Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

HISTORICAL GREEK GRAMMAR AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

SOME time ago I was led by the consideration of certain passages in the ninth chapter of St John's Gospel to an investigation of the origin of the use of the genitive as a dative in Modern Greek, the results of which were embodied in an article 'Cases ancient and modern' in the *Classical Review* of November 1935. The point of this article, the arguments and conclusions of which had, as I afterwards learned, been to a large extent anticipated by M. Gustave Merlier in an article on 'le remplacement du datif par le génitif en grec moderne' in the *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* of 1931, is that this Modern Greek phenomenon is the culmination of an evolution which may be seen in progress in the New Testament, in Plato and Herodotus, and even, in germ, in Homer. There existed in fact, from a very early date, a certain hesitation between the genitive and the dative in cases where a noun or pronoun might be held to stand in the relation of indirect object to a verb and in a possessive relation to another member of the sentence. Herodotus seems to have preferred the genitive. Plato in some places alternated genitive and dative in a manner which it is difficult to justify logically, but which certainly gives great vivacity to his style. This usage produced a sort of genitive with double function, which it will be convenient to call the 'dative genitive'. At the beginning of the Christian era this construction was well established in the κοινή, and is the most probable explanation of a number of genitives in the New Testament, whose position in the sentence has sometimes been otherwise explained or left unexplained. It was in fact so well established that the really incorrect use of the genitive for the dative had already begun to appear in papyri and inscriptions. My reason for returning to the subject now is that a further study of many of the New Testament examples, with a comparison of the various readings exhibited by the MSS, has not only confirmed my belief in the soundness of my conclusions, but suggested to me that the point is perhaps not without importance for textual criticism.

The passage which started me on my investigation is John ix 6, the latter part of which reads in the Textus Receptus ἐπέχρισε τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, in ℵ ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, in B ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, and in D ἐπέχρισεν αὐτῷ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, while the Vulgate, with some older Latin versions, reads *linivit lutum super oculos eius*.

The αὐτοῦ of ℵB has puzzled generations of scholars. Pallis, who translated the passage quite naturally τούβαλε τῇ λάσπῃ στὰ μάτια ἀπάνου, nevertheless in his *Notes on St John* says: 'respecting αὐτοῦ

Bloomfield remarks with reason that it is in opposition to *usus linguae*, since ἐπιχρίω is never construed with the genitive. Nor can it be construed with ὀφθαλμούς: where it stands it must be construed either with ἐπέχρισεν or with πηλόν. D gives αὐτῷ, which makes the syntax unobjectionable'. Blass says that this αὐτοῦ represents an old dative. It is clearly a case in which Plato might have used either a genitive or a dative. But whether we read αὐτῷ or αὐτοῦ, the pronoun is syntactically as much a dative as many examples that might be found in Modern Greek, and in a Modern Greek sentence would take a second possessive genitive after ὀφθαλμούς as naturally as in such sentences as μοῦ πονεῖ τὸ κεφάλι μου or τοῦ φέρνει τὸ παιγνίδι του. And ἐπέχρισεν (or ἐπέθηκεν) αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ would account perfectly for all the other variants. The double genitive would suggest different emendations to different scribes or editors. One would convert the first into a dative, hence the D reading. Another would strike out the second, hence the reading of ℵ and B. A third would strike out the first, hence the reading which underlies the Latin versions. Finally, the pronoun so far removed from its antecedent would seem ambiguous, hence the revision which appears in the Textus Receptus, which may very well have been originally a marginal gloss.

