. However, the shift of the indirect object to an emphatic position is not uncommon in D (which here departs from its Latin counterpart); see also 3:1 ημιν λαλησαι (D L P Ψ 88 1739 *pc*); 10:33 πασιν παντα αρεσκω (D; πασιν κατα παντα αρεσκω F G).

15:28.114

The addition of και intensifies this particular clause,<sup>25</sup> an emphasis that scribes are unlikely to remove. The addition is avoided by B D\* F G 0243 33 424<sup>c</sup> 1175 1319 1739 *sy*<sup>p</sup> and the Latin tradition (P<sup>46</sup> *lac*).

15:28.117

The word order alteration in D\* VL 75 is likely caused by the scribe skipping over the η and then replacing it after the subject (ο θεος).

15:28.118 [discussed at 12:19.80]

15:29.120 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:29.122

---

<sup>25</sup>Fee p. 746 n. 2.

The substitution of τῶν νεκρῶν (D<sup>2</sup> L 049 056 0142 424 876 pc) for αὐτῶν makes clear the ambiguous referent of the pronoun, which may otherwise be mistakenly construed as the plural οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι. 69 conflates the two readings, perhaps on the basis of a correction in its exemplar, by adding the “Byzantine” reading after the archetypal reading.<sup>26</sup>

15:30.123 [discussed at 7:8.28]

15:31.128

The function of ὑμετέρων is unusual. Its other uses in the *Hauptbriefe* are as a possessive adjective, modifying a noun. But here the objective use is required in the context, which is not otherwise seen in the NT but evident in other Greek literature.<sup>27</sup> The shift to the first person ἡμετέρων (A 6 876 pc) is an attempt to ameliorate the difficult usage.<sup>28</sup>

15:31.129 [discussed at 11:2.3]

15:34.137; 15:57.225

0243 1739 frequently have difficulty with word order. At 15:57, the shift of ὑμῶν

---

<sup>26</sup>J. C. O’Neill (“1 Corinthians 15<sup>29</sup>,” *Expository Times* 91 (1979-80), pp. 310-11) argues that ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τῶν νεκρῶν is the archetypal reading since the scribe would not have intentionally created such an awkward word order. This reconstruction, however, requires a dubious reconstruction of what is described by “baptism for the dead.” Recognizing that a correction in an exemplar led to the unusual reading is a simpler explanation for the reading of 69.

<sup>27</sup>BDR §285<sup>3</sup>; Examples are provided in Kühner-Gerth I,i §454 Anmerk. 11.

<sup>28</sup>D. R. MacDonald, “A Conjectural Emendation of 1 Cor. 15:31-32 or the Case of the Misplaced Lion Fight,” *HTR* 93 (1980), pp. 265-76 (esp. 266-67). MacDonald uses this difficult usage to posit the interpolation of 15:31c (ἡ . . . ἡμῶν). This conjecture is based on a hasty rejection of the use of ὑμετέρων that was described above and a very complex and historically dubious reconstruction of a specific tradition about Paul fighting with lions which led to the interpolation. See Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 770 n. 49.

may have been caused by its having been initially overlooked, then added after *τινες* had been written. These two witnesses, joined by their sister 0212, also alter *του κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου* to *ιησου χριστου του κυριου ημων* at 15:57. 1739 makes a similar word order shift at 10:28 (for which 0121 0243 are not extant). At 15:34, the reading *τινες θεου* (here 0243 1739 are joined by a handful of other witnesses) may be a pure error, or an intentional alteration which makes clear that Paul is speaking to Christians (“Some who belong to God are ignorant”).

15.34.138 [discussed at 6:5.14]

15:36.141

The spelling *αφρον* is the vocative form, while *αφρων* uses the nominative case for the vocative.<sup>29</sup> While potentially merely a phonological variation, the fact that only the “Byzantine” witnesses read *αφρον* suggest that an improvement from the “improper” form has been made.<sup>30</sup> *Αφρον* is the only third declension liquid stem to appear in the vocative in the NT. It occurs elsewhere only at Luke 12:20, where again the “Byzantine” witnesses read the “proper” form. 0243 6 424 1739 join the Byzantine witnesses here, a further indication that these manuscripts are the result of correcting away from a Byzantine exemplar toward manuscripts similar to  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B [discussed in chapter on “Alexandrian” witnesses].

15:36.142

A, Epiphanius, and Theodoret replace *ζωοποιειται* with *ζωογονειται*. The words

---

<sup>29</sup>cf. Jannaris, §377.

<sup>30</sup>Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 135.



are similar in both meaning and form, though only the former is Pauline.<sup>31</sup> Ζωογονέω occurs never occurs in the *Corpus Paulinum*, but is found at Luke 17:33 (Ψ ζωοποιησει) and Acts 7:19. A makes similar sight/sound confusion of verb forms at 15:22 (see also 14:28.28).

15:36.143

The addition of πρωτον makes clear the sequence of “dying” and “being made alive,” an addition which may have been suggested by the use of the adjective πρωτος at 15:45, 47 and the adverb πρωτον at 15:46. No obvious motive for its omission can be ascertained, apart from the typical clarifying additions frequently found in D F G and the Latin tradition. The reading may not be confined to the Latin tradition, for it is attested in the Latin of Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses* (5,7,1), though the Greek is not extant at this point. It is also found in Rufinus<sup>32</sup> and, with the same word order as D<sup>33</sup>, Basil (*Moralia* MPG 31, p. 805). Other early Latin witnesses lack the adverb, notably Tertullian (*De resurrectione mortuorum* 52) and Cyprian (*Ad Quirinium* 3,58).

15:37.145

A single letter differentiates γεννησομενον (Ϟ<sup>46</sup> F G) from the γενησομενον attested by the rest of the Greek tradition. The Latin witnesses reflect the Greek variation. The Vulgate and its typical witnesses, along with Tertullian and Ambrosiater, read *futurum est* with the majority of Greek witnesses. *Nascetur* is found in VL 75 77 and *nascitur* in the *Speculum* (27). VL 78\* and 89 each attest a unique conflation: *nasciturum* and *futurum*

---

<sup>31</sup>Without variation at Rom. 4:17; 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 2 Cor. 3:6; Gal. 3:21; 1 Tim. 3:16 (also Jn. 5:21; 6:63).

<sup>32</sup>*Apologeticus Pamphili martyris pro Origene* 7; *Expositio symboli* 40.

<sup>33</sup>F G place πρωτον before αποθανη, likely in conformity to the Latin’s *prius moriatur*.

*nascetur*, respectively. The shared reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G is not likely to be accidental, since this cluster frequently joins against the rest of the tradition (see chapter on D F G). However, given that Paul uses γεννάω to speak only of spiritual or physical birth (Rom. 9:11; 1 Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:23, 24, 29), not eschatological resurrection, γεννησομενον is likely to be an accidental – albeit early – corruption.

15:37.146

$\aleph^*$  drops the second σπειρεις, an omission which may have been accidental since και ο σπειρεις . . . γεννησομενον would construe as a single clause without altering the sense.

15:38.152

ἴδιος can be used without the article (1 Cor. 7:7; 9:7; 12:11), though the article is preferred.<sup>34</sup> Its addition by a handful of witnesses here ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$  I<sup>vid</sup> and the “Byzantine” witnesses) may therefore be considered a stylistic improvement.

15:39.154; 15:39.158; 15:40.159; 15:44.172

F G omits the second occurrence of σαρξ at v. 39 and the second of σωματος at v. 40. The text construes in both cases, with the absent nouns implied from the respective previous clauses. At v. 40, the omission may have been made to balance the second half of the verse, which does not repeat δοξα in the contrasted second clause. F G are joined in the omission by I sy<sup>p</sup> at v. 39<sup>35</sup> and VL 89 Tertullian and Ambrosiaster at v. 40 (for which I is not

---

<sup>34</sup>BDR §286(2).

<sup>35</sup> $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  is deficient here, though given the available space it must have lacked either σαρξ (2) or αλλη. Zuntz (p. 215 n. 2) posits a potential omission of σαρξ before κτηνων. This is impossible, however, given the fact that σαρξ κτηνων occurs on a different line than σαρξ αλλη. The omission of σαρξ (2) is attested by F G I sy<sup>p</sup>, while the omission of αλλη is

extant), though Tertullian lacks the second *σωμα* of v. 44 in identical circumstances (joined in the omission by Cyprian and Zeno). This may indicate a general tendency to omit the superfluous noun.

Other witnesses attest harmonizations to the near context, parablepsis, and word order variations which seem to be nearly unavoidable in series such as this. The loss of *αλλη δε κτηνους* by K and many minuscules is another example of the parablepsis which has beset the “Byzantine” witnesses (see also 9:20).  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  attests one of its typical additions by assimilation to the near context by adding *σαρξ* before *πηνων* (it makes similar additions at 12:9 and 15:47). D F G may have avoided assimilation by writing *κτηνους* rather than the plural *κτηνων*. In the LXX, the neuter singular is frequently used collectively (e.g., Ex. 9:25; Lev. 27:28; Jer. 28:62) even in, as at 1 Cor. 15:39, a series where other “creatures” are written in the plural (Gen. 6:7; 7:23<sup>36</sup>). In the NT the only other occurrence of the singular cannot be collective (Luke 10:34), in contrast to the two plural forms (Acts. 23:24; Rev. 18:13).<sup>37</sup> The D-text’s *pecoris* (VL 75 79 Amst Spe) is unlikely to have caused the shift to the singular in D F G, for while *pecus* in the singular may be used collectively, so also may the plural.<sup>38</sup> Hence there does not appear to be a motivation for the D-text to render a Greek plural form with a singular; rather, *pecoris* is likely rendering the singular *κτηνους*. This reconstruction is supported by noting that Tertullian’s *iumentis* (*De resurrectione mortuorum*

---

attested by D\* and VL 64. All of these witnesses occasionally attest unique agreement with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ .

<sup>36</sup>Gen. 6:7 and 7:23: ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἑρπετῶν ἕως τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. κτήνος: “mostly in pl. as collective.”

<sup>38</sup>Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *pecus* (1) and (2a).



52)<sup>39</sup> and the Peshitta also uses the singular form. Therefore, a single alteration in the D-text cannot account for the range of attestation, and the κτηνους of D\* F G attests an early Greek reading. Because it avoids harmonization to the plurals ανθρωπων, πτηνων, and ιχθυων, it is likely the archetypal reading.

15:39.154; 15:39.158; 15:41.162; 15:41.164; 15:44.166

As at 12:10, a series of contrasted clauses led to alteration of the conjunctions:

		ϑ <sup>46</sup>	κ* A B L P Ψ pm lat	D*	F G VL 77	VG
15:39a		lac	αλλα		αλλα	αλλα
15:39a	αλλη	μεν	μεν	μεν	μεν	
15:39b	αλλη	δε	δε	δε	δε	
15:39c	αλλη	δε	δε		δε	
15:39d	αλλη	δε	δε	δε	δε	
15:41a	αλλη				δε	
15:41b	και αλλη	αλλη	και αλλη	και αλλη	αλλη δε	αλλη
15:41c	και αλλη	και αλλη	και αλλη	και αλλη	και αλλη	αλλη

The Vulgate, which shows the most significant editing, removes all conjunctions. D\* makes two errors: the loss αλλα is an example of parablepsis and the omission δε of v. 39c. F G and VL 77 simply read δε for every clause, adding it at v. 41a and replacing και at v. 41b. Given the parallel use of και at v. 40a and b, it appears that the singular reading of ϑ<sup>46</sup>, which removes the και at v. 41b, is incorrect. The archetypal reading, which avoids assimilation, is found in the majority of witnesses.

<sup>39</sup>Though *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10 reads the plural: *alia vero pecudum et volucrum* (which omits the final element).

15:44.174

In a rare singular reading of G, the original hand writes καθως after πνευματικον. This is the result of another skip by the scribe, here to the πνευματικον καθως (attested only by F G) at the end of the sentence. The corrector does not omit the additional word, but alters it to ως.

15:44.175; 15:44.176

The “Byzantine” witnesses (K L Ψ 049 056 075 0151 5 424\* 876 *pm*) have substantially revised 15:44. First, the conditional sentence is turned into a statement by removing the particle ει. Conditional statements are also altered at 1:13; 5:13; 9:8; and 9:13 (though not limited to “Byzantine” witnesses). Next, adverbial και is moved to the position prior to the verb, changing its function to that of a conjunction. Finally, σωμα is added prior to πνευματικον, bringing it into parallel with σωμα ψυχικον. Such alterations can only be explained as the result of intentional editing, though perhaps an unintentional omission of ει (ΕΙΕCTIN) has prompted the other alterations.

15:45.178 [discussed at 9:9.26]

15:45.179; 15:45.180; 15:47.185; 15:47.187; 15:47.188

1 Cor. 15:42-49 received particular attention from Gnostics such as Theodotus and the Valentinian exegetes, and is even alluded to in the Gospel of Philip. For this reason, the apologists Tertullian and Irenaeus made a discussion of this passage central to their

argument.<sup>40</sup> However, the manner of debate over the meaning of this section did not encourage textual alteration. The “Gnostics” and the “Orthodox” differed not on the form of the text but on the meaning of the words in the text, such as ψυχικός and πνευματικός. E.

Pagels writes:

The present study of gnostic exegesis lends support to Conzelmann’s view. It seems that we can account for allegedly “gnostic terminology” in Paul’s letters if we assume that Paul’s theological language subsequently is appropriated and developed by the Valentinians (and other gnostics) into a technical theological vocabulary.<sup>41</sup>

For this reason Irenaeus made the complaint, noted above (at 15:15) that “they compel wicked and perverse interpretations to be made of all the passages in order to overturn and change the sense of what was said” (*Adversus haereses* 5,13,5).

Although the “Orthodox” and the “Gnostics” debated the nature of the resurrection of Jesus, the debate has not impacted the textual tradition of this passage. Instead, the alterations in this section are simply mechanical errors. B K 326 385 *pc* and Irenaeus lose ανθρωπος following πρωτος, most likely by accidental leap.<sup>42</sup> Others make additions by assimilation. At 15:47 C\* adds αδαμ after ανθρωπος (1) in conformity to 15:45 and replaces χοικος with ψυχικός from v. 46.

An alteration which may be thought to reflect theological interests is the addition in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  of πνευματικός after ανθρωπος (2) at 15:47. This is more likely an addition based on

---

<sup>40</sup>Tertullian, *De resurrectione* 49-54; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 5,7,1-2. See E. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul. Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 93 n. 190. Irenaeus reads only αδαμ in both the first and second clauses of 15:45. Since he is the only witness to do so, his reading in both places should be attributed to his adaptation rather than an attempt to accurately render an archetype.

<sup>41</sup>Pagels, *Gnostic Paul*, p. 163.

<sup>42</sup>B. Weiss, p. 83, who notes similar errors elsewhere in B (omit της δικαιοσυνης after της δωρεας Rom. 5:17, joined again by Irenaeus; omit αποστολοις after αγιοις Eph. 3:5).



το πνευματικον at 15:46 than a theologically motivated alteration. Similar theological emphases are not to be found elsewhere in the alterations of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ , whereas this witness frequently adds words by assimilation to the surrounding material.<sup>43</sup>

A second alteration has been identified as being motivated being by theological interests.<sup>44</sup> Marcion, according to both Tertullian and Adamantius,<sup>45</sup> replaced  $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$  both at 15:45b and 15:47 with  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ . Both Schmid and Clabeaux, however, have disputed the Marcionite origin of this reading. Both see the readings as arising early in the tradition as explanatory glosses that clarify who the “second Adam” was.<sup>46</sup> The gloss has affected the textual tradition at 15:47 with  $\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$  in 630 1912 2200 agreeing with Tertullian’s citation of Marcion (*dominus de caelo*), and the “Byzantine” witnesses reading a conflation,  $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$ .

15:48.190; 15:48.191

Adverbial  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  following  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$  is in question both in 15:48a (omit F G VL 77 M) and 15:48b (omit  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ). No witnesses omit both examples, however, and there does not appear to be any reason to unbalance the clauses. Likely both omissions are examples of accidental loss ( $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\ \_ \ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \_$ ), though one may also compare the occasional omission of adverbial  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  (cf. the discussions at 13:12.57; 14:15.68; and 16:6.32).

15:48.192; 15:48.193

---

<sup>43</sup>Royse (p. 264) cites thirty examples of addition by assimilation in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ .

<sup>44</sup>In particular Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 47-48. See also Thiselton, p. 1285.

<sup>45</sup>Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10,7 and Adamantius, *Dialogus* 2,19.

<sup>46</sup>Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, pp. 108, 210; Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, pp. 78-79; 112;13. Schmid (p. 108) further debates whether Tertullian has accurately described Marcion’s text here.

The adjective *επουρανιος* occurs only at 1 Cor. 15:40, 49; Eph. 1:3; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12; Phil. 2:10; and 2 Tim. 4:18, and with variation here and at Eph. 1:20 (*ουρανοις sic B*). Given the use of *επουρανιος* at 15:40 and 49, that must be the correct form at 15:48. However, *ουρανιος*, attested only by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D\* F G, again connects these witnesses as stemming from the same early source.

15:49.194 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:50.199

The shift from *δε* to *γαρ* in D\* F G the D-text, and Tertullian, is likely the result of intentional alteration (cf. the similar substitution of *γαρ* for *δε* at 14:5.18). 15:50 could be interpreted as either a conclusion to 15:44-49 or a part of a unit comprised of 15:50-53.<sup>47</sup> The *γαρ* forces v. 50 to be read with vv. 44-49, though it should more likely be read with vv. 50-53.

15:50.200; 15:50.201

The readings *ου κληρονομησουσιν* and *ου κληρονομησει*, found together only in F G, may seem to be obviously secondary given their “poor” attestation. However, *ου κληρονομησουσιν* is also read by Marcion<sup>48</sup> and *κληρονομησει* by Methodius<sup>49</sup> (though neither cites both clauses). However, as discussed at 6:9-10, harmonization to the standard phrase *βασιλείαν θεοῦ [οὐ] κληρονομήσουσιν* likely accounts for the future tense in both

---

<sup>47</sup>See Fee, *First Corinthians*, pp. 795 n. 1 and 797-98 n. 7.

<sup>48</sup>As cited by Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10,11; see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, p. 103.

<sup>49</sup>Methodius, *Symposium* 3,7,68.

cases and the shift from κληρονομησαι ου δυναται,<sup>50</sup> both in F G and in the citation of Methodius. Nevertheless, both readings must have arisen extremely early in the tradition.

15:51.203; 15:51.204

The tradition divides into four main readings and two sub-readings

- A. παντες ου κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα ℞<sup>46</sup> A<sup>c51</sup>  
 B. παντες ου κοιμηθησομεθα παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα B  
 B.1. παντες μεν ου κοιμηθησομεθα παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα D<sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 049 056  
 075 0142 0150 0243<sup>c</sup> 0243 5 6 88 424 876 915 1834 1881  
 C. παντες κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα ℞ C 0243\* 33<sup>52</sup> 1241<sup>s</sup>  
 1739  
 D. παντες αναστησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα D\* b d  
 D.1. παντες μεν ουν κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα F G f\* Vg Tert  
 Amst

Two readings can immediately be explained as subvariants. First, The addition/omission of μεν is the only difference between B (Reading B) and the “Byzantine” text (Reading B.1).

This reading is likely secondary, another example of the addition of μέν to balance a subsequent δέ (see discussion at 12:20.82). Second, F G read μεν ουν after παντες (1). This, however, is likely a corruption of μεν ου. We have already seen F G alter Greek particles to match the Latin (discussed at 6:5). Notably, the Vulgate’s *quidem*, which found its way into the predecessor of VL 77 78, which then led to the addition in F G.<sup>53</sup> These manuscripts add μεν based on the Vulgate’s *quidem* also at 12:20. The error μεν ουν for μεν ου takes place

---

<sup>50</sup>Δύναμαι + inf. occurs some twenty-two times in Paul, nowhere else with variation.

<sup>51</sup>A, in one of its characteristic singular readings, adds the article before each παντες: οι παντες ου κοιμηθησομεθα οι παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα. The confusion of ου for οι before παντες (2) likely prompted the addition of οι before παντες (1).

<sup>52</sup>von Soden cites 33 as reading κοιμηθησομεθα ου αλλ ου παντες; cited here from photographs (Tischendorf cites correctly).

<sup>53</sup>Μεν ουν renders *quidem* in the Latin witnesses also at 1 Cor. 9:25



in other Greek witnesses. 999 makes the same alteration at 15:51, and 1646 writes  $\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\omicron\nu\nu$   $\omicron\nu$ , showing that scribal corruption is a strong possibility. Whatever the cause, the  $\omicron\nu\nu$  of F G is a corruption of  $\omicron\nu$ . Therefore, apart from the presence of  $\mu\epsilon\nu$ , F G agree with reading A.

The question of  $\omicron\nu$  before  $\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  is the easiest to resolve. Its omission removes a potential difficulty that later generations of scribes may have had with the text: How can Paul say that “not all will sleep” when clearly (to a later scribe or reader) Paul and all of his contemporaries have died?<sup>54</sup> This rules out Reading C, and, for different reasons (discussed below), Reading D, which removes  $\omicron\nu$  and the replaces of  $\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  with  $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ .

This passage’s most challenging problem, however, is whether or not to read  $\omicron\nu$  before  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ . Although this negative particle is read by all witnesses apart from B the “Byzantine” text, and the Vulgate, it is usually given only slight consideration. Schrage, for example, suggests that a negated  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  cannot suit the argument of 15:52. Fee sees Readings C and D as reflecting later Christian eschatology (“all men must die, but transformation is for believers only”).<sup>55</sup> The reading of  $\wp$ <sup>46</sup> is typically dismissed as a conflation of Readings B and C,<sup>56</sup> though none who make this argument recognize that both A<sup>c</sup> and F G would have to result from the same conflation, a highly unlikely situation. For while  $\wp$ <sup>46</sup> conflates readings found in F G and the rest of the tradition, F G only conflates with the Vulgate (which it does not here) and A shows idiosyncratic editing, but not

---

<sup>54</sup>B. Weiss, p. 135; Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 796 n. 3. W. Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 2. Teilband 1 Kor 15,1-16,24, Evangelisch-Katholisch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Zürich: Benziger, 2001), p. 370 [hereafter Schrage IV].

<sup>55</sup>Schrage IV, p. 370; Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 782 n. 3.

<sup>56</sup>Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, p. 254; also Schrage and Fee (see previous note).

conflation. This textual problem must be resolved on the basis of an analysis of the context, not by hazardous conjectures of scribal practice.

In order to determine whether or not the second *ou* should be read, a decision must be made as to whether each occurrence of πάντες and ἡμεῖς refers to those who, “at the last trumpet,” are still living, to the dead, or to both groups. J. Gillman has analyzed the structure of 1 Cor. 15:50-53 in detail, which helps to clarify these referents. In 50-53 he finds an A B A’ pattern, with a substructure encompassing 51-52:

50a	A	Τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί,
50b		ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται
50c		οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ.
51a	B	ἴδου μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω·
51b	a	πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα,
51c		πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα,
52a	b	ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι·
52b	b’	σαλπύσει γάρ
52c	a	καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι
52d		καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα.
53a	A’	Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν
53b		καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν.

Regarding the πάντες and ἡμεῖς, Gillman concludes:

The living/dead distinction is contained in a (v. 51bc) and a’ (v. 52cd). In element a Paul progresses from the living (v. 51b) to the living and the dead who are both transformed (v. 51c). In element a’, Paul clarifies in a double way what he has said in v. 51c. For the dead, transformation means to be raised incorruptible. The ἡμεῖς of v. 52d by its contrast with οἱ νεκροί in v. 52c shows with greater certitude that Paul himself expects to be alive at the Parousia. (p. 322).

Recognizing the obvious distinction in v. 52 between the living (ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα) and the dead (οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι) is critical. The living are “changed,” but the dead are not changed because they are “raised imperishable” and therefore do not need to undergo the change that the “living” will. V. 52 is connected to v. 51 by γάρ, which makes clear that v. 52 is an explanation of the “mystery” stated in the previous sentence. Gillman

and others<sup>57</sup> view the πάντες ἀλλαγησόμεθα of v. 51 as applying to both the living and the dead, but this destroys the parallelism with v. 52 (where a *distinction* is made between the living and dead) and does not account for the fact that 52 is an explanation of v. 51.

Furthermore, because the πάντες at v 51b does not refer to both the living and the dead (only the living), the πάντες at v. 51c it is not likely to, either. However, the distinction of v. 52 is maintained if one reads οὐ before ἀλλαγησόμεθα in v. 51: “We will (not) all sleep” (v. 51b) refers to the living, who will “be changed” (v. 52d) while “but we will not all be changed” (v. 51c) refers to the dead, who are *not* changed, but raised imperishable (v. 52c). Reading the negative particle in v. 51c therefore strengthens the parallelism described by Gillman,<sup>58</sup> who, incidentally, does not discuss any textual problems, including the οὐ. The reading ου ἀλλαγησομεθα therefore best suits the structure of 15:51-52.

Reading the ου in v. 51c has the additional advantage of making this “mystery” correspond more closely to the parallel description of Paul’s teaching on what happens at the “trumpet” in 1 Thes. 4. 1 Cor. 15:50 uses the term μυστήριον to describe the teaching, at 1 Thess. 4 he “does not want you to be ignorant.” In 1 Thes. 4, Paul argues that both the living and the dead will “be with the Lord” (4:17), but in a distinct sequence. The dead (τούς κοιμηθέντας) will “rise first,” and then those still living will be “caught up in the clouds with them.” In 1 Cor. 15 the concern is not the sequence of the resurrection, but what happens to the body. Those who are dead rise ἀφθαρτοι, while the living must be changed (15:52). Only by reading οὐ at 15:51b is this distinction maintained. As a result, the reading

---

<sup>57</sup>E.g., Fee, pp. 800-801 and 802 n. 27, though without considering alternative explanations nor the role of v. 52.

<sup>58</sup>This may further indicate that a reassessment of the parallelism of the entire section is in order. Jeremias, for example, had argued that all of 15:50-53 presents a series of parallel distinctions between the living and the dead. See Gillman, pp. 310-13.



οὐ ἀλλαγησόμεθα suits not only the structure of 15:51-52 but also matches another Pauline description of the eschaton.

Finally, the reading ου κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα is able to account for the creation of the other readings, for each one assumes that the negative stood before both verbs at 15:51. Reading C removes the first οὐ in order to reflect the situation after Paul's death, as described above. Reading D, which replaces κοιμηθησομεθα with αναστησομεθα, accomplishes the same result as Reading C, though in a different way, by importing the verb ἀνίστηνι, likely from 1 Thess. 4:14, 16.<sup>59</sup> This alteration also requires that the base had read the negative was read before both verbs, for "we all will rise" would easily be substituted for "we will not all sleep" but not its opposite "we will all sleep." Further, the second οὐ must have been read since only if "not all will be changed" would there be a difficulty with "we will not all sleep" that would prompt such an alteration. As a result, only one alteration took place in the Latin tradition (*resurgemus* in primarily D-text witnesses, VL 75 89 Amst Spec<sup>60</sup>) and D\*, the shift of verb, not a complex alteration involving alteration of the verb and addition of the negative. As is the case with Reading C, the only text which could have produced Reading D is Reading A.

This analysis demonstrates that all readings, except for Readings B and B.1, are based on a text which read ου αλλαγησομεθα. But is Reading A the corruption, or is B? Setting aside the question of μέν (see below), these readings do preserve the archetypical ου κοιμηθησομεθα. But is it more likely that B, the "Byzantine" text, and the Vulgate, in

---

<sup>59</sup>In the *Corpus Paulinum*, only Eph. 5:14 uses the verb in connection with the resurrection.

<sup>60</sup>Fee (*First Corinthians*, p. 796 n. 3) cites Marcion as sharing this reading, though Schmid's *Marcion und sein Apostolos* does not locate any evidence for Marcion's text here.

contrast to the base text for all other witnesses, removed the *ου* before *αλλαγησομεθα*, or preserved it? On transcriptional probabilities the answer is relatively simple: the omission of *ου* results in the reading *παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα*, which brings v. 51c into harmony with *και ημεις αλλαγησομεθα* at v. 52d. This harmony, however, is only a surface parallel, for as noted above, the *αλλαγησομεθα* of v. 52d refers only to the living, while the *αλλαγησομεθα* of v. 51c refers to the dead – and even according to alternative interpretations, it refers to *both* the living and the dead. So while there is a facile parallel between Reading B (also B.1) and v. 51c, contextually it is not parallel. Readings B and B.1 are therefore the result of a common scribal corruption: assimilation to the near context. Furthermore, this is a typical alteration in these witnesses. One may compare the situation at 1 Cor. 2:4, where only  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G preserve the archetypal text, but all other witnesses, including B and the “Byzantine” text, assimilate the text to 2:13.

As a result, the reading *παντες ου κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα* ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A<sup>c</sup>) suits the both the structure and argument of 15:50-53 in ways that the other readings do not. It also suits Pauline theology as expressed at 1 Thess. 4 – without obviously harmonizing to it, as did D\*. The only argument against it, that it is the result of conflation, is extremely unlikely, given the known characteristics of witnesses that support it (A F G). Finally, all the other readings can be shown to have derived from this reading.

15:52.205

Zuntz’s argument, that *εν ροπη οφθαλμου* cannot be understood as “in the blink of an eye,” cannot be assailed.<sup>61</sup> \*Ροπη and ριπη, because they are similar in meaning, are

---

<sup>61</sup>Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, pp. 37-39. Searches of *TLG* and the Duke Documentary Papyri databases yielded no collocation of the nouns.

occasionally substituted for each other, but *εν ροπη οφθαμου* is senseless in this context.<sup>62</sup>

Hence *ροπη* (P<sup>46</sup> D\* F G 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739) must be a very early error,<sup>63</sup> showing that readings in both D F G and the 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 cluster go back into the second century.

15:52.207

Ψ alone adds an explanatory gloss to *σαλπισει γαρ: φοβερα σαλπιγγι απ ουρανου*, though an external source for the gloss cannot be identified.

15:52.209

A D F G 056 0142 0150 read *εγερθησονται* in place of *αναστησονται*. In Paul, *ανίστημι* is used of “resurrection” in the *Corpus Paulinum* only at Eph. 5:14 and 1 Thes. 4:14, 16. However, patristic formulations prefer *ανίστημι*, perhaps based on the use of that term in the gospels, particularly John (John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:23-24; 20:9; cf. Mark 16:9).<sup>64</sup>

15:53.210 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:53.213 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

15:54.215; 15:54.216

The range of variation suggests that accidental omission by accidental leap has caused the disruption in the tradition. F G 6 skip from *ΔΘΑΝΑCΙΔΝ* (15:53) to *ΔΦΘΑΡCΙΔΝ* (15:54). D\* and much of the Latin tradition (VL 75 89 Vg Amst) skip from *ΤΟΦΘΑΡPΤΟΝ* to

---

<sup>62</sup>Zuntz denies that any Latin reading goes back to *εν ροπη οφθαμου*, but Tertullian’s *in momentaneo oculi motu* (*De resurrectione* 42 and *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10) appears to be an attempt to make sense of the difficult reading.

<sup>63</sup>Compare also *πειθοις* at 2:4; *νεικος* at 15:54; and *ενεργης* at 16:9.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. Lampe, s.v. *ανιστήμι* (A.2).



TOΘNHTON, while other early witnesses (P<sup>46</sup> N\* C\* 088 0121 0243 1175 1739\* pc Mcion Ir) skipped from ΔΦΘΑΡCΙΔN to ΔΘΔNΔCΙΔN. The reading of the rest of the tradition, including N<sup>2</sup> B C<sup>2vid</sup> D K L P pm, may appear to be a conflation of these two readings which was based on the similar wording of 15:53. However, this would not explain why either the D\* reading would have intentionally replaced the P<sup>46</sup> reading, or the reverse. The reading of A, which reverses the two clauses, must be the result of a correction which replaced the missing clause in the wrong location.<sup>65</sup>

15:54.219; 15:55.221

The phrase εις νεικος (P<sup>46</sup> B D\* 088) reflects a Septuagintal rendering of Πῦλ (or Πῦ; “forever”).<sup>66</sup> The resultant text would translate: “Death is swallowed up forever,” a contextually appropriate meaning that reflects the eschatological fulfillment to which Paul points in this section. This reading is also the basis of Tertullian’s *in contentione* (*De resurrection* 51) and Cyprian’s *in contentionem* (*Ad Quirinium* 3,58). While attractive, εις νεικος at 15:54 may simply be an itacistic variation of εις νικος,<sup>67</sup> particularly since the same Greek witnesses read νεικος where νικος 15:55 (they read νικος, it should be noted, at 15:57).

15:55.220

This catena of passages is adapted from the LXX of Is. 25:8 and Hos. 13:14, though

---

<sup>65</sup>Also attested by a few minuscules and some Vulgate witnesses.

<sup>66</sup>Cf. Amos 1:11; Zeph. 3:5; Job 36:7; in the NT also Matt. 12:20. Rev. 21:4, also alluding to Is. 25:8, reads ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι. See Schrage IV, p. 364, n. 1817. Apparently, εις νικος renders Πῦλ at 2 Sam. 2:26.

<sup>67</sup>BDAG, s.v. νεῖκος. Fee (p. 803-804) argues that the νικος in the next clause requires that νικος be read also at 15:54.

no Pauline manuscript matches the texts of the LXX precisely.<sup>68</sup> For example, the only word retained by Paul from Is. 25 is ο θανατος. In addition, δίκη, a key term from Hos. 13:14 (ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε), is absent from all witnesses to 1 Cor. Even more strikingly, the word order of Hosea is rearranged by Paul, so that the vocative stands after the adverb, while the LXX reads the nominative after the adverb. Again, no Pauline manuscript adapts to this sequence. Furthermore, the *Textual Commentary* argues that the “Byzantine” reading “arose from scribal assimilation to the text of the Septuagint.”<sup>69</sup> This is difficult to sustain in light of the fact that the LXX of Hosea places το κεντρον in the second clause (the reading of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  B C 1739), whereas D F G and the Byzantine tradition reads το κεντρον in the first clause. The only adaptation in this unit which may plausibly be attributed to assimilation to the LXX is the substitution of αδη ( $\aleph^2$  A<sup>c</sup> K L P  $\Psi$  049 056 075 0142 0151 6 pm) for the second θανατε. Ἄδης is found nowhere else in Paul nor in any early translation of this passage. Two citations attributed to Origen, however, read αδη. In *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* fr. 54 his που σου θανατε το νικος που σου αδη το κεντρον matches 0121 0243 33 1739<sup>c</sup>. The connection with these witnesses is tantalizing, but catenae manuscripts are notoriously unreliable. At *De oratione* 25,3, the reading που σου θανατε το κεντρον που σου αδη το νικος matches only D<sup>2</sup>, and likely has no claim to represent manuscripts known to Origen. It may have entered Origen’s manuscript tradition via the “Byzantine” text, into which αδη could have been easily introduced through a marginal gloss or interlinear correction, in this case a minor adaptation to the LXX.

