

mihi in Deo confidens apposui, secundum deinceps adiacentes sermones quos nunc in meas venire accidit manus);¹ but I have not been able to determine whether this is an actual translation, like the Scholia, or a reworking.²

EZIO FRANCESCHINI.

THE CHESTER BEATTY PAPYRI

THE three publications by Sir Frederick Kenyon,³ which form the subject of this paper, give us a full account of the new MS of the Gospels and Acts and of its companions. When one adds that the new MS contains fragments of 30 leaves (out of an original 110), and that its date is probably a little earlier than A.D. 250, i.e. between the death of Origen and the Decian Persecution, it is obvious that its publication marks an epoch in textual history.

Sir Frederick Kenyon must be heartily congratulated on his work. The first volume gives an account of the find, with good facsimiles of each of the MSS. The second gives the text of the Gospels and Acts, together with a useful apparatus from cognate MSS; there is a very modest but informing introduction, which tells the reader everything he needs. In the Schweich Lectures there is a popular, and at the same time scientific, account of the chief discoveries made since Hort's edition was published, from the Sinai Palimpsest onwards. He discusses the theories of Lake and Streeter, so that the reader is at once put abreast of the present position. We see where we stand: even unlearned persons, under Sir Frederic Kenyon's guidance, can distinguish the controversy between Hort and Burgon, which is dead, from that between Hort and Lake (if I may so express it), which is alive and on which fresh light has been thrown by the great discovery of P⁴⁵, as the new Papyrus is to be called.

P⁴⁵, to begin with, is really antique. It has regularly *iota* adscript written after η and ω , but not after α : e.g. Lk x 12 $\epsilon\eta[\tau\eta]\nu\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta\eta$, and $\tau\upsilon\rho\omega$ for $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega$ in Lk x 13.⁴ There are a few breathings,

¹ Greek text in Migne *P. G.* iv 16-21. It is noteworthy that the Latin text, in so far as it is given from L₂, does not include all the Greek text, but omits just that part in which Maximus speaks of the attribution to Dionysius of the Areopagitic works (i.e. from $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\phi\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}$ *P. G.* iv 21A B).

² Grabmann, speaking (*loc. cit.*) of this Prologue of Maximus, says that it was already translated in the twelfth century, but he gives no evidence.

³ *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*: Fasc. 1, General Introduction with Twelve Plates; Fasc. II, Text of the Gospels and Acts (London, Emery Walker), 1933. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*, Schweich Lectures for 1932 (London, Milford), 1933.

⁴ In Mk ix 24 P⁴⁵ has . . . $\iota\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\iota$ for $\mu\omicron\nu$ $\tau\eta$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha$.

mostly over the article and other short words. $\overline{\text{IH}}$ stands for Ἰησοῦς , $\overline{\text{XP}}$ for Χριστοῦ (Acts xvi 18). In Lk x 15, the only place where Capharnaum occurs in P⁴⁵, the spelling is καφαρναογμ (*sic*). In John xi 49 we find καϊφας for Καϊάφας with D, the Latins and the Sahidic, also C twice.

But it would be a mistake to regard the witness of P⁴⁵ as decisive, or indeed as unbiased. We must remember that, if we regard the real 'neutral' text as unbiased, then we have (1) to consider to what extent B, or NB, is to be regarded as really 'neutral', and (2) to consider to what extent rejected readings of P⁴⁵ are to be regarded as really 'Caesarean', granted that 'Caesarean' is to be the label attached to the new Papyrus.

I.

B is a Bible: it contains many separate books, and the characteristics of B are not uniform throughout. In Ezekiel it seems a good text, in Isaiah it is distinctly bad. In Judges it exhibits a revision which differs altogether from the genuine text preserved in some minuscules and more or less attested by A. In Job, like other uncials, it has without note or warning the 400 extra half-verses added from Theodotion, which are absent from the genuine Old Latin.¹ Further, in Daniel it gives us the revised text of Theodotion, not the true LXX. Such a MS *may* have a naïvely unrevised text for the Gospels, but it is rather unlikely.