Such a reading does in fact exist. It is found in N, the famous Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, which reads ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ. Moreover, it would seem that it was in a text with this reading that the gloss τοῦ τυφλοῦ was inserted, for Codex A reads ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ. This reading is the basis of the Gothic version *gasmait imma ana augona þata fani þamma blindin*, which takes it back to the fourth century. It will be observed that the Gothic has a dative in both instances, which of course proves nothing as to the case in the Greek original. In the Latin versions also a Greek genitive is often represented by a dative, as in John xiii 6 *Tu mihi lavas pedes?* So in John ix 10 D reads in the Greek πῶς οὖν ἠνεῴχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, and in the Latin *Quomodo aperti sunt tibi oculi?* A Latin translator, unless he were an unintelligent literalist, could only translate such a genitive by a dative. The A reading, therefore, is not later than the fourth century, and may even have been that of the ancestor of ℵB, the disappearance of τοῦ τυφλοῦ being due to a line omission. Lines of nine letters were not infrequent in early MSS. A few sentences farther on *v.* 15 has the following variants: πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς in ℵBLXΓΛΠ unc⁷ al. plu., πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς in HN al. pauc., μου ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς in A, ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου in D al. mu., and finally πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου in Δ. Δ is of course a ninth century MS, but

one which preserves many old readings.   There is a whole series of
dative genitives in this chapter.   One of them, *v.* 10, has an alternative
reading σοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί in a few minuscules.

Another example of the construction, extraordinarily rich in variants
between genitive and dative, is found in Mark ii, Matt. ix, and Luke v.
The following are the most important readings, leaving out of account
the different forms of the verb :

Mark ii :

<div style="margin-left:2em">

5. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   A C³ E H K M² S U V Γ Π al. plu. (text. rec.)
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   C* al. pauc.
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אB D G L Δ 1. 33. 69. 102 al.[10] fere

9. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   al. pauc.
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   A C D S Γ Δ al. vix mu. (text. rec.)
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אB E F G H K L M U V Π 1. al.[130] fere

Matt. ix :

2. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   E F K L S U V X Π al. plu. (text. rec.)
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   D Δ²
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אB C Δ* 1. 33. 209 al. plus[10]

5. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   al.[10] fere
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   N S U Δ Π 1 al. mu. (text. rec.)
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אB C D E F K L M V X al.[100] fere

Luke v :

20. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   A B C E K L M N S U V X Γ Δ Λ Ξ Π 1. al. pler.
                           (text. rec.)
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   yˢᶜʳ
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אD Fᵂ al.[7]

23. σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου   A B E K L M S U V Γ Δ Ξ Π 1. al. pler. (text.
                           rec.)
    σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   N al. pauc.
    σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι   אD 48ᵉᵛ

</div>

The most remarkable thing about these passages, however, is that every
one of them, except Matt. ix 5, has a reading in one or more MSS with
both a dative genitive and a possessive genitive.

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Mark ii 5   σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου M* 28. 346 al.[10]
      9   ,,   ,,   247. 258 al.
Matt. ix 2   ,,   ,,   M N al.[10] fere
Luke v 20   ,,   ,,   al.[4]
      23   ,,   ,,   C F ᵂX Λ 33. 346 al.[5]

</div>

There has no doubt been a certain amount of assimilation here, and
there is always a possibility that the more vernacular forms are Mark's
and the more literary ones corrections by Matthew or Luke or both.
It is curious, however, that the oldest of the readings with the double
genitive is found in Luke, in which it is attested by C.   All the others

are in later MSS, the earliest being N in Matt. ix 2. Luke, moreover, makes considerable use of the dative genitive. One remarkable example is vii 44–48. Here the phrase which B gives as ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας has a number of varied readings. It is μοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας in x 33 cat[ox 62], ἐπὶ πόδας μοι in D, μου ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας in אLΞ, and ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου in A I P and many more, including the Textus Receptus. The Gothic, however, gives *wato mis ana fotuns meinans ni gaft*, which clearly suggests a reading μοι (or μου) ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου. This would also take us back to the fourth century, but leaves the choice open between μοι and μου. There are, however, at least two other examples in fourth century MSS of the double genitive construction. Codex B reads in Matt. xvii 15 ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱόν μου, while א has in Luke vi 47 the reading ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων μου. In both cases a later hand has deleted the second μου.

The question therefore still remains: did this fourth-century construction exist at the time that the Gospels were written? The later practice, coupled with the usage in Plato and Herodotus and such a passage as Odyssey iv 703–705, seems to me to make it not improbable. Moreover, the σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι readings in so many texts give considerable transmissional probability to σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου. It must be noted, however, that of the MSS which give this reading M in Mark ii 5 has the first σου corrected to σοι by a later hand, while the same MS reads σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in *v*. 9. In Matt. ix M has this reading in *v*. 2, but σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in *v*. 5, N has it in *v*. 2, but σοι in *v*. 5, while C X and Λ, which have the double genitive in Luke v 23, read σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in *v*. 20. It may be, therefore, that the first σου in all these readings is a slip.

A careful examination of the attestation of all the other readings in these passages shews a great preponderance of evidence, as regards numbers at least, in favour of the traditional reading in Luke, and in favour of σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in the first sentence and σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in the second in Mark and Matthew. That is to say, wherever there are two pronouns, the first is in the dative, while where there is only one it is in the genitive. A 'weighted' analysis of the evidence leads to somewhat similar results. The Textus Receptus reads σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in the first place and σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in the second place in Mark and Matthew, and σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in both places in Luke, and it will be generally assumed that this represents the Byzantine reading. If, however, the prevalent critical opinion is right in regarding E F G H K M S U V and the majority of the later minuscules as the great authorities for the Byzantine text, and still more if Canon Streeter is right in finding its best representatives in E S V, this is clearly one of the many cases in which the Textus Receptus diverges from the

Byzantine text, which in Mark and Matthew gives in the first place σοι
αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου and in the second σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, while in Luke it agrees
with the Textus Receptus.   A is of course wanting for Matthew, but in
Mark and Luke it supports the Textus Receptus.   ℵ reads σου αἱ
ἁμαρτίαι in all six places, B gives σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in both places in Mark
and Matthew and goes over to the received text in Luke, while L has
σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in both places in Mark, σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου and σου αἱ
ἁμαρτίαι in Matthew, and σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in both places in Luke.
D reads σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in Mark ii 5 and σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in Mark ii 9 ;
in Matt. ix it gives σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in *v.* 2 and σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in *v.* 5,
while in Luke it reads σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in both places.   It is curious to
note that the Latin text of D reads *tibi peccata tua* in the first place and
tibi peccata in the second in all three Gospels.

It is difficult to draw any conclusion from all this as to the original
text, but it strongly suggests that over the whole period covered by the
MSS the dative genitive was in common use, but that it was not
regarded as correct except where it really did duty as both dative and
genitive, and not as a dative pure and simple.   This is confirmed by
three interesting passages in Clement of Alexandria, which appear to be
indirect quotations of Matt. ix 29, which shew also how readily dative
and genitive were interchangeable in such phrases :

Γενηθήτω κατὰ τὴν πίστιν σου Paed. I vi 29 (115).
Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν σου γενηθήτω σοι Strom. II xi 49 (454).
Γενηθήτω σου κατὰ τὴν πίστιν Exc. ex Theod. 9 (969).

If this was also the state of the language in the first century, the double
genitive construction is conceivable in Mark and John, less likely in
Matthew, and improbable in Luke.   That is the most that can be said
until some positive evidence is forthcoming of its use in the first
century or earlier.   Until then the primitive form of the Synoptic
passage cannot be more precisely determined, and it is impossible to
feel certain whether D or N gives the oldest form of John ix 6.

There is another interesting example in Luke xix 23, which reads
διατί οὐκ ἔδωκάς μου τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τράπεζαν ; in ℵABL and several
minuscules, τὸ ἀργύριόν μου in DRΓΔΛΠ unc⁹ al. plu., and μου τὸ
ἀργύριόν μου in N.   In another place, Matt. viii 15, N joins hands with
what Moulton calls ' the more illiterate papyri and inscriptions ' and
reads διηκόνει αὐτῶν.

All this may seem very inconclusive and to raise more problems than
it solves.   I think, however, it sufficiently demonstrates the importance
for the criticism of the New Testament text of a fuller understanding
of the linguistic conditions in which that text was produced and trans-
mitted.   C. C. TARELLI.