The alternative order, however, is more likely simply scribal error. Irenaeus, for

---

<sup>68</sup>Cf. Schrage IV, p. 380.

<sup>69</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 570.

example, uses both sequences in the same writing, and Tertullian's citation varies in different writings.<sup>70</sup> Clement of Alexandria cites only one clause.<sup>71</sup> The sequence κεντρον . . . νικος (D F G K L P Ψ 6 *pm*) is the most difficult reading for two reasons: it separates νικος of v. 55 from the same word in v. 54, and likewise κεντρον from the same word at v. 56. In addition, as noted above, it avoids the sequence of the LXX.

15:56.222 [discussed at 12:6.23]

15:56.223

0151 alters νομος to θανατος, assimilating the noun to κεντρον του θανατου in the preceding clause.

15:57.224 [discussed at 14:7.28]

15:57.225 [discussed at 15:34.137]

15:58.226

Ϟ<sup>46</sup> alone adds a second μου after αγαπητοι, resulting in αδελφοι μου αγαπητοι μου. This may be the result of either harmonization to the near context<sup>72</sup> or adaptation to a stereotypical formula (see discussion at 1:4).

15:58.227

---

<sup>70</sup>*Adversus haereses* 3,23,7 twice reads *ubi est mors victoria tua ubi est mors aculeus tuus*, while 5,13,3 twice reads *ubi est mors aculeus tuus ubi est mors victoria tua*. Tertullian's *De resurrectione* 47 and 54 read: *ubi est mors aculeus tuus ubi est mors contentio tua* (51 replaces *contentione* with *potentia*), while *Adversus Marcionem* 5,10,16 reads *ubi est mors contentio tua ubi est mors aculeus tuus*.

<sup>71</sup>*Paedagogus* 2,8,74,3: που σου θανατε το κεντρον.

<sup>72</sup>Royse, p. 234.



A sy<sup>p</sup> add και or alter other conjunctions to και in three places. At 15:58 (joined by the Vulgate), the addition of και eases the asyndeton created by εδραιοι γινεσθε αμετακινητοι. At 11:5, these two witnesses write και πασα in place of πασα δε, and at 11:27 (joined by several minuscules) they write και πινη for η πινη.

15:58.230

F G shift ουκ εστιν to the initial position following οτι. Pauline usage demonstrates that this position is secondary, for Paul never places the copulative before both the noun and the predicate<sup>73</sup> and further, as in the majority reading, the subject always follows immediately after ειδότες οτι (Rom. 5:3; 6:9; 2 Cor. 1:7; 4:14; 5:6). The alteration, found only in F G and VL 77, may have been caused by a skip from ΟΚΟΠΟC to ΟΥΚΕCΤΙΝ, with ΟΚΟΠΟCΥΜΩΝ re-inserted after the mistake was noticed.

---

<sup>73</sup>The verb stands between the noun and the predicate: Rom. 1:9; 1 Cor. 12:14; Gal. 5:3 or after both: 1 Cor. 7:19; 1 Cor. 10:19 (D\* F G ειδωλοθυτον εστιν τι); Gal. 6:15 (εστιν ] ισχυει ϑ<sup>46</sup> B L Ψ pm).

## Notes on Chapter 16

## 16:2.6

This is the only Pauline occurrence of the phrase μία σαββάτων / σαββάτου. In the gospels, σάββατον is always in the plural (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7).<sup>1</sup> The plural form has been adapted at 1 Cor. 16:2 to the familiar phrase from the gospels, which were not copied with the gospels in the earliest periods of transmission. For this reason it must be a relatively late reading; indeed, it is only attested by “Byzantine” and related witnesses (N<sup>2</sup> K L 0121 0243 6 1739).

## 16:2.7; 16:3.18; 16:16.71

Further examples of υμ-/ ημ- variation in 1241<sup>ε</sup>.

## 16:2.10; 16:3.16; 16:6.33

The grammars extensively discuss variation between ἄν and ἔάν when a particle follows and indefinite pronoun. The consensus is that ἔάν is the Hellenistic form, with ἄν supplanting it ultimately in Middle Greek.<sup>2</sup> The early manuscripts are not consistent.<sup>3</sup> However, it appears that ἔάν should be preferred. The only textually firm example of ὅς followed by ἄν is Rom. 9:15 (*bis*), though this is a citation from the LXX. The manuscripts are otherwise inconsistent:

Rom. 14:23 ο δε διακριμενος εαν *cett*  
ο δε διακριμενος αν B

---

<sup>1</sup>Apart from Mark 16:9 πρώτη σαββάτου.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton I, pp. 41-43; BDR §107<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>See von Soden, I.ii.A, p. 1385, though he discusses only the gospels.

- 1 Cor. 6:18 ο εαν *cett*  
ο αν D\* 33 205 330 2400
- 1 Cor. 11:25 οσακις εαν P<sup>46</sup> N A B C D 6 1739  
οσακις αν D F G K L Ψ *pm*
- 1 Cor. 16:2 ο τι εαν B\* 088 0121 0243  
ο τι αν *cett*  
οταν 0151  
*lac* P<sup>46</sup> I
- 1 Cor. 16:3 ους εαν *cett*  
ους αν B D\* F G 1108 1611  
ους P<sup>46</sup>
- 1 Cor. 16:6 ου εαν *cett*  
ου αν D\* F G
- Gal. 5:10 οστις εαν P<sup>46</sup> N A B C P 062 0151 0278  
οστις αν D F G K L Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0151
- Gal 5:17 α εαν N A B<sup>1</sup> 0122<sup>\*vid</sup> 0278  
α αν C<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 049 056 075 0122<sup>c</sup> 0142 0150 0151  
ο αν D\* F G  
α C\*  
αν B\*
- ο γαρ αν B D\* F G
- Col 3:17 ο τι εαν P<sup>46</sup> B F G L 049  
ο τι αν N A C D I<sup>vid</sup> K Ψ 056 075
- Col 3:23 ο εαν  
ο αν P<sup>46</sup> D\* F G  
ο τι εαν D<sup>1</sup> K L 049 0150  
ο τι αν Ψ
- 1 Thes. 2:7 ως εαν N<sup>2</sup> B C D<sup>\*c</sup> F G P Ψ 0278  
ως αν N\* A D<sup>2</sup> K L 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151

In these eleven examples,<sup>4</sup> it is clear that several witnesses attest to the later shift to ἄν: D\* ten times and F G eight; K L Ψ six each. B\* makes the shift only three times, but two are singular readings.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, P<sup>46</sup> (where extant) does so only twice<sup>6</sup> and A three

---

<sup>4</sup>2 Cor. 8:12 is not considered since ἄν (καθο αν N D\* F G L 0150 may be correct here, with ἔάν influenced by εἶ in the previous clause.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. also 1 Cor. 7:8 εαν μεινωσιν *cett* ] αν μεινωσιν B.

<sup>6</sup>This result is all the more significant since P<sup>46</sup> errs in writing εαν in other situations: ως εαν (for αν) at 1 Cor. 11:34 and εαν ετερογλωσσαις (for εν) at 14:21. The manuscript may be correct, however, at Rom. 9:26, where it reads οὐ εαν κληθησονται (F G οὐ αν κληθησονται) against οὐ ερρεθη/ερρηθη in the rest of the tradition.



times.

16:4.21 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

16:5.27; 16:6.30

Ⓜ<sup>46</sup> replaces διερχομαι with παρερχομαι, likely a harmonization to παραμενω and παραχειμασω in the next sentence.<sup>7</sup> Harmonization likely also accounts for παραμενω at v. 6 (Ⓜ<sup>46</sup> Ⓝ A C D K L P Ψ 1739\*<sup>8</sup>).<sup>8</sup> However, the decision between καταμενω and παραπομενω (F G) is more difficult. Both words are non-Pauline, though παραπομενω is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT and extremely rare in Greek literature.<sup>9</sup> Though the shared ancestor of F G is frequently influenced by the Latin, *(re)manebo* is unlikely to have produced such a rare word. Παραπομενω is the most difficult reading, and would have been easily corrupted to παραμενω. However, since there no discernible cause for καταμενω, final judgment cannot be made.

16:6.29

Simple vowel confusion likely accounts for τυχων (P Ψ 0150 876\* 1241\*), even though τυχον is a rare use of the accusative absolute.<sup>10</sup>

16:6.32

D's awkward singular reading, as Vogels noted, was likely created by a

---

<sup>7</sup>Royse, p. 274.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. also 7:31, where L writes παραχρωμενοι for καταχρωμενοι under the influence of the next word, παραγει.

<sup>9</sup>See Liddell and Scott, s.v. παραπομένω.

<sup>10</sup>BDR §424.

misinterpreted correction.<sup>11</sup> This project demonstrates that the source of this correction is a manuscript similar to  $\aleph$  and A. However, instead of placing  $\iota\nu\alpha$  after  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\omega$ , it was placed after the similar  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$ . The error was easily made because both verbs are at the ends of lines in D. The reading of the shared ancestor of D F G is therefore the same as that found in the D-text:  $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\omega\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ / \textit{vel etiam heimabo nisi si}$ .<sup>12</sup>

This reading is likely another example of minor editing in D F G and their related Latin witnesses to improve the sense of the text. In 16:5a,  $\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{o}\nu$  indicates uncertainty as to whether or not Paul will stay in Corinth. This tradition's revisor took the uncertainty to be not about Paul's plans, but about whether or not the Corinthians will receive him. The reading likely originates in the Greek, for the D-text's *nisi si* is unique in 1 Corinthians, and three times the D-text reads *nisi* where the Vulgate reads *nisi si* (1 Cor. 14:5, 6, 9).

Unrelated to D F G's editing is the question of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ .  $\text{H}^{\text{c}}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$  is common in Paul (Rom. 2:15; 4:9; 14:10; 1 Cor. 9:8; 2 Cor. 1:13), with Rom. 2:15 and 2 Cor. 1:13 providing close parallels to 1 Cor. 16:6. Given that adverbial  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  is frequently lost in the manuscripts (see discussions at 13:12; 14:15; 15:48), and in particular by the witnesses that attest the shorter reading here ( $\aleph$  A B C at Rom. 8:34 ;  $\wp^{46}$  at 1 Cor. 15:48), it is more likely that  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  was lost either by accident or in yet another attempt to clarify Paul's description of his future plans.

16:7.35; 16:7.37

Explanatory  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  is necessary in both places, with 16:7b parallel but also clarifying Paul's statement of v. 7a. The "Byzantine" text alters the second  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  to  $\delta\epsilon$ , making v. 7b contrastive. As is the case with the alterations in 16:6, the alteration attempts to clarify the

---

<sup>11</sup>Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 292.

<sup>12</sup>F G lose  $\eta$ , a common error in these witnesses (see chapter on D F G).

uncertainty which Paul expresses regarding his travel plans.

16:7.38 [discussed at 9:12.40]

16:7.40

Interchange between the present -τρεπ- and aorist -τρεψ- would seem to be common, but this is the only place in the *Corpus Paulinum* where variation occurs (-τρεψ- Rom. 11:26; 2 Cor. 3:16; -τρεπ- 1 Cor. 4:14; 14:34; 1 Tim. 2:12; also Heb. 12:9). At 1 Cor. 16:7 the present form (D F G K Ψ 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 *pm*) is likely assimilation to ο εαν πορευωμαι at 16:6.

16:9.44

The use of ενεργης, found in every Greek witness, is difficult in this passage, for it cannot directly modify θυρα in the same way that μεγαλη does. Typically, commentators assume that ενεργης must refer to the activity or work that the “open door” presents.<sup>13</sup> However, this would require that μεγαλη and ενεργης function in different ways, whereas their connection by και and identical case should require an identical function. The Latin tradition, however, offers a potential solution. *Evidens* (VL 77 78 89 VG; *videns* 75) assumes the Greek εναργης, meaning “clear” or “obvious.” This form of the text is not attested in any Greek manuscripts, but is found in a citation of this passage in a writing wrongly attributed to Chrysostom.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the collocation of μεγαλη and εναργη is found elsewhere in

---

<sup>13</sup>Schrage IV, p. 440; Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 820, who gives the sense, “‘a great door’ for effective work has opened to me.”

<sup>14</sup>*De Circo* MPG 59, p. 569.



Greek literature,<sup>15</sup> whereas *μεγαλη* and *ενεργη* is not. Here, as in the readings *ροπη* at 1 Cor. 15:52 and *νεικος* at 15:54 the alteration of a single letter has produced a reading which is too difficult for the context. As at 2:4 and 10:20, the Latin tradition alone preserves the archetypal reading.

16:10.49 [discussed at 2:1.1]

16:11.50; 16:11.52

Güting and Mealand suggest that asyndeton in both places is original, with the shorter reading attested at 16:11a by D\* F G and the D-text and at 16:11b by *ℵ\**. However, it is more likely that *ℵ\** lost *δε* by accidental leap (*ΠΡΟΠΕΜΨΔΤΕΔΕ*),<sup>16</sup> a common error by the scribe of *ℵ*. Furthermore, while the addition of *ουν* appears to be a case of avoidance of asyndeton, other factors are more likely. One would not expect the addition in the third position rather than its typical second position in the clause.<sup>17</sup> In addition, D F G and its Latin relatives prefer not to read *ουν* in the third position:

Rom. 9:19	<i>ερεις μοι ουν ] ερεις ουν μοι</i>	D F G K L Ψ <i>pm</i>
Rom. 14:16	<i>μη βλασφημεισθω ουν ] μη βλασφημεισθω</i>	F G VL 77 78
2 Cor. 11:15	<i>ου μεγα ουν ] ου μεγα</i>	D* VL 61 75 89 Spe Luc

16:11.54

A case of parablepsis in B: *ΔΥΤΩΝΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΔΔΕΛΦΩΝ*.

---

<sup>15</sup> Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 10,4,34 *μεγάλα καὶ ἐναργῆ δείγματα*.

<sup>16</sup> Comparison may be made to similar loss of *de* at 1 Cor. 8:9 (*ΒΛΕΠΕΤΕΔΕ* *ℱ*<sup>46</sup> 104 1827 2464\*) and Eph. 4:32 (*ΓΙΝΕΘΕΔΕ* *ℱ*<sup>46</sup> B 0278 6 1739\* *pc*); but no loss at 1 Cor. 12:31; 14:1.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Col. 2:16: *μη ουν τις* (but 056 0142 0278 *μη τις ουν*)

16:12.56

The reading  $\delta\eta\lambda\omega\ \upsilon\mu\iota\nu\ \sigma\tau\iota$  is typical of the clarifying expansions found in D F G and related Latin witnesses. It helps to make clear that Paul had nothing to do with Apollos' absence. However, there is no reason for its omission, accidental or intentional.<sup>18</sup> Yet in this reading D F G and the Latin are not alone:  $\aleph^*$  has the identical reading. This reading cannot have originated in the Latin, therefore, and must have existed outside a narrow "Western" text. This should warn us against dismissing all the unique readings in D F G as originating only late in a narrow group of witnesses.

16:13.62 [discussed in chapter on D F G]

16:15.65

$\Delta\epsilon$  is lacking in  $\aleph^* D^*$ , the same witnesses which lost conjunctions at 16:11. Güting and Mealand, however, conclude that since these witnesses "rarely omit  $\delta\epsilon$ " their reading may be original, and the addition of  $\delta\epsilon$  due to the familiar phrase  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ .<sup>19</sup> At the same time, however,  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega$  without  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is found only at Phil. 4:2; there is no reason for not supplying it here.<sup>20</sup>

16:15.66

The addition of  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\omicron\rho\tau\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\chi\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$   $C^* \text{vid} F G 1611 pc sy^h$ ) is made from

---

<sup>18</sup>Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 823 n. 1.

<sup>19</sup>Güting and Mealand, pp. 48 and 101. There is a typographical error on p. 101, where they note that " $\aleph$  and B rarely omit  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ." It is not clear if this error, however, has affected their conclusion, since they claim that B loses  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  only once, but D three times.

<sup>20</sup>As there is at Phlm. 10, where there is anaphora, as Güting and Mealand (p. 48) note.

16:17; nothing can explain its loss. All witnesses that read this also write εἰσιν for εστίν in order to match the altered number of the subject. However, some witnesses add only καὶ φορτυνατου without altering the verb (ℵ<sup>2</sup> 0150 88 104 915 1241). There is no obvious motivation for the addition of only Fortunatus, who is otherwise unknown. It may be that parablepsis accounts for this reading (ΦΟΡΤΥΝΑΤΟΥΚΑΙΔΧΔΙΚΟΥ).

The same accidental omission must have taken place independently in D and the D-text (VL 75 89 Amst). This reading is based on the F G reading, since it has the plural form of the verb (εἰσιν / *sunt*), but lacks καὶ ἀχαικου.

16:15.67; 16:15.68

℘<sup>46</sup> and D\* attest independent harmonizations to the parallel in Rom. 16:5. ℘<sup>46</sup> reads ασιας for ἀχαιας, while D\* reads ἀπαρχης for ἀπαρχη. The addition of final sigma matches ἀπαρχης at Rom. 16:5, found only in ℘<sup>46</sup> and D\*. The addition of a single letter changes both Epaenetus and Stephanas into a “officials.” Furthermore, ℘<sup>46</sup> also read ασιας at Rom. 16:5. This may be, as Royse notes, harmonization to a parallel passage in ℘<sup>46</sup>, which occurs occasionally in the manuscript, most frequently in Hebrews.<sup>21</sup> This indicates not scribal activity, but editorial investigation and alteration.

16:17.75

This is the only interchange of ὑμετερος / ὑμων in 1 Corinthians. Given the relative infrequency of the former in the *Corpus Paulinum* (Rom. 11:31; 15:4; 1 Cor. 15:31; 2 Cor. 8:8; Gal. 6:13; 2 Tim. 4:15) it is likely to have been altered to ὑμων (℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ A K L Ψ 049 056

---

<sup>21</sup>Royse, p. 263.



075 0142 0150 0151 6 *pm*) than the reverse.<sup>22</sup> The two occurrences of υμεις at 16:15 and 16 may also have played a role.

16:17.76 [discussed at 7:13.46 and 9:12.39]

16:19.84

Assimilation to the near context explains the plural ασπαζονται (B F G L 049 056 075 0121 0243 6 33 88 424 876 915 1739). This form matches both the other occurrences of ασπαζονται at 16:19 and 20 and the grammatical number of the subject, even though Paul's practice is to use a singular verb when two personal names are the subject.<sup>23</sup> Compare also 15:50, where δυνανται replaces δυναται for the same reason.

16:19.86

Πρισκιλλα C D F G L Ψ 075 5 6 88 *pm*) is most easily explained as a harmonization to the same form in Acts 18. This becomes more certain when one recognizes that D F G, whose text form traces back to the second century, have also added παρ ους και ξενιζομαι in order to bring the mention of Prisc(ill)a and Aquila into harmony with Acts 18 (see further on 14:34-35).<sup>24</sup> Priska is otherwise read in the *Corpus Paulinum* (Rom. 16:3; 2 Tim. 4:19).

Ⲡ<sup>46</sup> attests a singular reading, πρεισκας. This is unlikely to be the result of intentional alteration, in spite of the potential of an "anti-feminist" tendency in the

---

<sup>22</sup>B. Weiss (p. 27) sees υμων resulting from simple carelessness.

<sup>23</sup>D. Kurek-Chomyx, "Is There an "Anti-Priscan" Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006), pp. 107-28; esp. pp. 112-13.

<sup>24</sup>This insertion is not recognized by Kurek-Chomyx (pp. 116-17 and 128), who posits that the diminutive "could also be interpreted as a put-down."

manuscripts.<sup>25</sup> Instead, simple doubling of the final sigma satisfactorily explains the reading (ΠΡΕΙCKΔCCYN).<sup>26</sup> Precisely the same error is made by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  at 1 Cor. 2:4. The manuscript also reads the feminine (πρεισκων) at Rom. 16:3, confirming that πρεισκας is a corruption and not intended as a masculine form.

16:19.87 [discussed at 14:34-35]

16:24.98

Αμην is a secondary addition made in virtually all of the Pauline letters, with the same witnesses making the addition:  $\aleph^2$  D K L P  $\Psi$  at 2 Cor. 13:13; Eph. 6:24; Col. 4:18 (also 0278); 2 Thes. 3:18; 1 Tim. 6:21; 2 Tim. 4:22. Other witnesses also add αμην.

Phil. 4:23	+ αμην $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ $\aleph$ A D K L P $\Psi$ <i>pm</i>
1 Thes. 5:28	+ αμην $\aleph$ A D <sup>1</sup> K L P $\Psi$ <i>pm</i>
Titus 3:15	+ αμην $\aleph^2$ D <sup>1</sup> F G H K L P $\Psi$ 0278 <i>pm</i>
Phlm. 25	+ αμην $\aleph$ C D <sup>1</sup> K L P $\Psi$ 0278 <i>pm</i>
Heb. 13:25	+ αμην $\aleph^2$ A C D K P $\Psi$ 0243 <i>pm</i>

Only Galatians may have ended with αμην (omitted only by G).

---

<sup>25</sup>See Kurek-Chomyx (pp. 109-11), who rules out unintentional error: “[W]e cannot be sure that this singular reading should be explained as a mere mechanical error. The outcome at any rate is obvious: the variant under discussion reduces the number of women mentioned in 1 Corinthians. This, however, does not yet facilitate any far-fetched conclusions with respect to the possible animosity toward women in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ .”

<sup>26</sup>Royse (p. 274) suggests that harmonization to the male name ακυλας led to the addition of the sigma.

## The Bilingual Manuscript Tradition and its Witness to the Text of 1 Corinthians

The most unique form of the text of 1 Corinthians is found in the Greco-Latin bilinguals D F G. As has been apparent to this point, they frequently differ from all other witnesses. Furthermore, their witness is complicated by the unique relationship between D and FG and between the three together and the Latin tradition. Because each witness has undergone unique alteration, the editorial and copying practices of each must be discussed individually. Ideally, a complete textual commentary on the readings of D F G would be produced; here only representative examples will be provided.<sup>1</sup> An outline is provided to guide the reader through these discussions:

### I. 89, AMst(A) and the Old Latin Tradition

### II. The Witness of D F G

- A. D F G Influenced by the Latin Text
- B. Alteration of Word Order
- C. Role of Paul in D F G
- D. Expansionist and Interpretive Alterations
- E. The Influence of the Near Context

### III. Secondary Editing in F G

- A. Latinisms in F G
- B. Latin Influenced Word Divisions
- C. Addition and Omission of the Article
- D. Other Latinisms in F G
- E. Alterations in F G Toward the Vulgate
- F. Greek Source of the Vulgate-Influenced Additions in F G
- G. Harmonization to Near Context in F G
- H. Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text
- I. Secondary Spelling in F G

### IV. Secondary Editing in D

---

<sup>1</sup>Compare the *desideratum* of a textual commentary on the text of Codex Bezae, as expressed by D. Parker in *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 250.



- A. Latinization in D
  - B. Harmonizations to Other Writings
  - C. Idiosyncratic Editing in D
  - D. Alterations Toward Alexandrian Witnesses
- V. Uncertain Z Readings
- VI. Results

Since the work of P. Corssen in 1887-9<sup>2</sup> it has been accepted that, in the late fourth or early fifth century, a Greco-Latin bilingual manuscript was created using existing Greek and Latin witnesses. These were related, but the Latin was not originally a translation of the Greek text which became a part of this manuscript. This bilingual manuscript, which Corssen labelled "Z,"<sup>3</sup> later became the source for two surviving lines of witnesses: D (06) 75 of the fifth century and a predecessor manuscript to the ninth century manuscripts F and G, which Corssen labelled "X." This basic outline has been widely accepted. Frede made two key additional proposals: First, that Z should be dated to the mid-fourth century;<sup>4</sup> and second, that X was an eighth century edition made by Carolingian scholars in the region of St. Gall, which is able to account for the alterations in the Latin toward a "St. Gall" type of Vulgate now found in 78 and partially in 77.<sup>5</sup>

The Latin text of the bilinguals has undergone detailed analysis. In the early 1960's monographs appeared on 2 Corinthians, 2 Timothy, and 1 Thessalonians,<sup>6</sup> as well as a

---

<sup>2</sup>P. Corssen, *Epistularum Paulinarum codices graece et latine scriptos Augiensem Boernerianum Claromontanum examinavit inter se comparavit ad communem originem revocavit* (s.l.: Typis expressit H. Fiencke Kiliensis, 1887-89).

<sup>3</sup>Corssen's labels X and Z will be used in this chapter.

<sup>4</sup>Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, p. 78.

<sup>5</sup>Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, pp. 77-78; 78 n. 1.

<sup>6</sup>H. Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der allateinischen Überlieferung des Zweiten Korintherbriefes*, Bonner Biblische Beiträge 16 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1960); F. H.

Festschrift essay on their text of Galatians,<sup>7</sup> which is perhaps the most insightful of these. Only Nellessen attempted at the same time an analysis of the Greek text of the bilinguals; unfortunately his study also has significant shortcomings, primarily due to the limited amount of material discussed.<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, surprisingly little research has been carried out on the Greek text of D F G. Subsequent to Corssen's study considerable attention was given to the relationship between F and G,<sup>9</sup> though in the end Corssen's conclusion that they are independent copies of X has been affirmed. Von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* devoted several pages to the three manuscripts, which in large measure appear to rely on Corssen.<sup>10</sup> Zuntz, as he has for so many areas related to the study of the Pauline epistles, provides what appears to be the current consensus on both the relationship between and the value of D F G.

Zuntz presumed a second century date for the origin of what he, continuing the tradition, labelled the "Western text," of which the bilinguals as a group represent one among

---

Tinnefeld, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Überlieferung des I Timotheusbriefes. Der lateinische Paulustext in den Handschriften DEFG und in den Kommentaren des Ambrosiaster und des Pelagius*, *Klassisch-philologische Studien* 26 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz, 1963); E. Nellessen, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Überlieferung des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes*, *Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 22 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1965).

<sup>7</sup>K. T. Schäfer, "Der griechisch-lateinische Text des Galaterbriefes in der Handschriftengruppe DEFG," in *Scientia Sacra* (Cologne: J. P. Bachem and Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1934), pp. 41-70.

<sup>8</sup>Note particularly the review of Nellessen by B. Bonsack in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1967), p. 221.

<sup>9</sup>W. H. P. Hatch, "On the Relationship of Codex Augiensis and Codex Boernerianus of the Pauline Epistles," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 9 (1951), pp. 187-99.

<sup>10</sup>Corssen is not cited, but the discussion of the sense lines in D and in the Gothic manuscripts must have come from his study.

several witnesses.<sup>11</sup> Because this text shows the types of readings one would expect of the “popular text” (as opposed to a controlled copying tradition) of the second century, Zuntz placed it into this earliest period of transmission.<sup>12</sup> Our extant witnesses, however, have by no means preserved this second century text intact.<sup>13</sup> The “leading Western manuscript,” according to Zuntz, is D.<sup>14</sup> F G “more often than not prove themselves its [Z’s] faithful representatives,”<sup>15</sup> but these are also considered to have undergone secondary corruption, apparently from the Byzantine text.<sup>16</sup> The relationship between Z and D is not clearly defined. The latter is derived from the former,<sup>17</sup> but Zuntz never clarifies how D can be the best witness to the Western text, while at the same time acknowledging that F G are often the only manuscripts that have retained readings that D has lost.

Royse has given the argument of a second century origin of the text behind D F G a more solid footing by pointing out two confluences that are unique to  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  (ca. 200). At Rom. 16:19 this manuscript reads  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\ \delta\epsilon$ , an impossible combination of  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$  in D\* F G and  $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\ \delta\epsilon$  in the rest of the manuscript tradition. In Phil. 1:11 the conflation is even more

---

<sup>11</sup>Zuntz, p. 267: “The Western tradition in its three main representatives, namely the Greek originals (a) of Tertullian’s text and (b) of the rest of the Old Latin version, and (c) the common ancestor of D F G, derives largely from this second-century basis.”

<sup>12</sup>Zuntz, p. 280: “The popular text, on the other hand, which amidst its corruptions preserved original features lost by its rival, lived on in the Latin versions and the few Greek copies (we know only of bilinguals) current in the West.”

<sup>13</sup>Zuntz, p. 240: “What D FG give us—or Cyprian or Augustine, &c.—is not ‘the text of the second century’: but they preserve features of it.”

<sup>14</sup>Zuntz, p. 42.

<sup>15</sup>Zuntz, p. 86.

<sup>16</sup>Zuntz, pp. 166-67, points out that the “older Western witnesses,” including D, avoid the “interpolation” found in F G at 1 Cor. 7:39 and 11:24 (but see the discussion of 7:39 below).

<sup>17</sup>Zuntz, p. 85.



striking: F G alone read εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐπαινον μοι, with the rest of the tradition reading εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐπαινον θεοῦ.<sup>18</sup> P<sup>46</sup> creates from these εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπαινον μοι.<sup>19</sup> Royse states: “P<sup>46</sup> thus provides clear evidence that the text now found in F G was already circulating in the second century.”<sup>20</sup> A third conflation has been identified at 1 Corinthians 15:2, where the scribe of P<sup>46</sup> shows considerable difficulty in dealing with the readings εἰ κατεχετε and οφειλετε κατεχειν (see the discussion *ad loc.*).

In addition, several source-critical features of these manuscripts, particularly F G, suggest that they represent a unique and potentially early form of the text. First, there are two identical lacunae in F’s and G’s Greek texts of 1 Corinthians (3:8-16; 6:7-15). F fills in the Latin column with a Vulgate text but leaves the corresponding Greek column empty. G, being interlinear, simply leaves an appropriate amount of space empty. This indicates damage to an ancestor of these manuscripts, but also signifies that from whatever point that damage took place the subsequent users of that manuscript did not have access to Greek manuscripts to “replace” the missing material. It therefore must hold true that, at least from that point, comparison to another Greek witnesses did not take place, not only in these two places but also throughout the entire manuscript. This is in sharp contrast to D, which underwent quite

---

<sup>18</sup>D\* reads: εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐπαινον χριστοῦ.

<sup>19</sup>The reading of F G has much to commend it, since the shift from praise of Paul to praise of God is quite understandable. Metzger, *Textual Commentary* 544 calls the reading of F G “very remarkable. . . , which has no parallel in Paul.” This is a puzzling statement, given that ἔπαινος does occur with the dative (1 Cor. 4:5), and ἔπαινος is used quite frequently of humans (Rom. 2:9; 13:3; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 8:18; Phil. 4:8). In fact, in the epistles God is never the recipient of ἔπαινος except the three occurrences in Eph. 1; these may have influenced the example in Philippians 1, which stands immediately after Ephesians in virtually all manuscripts Metzger does, however, also see the reading of P<sup>46</sup> as a conflation.

<sup>20</sup>Royse, p. 253.

rigorous later correction on the basis of manuscripts of the Byzantine text.<sup>21</sup> Second, F G lack the doxology of Romans 16:25-27. There is little doubt as to the secondary nature of this passage,<sup>22</sup> yet it appears in all the major “Alexandrians.”<sup>23</sup> The passage in D does not derive from Z, for as both Corssen and Vogels<sup>24</sup> have pointed out, its text of this passage is not in sense-line format, as is the rest of the manuscript. In addition, its Greek text in this passage is identical to  $\mathfrak{P}^{61}$  A P 0150 0151 apart from two readings that match its Latin text: the omission of  $\tau\epsilon$  in 16:26 and the word order  $\theta\epsilon\omega$   $\sigma\phi\omega$  in 16:26. Its Latin text (75), on the other hand, is unique. It conforms neither to the Vulgate<sup>25</sup> nor to any other known witnesses.<sup>26</sup> This immediately suggests that D represents a secondary stage in the transmission of the bilingual text, one which has been influenced by comparison to Greek manuscripts from outside the bilingual tradition. This will be explored below. One other feature of G in this connection points to an older tradition than that found in D: A space is left after chapter 14, a position in which many witnesses to the Latin tradition have the doxology.<sup>27</sup> However, once again F G do not have alternative Greek witnesses from which to supply the “missing” material. Third, F G

---

<sup>21</sup>Frede, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, p. 95.

<sup>22</sup>E.g., J.K. Elliott, “The Language and Style of the Concluding Doxology to the Epistle to the Romans;” K. Aland, “Der Schluß und die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Römerbriefes.” See further the discussion above at 14:34-35 (p. 550)

<sup>23</sup>The doxology appears after 16:23 in  $\aleph$  A B C and after chapter 15 in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ .

<sup>24</sup>Corssen II, pp. 26-27; Vogels, “Codex Claromantanus,” pp. 282-83.

<sup>25</sup>In contrast to the rest of its text, 89 presents a Vulgate text in Romans 16:13-27. See Frede, *neuer Paulustext* I, pp. 91-123.

<sup>26</sup>For example, the readings *qui autem potest* and *apocalypsem sacramenti* at 16:25 for *qui potens est* and *revelationem mysterii* in the rest of the tradition.

<sup>27</sup>Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*, pp. 16-29.

do not include Hebrews among the letters of their *Apostolos*. This is a later addition to Z<sup>28</sup> as well as to the *Corpus Paulinum*, as evidenced by its shifting location in the manuscript tradition. Furthermore, the *Text und Textwert* data, which is intended to give a general picture of the relationships among manuscripts,<sup>29</sup> shows that D has a closer relationship to the “Alexandrian” manuscripts in Hebrews than in 1 Corinthians.<sup>30</sup> This again shows that contact and interaction occurred between D and a Greek manuscript (or several) from outside the bilingual tradition. Since Zuntz’s *Text of the Epistles* focuses on 1 Corinthians and Hebrews, the lack of a text of Hebrews in F G and the close relationship of D with the “Alexandrian” witnesses in that book may have led to his undervaluation of F G. This brief examination of some source-critical features of D F G shows that there are some difficulties with Zuntz’s assessment of the value of F G in relation to D, and his view of the value of the bilinguals as a whole. This will be further assessed below by the examination of different types of readings in detail.

Aside from these larger features, all previous research on the text of the Pauline bilinguals, both the Greek and Latin, has been limited by the difficulty, and in places

---

<sup>28</sup>R. Schlossnikel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer und das Corpus Paulinum*, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel, 20 (Freiburg: Herder, 1991), p. 131. His thesis is that the Latin text of Hebrews was not produced by the same translator of the other epistles in this manuscript.

<sup>29</sup>See D. C. Parker, “A Comparison Between the Text und Textwert and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke,” *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003), pp. 108-38.