When we come to examine the text of the Gospels there is first of all the notorious case of Matt xxvii 49, where B with NCL and some minor witnesses insert a statement derived from John xix 34 about the piercing of our Lord's side. Here clearly the line of transmission represented by NB contains an error, which originally could not have come by a mere scribal blunder.

In Matt xxvii 16, 17, we find 'Jesus Barabbas' as an alternative in $\text{Ⓢ 1}^* \& \text{c syr. S}$ to 'Barabbas'. I must refer to my note in *Evangelion da-Mepharreshē* ii 277 for a full statement of the reasons which lead me here to prefer the longer reading. What I wish to point out now is that in *ver.* 17 the alternative readings are Βαραββάν and $\text{Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββάν}$. But B Origen have τὸν before Βαραββάν but without Ἰησοῦν . What does this mean? It means that B (or the immediate line of transmission represented by B) once had $\text{Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββάν}$, but that the name 'Jesus' has been cut out. This *is* conscious

¹ The 400 half-verses are also absent from the Sahidic, but it is possible that they were deliberately left out in translation as not genuine, in which case the Sahidic could not be quoted as 'unrevised'.

revision; a text which contains such evidence of conscious revision cannot rightly be labelled 'neutral'. Other examples of imperfect revision in B are Matt xxi 31 (ὑστερον), Matt xxiii 26 (αὐτοῦ), Lk xix 37 (πάντων): see *Ev. da-Meph.* ii 233.

B, then, is a revised text. But it would be a mistake to regard Hort's text of the Gospels as a revised transcript of B. There is generally other attestation, not only of its proper allies **N**, **LΞ**, the Egyptian versions, but also of either D and the Latins, or various 'Caesarean' authorities, or the Sinai Palimpsest. How ought we to interpret this 'subsidiary' attestation? In Lk xi 2-4 (the Lord's Prayer) P⁴⁶ is missing, but from the space it is clear that not all the three clauses were present. Other MSS omit as follows:

om. Our . . . which art in heaven	NB(L)	ι 22	700	lat.vg	syr.S
„ Thy will be done . . . earth	BL	ι 22		lat.vg	syr.SC
„ but deliver . . . evil	N*BL	ι 22	700	lat.vg	syr.S.

For the three readings, therefore, the true text is preserved by B with ι 22 lat.vg syr.S. Is this to be reckoned an 'Alexandrian' reading or a 'Caesarean' reading? What is to be the reconstructed *Caesarean* reading of the Lord's Prayer in St Luke?

In Lk xi 33 οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον is omitted by P⁴⁶ with ι & c 69 700, a characteristically 'Caesarean' group. The words are also omitted by syr.S and arm, and in syr.C are inserted in the wrong place, so that no doubt they were omitted by an ancestor of syr.C. It is likely enough that the omission is correct for the text of Luke, who may have disliked the idea of putting the lamp 'under the *modius*'. Be that as it may, how are we to explain that the group for omission also includes **LΞ** and the certainly Egyptian fragments edited by Amélineau in *Not. et Extr.* xxxiv, but not **N** or B? Is it not likely that Hort's 'Neutral Text' really omitted the clause, but that some reviser inserted into **N** and B the words from the parallel Matt v 15?

2.

What I have written hitherto is concerned with the 'Neutral' text, and particularly with the claim of B to represent it. 'Neutral', of course, is a question-begging epithet, but I am not sure what other word to use. I do not want to use 'Alexandrian', for cod. ι and syr.S are in no sense 'Alexandrian', and the last example shews, by the inclusion of **LΞ** and Amélineau's MS, that 'Caesarean' would be equally inappropriate.

Let us begin by a few characteristic readings of the new Papyrus, P⁴⁶.

Mk v 22 'Jaïrus by name'] P⁴⁵, i.e. ροϕ' is visible: *om. D a e f f i r.* The gap at the beginning does not allow us to decide whether P⁴⁵ had *ΩΙΟΝΟΜΑ* with W[Ⓞ] 565 700 (= Lk) or *ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ* with most MSS, but it is certain that the name Jaïrus was present.