<sup>30</sup>In Hebrews, among the manuscripts that are extant for most of the *Teststellen*, D shows the closest relationship to N and C (56%), then A (55%). In 1 Corinthians, after F G, the agreements drops significantly: C and 0243 agree in 40% of the passages, then 33 1739 in 39%. N B agree in 34%. Cited from K. Aland, G. Mink, A. Benduhn-Mertz, and H. Bachmann, hrsg., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, hrsg., Vol. II: Die Paulinischen Briefe. Band I: Allgemeines, Römerbrief und Ergänzungsliste, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 16 (Berlin ; New York: de Gruyter, 1991).



impossibility, of determining the Z's Latin reading in places where D 75 splits from F 78 G 77. For example, immediately at 1 Cor. 1:1 one finds the omission of κλητος in D 75 (with  $\mathfrak{P}^{61\text{vid}}$  A D 0151 81 1834 Cyr). Is this the Z reading, with F 78 G 77 moving toward the rest of the tradition? Or in the notoriously difficult set of variations in 2:4, do F G (with only  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ) preserve the Z reading εν πειθοις σοφιας, partially supported<sup>31</sup> by *in persuasione sapientiae* 77 78? Or does D, with the reading εν πειθοις σοφιας λογοις (with  $\mathfrak{N}$  B D 33 1175 1739 *pc*), partially supported by *in persuasione sapientiae sermones* 75? If one is able to determine the Z reading, then one may determine the scribal habits which produced the alterations in D or F G as well as eliminate that alteration from consideration as the archetypal reading.

Previous researchers have recognized that the Z ancestor of D F G has been adapted to the Latin. What has not always been agreed upon is the method by which it is determined that Latinization has occurred in a given place. Von Soden describes the situation rather simply, that the editor of Z “adapted the Greek text very frequently to Latin,”<sup>32</sup> and that determining the original reading of Z when D and F G differ is a matter of deciding which moves toward the Latin, because “the reading adapted to the Latin is secondary.”<sup>33</sup> The difficulty with this procedure, however, is that the Greek basis of Latin text of the bilinguals, the D-text, is similar to the text of D F G.<sup>34</sup> Schäfer, at the conclusion of his essay on the bilingual texts of Galatians, recognizes that a different approach is necessary to reconstruct the archetype of D F G:

---

<sup>31</sup>*In persuasione* renders εν πειθοι, not εν πειθοις; see the discussion *ad loc.*

<sup>32</sup>Teil 3,b, p. 1939

<sup>33</sup>Teil 3,b, p. 1942.

<sup>34</sup>A description of the “D-text” and its witnesses is provided in Uwe Fröhlich, *Epistula ad Corinthios I, Vetus Latina, die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel* 22.3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1998), pp. 195-96.

There is no method for it which can be used mechanically; the only useful one is the examination of each individual difference between the three descendants of Z . . . because each of the three texts has its own unique, sometimes difficult to trace, history.<sup>35</sup>

D and F G must therefore be studied as individual witnesses, which make unique types of alterations for different reasons. It is hoped that by a thorough assessment of the editorial activity in the bilinguals the reading of their shared archetype Z may be accurately reconstructed. Only when Z has been accurately reconstructed in each place may its readings be used to reconstruct the early transmission history of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

### I. 89, *AMst(A)* and the Old Latin Tradition

The pre-Vulgate Latin text of the Pauline Epistles is remarkably cohesive. The earliest patristic witnesses, such as Tertullian's citations of Marcion's text, show a text that is not yet settled,<sup>36</sup> but even these share readings that are unique to the Latin tradition, most notably the reading *portate / tollite* (= ἀρατε) in 6:20,<sup>37</sup> where the Greek reads a conjunction (δη).

However, by the time of Cyprian there is clear evidence that a single Latin version is gaining favor in North Africa (the "K-text"). Lucifer of Calitari shortly thereafter shows the use of a closely related text in Italy (the "D-text").<sup>38</sup> It is the D-text which was adopted for use in the Greco-Latin bilingual Z, and for this reason is critical for understanding the creation and

---

<sup>35</sup>Schäfer, p. 70.

<sup>36</sup>Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*.

<sup>37</sup>Another example is found at 11:20. While there are some uncertainties regarding the most appropriate way to understand οὐκ ἐστὶ . . . φαγεῖν, the reading οὐκετι φαγεῖν (D F G and the Latin tradition) is likely a simple scribal error, in which the sigma was dropped (ΟΥΚΕΤΙ). Nowhere else in the *Corpus Paulinum* does οὐκέτι modify an infinitive. The error clearly preceded the direct ancestor manuscript of D F G since it is followed by the entire Latin tradition (*iam non [est]*).

<sup>38</sup>Frede, *Allateinischen Handschriften*.

development of the Greek text of D, F and G.

The influence of D F G on their corresponding Latin texts has been profound.

Although neither a full analysis of the Latin tradition nor a reconstruction of the Latin of the Z archetype is a goal of this study, an example of how the Greek of D F G impacted the D-text may be helpful. At 1 Cor. 9:7, suspicion is cast on the reading of D F G because of the disruption it caused in its Latin counterparts. All four of the key witnesses to the D-text diverge here: *ipsius* (78); *eius* (77, also AMst(A)); *gregis* (89, also Vulgate); and *gregis ipsius* (75). This diversity can be accounted for by regarding *gregis* as the archetypal reading of the D-text prior to its adaptation to the Greek text in the bilinguals. This Greek text either inherited or, more likely, created the reading  $\epsilon\kappa$  του γαλακτος αυτης as an adaptation to the pronoun in τον καρπον αυτου in the preceding sentence.<sup>39</sup> Upon this alteration, the archetype of D F G used *ipsius* to bring the Latin into concord with the Greek. 78 retains this; 75 has the conflation *gregis ipsius*. This may be an indication that *gregis* was retained in the margin of this ancestor manuscript and subsequently reintroduced by 75,<sup>40</sup> a procedure which seems to have occurred in several places in this manuscript (see also 9:20.74). The reading in 77, *eius*, is local harmonization to the near context, matching the *eius* following *fructum* in the preceding sentence.

As a result of these Grecisms in the D-text, the assessment of D F G has been hindered by the lack of a “control” witness, that is, either a similar Greek manuscript that has not been affected by the Latin text or a Latin manuscript that has not been influenced by the Greek.

---

<sup>39</sup>A handful of minuscules (including 3 255 323 1241) share this adaptation, as well as 1831 with the reading αυτου, which is so clearly dependent on the earlier sentence that it does not alter the gender of the pronoun.

<sup>40</sup>Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus,” regards the reading of 75 to be a conflation of the reading of 77 with the Greek text of D. The evidence of 89 now shows this reconstruction to be unnecessary.



While a closely related Greek manuscript has yet to be found, the Latin tradition has been greatly clarified by the recovery of the lemma text of 89. Its text was first published in 1974; the accompanying volume assessing the significance of the manuscript was published one year earlier. Here, Frede evaluated previous work on the Latin text of the bilinguals and compared the results with this newly found manuscript. He concludes:

Mit Budapest lernen wir einen paulinischen Volltext kennen, der zwar dem von den Bilinguen vertretenen Texttyp angehört aber unabhängig von deren Überlieferung ist. Darin liegt die eigentliche Bedeutung dieses Fundes. Es wird nun ganz klar, daß die Verbindung mit dem Griechischen in Z und seinen Nachfahren, die vielfach zu Gräzismen führte, den Lateiner an den Rand der Textentwicklung drängte. . . . Budapest kann, natürlich in den durch spätere Veränderungen gesetzten Grenzen, für das gesamte Corpus Paulinum zeigen, was bisher hauptsächlich den Zitaten Lucifers auf kurzen Strecken deutlich zu machen gelang, daß und in welchem Ausmaß der D-Text in der Symbiose mit dem Griechischen seinen ursprünglichen Charakter veränderte. Für die Vetus Latina-Forschung ergibt sich damit die Notwendigkeit, Blick und Bemühen nicht so vordergründig wie bisher auf die bilingue Überlieferung zu richten, sondern mit Hilfe von Budapest womöglich mehr Licht in die zitatename Zeit vor der Mitte des 4. Jahrhunderts zu bringen und ein Stadium der Textentwicklung aufzuhellen, das praktisch unzugänglich war.<sup>41</sup>

Frede examined 89's relationship to the D-text only in Ephesians and 1 Thessalonians. His methodology was followed for sections of 1 Corinthians, with similar results attained. The table presents the agreements among the listed witnesses in chapters 1 and 6, with the total number of units of variation for which each witness is available given in the last column:

---

<sup>41</sup>Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, Bd. 1, pp. 82-3.

	89	75	77	64	Lcf	AMst	AmA	86	Spe	61	F	V	
89		0.71	0.54	0.45	0.73	0.59	0.60	0.71	0.48	0.52	0.60	0.60	171
75	0.71		0.61	0.49	0.73	0.53	0.58	0.86	0.52	0.47	0.53	0.56	171
77	0.54	0.66		0.42	0.40	0.49	0.47	0.71	0.33	0.46	0.53	0.62	134
64	0.45	0.49	0.42		0.40	0.47	0.45	0.64	0.42	0.40	0.50	0.51	161
Lcf	0.73	0.73	0.40	0.40		0.53	0.73	X	0.73	0.47	0.53	0.47	15
AMst	0.59	0.53	0.49	0.47	0.53		0.57	0.71	0.46	0.54	0.68	0.69	171
AmA	0.60	0.58	0.47	0.45	0.73	0.57		0.64	0.58	0.49	0.63	0.65	171
86	0.71	0.86	0.71	0.64	X	0.71	0.64		X	0.79	0.64	0.79	14
Spe	0.48	0.52	0.33	0.42	0.73	0.46	0.58	X		0.42	0.56	0.54	48
61	0.52	0.47	0.46	0.40	0.47	0.54	0.49	0.79	0.42		0.64	0.66	171
F	0.60	0.53	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.68	0.63	0.64	0.56	0.64		0.89	171
V	0.60	0.56	0.62	0.51	0.47	0.69	0.65	0.79	0.54	0.66	0.89		171

Several items are worthy of note, and will be clarified by attention to individual readings in the rest of this chapter. First, the highest agreement with 89 is found in Lucifer and 75. Second, 75 shows significant agreement with the same witnesses. Third, 77 has a relatively low percentage of agreement with all witnesses. This is due to the singular readings created by its regular adaptation of the Latin text to the Greek. 77 also shows significant agreement with the Vulgate, though next is 75. Finally, the lemma of the Amiens manuscript of Ambrosiaster, when compared with the rest of that tradition, shows movement away from the Vulgate and toward the D-text.

89 is not a pristine witness to the D-text. In addition to a fair number of singular readings (seven in the first chapter alone), the manuscript contains numerous “doublets,” or conflate readings. Frede listed the following five examples in 1 Corinthians:<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Frede, *neuer Paulustext*, pp. 123-28.

- 2:11 *quae sunt hominis quae in ipso sunt* 89 Hil Pel(B) Spe  
*quae sunt hominis* 61 64 75 77 78 VG AMst AMst(A) Am  
*quae in ipso sunt* Ps-Vig
- 7:6 *indulgentium consilium* 89  
*indulgentium* VG Te Ir Cy AMst AMst(A)  
*consilium* 75 77 78
- 7:31 *figura habitus* 89  
*figura* 61 77 78 VG AMst AMst(A)  
*habitus* 75 Te Ir Spe
- 9:3 *diudicant interrogant* 89  
*iudicant* 77 78 AMst(A)  
*interrogant* cet
- 9:18 *igitur est ergo* 89  
*igitur est* AMst(A); *igitur erit* 75;  
*est ergo* 61 VG
- 12:23 *abundatiora et verecundiora* 89  
*verecundiora* 75  $\Gamma^B$  AMst(A);

Similar examples are found in both 89 and the Vulgate. These may represent early examples of scribes offering alternative readings, a practice which is adopted with frequency and vigor in 77.

- 1:8 *in die adventus* 89 VG  
*in die* HI AMst(A); *in diem* 64  
*in adventum* 61 75; *in adventu* 77 78 AMst
- 6:20 *pretio magno* 89 VG AMst  
*pretio* 75 77 78 TE LUC Spe HI AU AMst(A)  
*magno* 64\* TE CY AM

In addition, 89 has received some influence from the I-text, both in the “doublets” listed above and, occasionally, in the replacement of D-text readings with those which would eventually be adopted in the Vulgate. This is more pronounced in certain sections than others. In chapter 1 89 agrees with the Vulgate in 65% of the units of variation; in chapter 6 this drops to 53% (also 64 from 49% to 41%; 61 from 56% to 46%). At the same time, the percentage of agreement with D-text witnesses such as 75 and even AMst(A) remains consistent.

An additional non-bilingual witness to the D-text is the lemma text found in the Amiens manuscript of the commentary of Ambrosiaster, designated “AMst(A).” This witness



has been only imperfectly known.<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, AMst(A) clearly represents a text similar to 75 89, but which has been altered by the adoption of Vulgate readings far more consistently than has 89. Indeed, in chapters 1 and 6 the witnesses with the highest percentage of agreement are Vulgate witnesses. However, this adaptation to the Vulgate does not appear to have been rigorously carried out. For example, in chapter 1 AMst(A) matches the Vulgate in 70% of the units of variation, but in chapter 6 this falls to 58%, while at the same time agreements with 75 rise from 53% to 62%. By chapter 16, however, the manuscript reverts to an almost completely Vulgate text. Various features of the manuscript itself may give clues as to the sections in which the different witnesses were used, such as the presence or absence of the Vulgate *capitula*, the use of uncial script at the beginning of certain lemmata, and various notations in the margins (which may or may not be original). These, however, remain to be explored fully, and it is clear that the manuscript requires further detailed analysis. Nevertheless, despite its adaptations to the Vulgate, the manuscript shares several readings with D-text witnesses:

---

<sup>43</sup>The edition in the *CSEL* was beset by the death of two editors during its production. Vogels produced Romans, but his successor's work on 1 Corinthians is less than perfect, with numerous errors in citation. Photographs of Amst(A) were used for this study.

- 6:2 *aut nescitis* 75 89 AMst(A)  
*aut ignoratis* AMst  
*an nescitis* 64 77 78 VG  
*nescitis* Cy
- 6:3 *neque saecularia* 64 75 AMst(A)  
*quanto magis saecularia* 77 78 VG  
omit 61 89 AMst
- 6:7 *est vobis* 75 89 AMst(A)  
*est in vobis* 61 78 VG  
*in vobis est* AMst
- 6:8 *aut nescitis* 75 89 AMst(A)  
*an nescitis* cet
- 6:20 *pretio* 75 77 78 Te Lcf Spe HI AU AMst(A)  
*magno* 64\* Te Cy Am  
*pretio magno* 89 VG AMst
- 8:10 *te qui habet scientiam* 75 AMst(A)  
*habentem scientiam* 77 78  
*eum qui habet scientiam* 89 VG
- 9:11 *magnum est* 89<sup>c</sup> 78 VG AMst  
*magnum* 77  
*non magnum* 75  
*non magnum est* 89\* AMst(A)

AMst(A) therefore serves as a further aid in the identification of D-text readings where it does not share the Vulgate reading.

Having explained the types of readings we might expect 89 and AMst(A) to alter from the D-text allows us, as Frede noted, to clarify the form of the D-text prior to its adaptations due to contact with the Greek. While this is significant for the history of the Latin *Corpus Paulinum*, it also provides an additional “control” for the Greek text of the bilinguals. Prior to recognizing the value of 89 and AMst(A), readings in D F G supported only by their Latin counterparts would rightly be looked at with suspicion as unique to the Z revision. However, when these readings are supported also by 89 it becomes clear that the reading predates the Z revision itself. This clarification of the D-text therefore allows one to form a clearer picture of the now-lost Greek witnesses that were similar, though not identical, to the Greek manuscript(s) that served as the basis of Z.

## II. *The Witness of D F G*

The Greek text of the shared archetype of D F G, labelled Z, has undergone alteration which is unique among manuscripts of 1 Corinthians. In places, there is evidence of influence from its Latin counterpart. This is not rigorously carried out, however. The most striking feature of this witness is evidence of editorial activity which attempted to produce a clear, readable text, with occasional theologically motivated alterations.

### II.A. *D F G Influenced by the Latin Text*

The adaptation of the Greek text to the corresponding Latin text of bilingual manuscripts of the NT has been frequently discussed, though most often in the case of Codex Bezae. The current consensus is that the Greek text of Codex Bezae has not undergone extensive Latinization.<sup>44</sup> The Pauline bilinguals have not received the same thorough attention; only suggestions of Latinization in the case of individual readings have been made.<sup>45</sup> Methodologically, it is not always possible to either prove or disprove that a given Greek reading has been altered to match the Latin. For example, if the Greek reading and the Latin reading both construe and are contextually possible, it is not possible to show that the Greek reading has been altered to match the Latin, even if it was actually so altered by a scribe or editor. It is more likely in such cases, however, that the Greek and the Latin texts derive from a shared tradition. In this section, we will examine readings where D F G depart from the rest

---

<sup>44</sup>A review of the history of the study of Latinism in Codex Bezae is provided in Parker, *Codex Bezae*, pp. 183-88. Parker concludes: "Present opinion rightly discards the theory that wholesale Latinization of the Greek has occurred. However, the fact remains that in a number of places Latinization remains the best explanation of the text." (*Codex Bezae*, p. 256).

<sup>45</sup>For example, Zuntz (pp. 88-89) describes 1:16; 4:8; 7:26, 28; and 15:5 as examples where "the Greek of the bilingual manuscripts reflects particular exigencies of the Latin tradition." On 7:28 see also Fee, p. 325 n. 10.



of the Greek tradition where 1) the cause for the reading may be an attempt to match a peculiarity of the Latin or a translational tendency of the Latin tradition found in the bilinguals and 2) the reading did not arise in the transmission of the Greek text alone.<sup>46</sup>

An example of the text of D F G being altered to match a translational tendency of the D-text is found at 14:10. There D\* F G (matched by VL 77 89) lack τοσαυτα. The omission brings 14:10 and 14:11 into visual parallel; D makes this obvious by enlarging and extending both ει (14:10) and εαν (14:11) into the margin.<sup>47</sup> D is laid out as follows (VL 75 is missing):

ΕΙΤΥΧΟΙΓΕΝΗΦΩΝΟΝΕCΤΙΝ  
 ΕΝΤΩΚΟCΜΩ  
 ΚΑΙΟΥΔΕΝΔΦΩΝΟΝΕCΤΙΝ  
 ΕΔΝΟΝΜΗΔΩ

This alteration, however, is likely to have taken place first in the Latin. The D-text<sup>48</sup> lacks an equivalent to τοσαυτα, while the Vulgate supplies *tam multa*. However, this is the only place in the *Corpus Paulinum* where *tam multus* is used to render τοσουτος. Instead, a form of *talis* or *eiusmodi / huiusmodi* is used.<sup>49</sup> Its presence in the Vulgate and 78 is therefore unusual and likely not by the same translator of the rest of the D-text. The lack of τοσαυτα / *tam multa* is therefore not an omission by the D-text of an existing *tam multa*. Instead, it is evidence of text that did not translate τοσαυτα at all.

---

<sup>46</sup>Parker (*Codex Bezae*, p. 186 and again on p. 257) cites approvingly a principle of H. Marsh: “There is no reason whatsoever for ascribing any reading of a Greek Ms. to the influence of the Latin, unless it can be proved that it could not have taken its rise in the Greek, and that it might have easily originated in the Latin.”

<sup>47</sup>G capitalizes the initial letter of each word, but since it is not written in sense-line format it cannot extend them into the margin.

<sup>48</sup>Represented here by VL 77 89; 75 lacks 14:9-18. Some manuscripts of Ambrosiaster also lack *tam multa*; AMst(A) has the unique reading *ut puta quanta*.

<sup>49</sup>E.g., *talis* at 1 Cor. 5:1; 11:16; 15:48; 16:16 D-text; *eiusmodi* or *huiusmodi* at 1 Cor. 5:5, 11; 7:15, 28; 16:16 VG; 16:18.

It is possible that the reading of D F G attempts to match match an unusual idiom. Εἰ τύχοι appears elsewhere in the NT only at 1 Cor. 15:37. Outside the NT it usually has the meaning “perhaps,” but at 14:10, according to BDAG, is “probably meant to limit τῶσαυτα . . . *there are probably ever so many different languages.*”<sup>50</sup> The Latin tradition, however, renders εἰ τύχοι with *ut puta*, which frequently introduces an example or illustration.<sup>51</sup> This understanding of *ut puta* suits 1 Cor. 15:37, where it translates εἰ τυχοι: “And what you sow, you do not sow the body which will be, but only a bare seed, for example of wheat or of some other kind” (*ut puta tritici aut alicuius ceterorum*).<sup>52</sup> Therefore, *ut puta genera linguarum . . .* at 14:10 could have been understood by a reader as “For example, there are many kinds of languages . . .” 14:11, now visually connected to 14:10 in the predecessor of D F G by the sense-line format, would have served as the conclusion (ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἶδῶ . . .) based upon the example given in 14:10. Since there is no obvious motivation for either intentional excision or accidental loss of τῶσαυτα, and *tam multa* never stood in the D-text, the influence of the Latin on the Greek is likely. Furthermore, εστιν is added in D F G also at the end of 14:10, balancing the εστιν of the first clause of 14:10, again on the basis of the Latin, as well as the addition of τω before κοσμω, another Latinism (see below). The problem of the unusual usage of εἰ τύχοι to modify τῶσαυτα was dealt with by adjusting the Greek to match the Latin.

A second example of the translation peculiarities of the D-text influencing the Greek of the bilinguals is the manner in which it translates the terms αἰών and κόσμος. In three

---

<sup>50</sup>BDAG, s.v. τυγχάνω 2b.

<sup>51</sup>Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *puto* 9b.

<sup>52</sup>VL 64 uses *fere* in place of *puta*, while VL 77 uses *utpote*, both of which correspond to the use of *ut puta* described here.

passages the Greek uses the demonstrative without variation:

1:20	ΤΟΥ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ	<i>saeculi huius</i> 77 78 CY <i>huius saeculi</i> 64 75 89 F VG AMst
3:18	ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΙΩΝΙ ΤΟΥΤΩ	<i>in saeculo hoc</i> 77 78 <i>in hoc saeculo</i> 75 89 VG AMst AMst(A)
5:10	ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ D	<i>mundi huius</i> 77 <i>huius mundi</i> 75 78 89 F VG TE LUC AMst <i>huius mundi inpudicis</i> 61

The following example should also be included here, since 056 0142 together represent a single witness to their unique error of omission:

3:19	ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ (ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ 056 0142)	<i>mundi huius</i> 77 78 <i>huius mundi</i> 89 VG CY AMst AMst(A) <i>huius saeculi</i> 61 75 AM
------	--	---

Note that at 5:10, D has been influenced by the Latin word order.

7:31	ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ	<i>mundi huius</i> 77 TE IR <i>huius mundi</i> 75 89 78 F VG CY SED-S
------	-------------------	--

Apart from the obvious, that where the demonstrative is present in the Greek it is also present in the Latin, it should be noted that with complete consistency 75 89 place the demonstrative before the noun, whereas in the Greek it follows. 77, and in one passage also 78, alter the Latin to match the Greek sequence.

However, with remarkable consistency the D-text uses a demonstrative where none is present in any Greek witnesses:

1:21	ο κοσμος	<i>mundus</i> 64 77 78 F VG Mcion <sup>T</sup> CY AMst <i>hic mundus</i> 61 89 Ambr Hil <i>mundum</i> 75*
1:28	του κοσμου	<i>mundi</i> 77 F VG Spe <i>huius mundi</i> 61 75 <sup>2</sup> 89 L <sup>1</sup> AMst <i>huiusmodi</i> d <sup>*53</sup> HI omit 78 TE Spe AU
3:22	κοσμος	<i>mundus</i> 75 t z* vg <sup>mss</sup> : C H Θ* T Or AMst AMst(A)

---

<sup>53</sup>75 has the error *huiusmodi*, an obvious corruption of *huius mundi*. The identical error occurs in Codex Fuldensis at 1 Cor. 4:13.



		<i>hic mundus</i> 77 78 89 VG
4:9	τω κοσμω ( <i>lac P</i> <sup>46</sup> )	<i>mundo</i> 77 t z* VG v <i>huic mundo</i> 61 75 78 89 z <sup>c</sup> vg <sup>mss</sup> AMst
4:13	του κοσμου	<i>mundi</i> 77 <i>huius mundi</i> 75 78 89 F VG AMst
6:2	τον κοσμον	<i>mundum</i> 64 77 78 CY HIL AU <i>de mundo</i> VG <i>de hoc mundo</i> 75 89 F CY <sup>E</sup> Zeno AM AMst(A) SED-S
7:33	τα του κοσμου	<i>quae sunt mundi</i> 77 78 F VG <i>quae sunt huius mundi</i> 61 75 89 vg <sup>mss</sup> AMst SPE
7:34	τα του κοσμου ( <i>omit B TE</i> )	<i>quae sunt mundi</i> 75 77 78 VG <i>quae sunt huius mundi</i> AMst SPE <i>quae sunt huius saeculi</i> 89 AMst(A)

The consistency of the addition of the demonstrative before *mundus* may be contrasted with the manner in which *saeculus* and *aeternus* are handled. In the two examples where the Greek reads the demonstrative, both at 2:6, the Latin follows. However, at 8:13 and 10:11, *αιων* is used without a pronoun; in these places neither does the Latin add one. Recognizing this practice of the D-text allows us to explain the variation within the Latin tradition at 8:4:

8:4	οιδαμεν οτι ουδεν ειδωλον εν κοσμω	<i>scimus quia nihil est idolum</i> 61 89 Spe AMst AU Pel Sedul <i>scimus quoniam nihil est idolum</i> Ir <i>scimus quod idolum nihil sint</i> Mcion <sup>T</sup> 54 <i>scimus quia nihil est in mundo</i> 77 78 VG <i>scimus quia nihil est idolum in saeculo</i> 75
-----	------------------------------------	---

The Greek text (without variation) reads οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ.

Immediately we might expect at least the D-text to add the demonstrative, with D F G likely following. However no Latin witness does so, and neither do D F G. This can be explained by the fact that the D-text reading here is preserved only in 75: *scimus quia nihil est idolum in saeculo*. As we have seen, with *saeculum* the demonstrative is not added. 89 has been assimilated to the I-text reading *scimus quia nihil est idolum* (61 Spe AMst AU Pel Sedul). 77

---

<sup>54</sup>Schmid, p. 68 points out that this is simply a brief form of citation which may have been influenced by 1 Cor. 10:19, is therefore not a true variant reading.

and 78 are assimilated to the Greek (along with the Vulgate) with the reading *scimus quia nihil est in mundo*. We may conclude, therefore, that the editorial habit of adding the demonstrative is limited to the first edition (Z), but was not followed by subsequent editors in the same tradition (77 78).

Having noted the consistency with which the D-text adds the demonstrative with κόσμος, we are now able to examine several passages where this translational habit has prompted alteration in Z:

2:12    το πνευμα του κοσμου ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν A B C L P Ψ 0150 0151 sy Or  
           *spiritum mundi* F VG  
           το πνευμα το του κοσμου 049 056 0142 203 257 506 2093  
           το πνευμα του κοσμου τουτου D F G bo arm Or Ath Bas Cyr  
           *spiritum huius mundi* 75 89 64 A B D G<sup>2</sup> K L<sup>1</sup> O<sup>2</sup> P W AMst AMst(A)  
           *spiritum mundi huius* 77 78

The addition of the demonstrative in this passage is not surprising, since the use of πνεῦμα would have prompted a desire for a clear indication of exactly which πνεῦμα has not been received. This accounts for the addition also in Origen, Athanasius, Basil, and Cyril, none of whom are related to the D F G or the Latin tradition.

7:31    τω κοστω τουτω Ν<sup>2</sup> D<sup>1</sup> K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 104 326 917 1175  
           1739<sup>c</sup> 1834 1881 sy<sup>h</sup> Or Ephr Bas Chr Eus Severian Thret Dam  
           *huic mundo* 78  
           *hoc mundo* F VG CY  
           *hoc saeculo* AMst AU  
           *mundo isto* TE HI  
           *de hoc mundo* 89  
           τουτω 177 337  
           τον κοσμον τουτον D\* F G 33 81 1739\* sa Or  
           *mundum hunc* 77  
           *hunc mundum* 75  
           τον κοσμον ϩ<sup>15</sup> ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν\* A B 6

The use of the accusative with χράομαι, the only example in the NT, prompted the alteration

to the more commonly used dative.<sup>55</sup> The presence of the demonstrative is not so easily dismissed as a mere Latinism, particularly since the “Byzantine” text is related to D F G. On the Latin side only 75 preserves the original D-text reading (*hunc mundum*); 89 is an alteration of the Vulgate; 78 follows the latter, while 77 attests the D-text reading with its habitual word order alteration to match the Greek (*mundum hunc*). The reading of D F G matches the pattern of other examples of this type of variation, but the addition of the demonstrative (with a shift in case) has apparently been followed by virtually all of the tradition. This adoption of a reading of D F G in the later tradition has not taken place in similar examples. Therefore this may not be a Latinism but a place where the Latin and the bilinguals preserve the archetypical reading.

14:10 εν κοσμω ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ⲙ A B D<sup>2</sup> L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243  
 εν τω κοσμω D\* F G K 216 440 1610  
*in hoc mundo* 76 78 89 VG AMst  
*lac* 75

Here the bilinguals do not add a demonstrative but instead the article, which produces the same semantic result. Significantly, the bilinguals rarely add but frequently omit the article, itself a potential sign of Latin interference (see below). 75 is illegible here, but Codex Sangermanensis (76) preserves what had been its reading, which matches the rest of the D-text witnesses. The few other witnesses that independently read the article do not prevent tracing its origin in the bilinguals to influence from the Latin.

This now places us in a position to evaluate the two passages showing disagreement among D F G for this type of variation:

1:20 του κοσμου τουτου ϩ<sup>11</sup> Ⲙ<sup>2</sup> C<sup>3</sup> D<sup>2</sup> F G L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 6 88 104 326  
 1739<sup>c</sup> sy cop arm Cl Chr Epiph Or Thret  
*mundi huius* 77 78  
*huius mundi* 75 89 64 F VG CY AMst

---

<sup>55</sup>See BDAG, s.v. χράομαι; Schrage II, p. 175 n. 698.



του κοσμου ϩ<sup>46</sup> κ\* A B C\* D\* P 33 81 181 206 314 429 917 1175 1610 1739\*  
 1758 1827 1834 1836 1875 arm Cl Cyr Did Epiph Dam Or  
*mundi* Mcion<sup>T</sup> TE Or HI

This addition of τουτου is caused by the previous example of του αιωνος τουτου (without variation) in the verse. D could only have avoided the addition by making comparison to other witnesses, as the demonstrative stands in 75 and the entire Latin manuscript tradition, as well as F G. The addition was clearly the Z reading, supported as it is by F G VL 75 77 78 89. The reading in D, no doubt also the original reading in this place (also ϩ<sup>46</sup> κ\* A B C\* Mcion<sup>T</sup> etc), therefore removes the addition made in Z by means of a comparison to other witnesses (see further below).

11:32 τω κοσμω ϩ<sup>46</sup> κ A B C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 *Hipp Cl*  
*modo* AU  
 τω κοσμω τουτω F G 794  
*modo hoc* 77  
*hoc modo* 75 89 78 VG

The presence of the demonstrative in F G in 11:32 should be compared to the variants in 14:10, where under the influence of *hoc modo* the article was added before κοσμω, but a demonstrative was not introduced. Since τω κοσμω already stood in the text, the united D-text reading *hoc modo* prompted the addition of τουτω in Z. The original sense-line in Z read:  
 ινα μη συν τω κοσμω τουτω κατακριθωμεν / *ut non cum hoc modo damnemur*. D splits this into two lines: | ινα μη συν τω κοσμω | κατακριθωμεν |. At the point at which the line break was made, the presence of τουτω would have been apparent to the scribe. Its omission prevents the line ending with τω κοσμω from inordinately exceeding those following and preceding, which may have perhaps been an additional consideration leading to the alteration. The consistent addition of the demonstrative pronoun before *mundus* in the D-text led to numerous alterations in the Greek of Z (1:20; 2:12; 7:31; 11:32; 14:10). It also prompted an

alteration in the word order of D (5:10). Here D F G show evidence of adaptation to the Latin.

An indirect Latinism may be found at 1:26. There βλέπετε could be either an indicative or imperative form. The indicative is presumed by γαρ<sup>56</sup> and the D-text's *videte enim*. However, *videte* must be the imperative form, which then influenced the scribe/editor of the shared ancestor of D F G to alter γαρ to ουν. Finally, VL 77 78 brings their Latin text into conformity with F G by writing *videte ergo*.

## II.B. Alteration of Word Order

Additional Latinization is seen in adapted word order. Following a comparative adjective Paul frequently, though not consistently, uses the copulative verb (1 Cor. 4:3; 7:9; 7:40; 15:19). This is limited to 1 Corinthians, though the reason that this stylistic peculiarity should be limited to that book is not clear.<sup>57</sup> The D-text adds the copulative in every passage where it is assumed in the Greek apart from 1 Cor. 13:13, perhaps in recognition of this text's poetic nature. In addition, it prefers the position immediately following the adjective, a pattern followed also by the I-text (note 64 AU in the first three examples<sup>58</sup>). Both the presence of the verb and its position relative to the adjective have caused variation in the bilinguals:

1:25 σοφωτερον των ανθρωπων εστιν N A B C L Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 33 81 88  
 104 326 1175 sy<sup>h</sup> Or Eus Chr  
 σοφωτερον των ανθρωπων εσται P 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739  
 σοφωτερον εστιν των ανθρωπων D F G sy<sup>p</sup>  
*sapientius est hominibus* 75 77 78 89 VG Hil AMst  
*sapientes est quam homines* 64 AU  
*sapientibus hominibus* Mcion<sup>T</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Barrett, p. 56; Fee, p. 79 n. 2.

<sup>57</sup>Only one comparative adjective is used in Romans; seven in 2 Corinthians, but never with a form of εἶμί.

<sup>58</sup>The readings attributed to Marcion by Tertullian in 1:25 and that of Irenaeus in 15:19 may be based on any of the Greek readings now in existence, except those of P 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 and 0150 in the first example.

σοφωτερον των ανθρωπων ϩ<sup>46</sup>  
ισχυροτερον των ανθρωπων εστιν 0150

1:25 ισχυροτερον των ανθρωπων εστιν (2) Ν<sup>c</sup> Α<sup>c7</sup> L P 049 056 0142 0150 0151  
88 104 326

ισχυροτερον εστιν των ανθρωπων D F G 256  
*fortius est hominibus* 75 77 78 89 VG Hil AMst  
*fortius est quam hominines* 64 AU

ισχυροτερον των ανθρωπων ϩ<sup>11vid</sup> Ν\* Α\*? B C 6 33 81 424<sup>c</sup> 440 1175 1739  
Or Gall Eus

*fortius hominibus* Mcion<sup>T</sup>  
*omit* (parablepsis) ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ψ 257

Both readings may be attributed to the influence of the Latin word order. In one additional example D shows independent Latin influence:

15:19 παντων ανθρωπων εσμεν ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν Α Β F G K L P 048 049 056 0142 0150  
0151 0243 0270 *cett* (παντων των ανθρωπων εσμεν 241)  
*omnibus hominibus sumus* 77  
*omnibus hominibus essemus* Eus-Emessa  
εσμεν παντων ανθρωπων D Ψ sy<sup>p</sup>  
*sumus omnibus hominibus* 64 75 78 89 F VG AM AMst AU HI SED-S  
*omnibus sumus hominibus* Ir

Why does D alone succumb to the Latin word order here? Because D (or a predecessor) is written in shorter sense lines than Z, with the result that some lines are awkwardly split. In 15:19, the sense-line in Z was ελεεινότεροι παντων ανθρωπων εσμεν / *miserabiliores sumus omnibus hominibus*.<sup>59</sup> Without the alteration, D would have read:

ΕΛΕΕΙΝΟΤΕΡΟΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ	<i>miserabiliores sumus</i>
ΔΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΕΣΜΕΝ	<i>omnibus hominibus</i>

This, however, would have separated the Greek noun from its adjective. To maintain the sense units, εσμεν was shifted to the previous line so that παντων ανθρωπων could stand together:

ΕΛΕΕΙΝΟΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΣΜΕΝ	<i>miserabiliores sumus</i>
ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ	<i>omnibus hominibus</i>

---

<sup>59</sup>As in G 89; F 78 do not make clear the beginning of the line, but it clearly ends as εσμεν / *hominibus*.



In this way D creates a variant based on the Latin that X, with its longer sense lines, had no reason to alter from Z.

However, alteration in D F G is not clear in other situations where the Latin uses the copulative. There are many places where the Latin reads it without any Greek support (e.g., 12:6.23; 16:4.21). This inconsistency makes it difficult to decide if the addition is attributable to the Latin. For example, at 1 Cor. 7:26, D\* F G 629 read καλον εστιν, which Zuntz describes as one of several places where “the Greek of the bilingual manuscripts reflects particular exigencies of the Latin tradition,”<sup>60</sup> matching the common idiom *bonum est*.

However, neither the D-text nor the Greek of the bilinguals add the verb in similar examples with any consistency:

Rom. 14:21	καλον	<i>bonum est</i>
1 Cor. 5:6	καλον	<i>bonum</i>
1 Cor. 7:1	καλον	<i>bonum est</i>
1 Cor. 7:8	καλον	<i>bonum est</i>
1 Cor. 7:26	καλον	
	καλον εστιν D* F G	<i>bonum est</i>
1 Cor. 9:15	καλον	<i>bonum</i>
2 Cor. 13:7	καλον	<i>bonum est (bonum 77)</i>

This is in contrast to the consistent addition of the verb following comparative adjectives, as discussed above. Although the addition is not consistent in the D-text, the addition of εστιν in D F G at 7:26 may have been caused by the Latin reading. This may have taken place in other examples where D F G adds the copulative:

14:5	μειζων γαρ	
	μειζων γαρ εστιν F G	
		<i>maior est enim</i> 61 75 89 Z* AMst AMst(A) SED-S
		<i>maior enim est</i> 77
		<i>nam maior est</i> 78 VG
14:10	ουδεν αφωνον Ϝ <sup>46</sup> κ* A B P 048 <sup>vid</sup> 0150 0243 0289 5 6 424 <sup>c</sup> 1739	

---

<sup>60</sup>Cf., with less assurance than Zuntz, Lindemann, p. 177.

*nihil sine voce* 76 AMst AMst(A)  
 ουδεν αυτων αφωνον  $\aleph^2$  D<sup>2</sup> K L  $\Psi$  049 056 0142 0151 88 *pm*  
 ουδεν αφωνον εστιν D\* F G  
*nihil sine voce est* 78 89 VG (75 *lac*)  
*nihil eorum sine voce est* 61 77 L Sed-S

Latin influence likely explains what appears to be a conflation in F G at 7:29:

συνεσταλμενος το λοιπον εστιν D<sup>2</sup> K L  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 88 *pm*  
 συνεσταλμενος εστιν το λοιπον  $\Phi^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B P 6 33 424<sup>c</sup> 1739  
 συνεσταλμενος εστιν λοιπον  $\Phi^{15}$  D\* Didymus  
 συνεσταλμενος εστιν λοιπον εστιν F G

The Latin witnesses, however, read:

*breve est reliquum est* 78 VG HI AU AMst(A)  
*breviatum est reliquum est* 75 AMstd AMst  
*breve est reliquum* 89  
*breve vel breviatum est reliquum est* 77

F G therefore add the second εστιν on the basis of the Latin, not from “Byzantine” witnesses, while D avoids the same addition.

### *II.C. Role of Paul in D F G*

In the Latin tradition in general, but also in D F G, the role, status, or authority of Paul is frequently highlighted. The Latin D-Text<sup>61</sup> and F G alter the third clause of 11:2 by removing the reference to the Corinthians (υμιν), adding πανταχου / *ubique* (VL 77<sup>c</sup> 78 89 AMst), and adding the possessive genitive (μου) after παραδοσις. This results in an emphasis on the universal acceptance of Paul’s teachings: “Just as everywhere I passed on you hold fast

---

<sup>61</sup>The archetype of D F G read καθως πανταχου παρεδωκα τας παραδοσεις μου; D has removed πανταχου and added υμιν, as in other places through adaptation to a Greek witness similar to  $\aleph$  A, but retained μου. Its Latin counterpart (VL 75) reflects an imperfect adaptation to this alteration in the Greek by reading a conflation, *ubique tradidi vobis* (with *vobis* added to match υμιν) but otherwise retaining the original Latin text of its ancestor, now found only in VL 77 89.

my traditions.”<sup>62</sup> The awkward lack of an object for παρεδωκα / *tradidi* betrays the secondary nature of these alterations. Other examples include 3:5 and 9:1; the most prominent example, however, may be the displacement of 1 Cor. 14:34-35. While not directly highlighting the role of Paul or his authority, that alterations may seek to keep a close associate of Paul from appearing to ‘break the rules’ that Paul taught “in all the churches.”

#### *II.D. Expansionist and Interpretive Alterations*

A major interest of the editor of the text behind D F G and the Latin tradition is the transmission of a clear, readable text. Most of these fall into the category of minor additions of words or phrases from the near context. For example, the addition of εις δειπνον (D F G VL 61 75 77 78 89) at 10:27 clarifies the event to which a person might be “called.” While this is a correct understanding of the context,<sup>63</sup> there would be little reason for its omission apart from a slight chance of accidental leap (ΔΠΙ C T Ω Ν Ε Ι C Δ Ε Ι Π Ν Ο Ν). More likely it is a clarifying addition. The substitution of απιστου (F G VL 61 75 78 89) for αλλης at 10:29 is a similar clarification. In the latter case D reads αλλης, which means either that it has been corrected to other Greek witnesses or that F G have been adapted to the Latin. The fact that these readings are limited to the Latin tradition and the bilinguals suggests that they are further examples of the minor glosses common in these witnesses. Nearly identical in procedure is 12:23-24, where D F G add μελη and τιμησ both from the near context, and 10:17, where και (ενος F G) του ποτηριου D\* is added from 10:16.

A striking example is the reading εν ειμι in place of γεγονα at 13:1 is typical of the

---

<sup>62</sup>Lietzmann (p. 53) claims that the addition of πανταχου is the result of “Angleichung” to 1 Cor. 4:17. Assimilation to such a remote passage, which is furthermore only passingly similar to 11:2, is unlikely.

<sup>63</sup>Schrage, p. 467 n. 517; Fee, p. 475 n. 3.



narrow band of witnesses associated with the Latin D-text. It is found in the Greek witnesses D\* F G as well as the *unum sum* of their Latin counterparts VL 75<sup>64</sup> 77 78.<sup>65</sup> It is also found in the cluster of Latin witnesses that frequently match these Greek witnesses: Ambrosiaster, the *Speculum* (7), and Rufinus' translations of Origen (*Origenis in Exodum* 13,2). The reading is extremely difficult in context; εν / *unum* must be construed as the predicate of ειμι /*sum*, with χαλκός / *aes* / *aeramentum* becoming the first word of a separate clause. The sense-line divisions found in D and VL 75 89 show this understanding. The reading is not Pauline, for aside from the contextual difficulties εν ειμι occurs nowhere in Paul. γεγωνα, however, is used with a predicate nominative (as at 13:1) also at 1 Cor. 9:22; 13:11; and 2 Cor. 12:11.

As Corssen suggests, the most likely cause of corruption is assimilation to the αγαπην δε μη εχω ουθεν ειμι at 13:2.<sup>66</sup> This form of the text makes 13:1-3 a series in which lack of love is described in progressively negative terms: εν ειμι (13:1), ουθεν ειμι (13:2), and finally ουθεν ωφελουμαι. The corruption, as Corssen also points out, took place not in Latin but in Greek. εν ειμι can be derived from ουθεν ειμι, but *unum sum* cannot have arisen from *factus sum*, the reading of the Vulgate witnesses, nor from γεγωνα. Here is firm evidence that at least some unique readings shared by D F G and the Latin tradition do not derive from Latin manuscripts which were then adopted into Greek, but originated in Greek and became the basis for the D-text.

These alterations cannot be blamed on the fourth century editor of the bilingual Z

---

<sup>64</sup>VL 75 reads *in unum sum*. This must have been the result of a misread correction which intended to replace *in* with *unum*. This correction misread the numeral ἕν as the preposition ἐν.

<sup>65</sup>In VL 78, *unum* is written above ειμι in the Greek column. The Vulgate reading *factus sum* is found in the Latin column.

<sup>66</sup>Corssen II, pp. 15-16.

archetype. Not only are they found in earlier Latin witnesses, but some are found already in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ . Perhaps the most obvious example is 15:2 where D F G smooth the difficult syntax with  $\text{οφειλετε κατεχειν}$ . The text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  is disrupted here, but the confusion in the manuscript is evidence that its scribe knows this reading, otherwise attested in Greek only in D F G (see the discussion *ad loc.*).

### *II.E. The Influence of the Near Context*

One of the most prominent features of D F G is their alteration of the text on the basis of surrounding material. At 9:22, D F G read  $\text{παντας}$  for  $\text{παντως τινας}$ . In addition, Didymus (*Commentarii in Zacchariam* 1,26) reads  $\text{παντας}$  and Clement reads either  $\text{παντας}$  (*Stromata* 1,1,15,5; 6,15,124,2; 7,9,53,4) or  $\text{τους παντας}$  (4,15,98,1; 5,2,18.7), the latter found also in 33 915 and Origen (*Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 20,35,319). Though early, this reading is likely secondary. First, because  $\text{παντως τινας}$  awkwardly combines the certainty expressed with  $\text{παντως}$  and the seeming limited response of  $\text{τινας}$ . Second, because the previous sentences all repeat the phrase of the first clause in the second clause (e.g.,  $\text{τοις ασηθενεσιν . . . τους ασηθενεις}$ ), assimilation to the previous sentences is likely since  $(\text{τους}) \text{παντας}$  would match the  $\text{τοις πασιν}$  of the preceding clause.<sup>67</sup>

At 14:5 D F G replace  $\text{διερμηνευη}$  with a participle form,  $\text{διερμηνευων}$ . This substitution was influenced by the participles in the two preceding clauses. Indeed, F G read the article, which D does not, which is present before both preceding participles.<sup>68</sup> In addition F G add the subjunctive verb:  $\text{η ο διερμηνευων}$ . Frequently the Latin of the D-text is written

---

<sup>67</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 493.

<sup>68</sup>In G, *qui interpretetur* is written above  $\text{ο διερμηνευων}$ , paralleling *qui prophetat* and *qui loquitur*.

as *qui* + verb when the Greek reads a participle. Here, however, only VL 77 and AMst(A) read *qui*; the rest of the tradition reads *interpretetur* (which properly renders διερμηνευη). The addition of ἦ is also unusual; D F G occasionally add the copulative, possibly under the influence of the Latin (see 8:4; 14:10), but none exists in Greek here, and the ἦ is left without a Latin equivalent in G. This verb form is omitted by F G at 2:5. It is unlikely that the distant influence of εαν δε μη η ο ερμηνευτης at 14:28 played a part, for there the accompanying Latin reads *fuertit* to match ἦ without *qui* to match the article.

These adaptations may not be confined to the archetype Z, for many are attested in non D-text Latin witnesses. The example at 7:14 clearly precedes Z. The archetypal text read:

ηγιασται γαρ ο ανηρ ο απιστος εν τη γυναικι  
και ηγιασται η γυνη η απιστος εν τω αδελφω

D F G, as well as the Peshitta and the entire Latin tradition, harmonize τη γυναικι to both ο ανηρ ο απιστος and η γυνη η απιστος with the addition of an adjective: τη γυναικι τη πιστη. This versional evidence points to the harmonization having arisen before translation, since it is attested in both in Tertullian (*sanctificatur . . . a fidei uxore et infidelis uxor . . .*<sup>69</sup>), the D-text, which reads different nouns: . . . *in* (omit, + *muliere vel 77*) *uxore fidei et sanctificata est mulier infidelis* (75 77 89 AMst; also HI),<sup>70</sup> and the Peshitta. At 16:15 και φορτυνατου και αχαικου is added from 16:17, though C\* and the Harklean share this harmonization.

This sampling of unique readings in D F G suggests that its text was not the result of accidental corruption but of intentional revision. Its alterations result in a smooth, readable

---

<sup>69</sup>*Ad uxorem* 2,2.

<sup>70</sup>The Vulgate, in conformity to the Greek, harmonizes also the nouns: *in muliere fidei et sanctificata est mulier infidelis*. . .



text. Nonsense readings are rare. Many of these edited readings exist in the Latin tradition prior to the creation of the shared ancestor of D F G, and are probably based on a Greek text (most obviously at 6:20). While occasional Latinization has occurred, such examples indicate neither a thorough revision to the Latin nor strikingly “ungreek” readings. It appears that the Greek and the Latin texts now found in D F G have a long, intertwined history in the tradition. Readings have been altered from the Greek to the Latin and from the Latin to the Greek. By the time that the archetype of the bilinguals was produced, however, this text was relatively stable, and the only interplay between the texts at that stage seems to be the result of a desire to bring sense lines into harmony.

### III. *Secondary Editing in F G*

These two manuscripts, products of the Carolingian Renaissance, were part of an attempt to introduce Greek to Latin speakers.<sup>71</sup> G itself may have served as a study guide to the Greek text. This is most clearly seen in the alternate translations for Greek words that it provides. There are also occasional explanatory notes on Greek words. At 1 Cor. 15:10 two grammatical notes are added: above  $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota$  the scribe wrote “*ablativus gratia*” – indicating the proper case. Above  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\eta$  is written “*pauper id est feminum.*” Another gloss is interpretive: above both occurrences of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  at 14:15, following *spiritus*, the glosses read: *id est voce* (“that is, with the voice”).

The lack of thorough acquaintance with Greek, however, is seen in the numerous copying blunders made in the predecessor of F G. Among them are dropped or added

---

<sup>71</sup>W. Berschin, “Greek Elements in Medieval Latin Manuscripts,” in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. M. W. Herren, King’s College London Medieval Studies II (London: King’s College, 1988), pp. 85-104; esp. pp. 91-93. Further description of the introduction of the study of Greek at St. Gall and Reichenau is provided in Berschin, *Greek and Latin in the Middle Ages*, trans. J. C. Frakes (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1988), pp. 145-56.

terminations:

- 2:11 εγνωκεν ] εγνω F G  
 10:7 ανεστησαν ] ανεστη F G  
 10:18 θυσιαστηριου ] θυσιαστηρει F G  
 13:3 παραδω ] παραδωσω F G  
 15:29 ποιησουσιν ] ποιουσιν F G

Others are simple blunders of sight or sound:

- 2:4 λογοις ] λογους F G  
 5:12 τι ] ει F G  
 11:14 ατιμια ] τιμια F G  
 11:27 εσθιετε ] αισθειηται F G  
 11:27 πινητε ] πινηται F G<sup>72</sup>  
 12:2 μορφα ] αμορφα F G  
 12:23 και α ] και ο F G  
 12:23 εχει ] εχειν F G  
 12:27 υμεις ] υμας F G  
 14:17 ετερος ] εταιρος F G sy<sup>p</sup>  
 15:15 εγειρεν ] εγιγεν F G  
 15:33 ηθη ] ηθηρ F G\*

Dittography is also common:

- 2:31 ους ] ουσου F G  
 7:25 δε διδωμι ] δε δεδιδωμι F G  
 13:12 εκ μερους ] εκ μερους εκ μερους G\*  
 14:22 εισιν ] εισιν εις F G

The challenge is that some of these construe in context, and may trace back to early readings readings. However, as the discussions at the appropriate locations demonstrate, most often these are simple mistakes.

### III.A. *Latinisms in F G*

Several examples where D splits from F G are not corruptions in D. Rather, F G underwent Latinization beyond what took place in the shared ancestor of D F G. The most

---

<sup>72</sup>At 11:27, αισθειηται and πινηται are simple vowel confusions, though these same indicative forms at 11:26 have likely influenced these alterations.

striking example of a Latinism in F G is the addition of ην εχι η αληθια του χριστου after φρονησετε at Gal. 5:10. This clause is written in the text of F, though preceded by an obelus. Likewise it appears in the margin of G, signaled by a marker in the text following φρονησεται. Inserted in the midst of v. 10 it is nonsense, ην having no referent.<sup>73</sup> The source of the Greek, however, is to be found in the Latin, for *quam habet veritas christi* is lifted verbatim from Pelagius' commentary, immediately following the lemma text's *facietis* (= φρονησεται). Initially a comment added in the margin of the shared ancestor of F G, it was left in the margin by the scribe of G but inserted into the text by the scribe of F. Since there is no evidence of a Greek translation of Pelagius' commentaries, the accompanying Greek must be an *ad hoc* translation. This is indisputable evidence of the Greek text being adapted to the Latin in the shared ancestor of F G.

Adaptations to the Latin occur throughout F G's text of 1 Corinthians. At 14:20-22, in a short span of text, F G show several unique readings which all match the Latin:

- 14:20 ινα ταις φρεσιν τελειοι γενησθε F G ]  
 ταις δε φρεσιν τελειοι γινεσθε *cett*  
*ut sensibus perfecti sitis* VL 61 75 77 78 89 Or AMst AMst(A) AU
- 14:21 ουδεπω F G ] ουδ ως ϖ<sup>46</sup>; ουδ ουτως *cett*  
*nondum* VL 75 77 89 AMst
- 14:21 εισακουσεται μου F G Thret ] εισακουσονται μου  
*exaudiet me* VL 77 89 vg<sup>mss</sup>: B G  
*me exaudiet* AMst
- 14:22 τοις πιστοις F G ] τοις πιστευσιν (2) *cett*  
*fidelibus* VL 75 78 89 V AMst(A)  
*fidelibus vel credentibus* VL 77

At 14:20 F G matches the entire Latin tradition – apart from Tertullian<sup>74</sup> and the

---

<sup>73</sup>It cannot be the verb ην, as Swanson's *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Galatians* indicates by adding breathing and accent marks and inserting a semicolon between ην and εχι[ε]ι.

<sup>74</sup>Tertullian paraphrases 14:41 at *Adversus Valentinianus* 2: Also the apostle entreats us to become children again (*repuerescere*) according to the will of the Lord, so that being



Vulgate: *ἵνα τὰς φρεσὶν τελειοὶ γενήσθε / ut sensibus perfecti sitis*. This again shows the unity of the Latin tradition (cf. also, e.g., 6:20). In the standard Greek text the logic of the argument is not clear. If both *ἀλλὰ* and *δε* are adversative, then 20b must be contrasted with both 20a and 20c. But then the argument is not advanced from 14:20a to 20c, for the latter is essentially a repetition of the former. Do the conjunctions then have a different function? Does *ἀλλὰ* contrast 20a and 20b, or function as simple connecting particle, without adversative force?<sup>75</sup> And if *ἀλλὰ* has an adversative function, does *δε* also contrast 20b and 20c?<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, assimilation to the near context is a possibility, with the subjunctive *γενήσθε* misread as an imperative (*γίνεσθε*); this would require, however, a subsequent addition of *ἵνα*.<sup>77</sup> It is likely that the difficulties of the relationship among the clauses led to the alteration now found in F G and the Latin tradition. Because the passage in these witnesses now flows logically, it is more likely that it is the secondary form. All these readings may have originated either in the Greek or the Latin as assimilations to the near context. However, given that several unique alterations occur in so few lines it is likely that at this point the editor of F G gave even more attention than normal to the relationship between the Greek and the Latin texts.

Many readings in F G can be confirmed as Latinisms, since they adapt the Greek to Latin usage. At 7:16, F G alone alter the cases of the vocatives *γυναῖ . . . ἀνερ* to the

---

like infants in evil by our simplicity, let us be only like (*ita demum*) wise people in our understanding. However, this appears to presuppose the  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B *cett* reading.

<sup>75</sup>The NASB renders this “yet in evil be infants, but . . .” while the KJV offers “howbeit” for *ἀλλὰ*. The RSV and NIV ignore *ἀλλὰ* altogether.

<sup>76</sup>056 0142 may indicate the difficulty by their omission of *δε*.

<sup>77</sup>VL B, a Vulgate witness, reads the subjunctive *sitis* without *ut*, but this is likely simply scribal error.

nominative γυνή . . . ανήρ. The alteration must be attributed to Latinization. Both *mulier* and *vir* use the same forms for the vocative and the nominative; the predecessor of F G here altered the Greek to match. Latin case usage also likely affected F G at 1:2; 3:5, 6. In each place ἀπολλω stands in place of ἀπολλως. The Latin nominative form is *apollo*, which is matched phonetically by F G. The Latin case forms for this proper name are phonetically identical for the other cases (e.g. the genitive: *apollo* / ἀπολλω 1:12; 3:4; 16:12), making such alteration elsewhere unnecessary.

Latin idiom has also led to alteration in F G at 1:21. The Latin tradition uses *placeo* to render εὐδοκέω, a verb which typically uses the dative of person. Hence, at 1 Cor. 1:21, the Latin renders εὐδοκησεν ὁ θεός with *placuit deo* (with variation). This then led F G to alter ὁ θεός to τῷ θεῷ = *deo*. The same alteration did not take place at 10:5, since the D-text renders the Greek with *voluntas fuit dei*. Instead, the editor of the Latin text in F G (VL 77 78) conforms the Latin to the Greek with the less elegant *bene placuit deus*.

Omissions are less common than additions or substitutions. One example is 11:14, where F G lose αὐτή. The D F G archetype reading was ἡ φύσις αὐτή / *ipsa natura* attested by D and the entire Latin tradition.<sup>78</sup> However, the shared ancestor of F G lost the pronoun when the Greek and Latin were brought together into an interlinear format, which G retains. In that manuscript, *ipsa* was written above the article ἡ and *natura* above φύσις. The lack of anything in the Latin corresponding to αὐτή led to its omission.

Several alterations in F G involve verb forms. Because only a present form of the imperative exists in Latin, the distinction between a Greek present and aorist imperative

---

<sup>78</sup>Tertullian lacks the pronoun at *De corona* 6 but reads it at *De oratione* 22,7. His text of 1 Cor. 11:14 cannot be reconstructed with confidence since both examples are paraphrases.

cannot be represented in translation.<sup>79</sup> In these situations the D-text most frequently uses the present imperative form with no impact on the Greek manuscripts

5:7	εκκαθαρατε	<i>expurgate</i>
5:13	εξαρατε	<i>auferte; aut ferte</i> 78;
	εξαιρετε ϩ <sup>46</sup> 6 1739 1881	
	εξαρειτε Byz	
6:20	δοξασατε	<i>glorificate</i> <i>clarificate</i> CY
7:21	χρησαι	<i>utere</i>
10:15	κρινατε	<i>iudicate</i>
	κρινεται F	
11:13	κρινατε	<i>iudicate</i>
15:34	εκνηψατε	<i>sobrii estote</i> 61 64 75 77 78 <sup>c</sup> 89 Spe AMst <i>evigilate</i> 78* VG
16:1	ποιησατε	<i>facite</i>
	ποιειτε 330 1108 1611 1890	
16:11	προπεμψατε	<i>praemittite</i> 75 77 <i>deducite</i> 78 89 VG
16:20	ασπασασθε	<i>salutate</i>
	ασπαζασθε 33 216 440	
16:22	μαραναθα	<i>maranatha</i> 75 78 89 VG AMst HI TE <i>in adventu domini</i> 77

Similarly, no variation in the Greek takes place where the Latin employs a subjunctive to translate an aorist imperative:

3:18	γενεσθω	<i>sit</i> 75 77 78 89 VG AMst AMst(A) <i>fiat</i> CY
11:6	κειρασθω	<i>tondeatur</i>
	κηρασθω K L P 0150	
	κειρεσθω 056 0142 181 206 1758	

However, in three places the tense shifts required in Latin caused alteration in F G:

7:11	μενετω αγαμος η τω ανδρι καταλλαγητω ϩ <sup>46</sup> 8 A B C D K L 056 0142 0150 0151 1739	
	μενειν αγαμον η τω ανδρι καταλλαγηναι F G Ψ	
	<i>manere innuptam aut viro reconciliari</i> 75 77 78 89 TE CY <sup>W.E</sup> AMst	
	<i>manere innuptam aut reconciliari viro</i> CY	
	<i>manere innuptam aut viro suo reconciliari</i> VG	

---

<sup>79</sup>B. Fischer, "Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek" in Bruce Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1977), p. 365.



*manere innuptam a viro suo reconciliari* F  
*manere innuptam aut reconciliari viro* Mcion<sup>T</sup>  
 ΜΕΝΕΤΩ ΑΓΑΜΟΣ Η ΤΩ ΙΔΙΩ ΑΝΔΡΙ ΚΑΤΑΛΛΑΓΗΤΩ P 241 547

At 1 Cor. 7:11 the use of the infinitives *manere* and *reconciliari* stand against the Greek imperatives *μένετω* and *καταλλαγήτω*. While grammatically correct as indirect discourse based on the verb *praecipio* in 7:10 and modelled on the preceding *discedere* (*praecipio . . . uxorem a viro non discedere*), the lack of a form equivalent to the aorist passive imperative *καταλλαγήτω* prompted the alteration. Already Marcion (cited by Tertullian) and Cyprian had done the same.<sup>80</sup> F G show the alteration of the Greek to match the Latin: *μένειν αγαμον η τω ανδρι καταλλαγηναι*. The use of an infinitive rather than an imperative, the only example in the D-text in 1 Cor., prompted the alteration in Z.

7:9 γαμησατωσαν Ϝ<sup>46</sup> ⋈ A B C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 1739 *pm*  
 γαμειτωσαν F G 2 38 81<sup>c</sup> 88 623<sup>\*</sup> 1611 *pc*  
*nubant* 75 77 78 89 VG  
 γαμητωσαν 102 462 1927

In 7:9 the Latin is forced to use the present subjunctive *nubant*, which F G follows by substituting *γαμειτωσαν* (present) for *γαμεισατωσαν* (aorist). This takes place independently in over a dozen other manuscripts,<sup>81</sup> testifying to the tendency toward a shorter form.

In addition, where the Greek uses the complementary infinitive, F G occasionally shifted to the indicative or subjunctive, matching the Latin. However, of nineteen potential examples, in 1 Corinthians, in only two places was alteration made in F G:

7:39 θελει γαμηθναι θελει γαμηθη F G = *vult nubat*  
 7:40 δοκω εχειν δοκω . . . εχω F G = *puto habeo* 75 77 89

---

<sup>80</sup>Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,7,7; Cyprian, *Ad Quirinium* 3, 90.

<sup>81</sup>38 81<sup>c</sup> 88 218 323 378 421 483 491 623<sup>\*</sup> 919 1610 1611 1838 1912 2125 2298 Eriph Chr; γαμητωσαν 102 462.

### III.B. Latin Influenced Word Divisions

It is not always obvious that the scribe of G had a clear understanding of the meaning of the Greek which he was copying. Bizarre word divisions abound; εν κοπηντιν αδωμεν at 9:12 (ενκοπην τινα δωμεν) may be only the most egregious example. However, frequently these mistaken word divisions are adaptations to the Latin. At 4:13 we see a “live” example of the manner in which the Latin influenced the Greek in G:

4:13 ως περικαθαρματα Ϙ<sup>46</sup> Ϙ<sup>68</sup> ⋈ A B C D<sup>c</sup> F G<sup>c</sup> L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 *pm*  
 ωσπερικαθαρμα D<sup>\*</sup>  
 ως περι καθαρματα G<sup>\*82</sup> 69 1927

G<sup>\*</sup> leaves a space between ωσ, περι, and καθαρματα, thus indicating three separate words. There is also a single point placed before ωσ and after καθαρματα, which G occasionally employs to indicate word breaks. F, on the other hand, places a point after ωσ (which is enlarged and stands at the beginning of a line) and after περικαθαρματα. It appears that when the translation was added in G by the original scribe, the space between ωσ περι was bridged with a subscript “v” (ωσ<sub>v</sub>περι), above which is written *tanquam*. His Latin text consisted only of *tanquam purgamenta* (75 77 78 89 VG); not having anything equivalent to περι, he created ωσπερι, for which *tanquam* is an accurate translation.

At 4:21 (further discussed below) the scribe wrote πνευματι τεπρα;οτητος, with precisely that word division. In itself this is evidence of a lack of understanding his Greek. When the Latin supralinear translation was added, however, this ignorance is shown even more clearly. Above πνευματι stand the alternatives *spiritus vel [spirit]u*. However, *qq* (= *quoque*) is placed above the space between the two Greek words, not above its equivalent τε,

---

<sup>82</sup>G<sup>\*</sup> leaves a space between each of the words; the space between ωσ περι is then bridged with a subscript “v”: ωσ<sub>v</sub> περι, above which is written *tanquam*. F, on the other hand, places a point between ωσ and after περικαθαρματα.

which had been incorrectly attached to the subsequent word. *Mansuetudinis* is written above τεπρα;οτητος, but the semi-colon inserted into the word appears to be secondary word division. This was likely added concurrently with the Latin since the normal word division is made either by a space or a point (as in F).

At times this improper word division led to alteration of the prefixes of compound forms:

- 7:9 ουκ εγκρατευονται  $\aleph$  A B<sup>c</sup> C D<sup>c</sup> K L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 614 1739  
 ουκ ενκρατευονται  $\wp^{46}$  B<sup>\*</sup> D<sup>\*</sup>  
 ου κρατευονται F G  
*non continent se* 61 77  
*non se continent* 89 VG AMst(A)  
*se non continent* 78 F L N U AMst Ambr HI AU
- 8:7 η συνειδησις D *rel*  
*conscientia* 61 75 77 78 89 VG AMst AMst(A)  
 η ιδησεις G<sup>\*</sup>  
 ιδησεις F G<sup>c</sup>
- 8:8 παριστησιν  $\aleph^2$  D L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0151 104 326 1881 Or  
 παραστησει  $\wp^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  A B 0150 5 6 33 81 88 181 256 365 467 623 915  
 917 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1319 1739 1836 1875 1912 Cl Ath Cy Or  
 συνιστησιν F G  
*commendat* 61 75 77 78 89 VG TE AMst AMst(A)

Some of the clearest of these secondary adaptations of the Greek to the Latin are found in the manner in which compound verbs are handled by X. In 7:9, the prefix εν- is dropped from the ενκρατευονται to conform with the Latin, which does not have a similar prefix. The NT nowhere else attests the verb without the prefix. Similarly, in 8:8 F G alter παριστησιν to συνιστησιν based on the Latin *commendat* in an attempt to match the prefixes of the verbs. In fact, G frequently separates the prefix from the main stem of the verb; in the immediate context συν ιδησι in 8:7 (discussed below) and συν • ιδησιν in 8:12 are found. The result at 8:8 is nonsense: βρωμα δε ημας ου συνιστησει τω θεω.



A similar confusion over the prefixes of verbs is found in 8:7. There D and all other witnesses read *καὶ ἡ συνειδησις αὐτῶν* against *καὶ ἰδησεις* (*sic* = *εἰδησις*) *αὐτῶν* in F G<sup>c</sup>. The correction in G betrays some of the editing that has occurred, for the original hand has the article *ἡ* before *ἰδησεις*. This is marked off with points above and below the letter and is not copied in F, but does show that the article had been present in the exemplar. In addition, the fact that the noun is written as *ἰδησεις* rather than *εἰδησις* shows that the prefix has been dropped. The noun *εἰδησις* does not occur in the NT except in the compound form with the prefix *συν-*. This prefix had been present here also in Z, but is removed in X under the influence of the Latin. The Latin equivalent *conscientia* probably would not have led to the alteration in the Greek except that earlier in the verse a form of *συνείδησις* is found in D F G (*συνήθεια*<sup>83</sup> *ℵ\** A B P Ψ 0150 1739 *pc*). In this earlier example the function of the Greek dative case *τῇ συνειδησει* is rendered with a prepositional phrase: *in conscientia*. The editor assumed *συν-* to be a preposition. Since an equivalent was not present in the Latin, *εἰδησις* was written without *ἡ συν*. Both examples reveal a minimal understanding of the Greek text, and little consideration for the resultant meaning of the text.<sup>84</sup>

Just as the prefixes of compounds were altered in F G, so were individual prepositions. At 4:6, F G alone read *κατὰ τοῦ ἐνός* (against *ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός*). In the Latin tradition of the Pauline epistles the participle *adversus* (from *adverto*) is used to translate the prepositions

---

<sup>83</sup>The only other Pauline occurrence of *συνήθεια* is 1 Cor. 11:16 (without variation) where it is matched by *consuetudo* (also without variation). At 8:7a several Latin manuscripts read something equivalent to *συνήθεια*: *cum scientia* 61; *consuetudine* P; *in consuetudine sua* O<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>84</sup>Cf. also 7:29, where F G omit the verb *ῶσιν*, which had no Latin equivalent and likely was confused with *ὡς* earlier in the sentence.

κατά (nine times)<sup>85</sup> and πρός (six times)<sup>86</sup> and, in Rom. 11:18, *adversus ramos* makes clear the function of the genitive τῶν κλάδων. The Latin of 1 Cor. 4:6 has a construction identical to the last of these: *adversus* + accusative, with the sense of “over.” This led to the alteration to κατα in F G, which corresponds to *adversus*. This also brings the phrase into parallel with κατα το ετερου at the end of the clause, even though in Latin the prepositions are not parallel (*adversus alterum infletur pro alio* 75 89 SPE).