Mk vii 31 *ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος*] NBLA 33 boh aeth D latt ^{Ⓞ^{13t}} 28 565 700 (*απο* for *εκ* Ⓞ 28 565): *εκ τ. ορ. Τ. και Σιδ. ηλθ. P⁴⁵ = ς* (incl. W 1 &c 13 &c), also syr.S.

I have no particular affection for ς (the Received or Byzantine text), but I cannot believe it is here the actual villain of the piece. P⁴⁵ here supports a wrong reading attested by important 'Caesarean' authorities, but other 'Caesarean' authorities agree with NB and the Latins also.

Mk ix 24 'straightway the father of the child cried out and said'] P⁴⁵ = NB A**C**LΔ W 28 700 & syr.S: + 'with tears' ς *rell*, incl. D latt. *exc. k.*

Here P⁴⁵ joins the 'neutral' band, and most 'Caesareans' (incl. Ⓞ-565) are with ς. Note that *εὐθύς* is read only by N[Ⓞ]B[Ⓞ]L[Ⓞ]Δ[Ⓞ], all others having *εὐθέως*; and for 'said' ς and most documents (incl. 28 and and 124) have *ἔλεγεν*, D Ⓞ 565 700 have *λέγει*, P⁴⁵ W and 13 &c have *εἶπεν*. Which is the 'Caesarean' reading here?

Lk ix 35 *ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος*] P⁴⁵ = NBLΞ, *ὁ ἐκλεκτός* Ⓞ 1 22*, *electus a f f l* syr.S: *ὁ ἀγαπητός* ς *rell*. (incl. W syr.C).¹

Lk ix 54 ff 'as Elias did' and 'ye know not what spirit ye are of'] *om. P⁴⁵ = NBLΞ lat.vg (codd. opt.) syr.S.*

Most Greek MSS have 'as Elias did', but omit in *ver.* 55 f; most Old Latin MSS omit 'as Elias did', but have the additions in *ver.* 55 f. Only those listed above omit in both places.

Lk x 41, 42 'Martha, Martha, &c.']['one thing is necessary' P⁴⁵ = ς (including most Caesarean MSS and syr.C): *om. lat.vt syr.S:* 'few things are necessary or one' NBC²L 33 and 1.

Here P⁴⁵ sides with the Caesareans, except cod. 1.

These readings illustrate the eclectic character of P⁴⁵. In most of them there is a serious doubt as to which reading ought to be put down as 'Caesarean'. And certainly it is not the Byzantine text, but an earlier ancestor of it, that has produced mixture. P⁴⁵, written about A.D. 240, is too early to be influenced by the Byzantine text, so that when it agrees with it the cause must be earlier. We cannot quite safely reconstruct the ancient Caesarean text from our late documents merely by rejecting Byzantine variants.

Let me repeat what I have said, to make myself clear. In the

¹ Kenyon (p. 14) does not notice this important variant. If so careful a scholar as Dr Kenyon overlooks such a variant we need not be surprised that here and there a MS that has undergone revision will present the text of the *other* family and not that of the revision!

middle ages the official Byzantine norm had great authority. If we are reconstructing from a number of minuscules of the 11th or 12th centuries the text of their common archetype, a MS of the 5th or 6th century, it is legitimate to take from among the variations of these late MSS the non-Byzantine reading found in one or some of the MSS as the readings of the archetype and to regard the Byzantine reading found in others as a new reading introduced from the Byzantine norm current when they were written. But when it comes to reconstructing from MSS which widely differ among themselves a hypothetical 3rd century type of text from which they are conceivably derived, the way is not so easy. In the early centuries, when most of the important variations took their rise 'the Byzantine text'—neither K^1 , nor K^x , nor 'the ecclesiastical text'—was not influential. I do not know when or where Lk x 42^a was reduced to 'one thing is necessary', but it was obviously prior to A.D. 240. I regard this reading as a corruption of the original reading, as I do the addition of the 'Longer Conclusion' to St Mark; but both corruptions are to be found in texts that go back to something like A.D. 200. Further, I would say that the few textual authorities that are free from these corruptions must have had a peculiar textual history.