A reading that has been substantially altered due to adaption to Latin word divisions is found at 14:19. Regarding the word order variant attested here by F G, Zuntz noted that the reading of Ϟ<sup>46</sup> is the basis for the reading of F G. This is partially correct, for ΛΑΛΗCAIEN was misread as ΛΑΛΗOMEN and divided in F G into two words. 77 (and the annotator of F) translates this as *loquor quidem*, which ignores the ο attached to μεν and translates only the last word. Λαλη, however, is nonsense in context but supplied with what stood in the Latin text: *loqui*, which is an accurate rendering of λαλησαι. What Zuntz fails to explain is how the verb in F G came to be placed prior to the prepositional phrase: It is the result of a Latinization in F G. Every Latin witness apart from Ambrose and the Vulgate-influenced manuscripts read *loqui* prior to the prepositional phrase.<sup>87</sup> The editor of F G moved what he thought was λαλη ο μεν to match the Latin, possibly because μεν / *quidem* could not stand at the end of a clause.

The avoidance of crasis in F G may also be a result of adaptation to the Latin (see 2:1.1).

---

<sup>85</sup>Rom 8:33; 11:2; 1 Cor. 15:15; 2 Cor. 10:5; 13:8; Gal. 3:21; 5:17; 5:23; 1 Tim. 5:19.

<sup>86</sup>1 Cor. 6:1; Eph. 6:11, 12 (three times); Col. 3:13.

<sup>87</sup>VL 75: *loqui per sensum meum*; 77: *loqui sensu meo*; 78: *loqui quidem mente mea*; 89 AMst: *loqui per legem*.

### III.C. Addition and Omission of the Article

D F G together infrequently omit the article:

12:11 το εν . . . πνευμα ] εν . . . πνευμα D\* F G 181 arm Chr Ps-Ignatius  
15:32 το οφελος ] οφελος D\* F G

However, F G add, omit, or alter the article, at times nonsensically, far more frequently than does D, or for that matter, any other Greek witness of 1 Corinthians. They add the article at:

1:16 λοιπον ] το λοιπον F G  
4:1 θεου ] του θεου F G  
5:7 χριστος ] ο χριστος F G  
8:6 ο θεος F G 33  
11:7 ανδρος ] του ανδρος F G  
15:15 νεκροι ] οι νεκροι  
15:20 εκ νεκρων ] εκ των νεκρων

On the other hand, they more frequently omit the article:

1:24 τοις κλητοις / κλητοις F G  
2:15 τα παντα / παντα F G (also B Byz)  
3:19 ο δρασσομενος τους σοφους / δρασσαμενος σοφους F G  
7:19 η περιτομη / περιτομη F G  
7:28<sup>88</sup> η παρθενος / παρθενος B F G  
10:4 η πετρα δε / η δε πετρα ] πετρα δε F G  
10:10 ολεθρευτου ] ολεθρευ F G  
11:23 απο του θεου ] απο θεου F G  
11:24 εις την εμην αναμνησιν ] εις εμην αναμνησιν F G  
15:8 τω εκτρωματι ] εκτρωματι F G  
16:13 εν τη πιστει / εν πιστει F G

The nonsense reading ολεθρευ at 10:10 is particularly striking; it may have been lost purely by accident or, more likely, on the mistaken assumption that it was an article. Finally, F G alter the case or number of the article:

1:25 το ασθενες ] ο ασθενες F G

---

<sup>88</sup>This omission may be due to the ending of the preceding word (ΓΔΜΗΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ); B. Weiss (p. 75) notes also the similar omission of Η after ΥΠΟΜΟΝΕΙ at 1 Cor. 13:8 (B) and Η after ΕΔΟΘΗ at Eph. 4:7 (B D F G L P).



13:10 το εκ μερους ] τα εκ μερους F G

15:53 το φθαρτον ] ο φθαρτον F G (but *corruptium* TE CY HI)

Two other omissions are particularly significant since the article is functioning with an infinitive. The loss results in nonsense, an indication of the lack of sophisticated understanding of the Greek text on the part of the scribe/editor:

4:6 το μη . . . γεγραπται / μη . . . γεγραπται F G *pc*

7:26 το ουτως ειναι / ουτως ειναι F G *Meth*

This lack of clear comprehension of the Greek is further demonstrated by the omission of words consisting of a single letter, such relative pronouns and forms of *ειμι*, apparently because they are confused with articles:

2:5 η πιστις υμων μη η εν σοφια  $\Phi^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B C D L P  $\Psi$  049 056 0142  
0150 0151 1739

*fides vestra non sit in sapientia* F VG AMst AMst(A)

*esset fides vestra non in sapientia* 78

*fides vestra non sit in sapientiam* 75 89

η πιστις υμων μη εν σοφια F G  $\Psi$  *pc*

*fides vestra non in sapientia* 77

The verb is read in the Latin; its omission in F G can be attributed to a confusion with the article. Similarly, at 16:6 F G lose the particle *η*, even though the corresponding *vel* is read in 75 77 89 VG, and again at 2:13 F G lose the relative pronoun, even though the Latin reads *quae*.

Finally, the loss and alteration of the article is more pronounced in F:

2:6 του αιωνος τουτου (1) / αιωνος τουτου F

7:39 ο ανηρ (1) / ανηρ F

8:4 των ειδωλοθυτον / του ειδωλοθυτον F

D, on the other hand, rarely omits the article without other support. The omission of *τα* before *παντα* (8:6; 12:6) involves other considerations, as discussed at 12:19.80

### III.D. Other Latinisms in F G

One alteration in F G is prompted by the Latin *nomina sacra*.

14:2 πνευματι  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph$  A B D K L P  $\Psi$  048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243  
*spiritu* 76 78 *vg<sup>mss</sup>*: A\* B C D G<sup>1</sup> K M N O P S U V Z AMst AM SED-S  
 (75 *lac*)  
 πνευμα F G  
*spiritus* 89 75 77 *vg<sup>mss</sup>*: A<sup>c</sup> F H  $\Theta$  L T W AU PEL

At 14:2 F G write  $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$  written to match  $\overline{sps}$ . The *spiritus* is not nominative here, however, but genitive. A similar use of the genitive where the Greek uses dative is seen at 1 Cor. 4:21.<sup>89</sup>

Although a corruption, the resultant text in F G actually construes: πνευμα δε λαλει μυστηρια, with the πνευμα now construed as the subject rather than the ο λαλων earlier in the verse. However, the context is discussing human speech, not the Spirit's speech.

Additional Latinisms in F G include:

4:17 πιστον  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{P}^{68}$   $\aleph$  A B C D L P  $\Psi$  049 056 0142 0150 0151 1739  
 πιστος F G  
*fidelis* 75 77 78 89 F VG AMst  
*fidelis minister* 61  
*lac*  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$

The Latin tradition uses the adjective *fidelis* in the masculine form because it modifies *filius*, which translates the neuter τέκνον. F G matches the gender of *fidelis* with πιστος, even though πιστον should have been protected by the immediately preceding τέκνον μου αγαπητόν. A literal, word-by word equivalency to the Latin text was apparently desired, though in the resultant text πιστος can no longer modify τεκνον. The result is a nonsense reading, though not a mere “scribal error.”

4:19 των πεφυσιωμενων  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{P}^{68}$   $\aleph$  A B C D P  $\Psi$  049 056 0142 0151 1739 *pm* Cl  
 αυτων των πεφυσιωμενων F G  
*eorum qui inflati sunt* 75 89 78 F VG  
*illorum qui inflati sunt* AMst  
*eorum infantium vel qui inflanti sunt* 77  
 τον πεφυσιωμενον L 0150 5 1912 *al* Or  
*lac*  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$

---

<sup>89</sup>At 4:21, D makes an alteration for the same reason that F G do here; see below.

The D-text frequently uses *qui* + finite verb to render Greek participles.<sup>90</sup> At 4:19, however, the addition of the genitive pronoun *eorum* was necessary in order to convey the possessive force of the participle. The editor of X introduced the “missing” pronoun αὐτῶν into his Greek text, translating *eorum* perfectly but failing to bring the participles into alignment (which was later accomplished by 77 with *infantium*).

6:4    μεν ουν  ⋈ B C D L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 614 1739  
           γουν F G  
               *igitur* 61 64 75 77 78 89 F VG AMst AMst(A)  
           omit (parablepsis) A  
           lac  Ⓢ<sup>46</sup>

At 6:4 only F G depart from μεν ουν to read γουν (γ’ οὖν; γε οὖν), a particle found nowhere else in Paul. The reading is caused by the Latin *igitur*, as can be seen from the way F G and the D-text handle this inferential particle. When οὖν stands in the Greek in 1 Corinthians, 77 78 89 read *itaque* (7:38; 4:16; *itaque vel autem* 78), *autem* (9:25; 15:11; 16:11), or *ergo* (6:15; 8:4; 9:18; 10:19; 10:31; 14:11, 15, 26; 16:18), but never *igitur*. In addition, in several passages where the Vulgate reads *igitur* the D-text either reads different particles: *ergo* (3:4); *quidem* (9:24) or omits it (15:49, discussed below). The only example of *igitur* in the D-text of 1 Corinthians is 6:4, likely accounting for this unusual Greek particle.

Another example of F G altering its text on the basis of the particles found in the Latin is seen at 14:3. There they intentionally replace ο δε προφητευων with ει γαρ ο προφητευων, for no transcriptional error can account for the alteration. In this context, ει γαρ would function as a wish: “if only the one prophesying . . .” However, this classical usage<sup>91</sup> is

---

<sup>90</sup>E.g., 7:30 *qui gaudent* 75 89 78 F VG CY AMst = οι χαιροντες.

<sup>91</sup>Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 91-95.



unknown in the NT.<sup>92</sup> It may have been introduced in F G on the basis of the *nam* read by most of the Latin tradition.

### III.E. Alterations in F G Toward the Vulgate

As noted above, when X was assembled, the Latin text was assimilated to the local “St. Gall” type of Vulgate text. The best extant witness to the text is the Winithar manuscript (S).<sup>93</sup> 77 and 78 each reflect this editorial activity in a different way; 78 has primarily a Vulgate text with a mixture of D-text readings. 77, on the other hand, has as its basis a D-text, though with a significant number of Vulgate readings introduced. In places these readings replace the D-text reading, at others they are added as an alternative in the “double translations.”<sup>94</sup> The places where both 77 and 78 adopt the Vulgate reading, however, have not only affected the Latin. In numerous cases, the Greek text now represented in F G was altered to match the both the existing D-text as well as these newly introduced Vulgate readings.

F G and virtually the entire Latin tradition add a disjunctive particle<sup>95</sup> at 13:1 prior to *aes / aerumtamen* (= χαλκος). This addition balances the *aut* prior to *cymbalum* (= κυμβαλον). In this case, the presence of the particle likely stems from the Latin, not the Greek. A similar adaptation takes place in the Latin tradition at Rom. 9:11, where the Greek

---

<sup>92</sup>Without γάρ, εἰ functions to introduce strong assertions (but never in Paul); see BDAG, s.v. εἰ (4).

<sup>93</sup>This local text was formed by comparison of several strands of the Vulgate, including a text similar to Codex Fuldensis, manuscripts of the Alcuin and Theodulf recensions, and the edition of Peregrinus. See Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, Bd. 1, p. 78 n. 1.

<sup>94</sup>These are exhaustively discussed in H. Rönsch, “Die Doppelübersetzungen im lateinischen Texte des cod. Boernarianus der Paulinischen Briefe,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 25 (1882), pp. 488-517; 26 (1883), pp. 73-98, 309-44.

<sup>95</sup>*velut* VL 77 78 VG; *vel* vg<sup>ms</sup>: A; *aut* VL 89; *ut* VL 75 AMst(A) *Speculum* Rufinus. The remaining witnesses read a comparative particle: *sicut* vg<sup>ms</sup>: S; *quasi* Jerome; *tamquam* Augustine.

reads μηδέ . . . ἥ but which is altered in the Latin to *aut . . . aut*.<sup>96</sup> Here again F G are unique in reading η in place of μηδε. Further confirmation that η is a later addition to the immediate predecessor of F G is the use of the lower-case H in G, which as the initial letter of the line would have been capitalized in its early ancestor. It is unlikely that D would have omitted η, since its adaptations to other Greek witnesses are typically additions, not omission.

Furthermore, this would require D to have omitted the particle based on other Greek manuscripts but without changing εν ειμι to γεγονα. Latinization is therefore the source of the addition of the particle in F G at both Rom. 9:11 and 1 Cor. 13:1.

12:20 μεν μελη Ϝ<sup>46c97</sup> ⚭ A C D<sup>c</sup> F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 33 1739  
*quidem membra* 77 78 VG  
 μελη Ϝ<sup>46\*</sup> B D\* 5 6 102 441 623 1241<sup>s</sup> 1827 1845  
*membra* 61 75 89 AU

This passage has an unusual number of particles, which no doubt contributed to the tendency to add/omit μὲν: νῦν δὲ πολλὰ [μὲν] μέλη, ἔν δὲ σῶμα. An argument could be made for the secondary addition of μὲν to balance the second δὲ; it may also have been omitted because of the proximity of the first δὲ. In either case, the μὲν was not present in Z since both 75 89 as well as D\* omit it. The reading *quidem* in 77 78 VG caused the addition in F G; these witnesses also add *quidem* in passages where 75 89 do not read it: 7:7; 11:7; 12:8 (75 89 = *enim*); and 12:28, each of which has μὲν without variation. In addition, 75 follows 77 78 VG with the reading *quidem* at 3:4 even though it is absent in 61 89. Latin does not normally

---

<sup>96</sup>The Latin tradition also reads *aut . . . aut* at Eph. 5:4 (supported by A D\* F G Ψ *pc* where some Greek witnesses read και . . . και).

<sup>97</sup>In Ϝ<sup>46</sup>, μεν is written above the line in a cursive hand. Kenyon assigns this to “m.2”; NTAp suggests “Benutzer” without specifying a date or correlating to specific corrections elsewhere in the manuscript.

provide an equivalent to μὲν.<sup>98</sup> Here the Vulgate shows its ancestry as a grecized D-text; 77 78 have been affected by it, and as a result so has X=F G. The addition of μὲν at 12:20 is therefore a secondary Latinism in F G, whatever the motives of other scribes for making the same addition.

3:22 πάντα Ϝ<sup>46</sup> ⋈ A B C D F G L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151 0289 1739  
*omnia* 61 89 75 TE AMst AMst(A) AU Priscill  
 πάντα γαρ 0150 1873  
 πάντα δι [= δη] F G  
*omnia enim* 77 78 VG

The addition of δι = δη<sup>99</sup> before υμων in 3:21 arises from the reading *enim*, which 77 78 share with the Vulgate. The secondary insertion into the Latin text (it is absent from 64 75 89 AMst(A) *etc*) created the need for a Greek equivalent, leading to the addition of δη. This particle is found in Paul only in 1 Cor. 6:20 (with variation) and in F G at 1:21, where they divide επειδη into two words (επει δη) based on the D-text's *nam quia*.

6:3 μητι γε βιωτικα Ϝ<sup>46 vid</sup> ⋈ B C D L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 614 1739  
*neque saecularia* 75  
*nedum saecularia* 64 AU  
*necdum saecularia* AMst(A)  
 μητοιγε βιωτικα 642  
 ποσω μαλλον βιωτικα F G  
*quanto magis saecularia* 77 78 F VG  
*omit* [parablepsis] A  
*omit* 61 89 AMst Pel

Elsewhere in Paul πόσω μᾶλλον is found in Rom. 11:12, 24; Phil. 1:23 and Phlm. 16 (without variation),<sup>100</sup> while μήτι is likewise infrequent (1 Cor. 7:2; 2 Cor. 1:17; 12:18; 13:5),

---

<sup>98</sup>Fischer, "Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek" in Bruce Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1977), p. 370.

<sup>99</sup>Gignac I, p. 236 lists examples of ι > η substitution of the similar μη in Roman papyri into the late 7<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>100</sup>Outside Paul in Matt 7:11; 10:25; Luke 11:13; 12:24, 28; Heb 9:14.



though never elsewhere with γε. Neither reading is likely to have arisen due to harmonization to any of these passages since none of the contexts are similar to 1 Cor. 6. A more likely explanation is that ποσω μαλλον is based on the Latin *quanto magis* (also translating ποσω μαλλον at Rom. 11:12, 24 Phil. 1:23; and Phlm. 16 ). *Quanto magis* is also used to translate μήτι γε.<sup>101</sup> The Greek particles are equivalent to each other. Photius' lexicon and the Seguerina provide the gloss πόσω γε μᾶλλον for μήτι γε. However, finding *quanto magis* in the Latin, a scribe of an ancestor manuscript to F G substituted the more familiar ποσω μαλλον.

The substitution of a particle on the basis of the Vulgate takes place again at 15:49:

καὶ (1) ℘<sup>46</sup> ⑈ A B D K L P Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243  
 ἀρα F G<sup>mg</sup>  
*igitur* 77<sup>mg</sup> 78 VG  
*itaque* AU  
*sicut* 89  
*igitur sicut* AMst(A) SPE  
 omit G\* 75 77\* Mcion IR OR CY TE

At 15:49, as noted above (see discussion of 6:7), the D-text omits the particle. In fact, the καὶ is not followed by any Latin witnesses, which read *sicut* (89), *itaque* (AU), or more often omit the particle. The καὶ may be secondary, for the previous two sentences both begin asyndetically. Regardless, it was absent in the predecessor of F G. In the margin of G, however, ἀρα / *igitur* is written, the latter of which is taken from the Vulgate. These both stand in the text of F 78 without notation. This particle is unusual in Paul, though not impossible. Its introduction here may arise from previous examples in 15:14, 15, 18. Similar to what took place in 6:4, apparently, the editor/scribe of X considered *igitur* a strong or unusual particle, and so selected ἀρα as a likely equivalent.

---

<sup>101</sup>Though here 75 uses *neque*; 64 *nedum*.

Verb tense was also adapted to the Vulgate:

8:11 και απολειται D<sup>2</sup> F G L 056 0142 0151 sy Ir Pel  
*et peribit* 77 78 VG AMst AMst(A)  
*et periet* IR  
 και απολλυται X<sup>2</sup> D\* Ψ 6 81 206 256 263 365 630 1739 1758 1881 2004  
 2127  
*et perit* 61 75 89 AU  
 απολλυται γαρ Ϝ<sup>46</sup> X\* B 33 917 1175 C1  
 απολλυται ουν A P  
 και απολειται ουν 326  
 και απολλυται ουν 0150 181 1875 2110  
 και απολλυται γαρ 104 459  
 απολλυται 1836

The F G reading και απολειται happens to agree with the Byzantine text. However, it is an alteration of the Z reading και απολλυται now found in D and supported by *et perit* in 61 75 89. When the Vulgate reading *peribit* was adopted in X, the future tense of the verb was altered in the Greek to match.

In some passages, adaptation to the Vulgate was only partial. At 9:15, D matches Ϝ<sup>46</sup> X\* B D with the reading η το καυχημα μου ουδεις κενωσει, while F G read τις for ουδεις. Their Latin equivalents, however, show no consistency. 75 matches D with *nemo*, but reads the verb *exinaniet* (future indicative) which is found in no other Latin witness. 77's *quis* matches G's τις, but offers a “*Doppelübersetzung*” for the verb: *evacuat vel exinaniat*. The former is the present indicative form, though it may have been unintentionally adapted to the termination of the alternative,<sup>102</sup> *exinaniat* (the present subjunctive) since 78 matches the Vulgate with *evacuet*. Further confusing the issue is that F G are inconsistent in the use of η and ει, so that one should be hesitant to put significant weight on the form καινωσει (*sic*) and attempt to decide what the Latin was attempting to match. The most likely reading of the shared ancestor of 75 77 78 is that found in 75: *quam gloriam meam nemo exinaniet*. This is

---

<sup>102</sup>AMst(A) and the Vulgate manuscripts H N read *evacuet*.

confirmed by the reading of 89 (*gloriam meam nemo evacuavit*), which, as we saw above, lost the particle. The Vulgate (also 78) corresponds to what is now in the “Byzantine” witnesses: *quam ut gloriam meam quis euacuet*. When the ancestor of 77 78 was adapted to a form of the Vulgate, 78 matched it precisely (*quam ut gloriam meam quis euacuet*, which matches the “Byzantine” witnesses), but 77 retained the D-text verb form as an alternative. At the same time, while *ut* entered 78's text, it was not adopted by 77, perhaps because placing the equivalent *ινα* before *το καυχημα* would have separated it too far from the verb. Nonetheless, *τις* replaced *ουδεις* to match *quis*. The reading of the Byzantine text therefore had indirect influence on the text of F G through the Vulgate and subsequent alteration to bring the Greek into closer agreement with the Latin.

Similarly, at 13:3 F G alone alter *παραδω* to its Latin text with the reading *παραδωσω*, matching the future tense of *distribuero*. The first verb in 13:2 is also a future in the Latin tradition (*distribuero*), but the Greek *ψωμισω* was not altered by the predecessor of F G because the Greek form could be construed either as the present subjunctive or the future indicative, the latter of which was apparently the choice of this scribe/editor.

7:39 δεδεται νομω  $\aleph^2$  D<sup>1</sup> F G L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 104 326 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> sy  
*alligata est legi* 61 78 vg<sup>mss</sup>: F  $\Theta^*$  L N O P R Z<sup>\*</sup> AMst(A)  
*vincta vel alligata est legi* 77  
*vincta est legi* Ambr Sedul  
*vincta est lege* AMst  
 δεδεται γαμω K 92 606 858 2659 *Epiph co bo*  
*alligata est viro* HI  
 δεδεται  $\mathfrak{P}^{15vid}$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^*$  A B D<sup>\*</sup> 0278 6 33 81 424c 1175 1739 1881 1962  
*alligata est* 75 89 VG HI  
*vincta est* TE CY PEL

The addition of *νόμω* is a secondary harmonization to Rom. 7:2, where the freedom of a married woman from the marriage law in the case of death is used as an metaphor for Paul's wider discussion of freedom and the law in Romans 7: ἡ γὰρ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι



ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ. Zuntz hints that this is a place where F G has been influenced by the Byzantine text.<sup>103</sup> However, this is one of only two passages cited by him where F G against D has been influenced by “Byzantine” witnesses; the other is in the eucharistic passage 11:24 (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν + κλώμενον), which is not an example of F G moving away from D, but D making an addition based on liturgical texts (see discussion *ad loc*). In the case of 7:34 it is more likely that the harmonization took place in the Latin independent of the Greek (note the presence of the reading in 61 Ambr AMst(A) F R) and from there introduced into F G. At 11:24, contrary to Zuntz’s claim that it “is not an Old Western Interpolation,” the reading was present in Z as attested by *frangitur* (75 AMst), *frangetur* 77 78<sup>c</sup>), and confirmed now by 89's *confringitur*. The Byzantine text had no influence on F G, unless indirectly through the Vulgate.

Numerous other examples may be cited, for which the reader is referred to the discussion *ad loc*:

12:12 τα μελη του σωματος του ενος Ν<sup>2</sup> D K Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 88 181 326  
915 917 1175 1836 1875 1898 1912

τα μελη του σωματος ϩ<sup>46vid</sup> Ν\* A B C D<sup>c</sup> F G L P 6 33<sup>vid</sup> 38 81 103 104 218  
256 263 365 441 464\* 623 642 794 999 1108 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1319 1505  
1611 1739 1827 1834 1838 1881 1906 1926 2127 2464  
*membra corporis* 77 78 VG AMst(A) HI AU  
*membra de corpore* 61

τα μελη εκ του σωματος του ενος D\*  
*membra de corpore uno* 75 89  
*membra ex uno corpore* AMst Hil  
lac 0201

14:33 των αγιων ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν A B D K L Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0243 sy<sup>p</sup> sy<sup>hc</sup>  
*sanctorum* 89 75 VG vg<sup>mss</sup>: A G\* M N\*  
των αγιων διδασκω F G 2 88 216 255 256 326 330 440 823 1831 2127 sy<sup>h\*</sup>  
*sanctorum doceo* 61 77 78 vg<sup>mss</sup>: B C F G<sup>1</sup> H Θ K L N<sup>1</sup> O P R S T U V  
W Z AMst AMst(A) Pel

---

<sup>103</sup>Zuntz, p. 166, with the remark: “Note that the older Western witnesses are free from the interpolation.”

των αγιων διατασσομαι 0151

15:27 υποτετακται ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν Α Β Δ Κ Λ Ρ Ψ 048 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243  
*subiecta sunt* 64 75 89 Ir VictAf Hil AU Pel  
 υποτετακται αυτω F G sy<sup>p</sup> sa bo Hipp Or  
*subiecta sunt ei* 77 78 VG Hil AMst AMst(A)

16:16 και κοπιωντι ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν Α Β C Δ Κ Λ Ρ Ψ 049 056 075 0121 0142 0150 0151  
 0243  
*et laboranti* VG AMst AMst(A)  
*et laborat* 75 89  
 και κοπιωντι εν υμιν F G  
*et laboranti in vobis* 61 77 78 vg<sup>mss</sup>: K O<sup>1</sup>  
 και κοπιωντι εν κυριω 81 255 256 1319 2127  
*omit* 33

15:34 υμιν λεγω Α F G K L 056 075 0142 0150 0151 104 181 326 1881 sy<sup>p</sup>  
*vobis dico* 61 77 78 Or AMst(A)  
*dico vobis* Spe  
 υμιν λαλω ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν Β Δ Ρ Ψ 049 0243 5 6 33 69 81 88 218 256 429 489 623  
 630 915 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1611 1739 1875 2127 2143 2464 sy<sup>h</sup>  
*vobis loquor* 64 75 89 VG AMst

Yet not all of the readings adapted into 77 78 from the Vulgate were also adopted in the Greek of F G. For example:

10:6 ημων εγενηθησαν F G *rel*  
*nostri facta sunt* 75 89 AMst AMst(A) Pel  
*facta sunt nostri* 77 78 VG

12:2 οιδατε οτι F G 0142 0151 *pm*  
*scitis quoniam* 61 75 89 vg<sup>mss</sup>: D K\* S\* AMst(A) AU  
 οιδατε οτι οτε Ν Α Β C Δ Λ Ρ Ψ *pc*  
*scitis quoniam cum* 77 78 VG AMst(A) Pel

The example from 12:2 is particularly interesting, since F G match the D-text reading while D matches the Vulgate reading. This is precisely the opposite of what would be expected if scribal activity were simply mechanical, and they always made the same types of changes. In fact, in this case it is more likely that the Vulgate, which generally agrees with the “Alexandrian” witnesses, and D, which is frequently adapted to “Alexandrian” readings (see below), have independently made the addition, and that F G and D-text preserves the original

Z reading. Again, we are reminded of Schäfer's caution: "There is no method for [the reconstruction of Z] which can be used mechanically . . . each of the three texts has its own unique, sometimes difficult to trace, history."<sup>104</sup>

These examples provides us a glimpse, confirmed time and again, of the scribe's lack of acquaintance with Greek. He is incapable of creating Greek readings "on the fly," and faithfully presents the lettering, if not always the wording, of his exemplar. The Greek text of G, confirmed by its close agreement with F, therefore represents the exemplar X with remarkable faithfulness. Any search for major alterations in the Greek of F G, particularly the addition of an entire word, must be found in its predecessor X, not these individual manuscripts.

### *III.F. Greek Source of the Vulgate-Influenced Additions in F G*

The adaptation of the Latin text of X to both the D-text and the Vulgate does not yet entirely account for the Greek readings. In some cases the source may appear to be Byzantine manuscripts. Others are singular readings. However, these readings can be accounted for not on the basis of comparison to a continuous text manuscript, as in the case of D, but the use of a Latin-Greek glossary.

The Latin-Greek glossary tradition is long and complex. The most widely used is the so-called *Pseudo-Philoxenus*, itself a compilation of several earlier lists of works.<sup>105</sup> This specific glossary is known to have been used by Carolingian scholars.<sup>106</sup> At St. Gall, the likely place of origin of Codex Boernarianus, there was a strong interest in bilingual glossaries.

---

<sup>104</sup>Schäfer, p. 70.

<sup>105</sup>Wouters, *Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499*, 101. Wouters supplies a list of other Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin glossaries found in papyrus documents on pp. 102-104.

<sup>106</sup>B. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts*, p. 57.



Though today only Greek-Latin (not Latin-Greek) glossaries have been identified as originating in St. Gall, these exist now only in a single codex and “it is likely that Carolingians possessed far more of them than we have today.”<sup>107</sup>

Many of the above-cited Greek alterations based on the Vulgate adaptations in F G can all be attributed to the *Pseudo-Philoxenus* glossary.<sup>108</sup> This glossary simply lists a Latin word, followed by one or occasionally two Greek glosses. The passages discussed so far correspond to the *Pseudo-Philoxenus* glossary as follows:

	77 78 VG	F G	Pseudo-Philoxenus
3:22	+ <i>enim</i>	δι [= δη]	<i>enim</i> γαρ, δη
6:3	<i>quanto magis</i>	ποσω μαλλον	<i>quantum</i> ποσον, πελικαν
		.	<i>magis</i> μαλλον
		μητι γε	
7:39	+ <i>legi</i>	νομω	<i>lex</i> νομος
12:20	+ <i>quidem</i>	μεν	<i>quidem</i> μεν
14:33	+ <i>doceo</i>	διδασκω	<i>doceo</i> διδασκω
15:34	<i>dico</i>	λεγω	<i>dic</i> ειπατε; <i>dicens</i> λεγων (cf. <i>loquitur</i> λαλει)
16:16	+ <i>in vobis</i>	εν υμιν	<i>in</i> εις, εν; <i>vobis</i> υμιν

Not all the additions, however, can be attributed to this glossary:

4:6	<i>adversus alterum</i>	κατα του ενος	F G
		υπερ του ενος	D cet
15:49	<i>igitur</i>	αρα	<i>igitur</i> τοινυν, τοιγαρουν

However, both the presence and use of such glossaries at St. Gall and the fact that the editor of X did not always clearly understand the Greek strongly suggests that such lexical and

---

<sup>107</sup>Kaczynski, p. 59.

<sup>108</sup>M. Laistner, *Philoxeni Glossarium*, in *Glossaria latina iussu academiae britannicae edita*. Vol II: Arma, Abavus, Philoxenus. Ed. W. -M. Lindsay, R. -G. Austin, M. Laistner, J. -F. Mountford. Nouvelle Collection de Textes et Documents. Paris: Société Anonyme d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres ». 1926; G. Goetz and G. Gundermann, ed. *Glossae latinograece et graecolatinae*. Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, ed. G. Loewe et G. Goetz, vol. II. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1888.

grammatical tools would have been used by the editor. Furthermore, a recently edited manuscript Greek-Latin word list for the Pauline epistles, designated  $\mathfrak{P}^{99}$  (ca. 400), is not a continuous script text but a Greco-Latin glossary of the Pauline epistles. The Latin equivalents most closely identify with D-text readings.<sup>109</sup> Unfortunately, the manuscript contains only portions of Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. There is no clear connection between this manuscript and the Carolingian manuscripts F G; nevertheless, it does indicate that Greco-Latin glossaries of the Pauline epistles had been compiled. The use of similar tools, whether specific to the epistles or of more general content, may explain the way in which single words were adapted from the Latin into the Greek by Carolingian scholars.

Furthermore, several misread corrections in F G correspond to the way that these glossaries would have been used. F G show a unique reading in G at 14:4. Here G\* reads ο λαλει *vel* λαλων, with *qui loquitur* written above ο λαλει but no corresponding Latin above λαλων (the reading of all Greek witnesses apart from F G). This is parallel to the numerous examples of the predecessor of F G providing both the inherited Latin D-text reading and an alternative, separated by a symbol (resembling a Roman lowercase “t”) that stands for *vel* (the “Doppelübersetzungen”). Here G preserves the reading inherited from the Greek portion of its ancestor while also providing an alternative, more literal rendering of the Latin. This was likely a marginal note, one written into the text of G with the λαλων retained, while F properly read the note, writing only λαλει. It appears, therefore, that adaptations in the Greek have occurred in the same way as the Latin. In the predecessor of F G, alternative renderings were written in the manuscript (either in the margins or interlinear). Some of these alternatives were

---

<sup>109</sup>Wouters, Alfons, ed., *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499. A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar*, Chester Beatty Monographs 12 (Leuven, Paris: Peeters, 1988).

adopted into the text of G without acknowledgment of the original word, as took place often in G's Latin text when the Vulgate reading replaces the D-text reading. On occasion, F similarly writes the non-Vulgate reading above the corresponding Greek text. At 14:4, the double-reading in the Greek text of G shows that in the predecessor manuscript the reading inherited from the shared ancestor of D F G (ο λαλων) is preserved, but in addition a rendering is provided which matches the Latin indicative form: λαλει. F copied only ο λαλει, but G copied both the inherited text and the Latinized notation. This is further evidence of Latinism in the ancestor of F G.

This method of producing the text led to a nonsense reading in G at 10:23. The predecessor manuscript of F G lost παντα μοι εξεστιν αλλ ου παντα οικοδομει, yet another example of parablepsis in these witnesses. However, G alone reads μηδεις το εαυτου in place of the missing text without, however, adding the Latin interlinear translation. The text is clearly adopted from 10:24, though in that place D F G read μηδεις το εαυτου ζητειτω all on the same line. There is no obvious similarity in text which would cause a leap from εξεστειν (*sic*) to the συμφερει which immediately precedes the added text, unless the leap made in the Latin text of the predecessor manuscript from *licent* to *expediunt*, with the text then marked for omission. F correctly interpreted the correction, hence it did not copy the text; the scribe of G did not, and so copied the nonsense Greek before him.

In another example of a misread correction in the shared exemplar of F G, at 10:32 G\* writes αυτου θεου but marks the initial αυ for omission. F misunderstands the correction by omitting αυτου altogether, resulting in the singular reading θεου (without the article). There is a possibility that F G preserve an early reading here, for apart from an absurd blunder no one would write τη εκκλησια αυτου θεου. However, if the archetypal text read only τη



ἐκκλησία αὐτοῦ one could easily imagine a scenario where a correction replaced the pronoun with θεοῦ, (modeled on the frequent use of the phrase “church of God” in the epistles) followed by a copyist misreading the correction and copying αὐτοῦ θεοῦ, as G\* preserves. If τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτοῦ were the archetypal reading, the αὐτοῦ would suit the context because it has a clear antecedent at the end of 10:31 in θεοῦ, which in turn may have led to the substitution. Nevertheless, because the correction may merely indicate a confused scribe, the conjecture is not necessary in this case.

14:25 shows corrections both to the Greek and the Latin. G\* has the bizarre reading ἀπαγγωνελλων, corrected to ἀπαγγελλων by striking through ων. The accompanying Latin has also been adapted: *annuntians* (*adnuntians* VL 75 89) has points placed over the *an* and a ligature for *pro* written before the verb, indicating correction to *pronuntians*.<sup>110</sup> This corresponds to the alterations of Greek prefixes noted above, but in this case the Latin prefix is altered. The reading of G\* is probably a misunderstood correction. The shared archetype of F G read ἀπαγγελων (as in D), and the correction was intended to replace ἀπ- with ἀν-. This was correctly interpreted by F (which read ἀναγγελων) but misunderstood by G to replace ἀναγγελλ- with ἀπαγγ-.<sup>111</sup> Additional evidence of misread corrections is to be seen at 9:8.25; 15:25.100; and Rom. 14:21 (discussed at 10:7.26).

While corrections and marginal notations, some likely derived from a lexicon, can account for many alterations in the Greek of F G, the Latin texts (77 78) do not appear to have been affected by this process. The use of Greek to Latin glossaries was quite common, and

---

<sup>110</sup>The preceding Latin word, *d̄m* (the Latin reading *adorabit deum* for προσκυνήσει τῷ θεῷ), is written to the left of  $\overline{\theta\omega}$ , as if the scribe realized that space was needed for *pro* before writing *d̄m*.

<sup>111</sup>Scrivener, *An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis*, p. xxvi, notes nine examples of the confusion of N and Π in F.

known to have existed in St. Gall. However, the most common, the Pseudo-Cyprian lexicon, could not have been used to produce the Vulgate readings. This is seen most clearly in the reading at 6:3. The rest of the Greek tradition reads μητι γε, for which the entries in Pseudo-Cyprian read: μητι *nequid num* and γε *verum*, which could not have produced the reading *quanto magis* of 77 78 VG.

### III.G. Harmonization to Near Context in F G

Aside from Latinizations, F G show several other features with relative consistency. These are attributable to the Greek alone, since both D and the D-text retains the Z reading. F G, as are all manuscripts, are prone to assimilation to the near context:

5:8 πονηριας Ϝ<sup>46</sup> ⑆ A B C D L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151  
*nequitiae* 75 89 78 F VG Spe AMst AMst(A)  
*malignitatis* AU  
 πορνειας F G  
*nequitiae vel fornicationis* 77

6:6 επι απιστων  
*infideles* 61 75 89 VG  
 απιστων και ου επι αγιων F  
*infideles et non apud sanctos* 77  
*infideles et non inter sanctos* 78  
 απιστων και ου επι αγιων ουκ οιδατε G

10:19 ειδωλοθυτον F G K L 056 0142 0151 88 915 *pm sy got Chr Thret Dam*  
 ειδωλον ⑆<sup>1</sup> B C<sup>c</sup> D P Ψ 6 1739 *al arm*  
*idolum* 61 75 78 89 VG AMst(A)  
*simulacrum* AMst  
*idolum vel idolothitum* 77  
 omit [parablepsis] Ϝ<sup>46</sup> ⑆<sup>\*</sup> A C<sup>\*</sup> 0150 6 33 *pc vg<sup>mss</sup>*

9:24 ουτως *cett*  
*sic* 75 89 VG AMst AMst(A) IR CY  
 εγω δε λεγω υμιν ουτως F G  
*ego autem dico vobis sic* 61 77 78

At 5:8, the reading πορνειας (F G) is adapted to the use at 5:1, and forms of the

similar πόρνος are about to appear in 5:9, 10 and 11. The mistake took place only in the Greek of F and G; 75 89 78 etc. read *nequitiae*; 77 preserves this reading but adds, in conformity to this newly minted reading, *vel fornicationis*. Here the Latin has shown itself the faithful transmitter of the second century ancestor since it is not liable to the sight/sound confusion that the Greek is in this case. Another example is the addition of και ου επι των αγιων after επι απιστων at 6:6, which is added from the identical phrase in 6:1. The Latin in 77 78 differ slightly here: 77 reads *infideles et non apud sanctos*; 77 reads *inter* in place of *apud*. The reading in 78 is explained by the double-translation offered in 6:1, where 77 reads *apud vel inter sanctos*.<sup>112</sup> An identical type of alteration occurs at 10:19. F G assimilate ειδωλον to the ειδωλοθυτον earlier in the verse. The D and the Latin preserve the original Z reading. 77 adds an alternative rendering to match the error in the Greek text, though in this case the transliteration *idolothitum* rather than a translation. Though shared by F G and “Byzantine” witnesses, this type of error is common in those witnesses, and does not indicate shared ancestry.

The addition λεγω δε υμιν at 9:24 is not assimilation to the near context, but an expansion that emphasizes the command of 9:24b. This exact phrase occurs nowhere else in Paul. The source of this addition, attested only by F G 77 78, is, however, not certain.

### III.H. Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text

As do all witnesses, F G lose text due to an accidental leap.<sup>113</sup> Its resultant altered text is easily discovered. At 10:2, the scribe leaped from εν τη to εν τη, which led to θαλασση

---

<sup>112</sup>For the ουκ οιδατε which follows in G, see the next section, “Adaptations to Accidentally Lost Text.”

<sup>113</sup>Obvious examples of parablepsis are 1:26 *omit ου πολλοι ευγενεις*; 1:27 *omit και . . . καταισχυνη*, 2:6 *omit ουδε . . . τουτου*; etc.



being written first, with *εν τη νεφελη* then written after the error was noticed. The corresponding Latin columns of these manuscripts follow the Greek in this error. A shift for similar reasons takes place at 15:58. F G place *ουκ εστιν* before *ο κοπος υμων*. This was likely caused by a leap from *ΟΚΟΠΟΣ* to *ΟΥΚΕΣΤΙΝ*, with *ΟΚΟΠΟΣΥΜΩΝ* re-inserted after the mistake was noticed.

A striking attempt at repair is seen at 6:15, where F G add the conjunction *η* before *ουκ οιδατε*. Since 6:7-14 are missing in these manuscripts, the addition could not have arisen from 6:9, though perhaps it comes from the distant influence of 6:2. However, at the end of 6:6 F G adds *και ου επι αγιων*, which is taken from 6:1, another example of harmonization to the near context in these manuscripts. However, at this point G also adds *ουκ οιδατε*. This cannot have come from 6:1, since at that place F G read *η ουκ οιδατε*. Instead, it is most likely the beginning of 6:15, broken off after these first two words. The lack of a Latin interlinear translation for these two words<sup>114</sup> suggests that the scribe did not realize that a sizeable portion of Greek text was missing until after *ουκ οιδατε* had been written and he had prepared to add the Latin. Once the missing text was noticed, a suitable blank space was left in the manuscript, with the text resuming at 6:15. Here, however is the addition of *η* before *ουκ οιδατε*. This may be an attempt by the scribe to create a connection with the preceding material, thereby alleviating the loss of 6:7-14. Significantly, 75 89 D do not read the *η*, indicating an *ad hoc* creation in X. F G, again without other Greek support and against 75 78 89, add *η* in the next clause as well (*η αρα[ς] ουν . . .*) again in an attempt to smooth over a

---

<sup>114</sup>This is the only example of two Greek words in G 77 not being given a Latin equivalent, aside from *γενεθητω γενεθητω* in the subscription.

now corrupted text.<sup>115</sup> The scribe of G makes a further blunder in the second part of the verse. He skipped from χριστου (1) to χριστου (2), then continued with ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο. The error was then noticed, whereupon he returned to χριστου (1) and continued with the lost η αρα ουν τα μελη του χριστου ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο, in the event copying a second time χριστου ποιησω πορνης μελη μη γενοιτο.

### III.I. Secondary Spelling in F G

The use of -ττ- and -σσ- by D F G helps to clarify the relationships among these witnesses (see further the discussions *ad loc*). D favors the Attic -ττ- at 1 Cor. 6:9 with the “Alexandrian” witnesses and reads (with 075) κρειττονα at Heb. 6:9 against all other witnesses.<sup>116</sup> On the other hand, apart from clearly secondary adaptations, F G consistently write -σσ-. This suggests that the shared ancestor of D F G used -σσ-, from which it follows that examples of -ττ- in D F G are secondary. For example, ελαττον in F G at 1 Cor. 11:17 (ησσον & A B C D\*; ηττον *pm*) must be a secondary adaptation. The -ττ- is primary evidence. Latinism may be an issue as well. The lexicon of Ps-Dositheus suggests ελαττον for both *minus* and *parum*,<sup>117</sup> and we find *minus* in the corresponding Latin here.<sup>118</sup> This may help explain ελασσον in F G alone at 2 Cor. 12:15, which, though written with -σσ-, again may be

---

<sup>115</sup>G\* has a unique corruption caused by a leap at 11:3. The scribe skipped from κεφαλη δε (1) to κεφαλη δε (2), then continued with χριστου. The mistake was noticed immediately, cristou marked for deletion, and the text resumes properly after κεφαλη δε (1).

<sup>116</sup>Hebrews shows the opposite usage of the *Corpus Paulinum* manuscripts: Aside from 6:9, -ττ- is used, without variation, in every example of a comparative adjective or adverb apart (1:4; 7:7bis; 19, 22; 8:6bis; 9:23; 10:34; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24).

<sup>117</sup>Ps-Dositheus, *Ars grammatica* 40.

<sup>118</sup>As well as 1 Tim. 5:9, where ελαττον is read without variation in the Greek manuscripts

based on the Latin *minus*.

F G have therefore undergone editing beyond the Latinisms present in Z. The most significant are the alterations in the Latin text toward the Vulgate, which then led to alterations of the Greek text. This took place, in almost every case, on a word-by-word basis, which is consistent with the use of the lexicon. In addition, X has adapted its text in unique ways, most of which are easily detectable. Such readings may therefore be eliminated as second alterations to the earlier form of the text otherwise witnessed in the these manuscripts. Nevertheless, once these peculiar alterations are identified as later adaptations, an underlying early form of the Pauline Epistles can be recovered.

#### IV. *Secondary Editing in D*

Just as a predecessor of F G underwent revision, so also D has undergone its own editing. Some of this editing was in the form of independent Latinization, but others result from harmonizations to other passages within the epistles, editing based on its unique sense-line format, and, most importantly, alteration based on a second Greek exemplar which comes from outside the bilingual tradition.

##### IV.A. *Latinization in D*

In contrast to the Latinization in F G, which was done on the basis of both the Vulgate and existing D-text reading, the Latinization in D was made only toward the D-text. Just as F G altered the Greek to match the Latin prefixes, so too did D. At 4:8 D\* alone reads συν υμιν συμβασιλευσωμεν, matching *vobiscum regnemus (regnetis 75\*)* in 75<sup>c</sup> 89. All other Greek witnesses read υμιν συμβασιλευσωμεν (F G συν-). D\*'s συν υμιν matches *vobiscum* without taking into account the compound verb.

Alterations resulting from *nomina sacra* also occur in D. At 4:21, the genitive *spiritus*



renders πνευματι (as at 14:12, where it caused problems in F G). Their case matches *quoque mansuetudinis*, which immediately follows . This is modified slightly in the Ambrosiaster commentary to *spiritus et mansuetudinis*, but retained in 75 and the *Doppelübersetzung* in 77: *spiritus vel [spirit]u quoque*. The alternate reading added in 77 is adopted from the Vulgate and 78. 89, perhaps recognizing the difficulty of the syntax, defected here to the I-text reading *spirituque* (Spe AM). The use of the genitive in this passage must be intended to give a description of *in caritate*: “or in love of [characterized by] the Spirit and humility.” The genitive form also occurs in P<sup>46</sup>, although this not an intentional alteration since P<sup>46</sup> makes the same alteration at 2:14, 15; and 3:1 each time writing π̄νς (see discussion at 2:14.61) . In this passage D suffers from Latinization, but through misunderstanding. *Spiritus* could be either the nominative or the genitive form; D writes π̄να, selecting the nominative to match *sps*. F G do not use a *nomen sacrum* abbreviation for πνευματι in this passage, which is similar to its habits in other passages where a form related to πνευμα does not refer to the deity (two examples of πνευματικός in 2:13, which immediately follow an occurrence of π̄νς; 2:14, 15 *etc*). This use of the *nomina sacra* in these places is further evidence of D moving away from its archetype Z. The Latinization was again facilitated by the shortened sense lines in D, with the resulting π̄να τε πραοτητης standing on its own line. While certainly nonsense in context, the sense-line format would have allowed this line to be understood independent its surrounding material.

At 11:13, D alone reads ῡμεις αῡτοι (against εν ῡμιν αῡτοις) The use of personal pronouns as the subject of the imperative is rare in the epistles (Rom. 6:11; 1 Cor. 16:1; Phil. 2:18). Therefore, while εν ῡμιν αῡτοις κριν̄ατε does not have a precise parallel elsewhere in Paul, neither is the reading of D clearly Pauline. However, Paul elsewhere uses κριν̄ω + εν̄,

with the preposition used to introduce the one(s) who are to judge (1 Cor. 6:2).<sup>119</sup> The fact that this usage is not common has likely prompted attempts to render the text more clearly.<sup>120</sup> Most Latin witnesses, including the Vulgate and the D-Text (here attested by VL 75 89), read instead the vocative (*vos ipsi*). This is matched by *υμεις αυτοι* in D. Güting and Mealand note that on occasion “D exhibits stylistic improvements,” of which 11:13 is a “remarkable instance.”<sup>121</sup> This example, however, is attributable to D’s adaptation to the Latin.

#### IV.B. *Harmonizations to Other Writings*

At 3:18, D reads *απατατω κενοις λογοις*<sup>122</sup> (matched by its Latin counterpart) against *εξαπατατω*. This matches precisely Eph. 5:6, including the loss of the prefix on the verb. In two places D has readings which are otherwise found only in the *Apostolic Constitutions*: *ζυμοι* at 5:6<sup>123</sup> and, more significantly, *θρυπτομενον* at 1 Cor. 11:24, which is a liturgical adaptation. No other specific connections between these witnesses has been uncovered in 1 Corinthians, however, and the shared readings probably point to some shared tradition rather than a direct relationship.

---

<sup>119</sup>Cf. the translations “Urteilt bei euch selbst” (Schrage II, p. 520) and “Come to a decision for yourself” (Thiselton, p. 800). Lindemann (p. 237) notes “Die Adressaten sollen ein eigenes Urteil fällen. Fee (p. 525) deviates from the NIV text upon which he is commenting (“judge among yourselves”) to note that Paul’s request was that the matter be “judged for themselves.”

<sup>120</sup>The Peshitta’s *ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ* (“Judge among yourselves for yourselves”) shows the difficulty of rendering the Greek.

<sup>121</sup>Güting and Mealand, p. 50. The reference to D’s text at 1 Cor. 11:13 is made in a discussion of the text of 1 Cor. 12:16, where they conclude that D\* K\* preserve the original asyndeton. No other examples of “stylistic improvements” in D are cited here.

<sup>122</sup>Here joined by the unrelated 441 463 and a marginal note in 1906.

<sup>123</sup>Though the *Apostolic Constitutions* may also be citing Gal. 5:9.

#### IV.C. *Idiosyncratic Editing in D*

Many alterations in D are attributable to adaptations that the scribe makes on the basis of D's unique sense-line format. The exemplar Z used long sense-lines, vestiges of which are still able to be reconstructed from the capitalization of the initial letters of the sense-lines retained in F and G. The scribe of D, however, was forced to shorten the sense-lines in order to suit its format because the manuscript is written with a Greek and Latin column on each leaf. The scribe usually tried to keep subjects and verbs, nouns and adjectives, verbs and adverbs, etc. on the same line. When these sense lines are disrupted, however, it is usually evidence of a secondary adaptation in D away from the archetype Z.

In 6:9b-10, D has a number of singular readings. These readings not only depart from the rest of the Greek tradition but from its own Latin column as well: First, a series of seven consecutive noun phrases beginning with ουδε, followed by two beginning with ουτε (before a final phrase beginning with ουχ as in the rest of the tradition). The Latin column reads *neque* in every case. After these, the verb phrase Θεου βασιλειαν κληρονομησουσιν, again differing (in word order) from the Latin column's *regnum dei possidebunt*. This has clearly received editorial attention, most likely influenced by the format in which the text was written:

ΗΟΥΚΟΙΔΔΤΕΟΤΙΔΔΙΚΟΙ  
 ΘΥΒΔCΙΛΕΙΔΝΟΥΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΗCΟΥCΙΝ  
 ΜΗΠΛΑΝΔCΘΔΙ  
 ΟΥΔΕΠΟΡΝΟΙ  
 ΟΥΔΕΕΙΔΩΧΟΛΔΤΡΔΙ  
 ΟΥΔΕΜΟΙΧΟΙΟΥΔΕΜΔΛΔΚΟΙ  
 ΟΥΔΕΔΡCΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΔΙ  
 ΟΥΔΕΚΛΕΠΤΔΙΟΥΔΕΠΛΕΟΝΕΚΤΔΙ  
 ΟΥΤΕΜΕΘΥCΟΙΟΥΤΕΛΟΙΔΟΡΟΙ  
 ΟΥΧΔΡΠΔΓΕC  
 ΘΥΒΔCΙΛΕΙΔΝΟΥΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΗCΟΥCΙΝ

The assimilation of the last line (6:10) to the second is apparent; the two lines form a frame (both visual and aural) for the list. The list itself is carefully structured; the switch from ουδε



to ουτε makes no difference semantically, and probably little difference in pronunciation, but would signal to the reader that the end of the list is approaching, which then concludes with ουχ at the beginning of the last phrase.

Formatting also influenced the text of D\* at 10:15-17, which was set apart as a distinct unit through the use of indentation and capitalization. Perhaps because it was an opening sentence, 10:15 was rewritten. The υμεις is shifted to the first clause and its case changed to dative to match φρονιμοις, while ουν is added after the imperative. The latter addition may have been made to avoid asyndeton, or to parallel βλεπετε ουν (10:18), which in D is set off with the same indentation and capitalization as is 10:15. This must have been an intentional alteration by D, for it is not even supported by its Latin counterpart, 75, which adds *vobis* to match υμεις but leaves *vos* without replacing it with a conjunction.

Harmonization to the near context takes place also in 8:5a, where D alone (followed by 75) adds και κυριοι after the first occurrence of θεοι in the verse, modelled on the θεοι πολλοι και κύριοι πολλοι in 8:5b. Again, the sense-line format led to the addition, which brings the phrases into parallel.

Another example of assimilation is found at 9:19-22. The sense-line format in which the manuscript is written breaks down after 9:20 ως ιουδαιος. The following six lines are far longer than normal and are not divided by sense. This is most obviously shown by the division of the first νομον and the separation of the second υπο from the νομον it governs:<sup>124</sup>

ΙΝΔΙΟΥΔΔΙΟΥΣΚΕΡΔΗCΩΤΟΙCΥΠΟΝΟ  
ΜΟΝΩCΥΠΟΝΟΜΟΝΜΗΩΝΔΥΤΟCΥΠΟ  
ΝΟΜΟΝΙΝΔΤΟΥCΥΠΟΝΟΜΟΝΚΕΡΔΗCΩ  
ΤΟΙCΔΝΟΜΟΙCΩCΔΝΟΜΟC  
ΜΗΩΝΔΝΟΜΟCΘΥΔΑΛΛΕΝΝΟΜΟCΧΥ

ΙΝΔΤΟΥCΔΝΟΜΟΥCΚΕΡΔΗCΩ

---

<sup>124</sup>The inconsistency of the spelling of VL 75 is shown by its writing *sene* twice in line four but *sine* in lines five and six.

to ουτε makes no difference semantically, and probably little difference in pronunciation, but would signal to the reader that the end of the list is approaching, which then concludes with ουχ at the beginning of the last phrase.

Formatting also influenced the text of D\* at 10:15-17, which was set apart as a distinct unit through the use of indentation and capitalization. Perhaps because it was an opening sentence, 10:15 was rewritten. The υμεις is shifted to the first clause and its case changed to dative to match φρονιμοις, while ουν is added after the imperative. The latter addition may have been made to avoid asyndeton, or to parallel βλεπετε ουν (10:18), which in D is set off with the same indentation and capitalization as is 10:15. This must have been an intentional alteration by D, for it is not even supported by its Latin counterpart, 75, which adds *vobis* to match υμεις but leaves *vos* without replacing it with a conjunction.

Harmonization to the near context takes place also in 8:5a, where D alone (followed by 75) adds και κυριοι after the first occurrence of θεοι in the verse, modelled on the θεοι πολλοι και κυριοι πολλοι in 8:5b. Again, the sense-line format led to the addition, which brings the phrases into parallel.

Another example of assimilation is found at 9:19-22. The sense-line format in which the manuscript is written breaks down after 9:20 ως ιουδαιος. The following six lines are far longer than normal and are not divided by sense. This is most obviously shown by the division of the first νομον and the separation of the second υπο from the νομον it governs:<sup>124</sup>

ΙΝΑ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΥΣ ΚΕΡΔΗCΩ ΤΟΙCΥΠΟΝΟ  
ΜΟΝΩCΥΠΟΝΟΜΟΝ ΜΗΩΝΔΥΤΟCΥΠΟ  
ΝΟΜΟΝ ΙΝΑ ΤΟΥCΥΠΟΝΟΜΟΝ ΚΕΡΔΗCΩ  
ΤΟΙCΔΝΟΜΟΙCΩCΔΝΟΜΟC  
ΜΗΩΝΔΝΟΜΟCΘΥΔΑΛΛΕΝΝΟΜΟCΧΥ

ΙΝΑ ΤΟΥCΔΝΟΜΟΥC ΚΕΡΔΗCΩ

<sup>124</sup>The inconsistency of the spelling of VL 75 is shown by its writing *sene* twice in line four but *sine* in lines five and six.

*ut iudaeos lucri facerem his qui sub lege sunt  
quasi sub lege cum ipse non esse[m] sub  
lege ut qui sunt sub lege lucrare[m]  
his qui sene lege sunt sicut sene lege  
cum sine lege dī non sim sed in lege sim xri  
ut eos qui sine lege erant lucri facerem*

The original lineation is preserved, as both Corssen and Vogels note,<sup>125</sup> in G:

Ινα ιουδαιους κερδησω  
Τους υπο νομον ως υπο νομον  
Μη ων αυτος υπο νομον  
Ινα τους υπο νομον κερδησω  
Τοις ανομοις ως ανομος μη ων ανομος θυ  
Αλλ εννομος χυ  
Ινα κερδανω τους ανομους

Both Corssen and Vogels noticed the similarity to the treatment of the doxology of Romans, which showed similar disruption of the sense lines. Corssen argued that a copy of the shared ancestor of D F G omitted the text from ινα ιουδαιους κερδησω (9:20) to ινα του ανομους κερδησω (9:21). Vogels argued, on the basis of the several unique readings in the corresponding Latin column, that the scribal leap was from υπο νομον κερδησω to τους ανομους κερδησω. Vogels' deduction accounts for the Latin text, but not the disrupted lineation of the first three lines. Corssen's reconstruction is more plausible. Furthermore, it may account for the word order ινα του ανομους κερδησω now found in D. After a leap from ινα at 9:20 to ινα at 9:21, the scribe rewrote in the margin the text from ινα ιουδαιος through εννομος χριστου. In this process the lineation was disrupted at the beginning (as seen above) and at the end by placing μη ων ανομος θυ on the same line as αλλ εννομος χυ rather than τοις ανομοις ως ανομος, as it stands in G. Once the scribe reached the ινα τους

---

<sup>125</sup>Corssen II, p. 26; Vogels, pp. 291-22. Vogels divides Τοις ανομοις ως ανομος μη ων ανομος θυ into two lines, but there is no indication in G that such a break should be seen there.



ιουδαιος κερδησω, ανομους was written as a correction for τους ιουδαιος rather than rewriting the entire line. Thereby this scribe altered both the word order and the verb form found in F G and created a singular reading now found in D.

At 12:13, the lineation of D\* has been disrupted by an impossible reading in its Greek column, so that the second and third lines no longer match the Latin column (VL 75):

ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΙ ΠΝΙ ΗΜΙ ΣΠΑΝΤΕΣ	<i>Nametunos p̄unos omnes</i>
ΕΙΣ ΕΣΜΕΝ	<i>in unum corpus</i>
ΕΝ ΣΩΜΑ ΕΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ	<i>baptizati sumus</i>

The original reading of the shared ancestor of D F G is preserved in F G: . . . εις εν σωμα εβαπτισθημεν (= the Latin of VL 75 77 78). The reading has likely crept in as the result of D's practice of bringing nearby lines into parallel (as at 6:9-10 and 8:5). Eight lines above the text cited above, at 12:12, D is laid out as follows:

ΚΑΘΑΠΕΡ ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ	<i>Sicut enim corpus</i>
ΕΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ	<i>unum est</i>

This is similar to the layout at 12:13, in that initial κ is enlarged and extended into the left column, γαρ is used in both places, and what is taken to be a numeral followed by a form of ειμι stands on the second line. Apparently, the scribe of D (or his immediate predecessor) departed from the exemplar in order to bring 12:13a into parallel with 12:12a.

At 12:31 F G and the D-text witnesses attest to επι / *adhuc* as the reading of the shared ancestor of D F G. Once again, D departs from its predecessor, as well as the Peshitta, in reading και. The lineation in D again shows an adaptation away from its archetype. The original lineation is shown by the enlarged size of the initial letters of the lines preserved in F G:

ΖΗΛΟΥΤΕ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ ΤΑ ΚΡΕΙΣΣΟΝΑ  
ΕΤΙ ΚΑΘ' ΥΠΕΡΒΟΛΗΝ ΟΔΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΔΕΙΚΝΥΜΙ

D, however, has broken the pattern of sense lines in a significant way:

ΖΗΛΟΥΤΕ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ	<i>aemulamini autem dona</i>
ΤΑ ΚΡΙΣΣΟΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΤΙ	<i>meliora adhuc</i>
ΚΑΘ' ΥΠΕΡΒΟΛΗΝ	<i>maiores</i>
ΟΔΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΔΕΙΚΝΥΜΙ	<i>viam vobis demonstro</i>

The lines of the exemplar were too long to fit into the two-column format adopted by D, hence τα κρι[ε]ισσονα is separated from the noun it modifies. But the addition of και to the Greek would have made the following line too long. This problem was compounded by the presence of a flaw in the vellum in the line with καθ' υπερβολην, which necessitated a gap in the text between υπερ and βολην. As a result, the scribe added και ειτι to the line with τα κρι[ε]ισσονα and destroyed the lineation which should have matched the clause structure. The Latin column was adapted to the Greek, though *et* was not added to match και. The additional και is found in other Greek witnesses, the significance of which will be discussed below.

Recognizing that D brings its sense lines into parallel also helps explain the creation of its reading at 14:5. Here D\* reads the simple infinitive προφητευσειν in place of ινα προφητευετε (*ut prophetis* VG 75 77 89), which anticipates the Vulgate's *prophetare*. Both readings are likely independent assimilation to λαλειν / *loqui* in the preceding clause. It should be noted that the identical phrase at 14:1 (μαλλον δε ινα προφητευετε) was not altered, since no infinitive form precedes the phrase there. The effect of the assimilation is particularly noticeable with D's sense-line format, with the infinitives in the initial and final positions of the contrasted phrases:

ΘΕΛΩ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΥΜΑΣ
ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΓΛΩΣΣΑΙΣ
ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΕΙΝ

Other potential examples of sense lines prompting alteration include 12:16.69, where και is omitted, and 15:2.8, where και is added.

#### IV.D. Alterations Toward Alexandrian Witnesses

Several readings in D that move away from its shared ancestor with F G and the Latin text are the result of comparison to one or more Greek witnesses. This has already been suggested by noting the large-scale additions that this manuscript makes at the doxology in Romans and with the entire book of Hebrews. However, the following examples demonstrate that this also took place in some of the most seemingly insignificant readings. Vogels has shown that this is most obvious when, as in the doxology of Romans, the sense-lines have been disrupted in D.<sup>126</sup> “Alexandrian” influence on D has also been suggested, though not argued, by Heinrich Zimmerman: “D<sup>gr</sup> ist nach einem Text der S [=N] A B C-Gruppe überarbeitet.”<sup>127</sup> Though he does not develop this statement with examples, his observation will be confirmed here, as well a discussion of other likely cases of secondary influence on D.

At 7:37 it was argued that εδραιος is a secondary intrusion, and that P<sup>46</sup> F G and the D-text preserve the archetypical form of the text. The bilinguals split here. D follows N\* A B 0278 line of text, whereas 75 77 78 89 all read *in corde suo* = εν τη καρδια αυτου with F G (and P<sup>46</sup>). D’s reading must therefore result from the introduction of a reading from a second Greek manuscript which comes from outside the bilingual tradition. To match this imported Greek exemplar D has broken the pattern of the sense-lines by placing the adjective at the beginning of a line, separated from the relative pronoun:<sup>128</sup>

ΟCΔΕΕCΤΗΚΕΝΕΝΤΗ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΔΥΤΟΥ  
ΕΔΡΑΙΟCΜΗΕΧΩΝΑΝΑΓΚΗΝ  
ΕΧΟΥCΙΑΝΔΕΕΧΕΙ

---

<sup>126</sup>Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus.”

<sup>127</sup>Zimmerman, *Allateinischen Überlieferung des Zweiten Korintherbriefes*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>128</sup>Vogels, “Der Codex Claromantanus,” p. 290; Corssen II, p. 22.



ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΙΔΙΟΥ ΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΣ<sup>129</sup>

Against this F G 77 78 89 stand in agreement, preserving the lineation of Z:

ος δε εστηκεν εν τη καρδια αυτου  
μη εχων αναγκην  
εξουσιαν δε εχει περι του ιδιου  
θεληματος

*qui autem statuit in corde suo.  
non habens necessitatem.  
potestatem autem habet suae voluntatis*

The use of *statuit in corde* is somewhat unusual here; in fact the apparatus of Wordsworth and White takes the unusual step of noting that, while *statuit* is the reading of every Latin witness, *stetit* would be a more accurate rendering of ἵστημι. It is true that in the fifteen occurrences of ἵστημι in the epistles the D-text uses the near-exact equivalent *sto* twelve times. However, two other passages that use *statuo* have in common with 1 Cor. 7:37 a focus on the definitiveness of the “standing”<sup>130</sup>: at Rom. 3:31 it is the verb that follows μὴ γένοιτο, while at 10:3 it intensifies the defiance of the person who chooses to “stand” in his own righteousness rather than God’s. This is reflected further in the D-text’s choice of *statuit* to translate κέκρικεν later in the verse (the Vulgate uses *iudicavit*). Thus the translator of the D-text recognized the “firmness” of the stand encouraged by Paul in 7:37 and so chose the verb *statuo* over *sto*. However, it is doubtful that this would have prompted a scribe with ὅς δὲ ἕστηκεν . . . ἑδραῖος present in his Greek text to omit the adjective.<sup>131</sup> Instead, it may

---

<sup>129</sup>75 matches D by splitting line three into two units: | *potestatem autem habet* | *suae voluntatis* |. It matches 77 78 89 for the first two lines, not reading anything equivalent to D’s εδραῖος.

<sup>130</sup>Cf. Lewis and Short, s.v. *statuo*, (F): “To judge, declare as a judgment, be of opinion, hold (especially of legal opinions), think, consider (always implying the establishment of a principle, or a decided conviction. . .).” The first reference listed there, Cicero’s *De provinciis consularibus in senatu oratio* 10, is especially relevant to the usage in 1 Cor. 7:37: “He decided (*statuit*) from the beginning and persevered in it . . .”

<sup>131</sup>A tempting solution is to posit a Latinism in F G based on a vowel interchange: ἑδραῖος corrupted to the adverb ἑδραῖως, “firmly.” The translator would have then used *statuo* assuming it equivalent to ἵστημι ἑδραῖως. This is ruled out, however, by the two

represent an attempt to clarify this unusual use of the verb εστηκεν, which is not otherwise used of an individual's personal decisions regarding a course of action in the NT.<sup>132</sup> It may be this unusual use of the verb that has caused the addition of εδραιος in its various positions in the Greek traditions (apart from P<sup>46</sup> F G). The text of F G cannot be attributed to interference from the Latin; the reading of D, which moves away from Z, must have come from an additional Greek manuscript. Given the word order, this manuscript must have been of an "Alexandrian" and not a "Byzantine" type.

Recognizing this pattern of readings in D that vary from both F G and the D-text but match the readings of "Alexandrian" witnesses helps to clarify other places where D and F G split:

8:10 σε τον εχοντα γνωσιν N<sup>2</sup> A D K L Ψ 1739 1881 sy  
*te qui habet scientiam* 75 AMst(A)  
σε τον γνωσιν εχοντα N<sup>\*</sup> 0150 33 81 104 181 326 467 1836 1875 Or  
*eum qui scientiam habet* AU  
τον εχοντα γνωσιν P<sup>46</sup> B F G  
*habentem scientiam* 77 78  
*eum qui habet scientiam* 89 VG AMst

A nonsense reading is created in 75's text of 8:10 as a result of an addition in the Greek of D. The D-text reading is found in 89: *eum qui habet scientiam*, another example of this text's use of a relative pronoun + finite verb render the participle. 77 78 show assimilation to the Greek of F G with *habentem scientiam*. 75, however, creates a new reading, altering the D-texts *eum* to *te* based on the σε found in D. The insertion is possible grammatically, though it

---

examples of *statuo* in Romans, as well its use again to translate κρίνω later in 1 Cor. 7:37.

<sup>132</sup>Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἵστημι (4), where 1 Cor. 7:37 is listed with three other passages under the gloss "stand firm"; however 2 of the examples are not in contexts of a person making a decision on a course of action, but remaining firm in their already held trust and confidence in God (1 Cor. 10:12; 2 Cor. 1:24); the third, 2 Tim. 2:19, discusses an external "foundation of God" that "cannot be shaken."

shifts the object from an unknown person to the hearer. Because *te* is based on *σε*, this shows that both have been added based on comparison to Greek witnesses outside the bilingual tradition. It is the reading of the Byzantine text, but also such key “Alexandrian” witnesses as *ⲛ*\* A 33 1739.

5:3 *ως παρων τον ουτω τουτο κατεργασαμενον* *ⲡ*<sup>46</sup> *Ⲙ* A B C D L P *Ψ* 049 056 0142 0150 0151

*ut praesens eum quis sic hoc operatus est* AMst Hil

*ως παρων τον ουτως κατεργασαμενον* F G

*ut praesens eum qui sic operatus est* 75 89 78 F VG Lcf AMst

*ut praesens eum qui ita operatus est* AMst(A)

*tamquam praesens eum qui sic operatus est* 77

*eum ut praesens qui sic operatus est* 61

*lac* *ⲡ*<sup>11</sup> *ⲡ*<sup>61</sup> *ⲡ*<sup>68</sup>

*κατεργάζομαι* is used twenty times in the epistles (eighteen times in Rom. 1 2 Cor.)

but never intransitively, even as a participle (Rom. 1:27; 2:9; 7:13; 2 Cor. 5:5; Eph. 6:13). In

addition, in two other passages the verb is modified by an adverb yet still takes an object:

Rom. 7:17 (*νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ*) and 7:20 (*οὐκέτι ἐγὼ*

*κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ*). At 1 Cor. 5:3 the omission of the object *τοῦτο* in virtually the entire

Latin tradition can be attributed to the lack of a need for it in translation due to the presence of

the adverb *sic*. One may compare “I have already passed judgment on the one who did this”

(NIV), which, though not translating the adverb, demonstrates the difficulty of word-for-word

rendering of the clause. Its loss in F G and the Latin tradition is likely an example of

parablepsis, but, as in other cases, this was the textual basis for virtually the entire Latin

tradition. D following the rest of the Greek tradition here adds *τοῦτο*, which was not present

in Z.