I have, frankly, no constructional hypothesis to offer. But a textual theory which is to hold the field must be able to answer all objections. Above all, B and 'the neutral text' are not synonymous. It is easier, from some points of view, to reconstruct the original than some half-way house like the 'neutral' or the 'Caesarean' text, that contains some corruptions but not all.

3.

There are one or two peculiar readings in P⁴⁵ that are worthy of special notice.

Mk vi 45 εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν] om. εἰς το περαν P⁴⁵ = W 1 & c syr.S (and georg. cod. opt).

This omission is in my opinion correct, and εἰς τὸ πέραν a harmonistic addition made from Matt xiv 22. The omission in the Adysh codex of the Georgian shews that the omission in syr.S is no isolated freak, while the substitution of εἰς for πρὸς in 28 © 565 700 and Origen suggests that εἰς was the original and the earliest form of the interpolation was εἰς [τὸ πέραν πρὸς] B. In that case we may regard the πρὸς B. of W and P⁴⁵ as a correction of εἰς B., preserved by 1-209 alone.

Neither k nor e are extant here, but $b i l q$ have a *Bedsaida* for *ad B.* No doubt the confusion arises from the idea that the boat went right across the lake instead of coasting along by the shore till it ceased to

be a lake and became a river. Then, before the disciples got to Bethsaida, the heavy North wind came down and drove them back to where they had left Jesus.

Lk vi 48 *end.*] *om.* last clause P⁴⁵ = 700 syr.S. Most MSS add 'for it was founded on the rock' from Matt vii 25, while NBL³ 33 have 'for it was well builded'. 'Perhaps the reading of [700] here is the original one', remarked Mr H. C. Hoskier in 1890.

John xi 25 'I am the Resurrection'] *sic* (omitting 'and the Life') P⁴⁵ = *l** Cyp. 310 and syr.S. Perhaps *a** ought to be added, but the reading is not certain.

It may be worth while adding to these examples Lk xii 27, where P⁴⁵ agrees with NB, the 'Caesareans' and the Byzantines, in having a text almost exactly assimilated to the well-known words in Matt vi 28, but D *a* (*c*) syr.SC and Clement of Alexandria have 'spin and weave' for 'toil and spin'. On general grounds it is likely that the Western reading here is original, and it is supported by Clement. But P⁴⁵ here agrees with the majority of Greek MSS.

4.

Something may be said in conclusion about the other Chester Beatty Papyri, not yet published, but described in Sir Frederic Kenyon's Introductory volume. There are twelve MSS in all. First comes P⁴⁵, with which we have been occupied. Then, ten leaves of a Papyrus book of the Pauline Epistles, of the 3rd cent., and ten leaves of a MS of the Apocalypse, late 3rd cent. From the Old Testament we have 44 leaves of Genesis, of the 4th cent., and 22 leaves of another MS of Genesis, late 3rd cent.; 33 leaves of Numbers and Deuteronomy (with smaller fragments) 2nd cent.; 27 leaves of Isaiah, early 3rd cent.; one leaf of Jeremiah, early 3rd cent.; 16 leaves of Ezekiel and Esther, late 3rd cent.; one leaf and a half of Ecclesiasticus, of the 4th cent. Besides these there are 13 leaves of Daniel according to the LXX, early 3rd cent.; and 8 leaves, containing the end of Enoch followed by a Christian Homily, of the 4th or 5th cent.

The last two are particularly important. I give a collation with the Chigi MS of the leaf containing Dan. viii 24-27.

24 και ουκ εν τη ισχυι αυτου] <i>om.</i>	φθερει (10)]	+ και συνκεντησει τη
ισχυι εαυτου	25 αφανειει	26 πεπραγμενον (<i>sic</i>) ευρεθη

27 folld. by v 1.

The MS of Enoch agrees pretty closely with the Ethiopic, but not entirely, and scholars will watch eagerly for the full text both of this and of the Daniel. Meanwhile we must congratulate Mr Chester Beatty on his great find, and on having so competent and scholarly an editor as Sir Frederic Kenyon to give it to the world. F. C. BURKITT.