3:21 *εν ανθρωποις* *ⲡ*<sup>46</sup> *Ⲙ* A B C D L P *Ψ* 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0289 1739  
*in hominibus* VG AMst(A)

*εν ανθρωπω* F G AU Ambr

*in homine* 61 77 78 89 Mcion<sup>T</sup> AMst AU Sedul

*in homines* 75



Zuntz does not cite this on his list of Marcion's readings (pp. 236-39) in comparison to the "Western" text. The singular *εν ανθρωπω* (F G and the D-Text) 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,<sup>133</sup> what precedes. That it is D, rather than F G, that has been affected by other witnesses is shown by the corruption in its Latin counterpart, 75. The reading *homines* in may be a conflate reading of *hominibus* (VG AMst(A)) and *homine* (cett),<sup>134</sup> though perhaps the addition of a final -s was influenced by the ending of the Greek *ανθρωποις*, which is the altered reading in D. This reading, as do the others described here, is found in "Alexandrian" witnesses.

In some examples where D shows influence from another Greek text the correction was incomplete and resulted in a reading unique to D:

---

<sup>133</sup>056 0142 0150 5 33 181 489 614 630 927 1099 1245 1506 1836 1875 bo<sup>mss</sup> Mcion<sup>E</sup> Epiph.

<sup>134</sup>Vogels, "Der Codex Claromontanus," p. 278.

2:2    ΤΟΥ ΕΙΔΕΝΑΙ ΤΙ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ L 049 056 0142 0151 104 326 *pm*  
 ΕΙΔΕΝΑΙ ΤΙ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ Ξ A F G 048<sup>vid</sup> 0150 6 88 623 915 *al Or*  
       *scire aliquid in vobis* 77 TE  
       *scire me aliquid in vobis* 78  
       *scire aliquid inter vos* 75  
       *me scire aliquid in vobis* 64  
       *me scire aliquid inter vos* 61 89 VG  
       *scire me aliquid inter vos* c vg<sup>mss</sup>: B F G H K O P R V\* AMst AMst(A)  
 ΤΙ ΕΙΔΕΝΑΙ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ B C P 048<sup>vid</sup> 33 81 263 1739 *pc Chr Cyr*  
 ΤΙ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΕΙΔΕΝΑΙ D\*<sup>2</sup>  
 ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΕΙΔΕΝΑΙ ΤΙ D<sup>1</sup>  
*lac* ϩ<sup>46</sup>

The editing of the word order in D matches B C P 048<sup>vid</sup> 33 1739 *pc* in reading τι εν υμιν ειδεναι in the position prior to the infinitive. However the resulting τι εν υμιν ειδεναι is found in no other witness. This may be a misreading of a correction in a predecessor manuscript that intended the reading of B, but removed ειδεναι to the end of the line. Again, the text moves away from Z toward several “Alexandrian” witnesses, but not to the B “Byzantine” text.

2:11    τα του θεου ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ξ A B C D F G L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151  
       *quae dei sunt* 78 VG  
       *quae dei* 75  
 ΤΟ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ D\*  
 ΤΑ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ F G  
       *quae in deo sunt* 89 Spe Or Hil AMst AMst(A)  
       *in deo* 77

The lineation in F 78 G 77 reads as follows:

ΤΙΣ ΓΑΡ ΟΙΔΕΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ	<i>quis enim scit hominum quae sunt hominis</i>
ΕΙ ΜΗ ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ	<i>nisi spiritus qui in ipso est</i>
ΟΥΤΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΝ ΘΕΩ	<i>ita et quae in deo sunt</i>
ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΕΓΝΩ ΕΙ ΜΗ ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ	<i>nemo cognovit nisi spiritus dei</i>

This is nearly identical, both in text and in structure, to that found in 89:

*quis enim scit hominum quae sunt hominis quae in ipso est*  
*nisi spiritus qui in ipso est*  
*ita et quae in deo sunt*  
*nemo cognovit nisi spiritus dei*

The sole difference between 89 and F 78 G 77 is the lengthened initial line. This, however, is

clearly one of the secondary “*Dublette*” found in 89,<sup>135</sup> in this passage comprised of the D-text reading (*quae sunt hominis*) and the reading of Ps-Vigilius (*quae in ipso est*).<sup>136</sup> Here both the text and the layout of the witnesses demonstrate that 89 F 78 G 77 preserve the Z text.

The text of D 75 also shows a similar ancestry, both in text and structure. However the intrusion of readings from a second Greek source has disrupted the layout:

ΤΙΣ ΓΑΡ ΟΙ ΔΕΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ  
 ΔΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΕΙΜΗΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΤΟΥ  
 ΔΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΤΟ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ  
 ΟΥΤΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ  
 ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΕΓΝΩΚΕΝ ΕΙΜΗΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ

*quis enim scit hominum quae sit  
 hominum nisi sp̄s qui  
 in homne qui in ipso est  
 ita et quae dī  
 nemo cognovit nisi sp̄s dī*

Both the beginning of the initial and the final lines are identical to 89 F G. However, the addition of the second του ανθρωπου has resulted in “three impossible ‘sense-lines’.”<sup>137</sup> This has forced the first two lines to end with the article, which is now separated from its noun. This addition has come from comparison to a second Greek source; 75 attempts to match this addition with *qui in homne* (sic), a reading attested nowhere else in the Latin tradition.<sup>138</sup> Likewise the shift from και τα εν θεω to και τα του θεου later in the verse is from a Greek source; the corresponding *et quae dei* is also unique within the Latin tradition.<sup>139</sup> Finally, εγνωκεν in place of εγνω = *cognovit* (75 89 F 78 G 77) may stem from this set of corrections, or may be a simple copying error in F G (see discussion above).

The readings discussed here have shown that D (or an intermediary between Z and D)

---

<sup>135</sup>Frede, *Neuer Paulustext*, p. 124. This reading is shared by Hilary, Pelagius, and *Speculum* 3.

<sup>136</sup>*Contra Varimadum Arianum* 2,5; 2,18.

<sup>137</sup>Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus, p. 289.

<sup>138</sup>*hominis* is found in the 64 VG F AMst(A).

<sup>139</sup>*quae dei sunt* is found in 77 F V; *quae sunt dei* W Vigil



has been corrected to a second Greek exemplar. This has already been suggested by Frede, who noted that this second manuscript was of the “*Normaltext*” type (= “Alexandrian”).<sup>140</sup> He does not, however, develop this argument. Trobisch also claimed that a predecessor of D has been influenced by another manuscript. He claims, however, that this was a member of the “*Koinetext*,” and incorporates this into a modified version of Corssen’s simple stemma of the bilinguals.<sup>141</sup> He does not attempt to demonstrate this claim, but does cite Frede in support. In every example discussed here, the alteration from Z has been toward readings found in manuscripts which would fall into the “Alexandrian” category, similar to  $\mathfrak{P}^{46} \times A B$  (but not identical with any extant manuscript. Further, there is not a single example of a reading of D that moves away from Z to a uniquely “Byzantine” (Koine) text reading. D only moves toward the “Byzantine” text when that reading is already present in the “Alexandrians.”

In addition to the readings already discussed where D introduces a reading which come either from “Alexandrian” manuscripts exclusively<sup>142</sup> or a reading shared by “Alexandrian” and “Byzantine” witnesses,<sup>143</sup> several others, which are discussed at the appropriate location, are be listed here:

---

<sup>140</sup>“Bei Differenzen zwischen D und G wird man jeweils die vom Normaltext abweichende, ‘westliche’ Lesart als die Archetyps ansehen müssen; gerade an den späteren Korrekturen in D sehen wir ja die Tendenz, die ‘westlichen’ Lesarten durch den Normaltext und näherhin durch den *Koine*-Typ zu ersetzen. Daß diese Tendenz schon vor der Niederschrift des *Claramontanus* in Italien am Werk war, zeigt neben anderen Unternehmungen die Revision, deren Ergebnis die Vulgata ist.” Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 95.

<sup>141</sup>Trobisch, *Entstehung*, p. 22.

<sup>142</sup>2:2  $\tau\iota$   $\epsilon\nu$   $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$   $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ ; 7:29 *omit*  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu^2$ ; 7:37  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  +  $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ .

<sup>143</sup>2:3  $\epsilon\nu$   $\phi\omicron\beta\omega$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\rho\omicron\mu\omega$ ; 2:11  $\tau\omicron$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ; 3:21  $\epsilon\nu$   $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ; 4:6  $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ; 5:3  $\tau\omicron\nu$   $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ ; 8:10 +  $\sigma\epsilon$ .

- 1:1 *omit* κλητος ϩ<sup>61vid</sup> A D 0151 *pc* VL 75 CY
- 2:4 εν πειθοις σοφιας λογοις Ν B D 0150 33 181 1175 1506 1739 1881  
εν πειθοις ανθρωπινης σοφιας λογοις Ν<sup>2</sup> A C L P Ψ *pm*  
εν πειθοις σοφιας ϩ<sup>46</sup> F G
- 11:22 επαινεσω Ν A<sup>vid</sup> C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 0199<sup>vid</sup> *pm*  
επαινω ϩ<sup>46</sup> B F G
- 11:19 ινα και οι δοκιμοι ϩ<sup>46</sup> B D\* 6 33 69 330 630 1175 1739 1881 1912  
ινα οι δοκιμοι Ν A C D<sup>1</sup> F G K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
- 12:2 οιδατε οτι οτε Ν A B C D L P Ψ 056<sup>c</sup> 33 1739 *sy*<sup>h</sup>  
οιδατε οτι F G 0142 0151 2 38 88 177 216 629 1875 2298 *sy*<sup>p</sup>  
οιδατε οτε K 0150 1 69 209 1834 1898 1906 2464  
*lac* ϩ<sup>46</sup> 0201
- 12:10 διερμηνεια A D\*  
ερμηνεια ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν C D<sup>c</sup> F G L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 0201 6 424 915 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739  
*omit* (parablepsis) B K 0150 *pc*
- 12:21 ου δυναται δε ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν B D K L Ψ 0150 0151 5 6 424 1739 *pm*  
ου δυναται A C F G P 056 0142 *al*
- 14:11 μη ιδω ϩ<sup>46</sup> A D\* L 5 33 181 623  
μη ειδω Ν B D<sup>2</sup> K P Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0243 0289<sup>vid</sup> 6 88 1739 *pm*  
μη γινωσκω F G
- 15:4 τη ημερα τη τριτη ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν A B D 048<sup>vid</sup> 33 *pc*  
τη τριτη ημερα F G K L P Ψ 049 0150 0151 5 6 424 *pm*
- 16:13 ανδριζεσθε και κραταιουσθε A D 1175 *pc sy*<sup>p</sup>  
ανδριζεσθε κραταιουσθε ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ν B C F G K L P Ψ 049 056 075 0121 0142  
0150 0151 0243 5 6 424 1739 *pm*

When D departs from F G, its agreement with the "Alexandrian" witnesses is striking. While the passages discussed here are only representative, the agreements with Ν and A in particular appear to indicate some connection to that line of the Alexandrian tradition, more so than ϩ<sup>46</sup> or B.

D therefore departs from the Greek Z toward other Greek witnesses more often than F

and G. It is in fact a “mixed-text,” neither an accurate example of Z nor an “Alexandrian” text, though it clearly has connections to both. It has not yet become a “Byzantine” text either, but is an example of the process by which this form of the text was eventually created.

#### V. *Uncertain Z Readings*

Having identified typical characteristics of the D F G and the D-text, several passages nevertheless remain for which the Z reading is uncertain.

7:2    δια δε τας πορνειας Ϝ<sup>46</sup> Ɀ A B C D K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 1739  
           *propter fornicationes autem* 64 75 L M R TE CY HI AU  
       δια δε την πορνειαν F G sy Or  
           *propter fornicationem autem* 78 89 F VG HI AMst(A)  
           *propter autem fornicationem* 61 77  
           *sed propter fornicationem* TE  
           *tamen propter fornicationem* AMst

Several competing factors are at work in this passage. Assimilation to the near context in either F G or the Latin tradition may be at work in this example as well since την πορνειαν occurs a few verses earlier in 6:18. However, the reading may have arisen from a common transcriptional error in the Latin. Only the final *-s* in *fornicationes* had to be altered to *-m* in order to shift from the plural number to singular, possibly also under the influence of 6:18. D, on the other hand, may be an adaptation to the “Alexandrian” reading, particularly since 75 is supported by no other D-text witnesses. Yet it is possible, though remotely so, that 78, 89, and AMst(A) all were independently assimilated to the Vulgate. The reading in F G would therefore be dismissed as adaptation to the Vulgate. A strong argument can be made, however, the F G reading is the archetypal reading since the plural of πορνεια occurs nowhere else in Paul. There does not appear to be any significance in the plural in this context. In addition, the reading is found also in Tertullian, Origen, and the Syriac. These, however, may be independent renderings rather than reflecting a specific Greek *vorlage*. While I believe



that the balance of probabilities favors the argument that the reading of F G is the Z reading, and D assimilation to the “Alexandrian” text, competing factors preclude a definitive solution.

Another example is the way that D F G, independently, alter τε και to match the Latin. The D-text uses *atque* (Rom. 1:12), *ac* (Rom. 1:14), *et . . . et* (1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 12:12), and *et* (Rom. 3:9; 1 Cor. 1:24, 30).<sup>144</sup> In four places D or F G was adapted to the Latin. At Rom. 10:12 D reads only και; at 1 Cor. 1:24 F G read only και; and at 1 Cor. 1:30 and 2 Cor. 12:12 F G read και . . . και. However, none of these alterations is likely traceable to Z.

While the archetypal reading at 9:11 is not in question, determining the D-text reading is difficult. The stichometry in D shows that ου is a secondary intrusion since it is separated from its clause:<sup>145</sup>

ΕΙ ΗΜΕΙ ΣΥΜΙΝΤΑ ΠΝΑ	<i>si nos vobis spiritalia</i>
ΕΣΠΕΙΡΑΜΕΝΟΥ	<i>seminavimus non</i>
ΜΕΓΔΕΙ ΗΜΕΙ ΣΥΜΩΝ	<i>magnum si nos carnalia</i>
ΤΑ ΣΑΡΚΙΚΑ ΘΕΡΙΣΜΕΝΑ	<i>vestra metamus</i>

Yet this reading is found in two manuscripts which usually have D-text readings (89\* AMst (A)), though they may have been influenced by the Vulgate and I-text reading. The original *non* is 89 is erased; the corrections in this manuscript are usually made not by the scribe when correcting copying errors, but by a diorthotes, usually back to the exemplar but occasionally toward the Vulgate.<sup>146</sup> Furthermore, the vestiges of the lineation of 89 show that *non* is placed in its proper clause. It must also be noted that this manuscript, alone among all witness to this passage, omits the interrogative particle (*si*) at the beginning of 9:11. This was left

---

<sup>144</sup>At Rom. 1:27 τε και is read as δε και in A D\* G P Ψ, which the D-text renders with *autem et*.

<sup>145</sup>Vogels, “Der Codex Claromontanus,” pp. 290-91.

<sup>146</sup>Frede, *Ein Neuer Paulustext un Kommentar*, Bd. 1, pp. 126-28.

uncorrected, though it is doubtful that this could have led to the independent insertion of *non*. The commentary provided by this manuscript could result from either the presence or absence of *non*: “Do not think that it is doing a ‘great thing,’ if they provided anything for the apostles when they themselves learned from them ‘greater things.’” In the end, only three explanations are possible: 1) All three witnesses independently added *non*, an unlikely explanation given the relationship among these witnesses. 2) *Non* is the reading of the D-text, but VL 77 78 and subsequently F G were altered to the Vulgate. 3) *Non/ou* was a correction in the D F G archetype back to the D-text reading which was later adopted by D (albeit written in the wrong line) but rejected later by the shared exemplar of F G. This last scenario seems the most likely of the three, particularly in the light of similar examples (see 9:7, discussed above, and 9:20.74).

## VI. *Results*

Several conclusions may be drawn from this analysis. First, the Greek of the archetype Z and the D-text arise from a similar tradition. This has been frequently recognized by previous researchers. This tradition’s most striking feature is an interest in a smooth, clear text. Second, when Z was created, editorial activity is seen in some limited adaptation of the Greek text to the D-text, while the D-Text was likewise adapted to the Greek; there is also a tendency toward assimilation to the near context, particularly in minor additions. Third, D was revised away from Z in several significant ways. Its unique sense-line format led to numerous harmonizations and alterations of particles. It was also adapted to the Latin, though less so than was F G. More importantly, it was corrected toward manuscripts of the “Alexandrian” text. It was because of this agreement with “Alexandrian” readings that Zuntz saw D as superior to F G; however, it is now clear that when D agrees with “Alexandrian”

witnesses against F G, it does not represent an independent witness. Instead, F G preserve the reading that stood in the archetype Z, and potentially that archetype's predecessor. Fourth, the archetype of F G (X) adapted its Latin text away from Z and toward a local Vulgate text. This resulted in a fresh set of Latinisms in F G, which account for virtually all of the "Byzantine" readings in F G. Again, this corrects Zuntz, who assumed that the later witnesses (F G) had been affected directly by Byzantine readings. X also suffered from numerous corruptions of word divisions, blunders, and simple adaptations, all of which indicate that the editor of X had only vague comprehension of the Greek, and the copyist of G in particular almost none. Fifth, even with these conclusions, there are places where the archetype Z cannot yet be accurately reconstructed. Last, and most significantly, with a clearer picture of the origins and types of alterations made in D F G, we are able to strip away the errors and recover what, at its base, is a text than was produced earlier than even  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ , and ultimately brings us back into the second century.

From these results, it should not be surprising that D F G do preserve archetypal readings against the rest of Greek tradition, or with only a handful other witnesses:

- 7:28 λαβης γυναικα D F G Latt sy<sup>p</sup>
- 9:5 γυναικας F G Clement
- 9:9 γεγραπται γαρ
- 9:9 κημωσεις B\* D\* F G 1739
- 9:16 χαρις  $\aleph^*$  D F G
- 9:20 omit ως F G\* 6\* 326 424<sup>c</sup> 1739
- 11:23 εν η νυκτη D\* F G
- 14:37 omit εντολη

And from the Latin tradition apart from D F G (though 2:4 and 16:9 involve only orthographical alterations in Greek):

- 2:4 εν πειθοι σοφιας / *in persuasione sapientiae* 77 78 89
- 10:20 + και ου θεω (shorter text in SPE AMst PEL)
- 16:9 εναργης / *evidens* 77 78 VG AU HI



## The "Alexandrian" Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians

There is no question that the "Alexandrian" witnesses preserve a large number of archetypal readings. These are most clearly seen in those readings where either D F G (singly or in common) or the "Byzantine" witnesses – at times both – make their characteristic alterations. Just as D F G preserve very early readings (once their alterations are removed), so do, in particular,  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  & A B.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, these witnesses, individually and as a group, also show their own unique alterations.

### *The Witness of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$*

$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  is, of course, the earliest continuous text witness to the text of 1 Corinthians, dated to the early third century.<sup>2</sup> A number of unique agreements with Clement of Alexandria show that it preserves readings from a slightly earlier period. Zuntz<sup>3</sup> and, more rigorously, Mees,<sup>4</sup> demonstrated that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and Clement of Alexandria share a number of readings. This has been confirmed in the present study. For example, in chapter 8 the two witnesses share several singular or sub-singular readings:

8:3    *omit* τὸν θεὸν  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  Cl

---

<sup>1</sup>Other witnesses, such as  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{15}$ , show agreement with the readings of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  & A B but are too fragmentary for full analysis. Unfortunately this is also the case with the text of 1 Corinthians in H and I, which show agreements both with the "Alexandrians" and with D F G. A study of the texts of those manuscripts in the rest of the epistles is clearly desirable.

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Pickering, "The Dating of the Chester Beatty-Michigan Codex of the Pauline Epistles ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ )," in T. W. Hillard, R. W. Kearsley, C. E. V. Nixon and A. M. Nobbs, eds., *Ancient History in a Modern University* (Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1998), vol. 2, pp. 216-27. This essay is a response to Young Kyu Kim, "The Paleographical Dating of P46 to the Later First Century," *Biblica* 69 (1988), pp. 248-57.

<sup>3</sup>*Text of the Epistles*, pp. 242-52.

<sup>4</sup>*Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens Alexandrien*, esp. pp. 129, 136-40, and 142.

- omit υπ αυτου P<sup>46</sup> N\* 33 C1  
 8:7 ασθενουσα P<sup>46</sup> 629\* C1  
 8:12 omit ασθενουσαν P<sup>46</sup> C1

Furthermore, where the witnesses disagree in chapter 8, it is P<sup>46</sup>, with its singular or sub-singular readings, that moves away from Clement (see the discussions at the individual units of variation):

- 8:1 η δε γνωσις P<sup>46</sup>  
 8:2 omit τι P<sup>46</sup>  
 8:4 περι δε της βρωσεως ουν P<sup>46</sup> 919 920 999 1149 1245 1872  
 8:8 μη φαγωμεν υστερουμεθα ουτε εαν φαγωμεν περισσευομεν P<sup>46</sup>

This close relationship is especially evident in 1 Cor. 8, so that the agreements between Clement and P<sup>46</sup> cited above should be attributed to a shared tradition.<sup>5</sup> These singular readings of P<sup>46</sup> all match this manuscript's typical corruptions. This at least indicates that the readings known to P<sup>46</sup> existed, in Alexandria, in the late second century.

The unique characteristics of this scribe's alterations have been made clear by Royse. The scribal habits of this witness include 1) errors in spelling; 2) local errors which create nonsense in the context, indicating that the scribe is not understanding (or paying attention to) what is being copied; 3) a marked tendency to omit a single word, usually through simple carelessness or oversight, or to add single words; 4) rare transpositions of text; 5) and, finally, harmonization to the near context is common.<sup>6</sup> There also seems to be a particular interest in questions (1:13; 5:13; 9:7), though some of these may be the result of the types of errors discussed by Royse. These observations caution one to view the unique readings of P<sup>46</sup> as that scribe's own creation, rather than readings which reach back to the archetype.

A few other observations are possible. P<sup>46</sup> is frequently the only witness to shift verb

---

<sup>5</sup>At 3:5 P<sup>46c</sup> B Clement share a corruption: το μη for τα.

<sup>6</sup>Royse, pp. 282-83.

tenses. Royse finds eight examples in the manuscript, five of which are to the aorist and three of these to the present.<sup>7</sup> Zuntz sees influence from general Septuagintal usage here,<sup>8</sup> but it is more likely simply a scribal trait, as shown by Royse. For example, at 10:27  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  alone reads φαγετε. Paul uses the present imperative ἐσθίετε also in 10:27, 28, and 31, and while it is possible to argue that φαγετε was altered to match to the later examples, there would be no reason to use the aorist at 10:27.

While, as Royse notes, the manuscript frequently appears to have little awareness of the sense of the text,<sup>9</sup> some alterations show clumsy attempts to make the text readable. The formulaic nature of εὐχαριστω τω θεω at 14:18 led some scribes to construe παντων υμων as the ones for whom thanks are given.  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  1874 add υπερ (cf. 2 Cor. 1:11; Eph. 1:16; 5:20); 5 1311 add περι (cf. Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 1:4; Col. 1:3; 1 Thes. 1:2; 2 Thes. 1:3). In this context, however, this is in error, since παντων υμων is expressed in the genitive here as a comparison (μαλλον) to Paul.<sup>10</sup> This indicates a desire for a readable text, but a myopic approach that works at the level of clause rather than sentence. However, the scribe of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  recognized the problem by the time he reached the end of the sentence, for now μαλλον must function absolutely (meaning “more than ever”<sup>11</sup>), with which the first person λαλω no longer

---

<sup>7</sup>Royse, 270-71. However, he mistakenly identifies φαγετε at 1 Cor. 10:27 as a future indicative; it is in fact an aorist imperative. The counts provided here take this correction into account.

<sup>8</sup>Zuntz, p. 19.

<sup>9</sup>Some corruptions result in the opposite of Paul's meaning: at 13:5 it reads Ευσχημονει in place of ασχημονει.

<sup>10</sup>Υπέρ + accusative can be used to express comparison (BDAG, s.v. ὑπέρ (B)), but not ὑπέρ + genitive.

<sup>11</sup>BDAG, s.v. μᾶλλον (1).



makes sense.  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  solves the problem by writing the infinitive  $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  in place of  $\lambda\lambda\omega$ , now functioning as object of  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ , so that the sentence is now rendered: "I give thanks to God for you, that you speak in tongues more than ever." Here, however, the one speaking in tongues is not Paul but the Corinthians. This solution may have been suggested by the  $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$  . . .  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$  in the next sentence. Here we find the scribe of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  attempting to create a text that construes, even if his improvements require further alterations that alter substantially its sense.

Nevertheless,  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  alone preserves the archetypal readings at 12:10:  $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ .

### *Codex Sinaiticus*

Codex Sinaiticus carries many early readings. Most notably, it preserves the archetypal text at 7:38 ( $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota$ , joined only by A) and 9:16 ( $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$  joined only by D F G latt). On the other hand, it is poorly copied, attesting numerous corruptions, in particular parablepsis. Aside from the characteristics that it shares with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A B (discussed below), it seems to have been copied from an exemplar that had been corrected. This does not often lead to nonsense readings, as is the case in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and B. But at 7:13  $\aleph^*$  reads  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$   $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha$ , a conflation of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  in the "Byzantine" witnesss and  $\tau\omicron\nu$   $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha$  in  $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$   $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  A B C D F G 6 1739. A similar conflation occurs at 1:29 in  $\aleph^c$ :  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ , a combination of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  (C\*  $\Psi$ ) and  $\tau\omicron\nu$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  (*rel*), though it is not clear that this correction is by the original scribe.

### *Codex Alexandrinus*

Codex Alexandrinus seems to have more errors and create more singular readings in the later parts of 1 Corinthians, at least by chap 12. Overall, the manuscript shows the kinds of omissions (3:7), editing of conjunctions (11:5, 13; esp. 12:9-10) and assimilations to the near

context (13:2) that are found in all the early witnesses. One unique feature of A, however, is its interest in verb stems. It writes απεσταλκεν at 1:17, an assimilation to the perfect verb forms in the previous sentence. At 9:18 it reads καταχρασθαι (with 33 and Origen). The infinitive of καταχραομαι occurs both as a present (καταχρασθαι A 33<sup>12</sup>) and an aorist (κατακρησασθαι *rel*). However, A appears to have had difficulty with this verb stem. At 1 Cor. 9:12, A alone reads ου κεχρημεθα a confusion for ουκ εχρησαμεθα. Furthermore, at 1 Tim. 1:8, A P 1245 read χρησηται for χρηται, the former the aorist of the -αω contract stem, perhaps to resolve a perceived difficulty in the use of the -εω contract stem with χραομαι.<sup>13</sup> At 1 Cor. 9:18, the reading of A 33 may therefore either be accidental or intentional, but should not be considered the archetypical reading.

Another unique feature of A is its harmonization to parallels, both near and distant. At 7:20 εν τουτω is adapted from 7:24, as is ωφελουμαι at 13:2 (from 13:3). From more remote passages, at 7:39 it reads αποθανη (with 0278) from Rom. 7:2 and at 1 Cor. 12:13 reads εν σωμα εσμεν from Rom. 12:5. The harmonizations again point to careful reading and intentional editing on the part of at least one user of the tradition that preceded the copying of A.

### *Codex Vaticanus*

Codex Vaticanus is another witness that frequently carries early readings, again in conjunction with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ . Two features of B's text merit discussion. First, B is far from a perfectly

---

<sup>12</sup>Origen's citation in *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam I ad Corinthios* (in *catenis*) 40 is an allusion: Οὐ πάντως ἐάν τινος ἐχουσίαν ἔχωμεν, ὀφείλομεν καταχρᾶθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ.

<sup>13</sup>On the interchange of the -αω and -εω stems, see Moulton and Howard, *Accidence*, p. 195.

copied manuscript. In chapter 13 several of its typical errors are evident. Some are simple blunders: *καὶ ἄν* at 13:3 is likely a simple corruption of *καὶ ἐάν* (see discussion *ad loc*), the dittography *πάντα στεγεί πάντα στεγεί* at 13:7, and likely the omission of the article before *ἀγάπη* at 13:8.<sup>14</sup> These errors make it more likely that B's singular reading at 13:4 is also accidental (see discussion *ad loc*). The verb form *καταργηθήσεται* (13:8; again, B alone), however, must be the result of intentional alteration, for it conforms the number of the verb to that of its subject *προφητεία*. The singular noun, however, is an error since it is not prophecy as such which is discussed, but individual examples of prophecy, thereby requiring the plural.<sup>15</sup> A alone also reads the singular noun, though the verb remains unaltered. Another intentional alteration by B is found at 13:11. The aorist *ἐγενομένην* is perhaps the result of assimilation to the aorist *ἔλθη* in the parallel clause at 13:10.<sup>16</sup> Another possibility is that the shift to the middle was motivated by Atticism.<sup>17</sup> B makes the same mood shift at Gal 3:24 (*ἐγενετο*  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B) and 1 Cor. 10:2 *ἐβαπτισάντο* ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46c}$  B K L P 056 0142 0150 1739).<sup>18</sup>

Second, B is not copied from a single exemplar. Its text has been produced by comparison of readings among two or more witnesses. This was seen already at 14:34-35,

---

<sup>14</sup>B. Weiss, however (p. 75) attributes this omission to post-classical scribal improvement, comparing the omission of the article at Eph 4:7 and 1 Cor. 7:28.

<sup>15</sup>B. Weiss, pp. 17-18.

<sup>16</sup>B. Weiss, p. 43.

<sup>17</sup>Caragounis, p. 109 (though he provides no NT examples).

<sup>18</sup>The most thorough study of the tendencies of the scribe of B is J. W. Voelz, "The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek," *Novum Testamentum* 47 (2005), pp. 209-49. Among his conclusions (p. 212-16) are that B prefers *καί* to *δέ* (p. 212), simple verbs to compounds, reflexive pronouns to personal pronouns, weak aorist terminations on strong aorist stems, and *ἄν* rather than *ἐάν* in general clauses. While this study examines only Mark, the tendency toward simple verbs and the use of *ἄν* have been observed also in 1 Corinthians.



where the use of the “umlauts” to indicate places where the scribe of B knows of other readings was discussed. Further evidence for B as an eclectic text are the singular readings that must have been caused by corrections or marginal notes in a predecessor. In a singular reading at 12:24,  $\tau\iota$  is read after  $\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$  and  $\tau\iota\mu\eta\nu$  is omitted. B. Weiss puzzles over the reading. He suggests that the exemplar of B read  $\tau\iota\mu\eta\nu$   $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu$ , an unattested reading but one created to conform to this wording at 12:23. The scribe of B then wrote the first two letters but failed to copy the rest of the word.<sup>19</sup> A more likely reconstruction is that a predecessor of B had a correction which placed  $\tau\iota$  (or perhaps  $\nu\tau\iota$ ) above the ending  $\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$ , so that the reconstructed reading would have been  $\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\nu\tau\iota$ . The scribe of B (or a predecessor) mistook this correction to indicate an addition;  $\tau\iota$  was taken to be a pronoun and understood as the direct object of  $\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$ . Once this was copied, the  $\tau\iota\mu\eta\nu$  at the end of 12:24 was superfluous, and so deleted.

Another example is 9:18. In the manuscript, following  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ , an abbreviation appears:  $\mu$  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 from the lower loop of  $\mu$ . This is a unique abbreviation in B. Parallel examples in the manuscript show a small omicron written to the right of the preceding letter (as in Heb. 1:3  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$  at the end of the line). Because the line would not be abnormally short without the abbreviation and because the addition brings the text into line with the prevailing “Byzantine” text, it is judged as a secondary addition. Because nothing is visible beyond this abbreviation,<sup>20</sup> the original hand is likely to have read  $\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\sigma\upsilon\nu$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ . Corrections in the exemplar of B also explain a conflation unique to

---

<sup>19</sup>B. Weiss, pp. 21-22.

<sup>20</sup>NTaP cites B as reading  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$   $\mu\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ , against both Tischendorf and von Soden; NA<sup>27</sup> only notes B as *incert*.

B at 2 Thes. 3:4:

και ποιειτε και ποιησετε  $\aleph^2 D^2 K L \Psi$  056 0142 0278  
 και ποιειτε και ποιησητε 075  
 και ποιειτε και ποιητε 0151  
 και ποιησατε και ποιειτε και ποιησετε B  
 και εποησαται και ποιειται F G  
 ποιειτε και ποιησετε  $\aleph^* A$   
 ποιειτε και ποιηστε  $D^*$

*The "Alexandrian" Witnesses and D F G*

Numerous readings are shared only by F G (occasionally also D) with the "Alexandrian" witnesses, and in particular with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B:

1:17 ο χριστος  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F G 43 927 999 Theodoret  
 1:18 ο λογος γαρ του σταυρου  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F\* G\*<sup>21</sup> 206\* 1758 Cyril  
 2:4 εν πειθοις σοφιας  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G  
 7:29 παρθενος B F G arm ( $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  lac)  
 8:10 omit σε  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F G vg  
 8:10 ειδωλειω  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D<sup>2</sup> F G 056 0142 0151  
 8:11 ο ασθενων εν τη ση γνωσει ο αδελφος  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^* A D^* F G$  6 33 181 1739  
 1875  
 9:4 πειν  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph B D F G$   
 9:27 υποπιαζω  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G K L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151  
 10:4 πειν  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph B D F G$   
 10:4 η πετρα δε  $\aleph B D^{*2}$  (F G)  
 10:8 εν μια ]μια  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\aleph^* B D^* F G$   
 10:20 θυουσιν τα εθνη ]θυουσιν B D F G Mcion<sup>E</sup> (correct!)  
 10:26 του κυριου γαρ  $\aleph B C D F G$   
 10:31 omit ποιετε (2)  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G f g m Ambr Ambst Hil  
 11:20 omit ουν  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D<sup>\*</sup> F G  
 11:22 επαινω  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F G  
 12:19 παντα B F G 33  
 12:26 και ει τι B F G  $\Psi$  1175 1739 1845 sy<sup>h</sup> arm (και επι  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ )  
 14:23 λαλωσιν ]λαλησωσιν  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  F G

These indicate a closer relationship between  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F G than with  $\aleph A$  on the one hand and D on the other. The fact that these shared readings are often archetypal confirms that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B F

---

<sup>21</sup>Von Soden does not note the original hands of F and G.

G preserve many readings that existed in the second century.

*Family 1739 (0121 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739)*

A key witness for Zuntz is 1739. He argues that it is a “proto-Alexandrian” witness (with  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B). Yet as proof that  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  and 1739 share a “special relationship,” he cites only three readings, all of which are of the “agreement in error” type seen as significant by Zuntz:

1 Cor. 15:31	<i>omit ημων</i> $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ 1739
Heb. 5:1	περι $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ 1739 <sup>22</sup> ] υπερ <i>cet</i>
Heb. 13:5	αρκουμενος $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ 1739 ] αρκουμενοι <i>cet</i>

However, all three of these variants may simply be a scribal slip shared in common, rather than both manuscripts faithfully copying a corrupt text. Furthermore, subsequent research calls into question the uniqueness of the relationship between  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B 1739. The *Text und Textwert* series, though in and of itself not sufficient to determine manuscript relationships, gives the following percentages of agreement with 1739 in 1 Corinthians: 0243 – 14/15 = 88%; C – 33/40 = 83%; 33 – 47/59 = 80%;  $\aleph$  – 46/59 = 78%; B – 45/59 = 76%;  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  – 30/54 = 56% (a similar percentage with such witnesses as 122 181 630 1874). Furthermore, while Zuntz (p. 75) argued that 424<sup>c</sup> and 6 are dependent on 1739, Birdsall notes six places where 424<sup>c</sup> “descends without error from a source anterior to 1739.”<sup>23</sup> As Birdsall has demonstrated, in 1 Corinthians “6 and 424 while related to 1739 [are] not descended from it but from a previous stage in its descent. Both manuscripts are contaminated by other readings, but in spite of this both preserve readings of the original lost in 1739.”<sup>24</sup> This ancestor, which

---

<sup>22</sup>Though Zuntz does acknowledge that this type of variation is common, he still includes it in the list.

<sup>23</sup>Birdsall, “A Study of MS. 1739,” pp. 136-37.

<sup>24</sup>Birdsall, “A Study of MS. 1739,” p. 140.



Birdsall designates “x,” is not assigned a precise date, but must postdate the παλαιον copy referenced in the colophon of 1739 and antedate 6 424 1739. Therefore, the ancestor manuscript must have been produced sometime after the third century and prior to the tenth.

Further, through a keen paleographic observation Birdsall further demonstrates that 1739 is not a direct copy of an early manuscript. At 1 Cor. 11:5, 1739 (also 1881) reads ακαταλυφος, a nonsense reading, where all other witnesses read ακαταλυπτω. The corruption was caused by the similarity of the form of the combination πτ in minuscule script to that of the minuscule form of φ. Therefore, 1739 could not have been copied from a manuscript that was earlier than the ninth century.<sup>25</sup> Birdsall has decisively demonstrated that 1739 is not the witness that Zuntz thought it was. What still needs to be determined is what type of witness it is.

A close relationship among ℞<sup>46</sup> B 0121 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 is undeniable. A large number of shared readings, against all other witnesses, requires that conclusion. A representative list is all that is necessary to confirm that conclusion:<sup>26</sup>

- 7:37 εν τη καρδια αυτου D F G K L Ψ 056 0150 0151 *pm*  
 εν τη ιδια καρδια ℞ A B P 0278 *al* (τη ιδια καρδια ℞<sup>15</sup>)  
 εν τη καρδια 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739
- 11:19 ινα οι δοκιμοι 424 *pm* ] ινα και οι δοκιμοι ℞<sup>46</sup> B D\* 6 1739 *pc*
- 15:1 το ευαγγελιον μου 0243 5 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 *pc*
- 15:10 εγω δε ] εγω δε μονος 0243 1739 *pc*
- 15:10 η συν εμοι ] συν εμοι ℞\* B D\* F G 0243 0270\* 6 1739
- 15:31 *omit* ημων after εν χριστω ιησου τω κυριω 0150 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739
- 15:34 θεου τινες ] τινες θεου 0243 1739 *pc*
- 15:57 του κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου ] 4, 5, 1, 2, 3 0121 0243 1739
- 16:12 ελθη προς υμας 0121 0243
- 16:16 *omit* και 0121 0243 1739

---

<sup>25</sup>Birdsall, “A Study of MS. 1739,” p. 78.

<sup>26</sup>Most readings will come from chapter 15, since that is where 0121 and 0243 are most complete.

In addition, these witnesses frequently carry “Alexandrian” readings:

- 11:29 εσθιων και πινων Ϝ<sup>46</sup> Ν\* A B C\* 33 1739 ] + αναξιως Ν<sup>2</sup> C<sup>2</sup> D F G K L P Ψ  
6 424 *pm*
- 14:14 εαν Ϝ<sup>46</sup> B F G 0243 0289<sup>vid</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 1739 *pc* ] + γαρ Ν A D<sup>s</sup> K L P Ψ 048 049 056  
0142 0150 0151 6 424
- 14:26 εκαστος B 0201 0243 1739 ] + υμων Ν<sup>2</sup> D F G K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150  
0151 688 424
- 15:4 τη τριτη ημερα ] τη ημερα τη τριτη Ϝ<sup>46</sup> Ν A B D 1739 *pc*

What neither Zuntz nor Birdsall considered, however, are the numerous places where 6 1739 read with “Byzantine” witnesses against the “Alexandrians”:

- 1:2 και Ϝ<sup>46</sup> Ν\* A\* B D\* F G ] τε και 6 424 1739 Byz
- 1:23 εθνεσι Ν A B C\* D\* F G L ] ελλησιν 6 1739 Byz
- 2:2 ειδεναι τι εν υμιν Ϝ<sup>46</sup> D F G ; τι ειδεναι εν υμιν B C 1739 ]  
του ειδεναι τι εν υμιν 6 424 Byz
- 3:1 λαησαι υμιν Ϝ<sup>46</sup> A Ν B D\* F G *al* ] υμιν λαησαι L P Ψ 049 6 424 1739 *al*
- 7:7 δε Ϝ<sup>46</sup> Ν\* A C D\* F G ] γαρ Ν<sup>2</sup> B D<sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739
- 11:22 ειπω υμιν ] υμιν ειπω K L Ψ 6 88 424; ειπω P

What can account for this situation? In the case of 424 the answer is obvious: It is a “Byzantine” witness which has been corrected with a set of readings that derive from “Alexandrian” readings.<sup>27</sup> But is it possible that the “Alexandrian” readings in 6 1729 0121 0243 have resulted from the same process? A few examples are telling. At 7:37, 6 424<sup>c</sup> read εδραιος εν τη καρδια, but 1739 places εδραιος in a different location (εν τη καρδια εδραιος); none, however, read the ιδια found in Ϝ<sup>15</sup> Ν A B P 0278. What can account for these readings? Only a correction that was placed in different locations by the different scribes. This reading of 6 424 1739 cannot have been produced by copying a continuous text manuscript that was similar to Ϝ<sup>15</sup> Ν A B P 0278. Another example is 14:5, where 0243 1739

---

<sup>27</sup>Birdsall describes the process correcting and erasing shown by 424 in “A Study of MS. 1739,” pp. 85-86.

add the implied subject τις.<sup>28</sup> 6, however, reads τι ερμηνευη for τις διερμηνευη. This reading is easily explained as a misreading of a marginal note which was intended to insert τις before διερμηνευη, but instead interpreted as a substitution of τι- for δι-. Another example of 6 producing a singular reading as the result of a misunderstood correction or marginal note was seen at 4:6, where υπερ ο α is combination of the υπερ ο of 424 and the υπερ α of 1739.<sup>29</sup> The insertion of a subject in a note also took place in these witnesses at 14:31, where the implied subject εκαστοι likely stood in the margin. 6 424<sup>c</sup> interpreted the note as intending to stand for παντες,<sup>30</sup> whereas 0243 1739 read the note as an insertion, producing καθ ενα εκαστοι παντες.<sup>31</sup> In addition, 6 has long stretches of text, for example much of chapter 11, where it agrees with the “Byzantine” readings and does not attest any “Alexandrian” readings.

In the textual discussions we have already seen 1739 produce singular readings as the result of corrections or marginal notes, most notably the reading η και η αδελφη at 7:15 (for which 0243 is not extant). In fact, 1739 has numerous singular readings which can only be accounted for as attempts to incorporate notes or corrections into the text. At 12:24 the original reading of 1739 is not clear. Both von Soden and Lake<sup>32</sup> fail to note any correction. But NA<sup>27</sup> and now Swanson cite the original hand as reading υστερουντι and the correction

---

<sup>28</sup>Sharing this addition are 1505 1611 1881 2495, which read διερμηνευει for διερμηνευη.

<sup>29</sup>Birdsall, “A Study of MS. 1739,” p. 138.

<sup>30</sup>Another example of 424<sup>c</sup> writing a correction in the wrong location may be seen in the reading και το αυτο πνευμα at 12:4 (see discussion *ad loc.*).

<sup>31</sup>This reading is shared by other witnesses, including von Soden’s *K<sup>c</sup>* mss.

<sup>32</sup>Lake and New, *Six Collations*, p. 174.



reading ουστερουμενω. An examination of the microfilm allows us to reach the following conclusions. First, -μενω is written with a thicker stroke, and there appear to be marks between μ and ε, though what lettering may have been present cannot be determined. The minuscule ν appears to have been converted to μ (easily done with a single stroke). Also, τι has had a few strokes added to alter it to εν. However the gap that would have been between ν and τ is far larger than anything nearby on the page, making it unlikely that they were part of the same word. In addition, the ι in τι (which are always connected) does not extend above the centerline, which regularly happens in this manuscript (cf. σωματι one line below and επι two lines below). Furthermore, a space stands between -μενω and the following word, which would again be too large had οστερουντι been written originally. A possible reconstruction based on this evidence is that the scribe wrote οστερουν (and perhaps the τ of τι), then having noticed a correction in his exemplar altered ν to μ and finished the word, thereupon continuing with περισσοτερον. Indeed, this is the exact correction in 424, where μενω is written above the ending τι. This would be further evidence that the exemplar of 1739 is not a direct descendant of an early manuscript. Instead it was copied from a text that was essentially of a "Byzantine" form but which contained corrections toward a text similar to B – a manuscript not unlike 424 itself.

Two readings appear to have been caused by making the correction at the wrong place. 6:9-10 In 1739, a second ου is written supralinear by a corrector following κληρονομησουσιν; the first ου, placed before βασιλειαν θεου, has not been altered. No edition notes this correction, including the collation by Lake and New, but the form of the correction is identical to that made in 6:10. "Η και η αδελφη (with this accenting) at 7:15, another unique reading, again points to the introduction of a marginal note in the wrong place.

Finally, 1739 appears to have had difficulty even with lectionary markings. At 7:20, the correction shows influence from 7:24, though in an indirect manner. The text was partially erased and rewritten, obscuring the original hand. The correction as it now stands reads εν τη κλησει εν ω εκληθη ταυτη. The εν is written on the main line over an erasure, with ω written supralinear. The style and thickness of the script matches the rubrics indicating the lectionary reading, which is also written supra linear, the αρχη symbol standing above εκληθη. This is, however, not the correct location for the beginning of this lectionary reading (ε' τη ζ' εβδ), which should begin at 7:24 (see discussion at 7:20.77). The similarity of wording between 7:20 and 7:24 led to the accidental insertion of the lectionary note at 7:20, the text of which was then altered to match both 7:24 and the lectionary *titulus*.<sup>33</sup>

What results from this? Birdsall had already shown that 1739 does not trace as far back as Zuntz had thought, and that 6 424<sup>c</sup> often preserve the readings of their shared archetype better than does 1739. By analyzing the types of alterations – and just as important – the places where these witnesses do not alter their base text, a clearer picture emerges of what kinds of readings we can expect to be unreliable from these witnesses. First, they will be unreliable for word order variation. As three of the agreements with the Byzantine text cited above show (2:2; 3:1; 11:22), making word order changes is difficult in an annotated manuscript. The correction must either delete the entire original text and rewrite the text in a new order, or delete the word to be shifted and rewrite it at the proper location. The latter method accounts for 1739's reading at 7:15, for example. An additional reason that these witnesses are unreliable for word order is the nature of the process of transmission itself. Corrections are frequently simply placed in the wrong location. Second, these witnesses will

---

<sup>33</sup>Lake and New (172) attribute the correction in 1739 solely to the lectionary *titulus*.

rarely carry a pure form of any text over any given length of copying. At times they will read with the “Byzantine” witnesses, at times with the “Alexandrian” (though they seem not to carry “Western” readings). Third, their “value” as independent witnesses to the archetypical text is minimal. With readings drawn from more than one source, it is unlikely that they will independently attest to the archetypical reading. Indeed, in this study not a single reading supported only by 0121 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739, either as a group or individually, was found to be archetypical.



## The “Byzantine” Manuscripts of 1 Corinthians

Zuntz seemed to place the “Byzantine” text in high regard. He argued that “readings which recur in Western witnesses *must* be ancient. They go back to the time before the Chester Beatty papyrus [P<sup>46</sup>] was written; the time before the emergence of separate Eastern and Western traditions; in short, they reach back deep into the second century.”<sup>1</sup> In spite of this high regard, however, he finds only one place where the Byzantine text, without “Western” or “Alexandrian” support, preserves the archetypal reading (14:19 see below). If read carefully, however, it will be noticed that Zuntz regarded only those Byzantine readings as early that are also found in the “Western” text. This study confirms this assessment.

The unique readings of the “Byzantine” text suggest intentional editing. The result of this editing, almost without fail, is a clearer, more precise text that seems to spare no effort to ensure that the reader will not misunderstand the text. For example, one consistent alteration is the smoothing of transitions between clauses and sentences. Conjunctions are very frequently edited or added for this reason:

3:5	+ αλλ η D <sup>2</sup> L P Ψ 049 056 0142 0151
5:10	ου ] και ου N <sup>2</sup> D <sup>1</sup> L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151
7:7	δε ] γαρ N <sup>2</sup> B D <sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 056 0142 0151 6 424 1739 <i>pm</i>
7:38	και ο ] ο δε N <sup>2</sup> K L P Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 <i>pm</i>
10:1	γαρ ] δε N <sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 <i>pm</i>
10:27	ει ] + δε C D <sup>2</sup> H K L Ψ 056 0142 0150 0151 <i>pm</i>
12:9-10	+ δε (seven times) A C
11:14	ουδε ] η ουδε D <sup>1</sup> K L 056 0142 0150 <i>pm</i>
13:9	δε ] γαρ K L 049 056 0142 0151 88 424* 915 <i>pc</i>
14:15	και B F G 0150 0151* ] δε και N A D <sup>s</sup> K L P 048 049 056 0142 6 424 1739
14:25	τα κρυπτα ] και ουτως τα κρυπτα D <sup>2</sup> K L Ψ 049 056 0142 0150 0151

Additions or alterations are made based on the near context:

---

<sup>1</sup>Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, pp. 150-52; emphasis by Zuntz.

- 7:14 αδελφω ] ανδρι  $\aleph^2$  D<sup>2</sup> K L 056<sup>c</sup> 0142 0150 0151 *pm*  
 7:18 κεκληται ] εκληθη D<sup>2</sup> K  $\Psi$  0156 0142 *pm*  
 10:28 lengthy addition, added from 10:26  
 12:12 του σωματος ] + του ενος  $\aleph^2$  K  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 5 6 88 424 *pm*  
 12:13 εν πνευμα ] εις εν πνευμα D<sup>2</sup> K L 0150 0151 5 88 93 326 424 *pm*  
 13:10 τελειον + τοτε D<sup>1</sup> K L 049 056 0142 0151 5 *pm*

Other additions are made for theological reasons, or assimilate to other writings:

- 2:10 πνευματος ] πνευματος αυτου  $\aleph^2$  D F G L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 *pm*  
 2:13 πνευματος ] πνευματος αγιου D<sup>1</sup> L P 049 056 0142 0151 *pm*  
 5:1 εθνεσιν ] + ονομαζεται  $\Phi^{68}$   $\aleph^2$  L P  $\Psi$  049 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm* (Eph. 5:3)  
 5:7 ημων ] + υπερ ημων  $\aleph^2$  C<sup>3</sup> L  $\Psi$  048<sup>vid2</sup> 049 056 0142 0150 0151  
 7:3 οφειλομενην ] + ευνοιαν K L 056 0142 0150 0151 *pm*  
 7:39 δεδεται ] + νομω  $\aleph^2$  D<sup>1</sup> F G L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 *pm* (Rom. 7:2)  
 11:24 ειπεν ] + λαβετε φαγετε C<sup>3</sup> K L P  $\Psi$  056 0142 0150 0151 *pm* (Matt. 26:26)

At least two conflations appear in these witnesses:

- 9:10 επ ελπιδι οφειλει ο αροτριων αροτριαν και ο αλων της ελπιδος αυτου  
 μετεχειν επ ελπιδι  $\aleph^2$  D<sup>1</sup> K L  $\Psi$  056 0151 5 6 424 614 876 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> sy<sup>p</sup>  
 14:23 εαν ουν ελθη  $\Phi^{46vid}$  B; εαν συνελθη F G<sup>c</sup> 0243 5 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 *pc* ] εαν ουν  
 συνελθη  $\aleph$  A D K L P  $\Psi$  048 049 056 0201<sup>vid</sup> 0142 0150 0151 88 424<sup>\*</sup> *pm*

These types of alterations appear again and again in the discussion of individual readings. No archetypical readings were found that are attested solely by the "Byzantine" witnesses. Zuntz was able to find one, at 14:19. However, his argument is based on incorrect evidence and fails to take into account the types of changes, described here, that are so typical of these witnesses (see discussion *ad loc*).

As a result, the "Byzantine" witnesses are never an independent witness. They are at times correct when they read with "Western" witnesses (13:3) and at times correct when they avoid the types of alterations typical of the "Western" witnesses. But they are also at times wrong when they read with the Alexandrian witnesses. Therefore, the "Byzantine" text has been produced from a wide range of witnesses, both "Western" and "Alexandrian," or to say it

---

<sup>2</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> does not cite 048 here, although listed as a "Consistently cited witness of the first order" on p. 60<sup>\*</sup>; TuT does not note the reading as *vid*.

more accurately, it contains both "Western" and "Alexandrian" readings as well as its own corruptions.

*Two Significant Byzantine Witnesses: 88 and 915*

88 915 are relatively unknown witnesses. They are discussed here not because they have been found to carry an early form of the text, but because they share with D F G one of the most noted variants in 1 Corinthians: the displacement of 14:34-35. Their witness to that passage has already been discussed; here we will present material that confirms that discussion.

Already von Soden had connected these two manuscripts.<sup>3</sup> He noted the partial use of the Euthalian material, and in particular the matching divisions of the Euthalian sense-line lines by the use of medial points.<sup>4</sup> His analysis is supplemented by two further pieces of data: the identical marginal notations which indicating variant readings and shared unique readings (including 14:34-35).

The shared marginal notations are striking. Some provide information common to other manuscripts, such as identifying the source of an OT citation. Others give explanatory notes on items in the text, for example a list of the "sons of Joseph" at 9:15 (88 915) and a note explaining that Crispus and Gaius "are Corinthians" at 1:14 (915). The most striking marginal notations, however, are indications of the awareness of readings of other manuscripts. These are introduced with the phrase ἐν ἄλλω: "In another [manuscript]." A full

---

<sup>3</sup>He placed them in next to each other in his *F*<sup>1</sup>, his apparatus using the convenient designation "200f" for their shared readings.

<sup>4</sup>von Soden, p. 677. Payne (p. 152 n. 2) misunderstands these "dots" as "marking punctuation." He finds significance in the fact that the "dot" marking the end of 14:35 is that "largest red spot on the page." Such large points are in evidence, however, elsewhere in the ms., particularly in connection with the beginning and end of lectionary units.



list of these marginal notes, as they stand in 915 is provided here, with manuscript support added for the textual notes.

- 1:14 κορίνθιοι εἰσὶν οὗτοι at foot of page, with elongated ω siglum above κρίσπον
- 5:13 ἐν ἄλλω· εξαρατε  
 Ⲛ A B C D\* F G P Y 33 38 81 69 104 181 365 462 642 181 256 263 436 917  
 1175 1319 1836 1837 1875 2127 2464 Or
- 7:28 ἐν ἄλλω· | γαμίσης (γαμησης in margin of 88)  
 γαμησης ϩ<sup>15</sup> ϩ<sup>46</sup> Ⲛ B P Ψ 6 33 43 69 81 101<sup>mg</sup> 181 917 1739 1834 1836 1838 1875
- 7:33 ἐν ἄλλω· | γαμής ??
- 8:8 ἐν ἄλλ· οὐ τ | ρίστησιν; since τρίστησιν is an impossible form, this is likely a misreading (or unclear photo) for οὐ παρίστησιν.
- 8:11 ἐν ἄλλ· ἀπό | λλυται (απολλυται marginal note in 88)  
 Ⲛ<sup>2</sup> D\* Ψ 6 81 88<sup>mg</sup> 206 256 263 365 424<sup>c</sup> 429 441 621 630 915<sup>mg</sup> 917 1319  
 1490 1573 1721 1739 1758 1836 1874 1881 1942 1962 2004 2127 2200 2201<sup>c</sup>
- 9:5 ὕιοι ἰωσηφ· | ἰάκωβος· | σίμων· | ἰούδ(ας) (same list in 88)  
 List of the “sons of Joseph”
- 10:6-9  $\overline{\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu}$  |  $\overline{\epsilon\chi\omicron}$  |  $\overline{\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu}$  |  $\overline{\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu}$  (88 reverses the first two books)  
 Indicates OT citation source
- 10:26 ψα  
 Indicates OT citation source
- 10:28 ψα  
 Indicates OT citation source
- 14:16 ἐν ἄλλ· εὐλο | γης· (88 has same note, with introductory formula)  
 Ⲛ A B D<sup>s</sup> P 0150 0243 5 6 33 81 88<sup>mg</sup> 104 216<sup>\*5</sup> 256 263 365 436 440 441 467  
 623 915<sup>mg</sup> 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1319 1739 1834 1881 2127 2464 Dam

---

<sup>5</sup>von Soden does not cite an original hand of 216.

14:19 ἐν ἄλλω· τῶ νο | ἰ μου· (88 has same note, with introductory formula)  
 ⱼ A B D<sup>s</sup> P Ψ 0150 0243 5 38 43 69 81 104 256 263 326 436 467 623 630  
 915<sup>txt</sup> 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1319 1739 1834 1837 1881 2127 2464 sy<sup>p</sup> Mcion Epiph  
 GrNy Dam

14:25 ἐν ἄλλω· προσ | κυνεῖ

88, which reads προσκυνει, has a notation in the text pointing to this marginal note:  
 πρωσωπον προσκ

15:22 ἐν ἄλλω· ἀπὸ | θνήσκουσιν

915<sup>txt</sup> reads αποθνησκομεν, a singular reading

88 does not have all the notes. Furthermore, some marginal notations in 88 must have been adopted from a predecessor. This is demonstrated most clearly by the marginal note at 9:5.

There 88 omits, due to accidental leap, και οι αδελφοι. This spot is marked in the text with the siglum ⱼ ⱼ. This, however, does not fill in the missing text but points to the marginal note:

ὅτι οἱ ἰωσηφ· | ἰάκωβος·<sup>τ</sup> σίμων·<sup>τ</sup> ἰούδ[ας]. The identical note is present in 915. Thus the very text that the note explains is missing from 88, and must have existed in a predecessor

manuscript. 915 reads both και οι αδελφοι (hence the error is unique to 88) and the marginal note. Again at 14:25 88 has the symbol ⱼ ⱼ in the text, which points to πρωσωπον προσκ.

The note is obviously incomplete and useless in 88, but the note in 915 supplies what the note should have been: προσκυνει.

Furthermore, 88 makes corrections using a notation system that is independent of the notes found in 915. At 11:25 88 places a slash ( / ) in the left margin. This must indicate the omission of ος αν πινητε, an omission shared by 915. However, 88 marks the omission, while 915 does not. The same mark is used at 15:5, which may indicate, in place of επειτα, either the reading ειτα (ⱼ<sup>46</sup> B P L Ψ 6 1739) or και μετα ταυτα (D\* F G).

A cross ( + ) is placed in the margin in five places in 1 Corinthians, with varying

functions. Text lost by parablepsis is replaced at 3:2 (αλλ ουδε επι νυν δυνασθε). In three places it appears to note alternative readings: at 7:6 the only known Greek variant is γνωμην (823 2815) for συγγνωμην, but the Latin tradition splits: *indulgentium* VL 89 V Te Ir Cy or *veniam* 64 Te Cy (= συγγνωμην) for *consilium* 75 77<sup>vel</sup> 78 Cy<sup>mss</sup> (= γνωμην); at 7:10 it may mark χωρισθηναι where other witnesses read χωριζεσθαι (A D F G pc) or χωριζεσθω (P<sup>46</sup> 614); and 9:2 it likely marks της εμης αποστολης, for which an alternative is μου της αποστολης (N B P 0150 33 1739 pc). Finally, at 14:16 it apparently marks ευλογησης, for which a note identical to that in 915 is provided at the foot of the page: εν αλλω ευλογης (discussed above).

Apart from the displacement of 14:34-35, these witnesses do not carry early readings. However, the fact that manuscripts are noting alternative readings shows the process by which the text of 1 Corinthians would have been altered even in the later periods of transmission. In at least some cases, scribes did not simply copy what was in front of them, but made comparison to other witnesses and marked differences in the margins. While the relatively few notations in 88 915 do not amount to anything approaching a textual apparatus, they do show that the text was copied, compared, altered, and copied again, one reading at a time. Any attempt to work back through these alterations to earlier forms of the text must therefore proceed in the same way: One reading at a time.



### Concluding Observations

The goal of this study has been realized: To apply the principles of thoroughgoing eclecticism to the readings of the Greek manuscripts of 1 Corinthians, in order to determine how and, where possible, why the manuscripts were altered in the earliest period of transmission, that is, up to the fourth century. Witnesses were compared against themselves, with the result that characteristics of the key witnesses have been identified. They were also studied within the context of the linguistic, theological, and ethical developments of the period, and the effects that these developments had on the text has been described. Here, a brief summary describes what has been observed in the process of transmitting the text of 1 Corinthians.

What types of alterations does one find in the witnesses of 1 Corinthians? The vast majority, of course, involve mundane causes. Parablepsis is common; no witness escapes it entirely, though some show it more than others. The addition of words from the near context is very common, and explains numerous alterations (perhaps most significantly at 2:4). Conjunctions are frequently added and changed. No manuscript reliably transmits them (see 14.15, 14:23; 15:6, 14, etc.) The procedure of NA<sup>27</sup>, to typically follow B in these cases unless obviously incorrect, simply accepts this manuscript's editing rather than another's. It is clear, however, that B and its related witnesses make numerous alterations, though it must be recalled that the Byzantine witnesses alter conjunctions far more frequently than other witnesses.

In addition, however, the relatively recent recognition that readings were prompted by the theological and ethical concerns of the communities that produced and used the manuscripts has helped explain numerous alterations in 1 Corinthians. For example, there is a concern for propriety in marital and sexual discussion (7:5; 7:33-34; 9:5), and Paul and his

authority receive particular attention (1:1; 3:5; 9:1; 11:2).

On the other hand, some types of alterations that might have been expected were not evident in 1 Corinthians. There is a surprising lack of harmonization to liturgical texts at 11:23-25. There is an absence of “anti-feminist” readings, even though some have posited this as a potential motivation at 7:2 and 14:34-35. Furthermore, there is no evidence of such a concern in the readings at 11:2-16. The manuscripts also fail to show any concern for Gnostic theology (15:15; 15:45). Only rarely is an insertion made from another Pauline book, and even less rarely from other writings (including the adaption of LXX citations). The most obvious example of large scale additions and moving text is seen at the end of Romans and 1 Cor. 14 in D F G and the Latin tradition (see 14:34-35).

Whether or not conjecture is a valid procedure in textual criticism was discussed in interaction with the issues at 4:6 and 14:34-35. This study has found no manuscript evidence of lengthy additions or omissions of the type often posited for 11:2-16 and 14:34-35. On the other hand, it was found necessary to conclude that in a surprising number of places the entire tradition is corrupt, or that the archetypal reading is preserved in only a handful of witnesses that would not be accepted by most as “significant.”

- 1:2 omit τη ουση εν κορινθω
- 2:4 read πειθοι (61 75 77 89 Ambrose Ambrosiaster)
- 6:5 και των αδελφων is lost
- 10:5 omit ο θεος or ο κυριος (shorter text in 81 257 1610 Cl Mcion<sup>E</sup>)
- 10:20 omit και ου θεω (shorter text in *Speculum* Ambrosiaster Pelagius)
- 14:25 omit ο θεος
- 14:33 omit ο θεος
- 16:9 read εναργης (*evidens* 77 78 89 VG)

All of these proposed conjectures match the types of alterations seen throughout the manuscript tradition. In most cases the implied subject is added, or the addition clarifies the argument. In two cases, it is proposed that orthographical variation has corrupted the entire

Greek tradition, but since the Latin was not liable to the same type of alteration in those cases, it preserves the archetypal reading. On the other hand, several interpolations proposed by others have been shown to be unnecessary (e.g., 4:6; 15:31).

This results in several implications for the study of the text of the Pauline epistles. First, individual units of variation cannot be discussed without an understanding of how the individual witnesses have produced their texts. Some are comparing readings found in more than one witness. In some cases this happened through incorporating marginal notes or corrections into the text (6 424 1739). In others, it appears that other manuscripts were consulted (D), or even readings found in other languages (F G). Even the manuscript's format can affect its readings, as scribes altered the text to suit the layout (D). Understanding that different scribes are copying and editing in different ways helps explain how witnesses that generally do not show any unique relationship will, on occasion, share a unique reading.<sup>1</sup>

Second, scribes worked locally. The distilling of a complex tradition such as the text of the *Corpus Paulinum* into "text types," and then evaluating readings and even manuscripts based on how they perform against the one's preferred "text type," is an oversimplification of the process of transmission. Argumentation such as this is frequently encountered in the discussion of the text of 1 Corinthians: "What remains to be considered is the external evidence. Not much needs to be discussed, since it is rather obvious that *καυχησῶμαι* has by far the best attestation, being supported by all the best Greek witnesses (P<sup>46</sup> & A B) as well as the Coptic versions and some Church Fathers. This evidence speaks for itself."<sup>2</sup> However,

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., F G<sup>c</sup> and 0243 6 424<sup>c</sup> 1739 (also 5 623 1245) share the reading *εἰς συνέληθη* at 14:23.

<sup>2</sup>Petzer, "Contextual Evidence in Favour of *καυθησῶμαι* in 1 Corinthians 13.3," p. 251. As discussed at 13:3, Petzer does interact in a significant way with the internal evidence; however, such is not always the practice of those who use "external evidence" arguments in this way.



Scribes did not reproduce text types, they produced texts as they copied one letter, word, or phrase at a time. This is precisely the way the early fathers used the text. They generally worked with smaller units and focused on key terms or ideas (e.g., see the discussions at 9:5 and 7:34). Only this process of transmission can account for such a “mixed” tradition, where, for example  $\aleph^*$  preserves the archetypical  $\piοιει$  at 7:38, joined only by A, yet at 9:16 preserves the archetypical  $χαρις$ , joined only by D F G. Then, a few lines later, is the only witness to add the preposition at 9:18.

This is further seen by the large number of readings that individual manuscripts created on the basis of corrections and notations in their predecessors. Virtually all the manuscripts that carry early readings have been corrupted by their attempts to incorporate these corrections into their texts.  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ , the earliest manuscript, already shows conflation and misread corrections. Because the effect of these corrections can only be made obvious when a singular reading is created, many more corrected readings that “improved” the text were simply passed along, unable to be recognized except by conjecture. This confirms that the types of small interpolations described above are plausible.

Third, the contexts of those individual witnesses must be understood. This can be known only in the case of a handful of witnesses (for example F G), and even there only imperfectly. Nevertheless, the theological, ethical, and even linguistic developments that were taking place during the first few centuries of the transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum* must be understood. For example, only after a highly-developed Trinitarian theology took hold could the addition at 8:6 have been made. The meaning of vocabulary changed (e.g.,  $\piαρθένος$  at 7:34;  $τύπος$  /  $τυπικῶς$  at 10:11). The use of the *nomina sacra* expanded to examples that were not referencing sacred things (esp.  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  D at 2:14, 15; 3:1; 4:22). Grammatical preferences shifted, for example in the use of thematic stems (7:3; 9:18; and 13:2 in  $\aleph$  and A).

The alterations can be explained in a satisfactory manner only when understood within the historical setting of the early period of transmission. This also demonstrates one of the limitations of a study such as this: It will, in a sense, never be complete. The range of early Christian literature is vast, and no individual could possibly master all of it. Alterations that seem to be simple blunders to one individual will be recognized as the result of a profound theological shift by another. A study such as this, therefore, is an invitation to others to apply their unique expertise to the study of the witnesses and their readings.

While the goal of this study has not been a reconstruction of the history of the transmission of 1 Corinthians, the analysis of thousands of places of variation does allow some features of this history to be known more clearly. For example, it is clear that every witness is corrupt, though in their own ways and for their own reasons. Even though F G are among the most recent witnesses that this study examined in detail, it has been demonstrated that they carry very early readings. F G have also undergone their own corruptions, indeed perhaps more than any other witness. Nevertheless, because the types of corruption and their causes have been described, those corruptions are able to be removed from consideration as potentially early readings. The same can be said for  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ , which had already been carefully described by previous researchers. This process continued as manuscripts were copied, compared, and created their own unique readings. In this process, however, the readings of the earlier witnesses were often replaced. Additions once made are simply perpetuated. Smoother and harmonized readings replace the less clear and obtrusive readings. Ultimately, the “Byzantine” text, with access both to “Western” and to “Alexandrian” witnesses, produced the least difficult text of all.

Zuntz had a different picture of the tradition. The purity of  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B 1739 was initially corrupted by a “wild” second century text (which D F G partially preserve). The influence of

Alexandrian philology, however, led early scholars to seek out and copy uncorrupted manuscripts, of which  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B 1739 are the best witnesses. While these witnesses unquestionably carry early readings, this study has made clear that they are not so pure, nor D F G so corrupt. Indeed, rather than showing corruption being replaced by purity, many early readings now preserved in D F G were replaced by inferior readings by  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  B 1739. By repeated copying and comparison they supplanted the older readings. Even the early readings in the Latin tradition were eventually overwhelmed by the Vulgate, which was based on “Alexandrian” witnesses. The “Byzantine” witnesses preserved a few of these “Western” readings, and so they ended up in early printed editions. However, the rediscovery of  $\aleph$  B and then  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  removed even the few readings that had survived. Beginning with the editions of Tischendorf and then Westcott and Hort, and culminating in our present-day editions, the “Alexandrians” have been so influential that many second century readings have simply been ignored. No witness is perfect. Even if this study has highlighted the early readings found in the bilinguals and the Latin tradition, it has also identified numerous corruptions in the same witnesses. Nevertheless, until witnesses beyond the “Alexandrians” are understood and heard from, we will have only imperfect knowledge of Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians.