



BRILL

---

Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels

Author(s): Peter M. Head

Source: *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 35, Fasc. 2 (Apr., 1993), pp. 105-129

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1560881>

Accessed: 09-04-2020 05:06 UTC

## REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/1560881?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1560881?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Brill* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Novum Testamentum*

# CHRISTOLOGY AND TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION: REVERENTIAL ALTERATIONS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

by

PETER M. HEAD

London

## 1. *Introduction*

There were many sources of error in the transmission of NT texts, and they are usually grouped into two types: unintentional errors (e.g. mistaken letters, homoioteleuton, haplography, mishearing vowels, assimilation); and intentional errors (e.g. 'correcting' spelling, harmonising, historical clarifications, conflation, addition of detail). One group of intentional changes often referred to is 'alterations made because of doctrinal considerations.' According to Metzger, there are two types of such alteration: 'those which involve the elimination or alteration of what was regarded as doctrinally unacceptable or inconvenient, and those which introduce into the Scriptures 'proof' for a favourite theological tenet or practice.'<sup>1</sup>

A summary of this type of alteration is provided by Williams, who refers to 'tendencious [sic], reverential and doctrinal alterations' which raise 'the most fascinating problems in the whole field of the textual criticism of the New Testament.'<sup>2</sup> He offers examples of passages altered and omitted because they didn't fit with the theology of the scribes (including Luke 22:43 f.—omitted because of its christology; and 23:24—omitted by scribes because Jesus' prayer had not been answered).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> B.M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (NY & Oxford: OUP, 1968, 2nd ed.) 201.

<sup>2</sup> C.S.C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1951) 5.

<sup>3</sup> See Williams, *Alterations*, 6-9, also pp. 25-53. Other passages are discussed in L.E. Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century* (Harv. Hist. Mon. 25; Camb., Mass: Harvard UP, 1952) 58-68; cf. also M.R. Pelt, *Textual Variation in Relation to Theological Interpretation in the New Testament* (PhD, Duke University, 1966).

The aim of this article is to examine examples of christologically motivated alterations to the texts of the synoptic gospels, and to assess the extent of such alterations and the means by which scribes adapted their texts in support of (or under the influence of) later christological positions. We shall focus in particular on the period up until AD 300—commonly regarded as the period of greatest divergence in the transmission of the NT text.

## 2. *The History of Discussion*

It should not be supposed that the early Fathers were ignorant of the problems associated with the multiplicity of texts of the NT, and of ensuring that accurate copies were made.<sup>4</sup> The almost unanimous opinion of the Fathers was that NT texts were affected by ‘christological alterations’ made by scribes. This opinion normally appears to have been expressed in the course of accusing heretics of shaping the text to suit their own interests.

Of course, even in the NT itself there are suggestions of mis-handling and mis-interpretation of the texts (2 Tim. 2:17 f; 3:8; 2 Peter 3:16; Rev. 22:18 f). Both Polycarp (ca AD 120)<sup>5</sup> and Dionysius (ca 170)<sup>6</sup> refer to those who pervert and falsify the Gospels.<sup>7</sup> Eusebius also preserves portions of an anonymous

<sup>4</sup> B.M. Metzger, ‘The Practice of Textual Criticism Among the Church Fathers’, *New Testament Studies; Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (NTTS X; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 189–198.

<sup>5</sup> ‘... whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (μεθοδεύη τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου) to his own lusts and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the first-born of Satan’ (Polycarp, *Phil.* 7:1). J.B. Lightfoot suggests that Polycarp here refers to perverse interpretations of the discourses of the Lord (*The Apostolic Fathers, Part II. S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp* [3 vols; Macmillan & Co., 1889, 2nd ed.] volume 3.335). The usage of μεθοδεύη would support this (G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961] 839; cf. the complaints of Irenaeus against the gnostics *Adv. Haer.* 1.3.6; 8.1, and also Clement, *Strom.* 3.4.39; and the Marcosians: Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.20.2). The λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου of this passage could be a reference to the sayings of Jesus, but it is more likely that written documents are in mind here (cf. the use of λόγια in 1 Clement 13:4—where it appears to refer back both to the words of Jesus and ‘that which is written’ in 13:1; 19:1; 53:1—where τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ stands parallel to τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς; 62:4; cf. also 2 Clem. 13:3; and Papias’ famous statement quoted in Eus., *EH* III.39.16 concerning Matthew’s Gospel).

<sup>6</sup> Eus., *EH* IV.23.12: ‘some have gone about to falsify even the scriptures of the Lord’.

<sup>7</sup> On these and many of the following passages see further E. Nestle, *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899, 2nd

account of some disciples of Theodotus the Cobbler (ca 200), who corrupted their copies of the scriptures (*EH* V.28.16 f).

**Origen** (185-254) argued that the variant which adds the name 'Jesus' to Barabbas in Matt. 27:16 & 17 is the work of heretics (because the name 'Jesus' could not apply to evildoers).<sup>8</sup> Similarly, 'the enemies of the church altered the text [of Luke 23:45] in order to be able to use it as a point of attack on the Gospels.'<sup>9</sup> As we shall see, however, the evidence available to us suggests that in both these cases he was wrong.

**Epiphanius** (315-403) is one of several in the early church to argue that Luke 22:43 f. was omitted by orthodox scribes because of embarrassment over its Christology.<sup>10</sup> **Ambrose** (339-397) argued that Arians had corrupted the Gospels by inserting 'nor the Son' into Matt. 24:36 (*De fide* V.16); and by erasing a phrase from John 3:6: 'because the Spirit is God, and is born of God' (*De spiritu* III.10). All three of these accusations were mistaken. Whatever solution is proposed for the first two, both variants were certainly in existence in the second century. In addition, Ambrose's phrase in John 3:6 is exceedingly rarely supported in the manuscripts.<sup>11</sup>

ed.) 161-170; E.S. Buchanan, 'Ancient Testimony to the Early Corruption of the Gospels', *BibSac* 73 (1916) 177-191; A. Bludau, *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik der Bibel* (NTAbh XI.5; Münster, 1925). I have not had access to M.A. Siotis, "Περὶ τῶν δογματικῶν παραλλαγῶν τοῦ κειμένου τῆς ΚΔ", *Επιστημονικὴ ἐπετηρὶς τῆς θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς ... Ἀθηνῶν 1957/1958* (Athens, 1960) 359-408.

<sup>8</sup> Origen, *Matt. Comm. ser.*, 121; see Metzger, 'Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts', *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (NTTS VIII; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 94.

<sup>9</sup> Origen, *Matt. Comm. ser.*, 134; this concerns the two readings: τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπνόντος (*sole deficiente*) [P<sup>75</sup> 01 B etc.], and καὶ ἐσκοτισθῇ ὁ ἡλῖος (*et obscuratus est sol*) [A K W X ...f<sup>3</sup> it syr etc.]. Origen favoured the latter, arguing that opponents had included the former because an eclipse is impossible at the time of a full moon (see Metzger, 'Origen', 96). For the originality of the former see 'Notes on Select Readings', B.F. Westcott & F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Volume 2; London: Macmillan, 1896, 2nd ed.) 69-71.

<sup>10</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 31: 'the orthodox removed the passage out of fear because they did not understand its perfection and strength.' On the later writers—Anastasius Sinaita (7th Cent.) in *Hodegos*, 148; and Photius (9th Cent.) in *Epistle 138 to Theodore*—see C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Editio octava critica maior; Vol. 1; Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869, 8th ed.) 694 f., and B.D. Ehrman & M.A. Plunkett, 'The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44', *CBQ* 45 (1983) 405.

<sup>11</sup> It probably arose from Tertullian, *De carne* 18.

Similar statements (and inaccuracies) can be found in the later Fathers.<sup>12</sup>

The Fathers appear to be 'blind guides' in this area; the accusations of falsification relate (if they have any basis at all) to selection from available readings rather than invention of heretical texts or omission of orthodox ones. Nevertheless they have pointed us to several important passages, the retention or omission of which had christological consequences.

Richard Simon noted these ancient accusations in 1689 (discussing 1 John 5:7; John 7:39; John 3:6 and 1 John 4:3):

'So soon as there is a difference perceived in Copies, if this difference do favour the Opinions of some Party, they will be sure to accuse that Party of corrupting the Sacred Writings, although that difference does for the most part come from the Transcribers.'<sup>13</sup>

In his opinion, the difficult texts provoked marginal annotations explaining the difficulty, which passed into the text at the hand of scribes.<sup>14</sup>

The view that doctrinal alterations have affected the NT text was first formally proposed as an element in the evaluation of variants by Wettstein in 1730. He states the principle as follows: 'Of two variant readings, that which seems more orthodox is not immediately to be preferred.'<sup>15</sup> He explains that 'more orthodox'

<sup>12</sup> Socrates on 1 John 4:3 (*Eccl. Hist.* VII.32. and B.D. Ehrman, '1 Joh. 4 3 and the Orthodox Corruption of Scripture', ZNW 79 [1988] 229); cf. also Augustine, *Confessions*, V.11 (on the general question of asserting corruption by one's opponents even without evidence); Liberatus, *Breviarium* ch 19 (PL 68, 969 ff. on 1 Tim. 3:16; see J.J. Wettstein, *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Novum Testamentum Graecum* [Amsterdam: Dommerian, 1751-1752] vol. 2.330 f.); Theodore Chrtzenavor [sic] (8th Cent.) who argued that Docetists cut out Luke 22:43 f. (F.C. Conybeare, 'On the Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark's Gospel', *The Expositor* 5th Series, volume II [1895] 405).

<sup>13</sup> R. Simon, *A Critical History of the Text of the New Testament* (London: R. Taylor, 1689) Part II.123.

<sup>14</sup> 'Quand les mots du Texte sont équivoques, ou trop généraux, on les éclaircit dans les Scolies; & quand cet éclaircissement consiste en peu de mots, la Scolie passe facilement dans le texte.' R. Simon, *Histoire critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam: R. Leers, 1689) 355.

<sup>15</sup> Wettstein, *NTG* (1751 f.) 2.864: 'Inter duas variantes Lectiones ea, quae magis Orthodoxa videtur, non est protinus alteri praeferenda' (This section 'Animadversiones ...' *NTG* 2.851-874 corresponds to his earlier *Prolegomena ad Novi Testamenti graeci editionem accuratissimam* ... [Amsterdam, 1730] 165-201). In his explanation of this principle he argues (#3) that since the orthodox had possession of the MSS it was impossible for the heterodox to corrupt them. He also shows (#4) that editors and copyists changed the texts of the Fathers, and accommodated

readings are those which favour one side of a doctrinal dispute over the other, while 'less orthodox' readings favour neither side. This principle, he argues, is important in evaluating Luke 22:43; 1 Cor. 10:9; 1 Tim. 3:16; Acts 20:28; 1 John 5:7; and Jude 4.

**Griesbach** repeats this principle: 'where there are more readings than one at any place, that reading which favours orthodoxy is an object of suspicion.'<sup>16</sup> While this principle could be said to be a corollary of Bengel's maxim: 'Proclivi scriptiōni praestat ardua' ['the difficult is to be preferred to the easy reading'],<sup>17</sup> Bengel himself does not discuss this principle, nor do Tischendorf or Tregelles. Of other textual critics before Westcott and Hort, Scrivener does not regard it as a generally acceptable rule, but he does allow that it accounts for a few variants.<sup>18</sup>

**Burgon** argued against the principle, calling it a 'monstrous Canon.'<sup>19</sup> Burgon's position is, however, inconsistent, since in various places he argues that both heretics and orthodox did corrupt the NT text in various ways.<sup>20</sup> A major turning point appears in **Hort's** rejection of the principle in 1881. He stated: 'even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes.'<sup>21</sup> He argues that dogmatic preferences influ-

---

them to orthodox formulae that were used later (hence we should expect similar changes made to the NT). For an English summary see C.L. Hulbert-Powell, *John James Wettstein, 1693-1754: An Account of his Life, Work, and some of his Contemporaries* (London: SPCK, n.d. = 1938?) 118 f.

<sup>16</sup> J.J. Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (London: P. Elmsly, 1796, 2nd ed.) vol I.LXII: 'Inter plures unius loci lectiones ea pro suspecta merito habetur, quae orthodoxorum dogmatibus manifeste prae caeteris favet.' I am indebted to my friend Dr. P.E. Satterthwaite for the translations from Wettstein and Griesbach.

<sup>17</sup> J.A. Bengel, *Η Καινή Διαθήκη. Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Tübingen: I.G. Cotta, 1734) 433.

<sup>18</sup> F.H.A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the use of Biblical students* (ed. E. Miller; 2 vols; London: George Bell & Sons, 1894, 4th ed.) vol. 2.251 f.

<sup>19</sup> J.W. Burgon, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established* (ed. E. Miller; London: George Bell & Sons, 1896) 66.

<sup>20</sup> J.W. Burgon, *The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (ed. E. Miller; London: G. Bell & Sons, 1896) 191-210 on heretical groups; pp. 211-231 on orthodox. Examples of orthodox corruption include Luke 2:40 (p. 212 ff.); John 8:40 (p. 214 f.); 1:18 (pp. 215-218, also *Traditional*, 113 f.); 1 Cor. 15:47 (pp. 219-222).

<sup>21</sup> Hort, *Introduction*, 282.

enced the *choice* (by theologian and scribe) between rival readings, but did not cause the *invention* of readings.<sup>22</sup>

Hort's statement was challenged by Harris,<sup>23</sup> Howard,<sup>24</sup> Conybeare,<sup>25</sup> and Lake<sup>26</sup> (among them some of the most important textual critics of the early twentieth century). While many of the passages examined by these four (which were meant to show concrete examples of doctrinal alteration at work) have never been generally accepted; the principle that scribes *did* alter the NT text for dogmatic purposes appears to be accepted in most of the standard works of this century.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Hort, *Introduction*, 283. This conclusion was echoed by J.M. Bebb, 'The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament', *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1890) 224-226.

<sup>23</sup> J.R. Harris, *Side-Lights on New Testament Research* (Angus Lectures for 1908; London: Kingsgate Press, n.d.) 29-35. He expresses astonishment at Hort's statements and finds examples of dogmatic alterations not only in the theologically motivated works of both Marcion and Tatian, but also in variants at Luke 4:16; 22:43 f.; 23:34.

<sup>24</sup> W.F. Howard, 'The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament', London Quarterly and Holborn Review Sixth Series, Vol. 10 (1941) 1-16. He discusses (following Harris): Luke 4:16; John 1:34; Luke 22:43 f.; 23:34. He argues that there was a 'tendency on the part of the scribes to insert in the text of the Gospels what they knew to be established in the belief and practice of the Church' (p. 12, examples Matt. 1:16; John 1:12 f.; 1 John 4:2; Heb. 2:8-10; 5:7-9).

<sup>25</sup> F.C. Conybeare, 'Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels', HibJ 1 (1902) 96-113. He discusses Matt. 1:16; 28:19; 19:17; he argues that Hort was wrong, but that the Church did not let too many instances survive in the manuscripts: they must more likely be recovered from the Fathers. Conybeare had previously argued that the Eusebian reading of Matt. 28:19 (πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, διδάσκοντες ...) represented the original text. This original (not attested in any manuscript of Matthew) had been altered by orthodox scribes, and brought into line with orthodox trinitarian baptismal theology ('The Eusebian Form of the Text Matth. 28, 19', ZNW 2 [1901] 275-288; also *History of New Testament Criticism* [London: Watts & Co., 1910] 74-77).

<sup>26</sup> K. Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* ('Inaugural Lecture before the University of Leyden, Jan 27, 1904'; Oxford: Parker & Sons, 1904). He added to Conybeare's discussion with examples from Mark 16:16; Acts 8; John 3:5, where details drawn from ecclesiastical usage have been added to the text; he also accepts that only the slightest manuscript evidence is needed.

<sup>27</sup> M. Goguel, *Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1920) 64-67; D. Plooij, *Tendentieus Varianten in den Text der Evangelien* (Leiden: Brill, 1926); K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament* (rev. S. New; London, 1928, 6th ed.) 6; L. Vaganay, *Initiation à la critique textuelle néotestamentaire* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1934) 53 f.; A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (rev. C.S.C.

An example of contemporary thought is the *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* edited by Metzger as an expression of the deliberations of the committee who decided upon the UBS text. In this work we find references to the suppression of readings 'for reverential considerations', the omission of doctrinally difficult words, and to 'secondary improvement(s), introduced from a sense of reverence for the person of Jesus.'<sup>28</sup>

While the principle is thus now relatively well-established for most of the NT,<sup>29</sup> no thorough investigation of the evidence of the manuscripts and variants of the synoptic gospels has yet been carried out. In what follows we shall firstly investigate the christological *Tendenz* of some early gospel manuscripts, and secondly collect and discuss (under several headings) groups of variants which exhibit similar christological influences.

### 3. *The Evidence of Particular Early Manuscripts*

Gospel manuscripts from the second century are very scarce, with only two fragments of John's Gospel definitely written before AD 200 (i.e. P<sup>52</sup> and P<sup>90</sup>). While manuscripts of the synoptic Gospels are extant from around 200, they are generally too fragmentary to provide clear evidence of scribal christological tendencies. Indeed, of all the synoptic manuscripts which can be

---

Williams; London: Duckworth, 1954, 2nd ed.) 106; H.J. Vogels, *Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1955, 2nd ed.) 178-182; J.H. Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 68; Nestle, *Einführung*, 161 f.; Metzger, Williams and Wright referred to earlier.

<sup>28</sup> B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: UBS, 1975) 68 on Matt. 27:16; p. 62 on Matt. 24:36 and p. 235 on John 11:33. Also see the discussions of 'Western non-interpolations' (p. 193), and John 7:8 (p. 216).

<sup>29</sup> Important studies include A. von Harnack, 'Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Würdigung der ältesten lateinischen Überlieferung und der Vulgata', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie* (1915) 534-573, and 'Zwei alte dogmatische Korrekturen im Hebräerbrief', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie* (1929) 62-73; E.J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (SNTSMS 3; Cambridge: CUP, 1966); G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (Schweich Lectures 1946; London: British Academy, 1953); B.D. Ehrman, '1 Joh 4 3 and the Orthodox Corruption of Scripture', *ZNW* 79 (1988) 221-243.



dated to the fourth century or earlier,<sup>30</sup> only two (P<sup>45</sup> & P<sup>75</sup>, both of the third century) contain more than a chapter.<sup>31</sup>

P<sup>45</sup> (Chester Beatty II) is a single codex containing portions of all four Gospels and Acts (including Matt. 20:24-32; 21:13-19; 25:41-26:39; Mark 4:36-9:31; 11:27-12:28; Luke 6:31-7:7; 9:26-14:33). While the text has similarities with "Caesarean" witnesses (such as W, Θ, f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>13</sup>), especially in Mark,<sup>32</sup> it can only be described as presenting a mixed text-type overall.<sup>33</sup> The scribe was careful and consistent, described by Kenyon as 'a competent scribe.'<sup>34</sup> Studies of the singular readings of P<sup>45</sup> have found evidence of the scribe's omissions, clarifications, stylistic improvements and harmonisations,<sup>35</sup> but no distinctive christological tendency emerges.<sup>36</sup>

P<sup>75</sup> (Bodmer Papyri XIV & XV) contains portions of Luke 3-24 and John 1-15. Its text is, in general, very close to Vaticanus (but 200 years earlier) and has thus provided evidence for the early existence of a "Neutral" or Alexandrian text-type.<sup>37</sup> The singular

---

<sup>30</sup> **Matthew:** P<sup>1</sup>, P<sup>25</sup>, P<sup>35</sup>, P<sup>37</sup>, P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>53</sup>, P<sup>62</sup>, P<sup>64</sup>(= +67), P<sup>70</sup>, P<sup>71</sup>, P<sup>77</sup>, P<sup>86</sup>. **Mark:** P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>88</sup>. **Luke:** P<sup>4</sup>, P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>69</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> The fragmentary synoptic manuscripts exhibit no christological alterations. See P.M. Head, 'Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the "Scribal Habits"', *Biblica* 71 (1990) 240-247.

<sup>32</sup> F.G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus II. The Gospels and Acts. 1. Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1933) xv; Metzger, *Text*, 37.

<sup>33</sup> C.C. Tarelli, 'The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text', *JTS* 40 (1939) 46-55; B. & K. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans & Leiden: Brill, 1987) 99 (Aland disputes the existence of an identifiable Caesarean text on p. 66). See also Kenyon, *Chester Beatty II.1*, xv f.

<sup>34</sup> Kenyon, *Chester Beatty II.1*, ix; so also G. Zuntz, 'Reconstruction of one Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospels and Acts', *Chronique d'Égypte* 26 (1951) 192 f.

<sup>35</sup> J.R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (ThD, Graduate Theological Union; UMI, 1981) 88-181 [a complete list of singular readings pp. 91-119]; also E.C. Colwell, 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text', *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (ed. J.P. Hyatt; Nashville, 1965) 383-385; M.J. Lagrange, 'Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles', *RB* 43 (1934) 5-41.

<sup>36</sup> Variations (from NA<sup>26</sup>) held in common with other mss include the addition of ο Ἰησους (at Matt. 26:25; Mark 9:2,19) and the omission of same (Matt. 26:36; Luke 13:12). At Luke 9:59 it has κυριε (probably original), at 10:39 it has του Ἰησου (in a notorious split decision) and at 10:41 it has ο κυριος (on the other side of another crux); cf. also Matt. 20:30 where it supports κυριε. At Luke 9:33,49 the characteristically Lukan term επιστατα is altered to διδασκαλε (with a few other mss).

<sup>37</sup> V. Martin & R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV. Evangiles de Luc et Jean. Tome I Papyrus Bodmer XIV. Evangile de Luc chap. 3-24* (Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana,

readings of P<sup>75</sup> reveal the scribe to be basically careful, prone to omit rather than add, and to introduce harmonisations (often to the immediate context).<sup>38</sup> M.C. Parsons has suggested that the scribe of P<sup>75</sup> tended to 'heighten or elevate the Christology of Luke,'<sup>39</sup> and is actually responsible for the long readings of the 'Western non-interpolations' in Luke 24. Although it is true (as we shall see) that some of the Western non-interpolations may helpfully be approached from the point of view of theological tendency, the point of divergence must be earlier than P<sup>75</sup>. The examples of christological interest in the singular variants of P<sup>75</sup> adduced by Parsons are far from convincing.<sup>40</sup> In short, while several of the singular readings may reflect interesting theological tendencies,<sup>41</sup> there is no evidence for ascribing the christological alterations to this particular scribe.

A clear christological tendency is found in some later manuscripts of the gospels (e.g. W, D, 2614);<sup>42</sup> and in P<sup>72</sup> (ca 200), which

---

1961) 29; C.M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (AB 26; Rome: PIB, 1966); G.D. Fee, 'P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup> and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria', *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. R.N. Longenecker & M.C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 19-45, esp. 24-28.

<sup>38</sup> Royse, *Habits* 512-592; Colwell, 'Habits', 385 f. Royse lists the singular readings on pp. 516-532; selective lists for singular and sub-singular readings in Luke are also provided by Martini, *Problema*, 184-187.

<sup>39</sup> M.C. Parsons, 'A Christological Tendency in P<sup>75</sup>', JBL 105 (1986) 463-479, quotation from 471.

<sup>40</sup> The reading of ερεθη in Luke 16:30,31 reveals an interest in the resurrection, but is not clearly christologically based; the examples cited from 9:34; 22:47; 24:27 (Parsons, 'Christological', 473) are irrelevant. Parsons' argument is vitiated by his insistence on *lectior breuior potior* (on which see Head, 'Observations'). The more basic problem, explaining how all the non-Western text-traditions could be influenced by a redactor/scribe of AD 200, is nowhere dealt with. See K. Aland, 'Die Bedeutung des P<sup>75</sup> für den Text des Neuen Testaments. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der "Western non-interpolations"', *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (ANTTF 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 155-172 for discussion (including very helpful presentations of the witnesses for and against the 'Western non-interpolations').

<sup>41</sup> As already argued by K.W. Clark, 'The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament', JBL 85 (1966) 14 f.; reprinted in *The Gentile Bias and other Essays* (NovTSupp 54; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 104-119.

<sup>42</sup> W (see L.W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark* [SD 43; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981] 77-79, 87), D (G.E. Rice, 'Is Bezae a Homogeneous Codex?', *Perspectives on the New Testament* [FS F. Stagg; ed. C.H. Talbert; Macon, MA: Mercer UP, 1985] 39-54, esp. 46-50), and 2614 (E.W. Saunders, 'Studies in Doctrinal Influence on the Byzantine Text of the Gospels', JBL 71 [1952] 85-92).

exhibits, in three singular readings (at 1 Peter 5:1a; 2 Peter 1:2b; Jude 5b), alterations based on belief in the deity of Christ.<sup>43</sup>

In order to assess the types of alterations made in the texts of the synoptic gospels by early scribes, we shall isolate those variants which arose during the second and third centuries and which might have christological importance. Variants are identified as early on the basis of the witnesses supporting the reading. In general we have adjudged that strong papyrus support, or a division in the early uncials, or the support of any combination of Old Latin, Coptic or Syriac versions, or important family groups, or readings supported by early Fathers, can claim to have originated in the early period.<sup>44</sup>

#### 4. *Variants on the Names and Titles of Jesus*

The greatest number of variants which (at least at first sight) seem to relate to Christology are those concerning the names and titles of Jesus. This is certainly true in the textual tradition of the Pauline epistles,<sup>45</sup> but is more complicated in the Gospels. The most common variation is the addition of the name 'Jesus' to a passage. This is a very common occurrence, well attested examples can be seen at Matt. 4:23; 8:7,29; 13:36; 14:22; Mark 8:17; 9:19; 12:41; 14:22. The reverse (omission of 'Jesus') is, however, also found in various places: Matt. 3:16; 8:22; 9:22; 14:16; Mark 1:25; 2:19; 10:21. According to Metzger 'codex Bezae inserts Ἰησοῦς, or substitutes it for κύριος or αὐτός, fifty-seven times.'<sup>46</sup> The explanation for these variations is probably not to be found in christological interests, but in the necessity to clarify the identity of the speaker (or actor) for lectionary use.<sup>47</sup>

The vocative title κυριε was added in several places: Matt. 13:51 (C L W Byz cop); Mark 1:40 (from Matt. 8:2 // Luke 5:12?; C W

<sup>43</sup> M.A. King, 'Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Jude and 1 and 2 Peter', *BSac* 121 (1964) 54-57.

<sup>44</sup> For dates of manuscripts and versions etc. see UBS<sup>3</sup>, xiii-xl; also Metzger, *Text*, 36-92; Aland, *Text*, 72-217. Variants have been selected from a study of the following editions: Tischendorf (1869<sup>8</sup>); Legg (*Matthew and Mark*); IGNT, *Luke* (2 vols.); NA<sup>26</sup>; UBS<sup>3</sup>; Aland, *Synopsis*. Evidence has been cited from these editions and not from independent scrutiny of the manuscripts.

<sup>45</sup> Zuntz, *Text*, 180-183.

<sup>46</sup> *TCGNT*, 29.

<sup>47</sup> R.C. Nevius, *The Divine Names in the Gospels* (S&D 30; Salt Lake City: Uni Utah Press, 1967) 7.

Θ it); Mark 9:22 (D G Θ it); Mark 10:51 (D it); John 13:8 (D Θ); John 20:16 (D it). But it was omitted in others: Matt. 8:6 (01\* it<sup>k</sup> syr<sup>s&c</sup> Origen, Hilary); Matt. 17:15 (01 Z bo<sup>p</sup>); John 11:21 (B syr<sup>s</sup>); John 11:39 (P<sup>66</sup>); John 13:37 (01\* 33 565 Vg syr<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>p</sup> bo<sup>p</sup>). In some places (particularly Matt. 20:30) deciding on the original is extremely difficult. The situation is further complicated in Luke, where ο κυριος appears as the narrative title for Jesus, and is often replaced by 'Jesus' in the MSS at Luke 7:13,19; 10:41 (possibly); 11:39; 18:6; 22:61 (cf also Luke 9:57,59 for uncertain readings). On the other hand at Matt. 28:6 ο κυριος is added by A C D K L W fl<sup>a</sup>13 it.<sup>48</sup>

'Son of God' is added by scribes in several places (some relatively late):

Matt. 1:1 Victor: *fili dei*.

Matt. 1:16 *Dial. Tim. & Aquil.* fol 112v: ο υιος του θεου.

Matt. 13:37 28: ο υιος του θεου (replacing ο υιος του ανθρωπου).

Mark 14:61 01\* 579: substituting του θεου for του ευλογητου.

A notable example is Mark 8:29 where 01 L 157 add ο υιος του θεου to the confession of Peter Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; a further group of MSS (W fl<sup>a</sup> 543 syr<sup>p</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> it<sup>b</sup>) add the full version of the Matthean parallel (Matt. 16:16): ο υιος του θεου του ζωντος.

Mark 1:1 should probably also be regarded as an example. The text I take as original is the shorter text:

Αρχη του ευαγγελιου Ιησου Χριστου

[01\* Θ 28<sup>c</sup> 255 (= 1555\*) syr<sup>pal</sup> Geo<sup>1</sup> Arm<sup>9</sup>mss  
Irenaeus, Origen, Victorinus-Pettau and  
Serapion].<sup>49</sup>

To this text υιου θεου or in some cases υιου του θεου was added by the vast majority of the manuscripts (01<sup>a</sup> B D L W etc.; and A K Δ Π fl<sup>a</sup>13 33 565 700 etc. respectively; the versions: it Vg syr cop could support either long reading).

<sup>48</sup> The Old Syriac manuscripts tend to use 'our Lord' instead of 'Jesus' or 'he' (particularly syr<sup>s</sup>). See e.g. Matt. 8:3,4,10,13,14,18,20 [syr<sup>s</sup>: Lord; syr<sup>c</sup>: Jesus (original)]; 8:23,34; 9:2,9 f.,15,19,23,27,30,35;10:5 [syr<sup>c</sup> not extant]; 11:1, 2,7. This is very similar in John: see F.C. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe* (Cambridge: CUP, 1904) vol. 2.97 (John 1:36-6:5 [inclusive]; 8:34; 9:44; 12:16; 13:23). The tendency is not, however, universal, because in other places 'Jesus' continues to function as the basic referent in both syr<sup>s</sup> and syr<sup>c</sup> (so Matt. 11:20, 25; 12:1,15).

<sup>49</sup> I have defended this more fully in 'A Text-Critical Study of Mark 1.1', NTS 37 (1991) 621-629.

To conclude this section we refer back to Origen's comments on Matt. 27:16 f. In these two places relatively few MSS support the readings *Ἰησοῦν Βαραββαν* and *Ἰησοῦν τον Βαραββαν* respectively (Θ f<sup>1</sup> 700\* syr<sup>s</sup> pal arm geo<sup>2</sup> Origen). Although the majority of MSS lack 'Jesus', Origen's comments explain why the longer reading should be regarded as the more difficult reading.<sup>50</sup>

### 5. Passages Concerning the Birth and Family of Jesus

Matt. 1:16. As is well known, variants on this verse are often attributed to christological influence.<sup>51</sup> While UBS<sup>3</sup> gives six variants, there are really three main readings; each begins with the words: *Ἰακωβ δε εγεννησεν τον Ἰωσηφ* and then continues:

- A. *τον ανδρα Μαρίας, εξ ης εγεννηθη Ἰησους ο λεγομενος Χριστος.*  
P<sup>1</sup> 01 B C K L P W 28 33 565 700 1071 etc., itaur,f,ff1  
Vg syrph, h, pal cop<sup>sa</sup> Tertullian (*De carne* 20)  
Augustine. f<sup>1</sup> follow this reading except for omitting *Ἰησους*.
- B. *ω μνηστευθεισα παρθενος Μαριαμ εγεννησεν Ἰησουν τον λεγομενον Χριστον.* Θ f<sup>13</sup> ita, (b), c, d, g<sup>1</sup>, (k), q Hippolytus Ambrosiaster.<sup>52</sup>
- C. 'Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begot Jesus who is called the Christ' syr<sup>s</sup>.<sup>53</sup>

It was Conybeare who originally argued for the originality of the third reading,<sup>54</sup> and this was subsequently adopted by von Soden (and in Moffat's ET [1913]; and as a marginal reading by *NEB* and *JB*). There is little argument today for the third variant, and we

<sup>50</sup> So also *TCGNT*, 67 f.

<sup>51</sup> Goguel, *Texte*, 64 f.; Williams, *Alterations*, 25-28.

<sup>52</sup> Syr<sup>c</sup>: 'to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, she who bore Jesus the Christ'; and Arm: 'the husband of Mary, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, from whom was born Jesus who was called Christ' are most similar to this reading.

<sup>53</sup> Metzger, 'The Text of Matthew 1.16', *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (FS A.P. Wikgren; ed. D.E. Aune; NovTSupp 33; Leiden: Brill, 1972) 16-24 argues convincingly that the other suggested witnesses to this reading: *Dial. Tim. & Aquil.*; Barsalibi; Arabic Diatessaron<sup>MS A</sup>; do not in fact offer any support. For an earlier, and extremely lucid, assessment of these texts see Burkitt, *Da-Mepharreshe*, vol. 2.262-266, who regarded the reading of syr<sup>s</sup> as originating in a paraphrase of the second variant.

<sup>54</sup> Conybeare, 'Modifications', 96-102.

accept the first as the original reading<sup>55</sup> because 1) it has overwhelming attestation; 2) it lacks *παρθένος* (which surely would have been included had the reading been a secondary one protecting the virgin birth); and 3) explanations can be found for the other two forms on the basis of the originality of the first.<sup>56</sup> Thus the second reading (which in view of its support from the versions, Caesarean MSS, and Hippolytus should be ascribed to the second century) probably originated in a scribe's dissatisfaction with calling Joseph 'the husband of Mary' and his desire to clearly introduce the virginity of Mary into the text. The third reading probably arose as a paraphrase of the second.

This passage introduces us to a whole series of passages, especially in the birth narratives, relating to the birth and parentage of Jesus, which reveal a disturbed textual history.<sup>57</sup> Some of these variants are quite late and of marginal interest to us here (most do not appear in the standard apparatus, e.g. Matt. 1:18: variants on *πριν η συνελθειν αυτους*; 1:20: variants on *Μαριαμ την γυναικα σου*; 1:24: variants on *παρελαβεν την γυναικα αυτου*; 1:25: variants on *και ουκ εγνωσκεν αυτην*; Luke 2:22: variants on *ανηγαγον αυτον*; 2:27: omission of *τους γονεις*; 2:41: variations of *οι γονεις αυτου*; 2:42: variants on *αναβαινοντων αυτων*; and those on Luke 2:48: *ο πατηρ σου καγω*); but others may have arisen in the second century.<sup>58</sup>

1. Matt. 1:19: *Ιωσηφ δε ο ανηρ αυτης, δικαιος ων*. The Diatessaron and syrc read (the equivalent of) *Ιωσηφ δε δικαιος ανηρ ων* (cf REB), which may well be the result of both grammatical smoothing and Tatian's anti-marriage redaction.

2. Matt. 1:25: *ου ετεκεν υιον* [supported by 01 B f1&13 33 itb c g1k syrs&c Ambrose etc.] was in many texts harmonised to Luke 2:7 to

<sup>55</sup> With NA<sup>26</sup> and UBS<sup>3</sup>; R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (London: G. Chapman; New York: Doubleday, 1977) 62-64; W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; vol. 1, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 183 f. n71; J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HtKNT 1; Freiburg: Herder, 1986) 11; A. Globe, 'Some Doctrinal Variants in Matthew 1 and Luke 2, and the Authority of the Neutral Text', CBQ 42 (1980) 66.

<sup>56</sup> J.G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (London: J. Clarke & Co., 1930, 1958 reprint) 176-187.

<sup>57</sup> Discussed (along with 24 other variants of much later date) in Globe, 'Variants'.

<sup>58</sup> We have not attempted a complete citation of the evidence. Globe, 'Variants', 68-72 has a detailed critical apparatus.

read: τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοχον [C D\* K W Δ Π 28 565 700 Maj. itaur d f ff1 g Vg Dia Athanasius etc.].

3. Luke 2:5: Μαριαμ τη εμνηστευμενη αυτω [01\* B C\* D L W 565 700 ita β d f r1 cop<sup>bo</sup> sa etc.] which was altered to 'Mary his wife' [Dia ita aur b c syr<sup>s</sup>], after which these two were conflated to produce 'Mary his betrothed wife' [01<sup>c</sup> A C<sup>3</sup> Θ Ψ 053 f1<sup>3</sup> Vg syr<sup>h</sup> Maj.].

4. Luke 2:33: ο πατηρ αυτου και η μητηρ [01 B D L W 700 Vg cop etc.]. Several witnesses substitute 'Joseph' for 'his father' [A K X Δ Θ Π Ψ 053 f1<sup>3</sup> 28 565 ... it syr<sup>ph</sup>, h, pal(MSS) cop<sup>bo</sup>(MSS) goth Dia etc.].

5. Luke 2:43: ουκ εγνωσαν οι γονεις αυτου [01 B D L W Θ etc.]. Syr<sup>s</sup> substitutes 'his kinfolk'; others substitute 'Joseph and his mother' [A C Ψ 0130 f1<sup>3</sup> it syr<sup>P</sup>, h cop<sup>bo</sup>(MSS)].

There is very little doubt concerning the adequacy of the UBS<sup>3</sup> text at these points; what is interesting is the way in which various points of ambiguity in the birth narratives are cleared up by many of the scribes. Globe concludes 'that most of the non-Neutral readings under consideration were introduced to remove inconsistencies between the biblical narratives and abstract doctrinal statements concerning the virginity of Mary.'<sup>59</sup> Note should also be taken (as Globe mentions) of the importance of Tatian in the formation and propagation of some of these readings. The question remains whether Tatian's redaction was influenced by his well known stance against marriage or by his christological position.<sup>60</sup>

Mark 6:3 contains a notable variant. The reading: ο τεκτων, ο υιος της Μαρίας gives every evidence of being the original [supported by 01 A B C D K L W Δ Θ Π f1 28 892 1071 ... itd, f, ff2, 1, q Vg syr<sup>P</sup>, h cop<sup>sa</sup>, bo]. The major variant to this reading is ο του τεκτονος υιος [και] της Μαρίας [supported by P<sup>45</sup> (which reads: τεκτον]ος ο υ[ιος). f1<sup>3</sup> 33 565 700 ita, aur, b, c, e, i, r1 cop<sup>bo</sup>(MSS) arm Origen<sup>61</sup>], which assimilates the text to Matt. 13:55, and avoids

<sup>59</sup> Globe, 'Variants', 54.

<sup>60</sup> For evidence from the Diatessaron concerning Tatian's Encratism see B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament. Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 34 f. Cf. also P. M. Head, 'Tatian's Christology and Its Influence on the Composition of the Diatessaron', *Tyn. Bull.* 43 (1992) 121-137.

<sup>61</sup> Origen responds to Celsus' jibe concerning Jesus being a carpenter: 'In none of the Gospels current in the churches is Jesus Himself ever described as being a carpenter' (*Contra Celsum* VI.36). While some have blamed this statement on Origen's forgetfulness and general ignorance of Mark (P. Koetschau, *Origenes Werke I* [GCS Origenes 1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899] xxxiv; Metzger, 'Origen', 101), the wording of this comment (particularly ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις

calling Jesus ο τεκτων.<sup>62</sup> It is possible to argue that the reading with ο τεκτων is an alteration designed to safeguard the doctrine of the virgin birth,<sup>63</sup> but the other reading is split three or four ways (του τεκτονος υιος, του τεκτονος υιος και, ο υιος, τεκτονος ο υιος), which would seem to fit better with independent divergences from a common original (especially since Matt. 13:55 remained unaffected). This variation can certainly be dated to the second century, the combination of avoiding embarrassment and assimilation to Matthew seems to have occurred quite frequently in Markan texts.

A similar type of alteration was made to Mark 3:21. Here the text και ακουσαντες οι παρ αυτου εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον, ελεγον γαρ οτι εξεστη which in the context of 3:31 ff. involved the identification of οι παρ αυτου with Jesus' mother and brothers, was altered so that those who heard about him were identified as οι γραμματαις και οι λοιποι (so in D W it<sup>10/12</sup> goth).

#### 6. Variant Readings Which Appear to Increase Jesus' Impact

A different type of alteration is found in Matt. 4:24 where Matthew's summary of Jesus' activity closes with the phrase και εθεραπευσεν αυτους. In one section of the manuscript tradition this is altered to και παντας εθεραπευσεν (D, it syr<sup>s&c</sup>). This is an example of a type of change which appears fairly often in the manuscripts in which the impact made by Jesus is emphasised or increased (by addition or substitution of words). Other examples are found in:

1. Matt. 7:28: εξεπλησσοντο οι οχλοι επι τη διδαχη αυτου. Several manuscripts add παντες to οι οχλοι [Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 1582 22 697 1278, Origen]; and two substitute παντες for οι οχλοι [998, Eusebius].
2. Matt. 8:18: Ιδων δε ο Ιησους οχλον περι αυτον.<sup>64</sup> This was expanded in various ways (ignoring the word order differences): by

---

φερομένων ευαγγελίων) could indicate his awareness of other readings, which he does not accept. It seems best to take Origen as a witness for the second variant (so H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated with an Introduction and Notes* [Cambridge: CUP, 1953] 352; UBS<sup>3</sup> etc.).

<sup>62</sup> On the problems associated with Jesus as a carpenter see Celsus (according to Origen, *Contra Celsum* VI.34), cf., more positively, Justin, *Dial.* 88.

<sup>63</sup> So E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium* (HzNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 1936, 3rd ed.) 55.

<sup>64</sup> Text according to NA<sup>26</sup> = UBS<sup>3</sup>, and defended in *TCGNT*, 21; but uncertain as only B cop<sup>sa</sup> support it. It is, however, the one which best explains all the other readings.



the addition of *πολυν* [W it syr cop geo]; and the addition of *πολλους* [01<sup>c</sup> C K L X Δ Θ Π f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 etc. and various versions].

3. Matt. 9:35 was expanded by the addition of the phrase *και πολλοι ηκολουθησαν αυτω* [L Φ f<sup>13</sup> 1010 1024 it<sup>a</sup>, b, h, g<sup>1</sup> Dia; 01\* has the addition without *πολλοι*]. This is a harmonisation to the similar clauses in Matt. 4:25 (the final clause of the corresponding summary statement; cf also Matt. 8:1; 12:15; 19:2).

4. Matt. 15:30: *και εθεραπευσεν αυτους*. To this *παντας* has been added [D 945 it sa<sup>Pt</sup>], a harmonisation to Matt. 12:15, and a strengthening of the impression given by Matthew by extending the scope of Jesus' activities.

5. Mark 1:34: *και εθεραπευσεν πολλους κακως εχοντας ποικιλαις νοσοις*. This is altered in various ways: D substitutes *αυτους* for *πολλους*, thus giving the impression that all those mentioned in v 32 were healed (while "many" implies that some were not). Some manuscripts supply this implication in a different way by adding *παντας* [229 349 472 acc Legg].

6. Luke 4:32: *και εξεπλησσοντο επι τη διδαχη αυτου*, becomes *και εξεπλησσοντο παντες επι τη διδαχη αυτου* [1093 it<sup>r</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> syr<sup>h</sup> Marcion].

7. Luke 4:36: *και εγενετο θαμβος επι παντας*. D and several versions add *μεγας* to the description of the *θαμβος* that came upon all present [D it<sup>b</sup> d r<sup>1</sup> syr<sup>P</sup> cop<sup>bo</sup> Dia<sup>Arabic & Persian</sup>].

8. Luke 5:17: *και δυναμις κυριου ην εις το ιασθαι αυτον*. This was altered in various ways (taking *κυριος* to refer to Jesus), and had the effect of extending Jesus' healing power: to *αυτους* [A C D X Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1&13</sup> 28 33 565 700 it Vg cop<sup>bo</sup> Dia etc.]; or to *παντας* [K Cyril]; or to *αυτους παντας* [syr<sup>pal</sup>]; or to *τους ασθενουντας* [1<sup>11</sup>].

9. There are several additional examples in Luke, although they are attested in few manuscripts. At Luke 4:40 syr<sup>s</sup> adds "all" to the end of the sentence. At Luke 6:18 syr<sup>s</sup> adds "all"; and 69 adds *απαντες* to the close of the verse. D adds *αυτου παντας* to the description of Jesus' healing at Luke 9:11. At Luke 11:14, Θ and the Old Latin add *παντες* to the statement of the crowd's astonishment.

### 7. Other Passages of Christological Importance

A good example of the scribal modification of an important text is Jesus' saying in Mark 13:32 // Matt. 24:36. If we begin with Mark's version it seems relatively certain that the original read:

Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

This was altered in two ways to avoid the implication of Jesus' ignorance. The simplest of these was to omit the words οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός [X 983 Vg<sup>1</sup>MS]. Codex W took a different tack by adding to the following verse so that it read οὐκ οἰδατε γὰρ εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱός ποτε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν. 'The inserted words modify this statement [i.e. that no man knows the time of the end] to make it clear that the Father and the Son do know the time.'<sup>65</sup> It is important to note, however, that both of these movements in the Markan textual tradition are attested relatively late. In fact an earlier movement involved the addition of *μονος* to the close of the verse, presumably under the influence of the Matthean parallel, but with the effect that the distinction between the Father's knowledge and that of the Son is actually emphasised [Arm Δ: added *μονος* before ὁ πατήρ; Θ Φ f<sup>13</sup> 565 it<sup>a</sup> c k cops<sup>a&b</sup> Geo Eth etc.: *μονος* follows ὁ πατήρ]. In other words the tendency is not uniformly away from ascribing ignorance to the Son.

It is not so easy to decide the fundamental question of the original text of the corresponding passage in Matt. 24:36. The TR does not contain the phrase οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, but the modern editions do:

Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν,  
οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν  
οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός,  
εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ *μόνος*.

The decision is not an easy one, with prominent witnesses (01\* B D Θ f<sup>13</sup> it) favouring the phrase,<sup>66</sup> but others, including some of the early versions, favouring the omission [K L W f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 700 syr cops<sup>a&b</sup> Vg]. The Fathers are split. The evidence is most fully presented in UBS<sup>3</sup> and there does not seem much point in repeating it again here. The originality of the phrase is attested in some of the strongest witnesses of diverse text-types (particularly important is the agreement of 01\* and B on the one hand, with D and the Old Latin on the other). In addition, there are good grounds for suggesting that the difficulties which this phrase presented for patristic theologians provides a plausible reason for its omission.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Hurtado, *Pre-Caesarean*, 79.

<sup>66</sup> Sinaiticus includes οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός in the original, a subsequent corrector erased it, then it was restored.

<sup>67</sup> See Tischendorf, also cf. C. Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation* (London: J. Murray, 1895) 98-166.

The influence of Mark's text upon Matthew does not seem to have been strong enough to introduce this type of difficulty into Matthew. Further, as Metzger shows, the structure of the sentence suggests the originality of the phrase.<sup>68</sup> To sum up, *οὐδε ο υιος* was omitted from Matthew because of the difficulties it caused (in much the same way as it was omitted from Mark but to a greater extent due to the prominence of Matthew in the early church). The omission must have occurred at a relatively early stage (in order to have influenced such a wide number of Fathers, versions and manuscripts).

This omission of a passage concerning Jesus' knowledge is one of a number of passages which apparently was affected by christologically motivated scribal alteration. A well known example is Mark 1:41. Diverse and strong external attestation exists for the reading *και σπλαγχνισθεις εκτεινας την χειρα αυτου*.<sup>69</sup> The alternative reading has *οργισθεις* instead of *σπλαγχνισθεις* and is supported by only a few witnesses [D ita, d, ff2, r1 Ephraem]. Nevertheless most commentators have preferred it, as it is generally considered to be the more difficult reading.<sup>70</sup> We should not, however, jump to the conclusion that the scribes were opposed to Jesus' anger in principle. In Mark 3:5 there is no sign of any alteration, and indeed it is possible that many scribes have added a reference to Jesus' anger at Luke 6:10: assimilating Luke to the Markan parallel by introducing *εν οργη* [D Θ f<sup>1</sup> it; μετ οργης: f<sup>13</sup>]. It is, of course, possible that 'anger' was original to Luke 6:10<sup>71</sup> and subsequently omitted by most of the later scribes; but there is little indication that scribes were opposed to Jesus' anger *per se*, and the power of har-

<sup>68</sup> *TCGNT*, 62. This is based upon 'the presence of *μόνος* and the cast of the sentence as a whole (*οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ ...* belong together as a parenthesis, for *εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μόνος* goes with *οὐδεὶς οἶδεν*).' See also R.H. Gundry, *Matthew. A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 492 for supporting arguments re the Matthean style of the phrase.

<sup>69</sup> This is the text preferred by NA<sup>26</sup> = UBS<sup>3</sup> and defended in *TCGNT*, 70.

<sup>70</sup> The difficulty is not that Mark refers to Jesus' anger (such references also occur in Mark 3:5; 10:14), rather it is in understanding the cause and object of Jesus' anger. See C.H. Turner, 'A Textual Commentary on Mark 1', *JTS* 28 (1927) 147 and the commentaries. S.T. Lachs ('Hebrew Elements in the Gospels and Acts', *JQR* 71 [1980] 31-36) argues that *σπλαγχνισθεις* is the *lectio difficilior* here on the grounds of its rarity in classical Greek. This misses the point since scribes of the NT would be accustomed to it from Matthew.

<sup>71</sup> J.B. Orchard, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek Arranged According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983) 55.

monisation must be acknowledged. Once again we are faced with the fact that evidence for a clear, unambiguous, and universal tendency is lacking.

A passage which was important in early christological discussions is Luke 22:43 f:

ὠφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὥσει θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

Designated a 'Western interpolation' and marked for omission [[by double square brackets]] by Westcott & Hort,<sup>72</sup> this passage has in recent years been progressively rehabilitated and is included in most texts.<sup>73</sup> To summarise the evidence briefly<sup>74</sup> there are two major groups of witnesses:<sup>75</sup>

Include: 01<sup>\*b</sup> D K L X Δ<sup>\*</sup> Θ Π<sup>\*</sup> Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 565 700 892<sup>\*</sup> 1071 ...  
it syr<sup>c</sup>, ph, h, pal Vg arm eth Dia Justin Irenaeus Hippolytus etc.

Exclude: P<sup>69</sup>(*vid*)<sup>76</sup> P<sup>75</sup> 01a A B T W 1071<sup>\*</sup> it<sup>f</sup> syr<sup>s</sup> cop<sup>sa&bo</sup> geo  
Marcion Clement Origen Athanasius Ambrose.

<sup>72</sup> Hort, 'Notes', 64-67.

<sup>73</sup> V. Taylor wrote: 'since their day opinion has steadily mounted in favour of the genuineness of the passage' (*The Text of the New Testament. A Short Introduction* [London: Macmillan & Co., 1961] 94). I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster / Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978) 832 gives a list of scholars supporting the reading (also L. Brun, 'Engel und Blutschweiss Lc 22,43-44', ZNW 32 [1933] 265 n1). Further evidence of this trend is the difference between the UBS first edition (which gave the *omission* a "C" rating) and the third edition (which gave the *inclusion* of the verses a "C" rating).

<sup>74</sup> The clearest presentation is in Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel' (see note 10), 402; IGNT, *Luke II*, 190 provides a fuller listing, with references to the Fathers (Patristic witnesses can be found in Tischendorf, and are discussed in J.A. Fitzmyer, 'Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some features of our oldest text of Luke', CBQ 24 (1962) 170-179 and Ehrman & Plunkett).

<sup>75</sup> There are variations on each of the two major possibilities in that some of the MSS which include the verses obelise them for omission (Δ<sup>c</sup> Π<sup>c</sup> 892<sup>mg</sup> 1079 1216 cop<sup>bo</sup>(MSS)); and some MSS include the verses after Matt. 26:39 (f<sup>3</sup> LectP<sup>4</sup>).

<sup>76</sup> P<sup>69</sup> is a fragment of one leaf of Luke from the third century (= POxy 2383, *OxyPap* 24 [1957] 1-4); the text is described by the editor as "idiosyncratic" with many unusual variants. In fact the fragment omits vv 42-44 and probably the first line of v 45 between lines 3 & 4. This seems best explained (with the editors) as an omission due to the fact that the scribe's eye went from *προσευχετο* in v 41 to *προσευχῆς* in v 45 (both of which would have been at the end of a line four lines apart assuming vv 43 & 44 to have been absent). If the verses were present then the similar endings would have been many lines apart, and there would be no explanation for the resultant text.

To make the obvious point, the textual diversity goes back to the earliest accessible stage. The great uncials are split, with Sinaiticus exemplifying the diversity among its own correctors.<sup>77</sup> The second-century Fathers offer diverse texts, as do the early versions, and this pushes the division well back into the second century.<sup>78</sup> We have already noted the way in which Epiphanius and others attributed the omission of the verses to embarrassment at the Christology.<sup>79</sup> By the fourth and fifth centuries both readings were widely distributed, and at that stage scribes might include or exclude the verses 'on the basis of local textual traditions and individual theological proclivities.'<sup>80</sup>

Since there is no evidence to suggest an accidental omission of the passage, almost all scholars base their case on dogmatic considerations. Other issues are, of course, both important and much discussed: Is the passage consistent with "Lukan" style and vocabulary?<sup>81</sup> Is the passage consistent with Lukan theology and Christology in general?<sup>82</sup> Is it intrusive to the literary framework of the context in which it occurs?<sup>83</sup> In the final analysis these

<sup>77</sup> Sinaiticus and its correctors commonly support both sides in textual disputes (as we have seen on Mark 1:1; Matt. 24:36; Luke 22:43 f.). Examples drawn from a survey of Matthew include the following: 3:16 (bis); 5:22; 6:8,28; 7:13,14,18; 8:12,18,23,28; 9:14; 11:9; 12:25,47; 13:9,35(bis),43,55; 14:22,29; 15:4,6,14,39; 16:12,21; 17:20; 18:21,34; 19:3; 22:23; 25:15 f.; 27:28,40.

<sup>78</sup> Long before the time of Athanasian orthodoxy (where Williams, *Alterations*, 7 places the omission), or the Nestorian controversy (where an Armenian monophysite called John Mayragomec'i placed the addition—see Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 406).

<sup>79</sup> Above, section 2.

<sup>80</sup> Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 407.

<sup>81</sup> Yes: Harnack, 'Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu', *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche. I. Zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik* (AzKG 19; Berlin & Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1931) 88. No: Brun, 'Engel', 266 f. [see Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 408 f for discussion].

<sup>82</sup> Yes: W.J. Larkin, 'The Old Testament Background of Luke XXII.43-44', NTS 25 (1979) 250-254. Is it typical of martyrologies (on which Luke models his presentation)? Yes: M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (ed. G. Bornkamm; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1959, 3rd ed.) 202 f.; N. Ascher-mann, 'Zum Agoniegebet Jesu, Luk 22:43-44', *Theologia Viatorum* 5 (1953 f.) 143-149. Or does Luke characteristically present Jesus as emotionally restrained? Yes: Ehrman & Plunkett, therefore passage intrusive as 'Angel', 411 f.). But Ehrman & Plunkett depend on J.H. Neyrey, who says that vv 43 f. 'are shown to be apposite of Luke's presentation, even required by his scenario' ('The Absence of Jesus' Emotions—the Lucan Redaction of Lk 22,39-46', *Biblica* 61 [1980] 171).

<sup>83</sup> Yes: Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 412-415 (because it intrudes into a chiasm). No: G. Schneider, 'Engel und Blutschweiß [Lk 22,43-44]'. «Redaktions-geschichte» im Dienste der Textkritik', BZ 20 (1976) 112-116.

arguments are inconclusive. The reason for omission/addition always comes back to the christological question: 'Which reading is more readily explained as originating in the theological climate of the second century?'<sup>84</sup>

The most recent arguments against the originality of the verses are those of Fitzmyer and Ehrman & Plunkett. Fitzmyer's arguments really boil down to two: 1) they go against the thrust of the Lukan passage; and 2) the oldest MS does not have them.<sup>85</sup> Ehrman & Plunkett also argue that the verses are intrusive into the Lukan passage;<sup>86</sup> but this intrusiveness can be exaggerated, since the chiasm perceived by Ehrman & Plunkett functions just as well with the verses as without them—it would simply result in the whole prayer-experience of Jesus in vv 42-44 being the pivot of the chiasm.<sup>87</sup> The weak link in their overall argument is their insistence that these verses could have been incorporated into the text to facilitate the polemic against docetism, because:

The theological preoccupation of "mainstream" Christinanity in the second century was the affirmation of Jesus' real humanity in the face of various strands of the docetic heresy.<sup>88</sup>

This argument begs several questions. Firstly, the use of a passage in a polemical situation does not imply that it has been invented or incorporated into the text (this would be rather poor technique if spotted by one's opponents). Secondly (leaving aside the difficulty in identifying "mainstream Christianity"), there is evidence (e.g. in the *Gospel of Peter* and elsewhere) of a preoccupation rather with Jesus' *deity* in second-century Gospel interpretation.<sup>89</sup> Thirdly, it is obvious that aspects of Jesus' full humanity were problematic for the "orthodox" groups as much as for the docetists.<sup>90</sup> It seems that

<sup>84</sup> Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 407.

<sup>85</sup> J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke. Introduction, translation and notes* (2 vols.; AB 28&28A; Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985) 1444. His other arguments include: a) *lectio brevior potior* (a questionable rule in the early period of transmission, see Head, 'Observations' and literature cited there); b) lack of parallels in Matthew and Mark (but this, if anything, must be an argument for the passage in light of known harmonistic tendencies).

<sup>86</sup> Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 410-415.

<sup>87</sup> See Marshall, *Luke*, 832 for an interpretation based on the originality of the verses which shows how they fit into the context (also Schneider, 'Angel').

<sup>88</sup> Ehrman & Plunkett, 'Angel', 407.

<sup>89</sup> See, for examples, P.M. Head, 'On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter', *Vig. Chr.* 46 (1992) forthcoming.

<sup>90</sup> See our earlier discussion of the Fathers (especially Epiphanius); and cf., Gore, *Dissertations*, 98-166.

more can be said for the originality of the verses than against them, especially in view of the problematic nature of these verses in early Christianity.

### 8. *Concluding Observations*

Our investigations have substantiated the generally held opinion that scribes *did* make alterations in support of later christological positions, and many of those discussed here would certainly classify as “reverential alterations”. Certainly, christological titles such as ‘Lord’ and ‘Son of God’ appear to have been added to the tradition far more often than they were omitted. In addition, ‘Passages Concerning the Birth and Family of Jesus’ showed a very consistent pattern of scribal alterations: many of these passages were altered in order to fit better with the doctrine of the virgin birth, and perhaps increasing reverence for Mary. Many scribes appear to have altered passages in order to increase the impact made by Jesus. No clear tendencies are, however, found in passages concerned with the knowledge or emotions of Jesus—although alterations denying that Jesus was ignorant and avoiding use of anger are found, alterations in the other direction were also apparent.

The extent of such alterations and the impact of such practices upon the textual tradition of the NT should not, perhaps, be exaggerated.<sup>91</sup> In addition, it is not clear to what extent the types of alteration we have observed should be labelled as “intentional”. In many cases, it is clear that harmonisation to a parallel passage (either in the same gospel or another) was a more powerful force than christological redaction; and in this context the resultant text can hardly be said to be due to intentional (or conscious) alteration (e.g., from passages discussed above: Matt. 9:35; 15:30; Mark 8:29).<sup>92</sup> There are also enough exceptions to the rule to provoke caution in the use of a tendency to increasing reverence of Christ

---

<sup>91</sup> This point has recently been affirmed by F. Wisse, ‘The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels’, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (ed. W.L. Petersen; Christianity & Judaism in Antiquity 3; London & New York: Uni Notre Dame, 1989) 44 f.

<sup>92</sup> A particular example of this is Mark 13:32 where the harmonising influence leads in the opposite direction to the expected (and found in some later mss) christological redaction.

as a major text-critical principle. Nevertheless, that it is *one* important text-principle should not be denied.

Concerning the reason for such changes, Farmer has suggested that Christian scribes were influenced by Alexandrian Homeric criticism which 'called for the omission of any passage which was regarded as offensive to or unworthy of the gods.'<sup>93</sup> There is little doubt that the three librarians in the great Alexandrian library: Zenodotus of Ephesus (b. 325 BC); Aristophanes of Byzantium (257-180 BC); and Aristarchus of Samothrace (217-145 BC) were inclined to condemn 'unseemly' passages (in commentaries and by obelisation).<sup>94</sup> There is certainly, however, reason to doubt whether their opinions ever greatly influenced the texts concerned. Recent studies suggest that 'the Alexandrians avoided the temptation to incorporate all their proposed alterations into the text itself and were content to note proposals in their commentaries.'<sup>95</sup> Indeed the ancients appeared to have been shifting away from the subjective suggestions, and towards an accompanying commentary in which the text was explained. Origen, the Christian scholar most obviously indebted to Alexandrian practices, did use obelising marks in his hexapla in order to mark passages in the Greek translations which did not appear in the original (i.e. Hebrew) text, nevertheless he wrote: 'we did not dare to remove them entirely' (*Comm. Matt.* XV.14).<sup>96</sup> There is little evidence that such practices influenced Christian scribes before Origen.

It is important to note that during the second century (and later!) it was not only the scribes who were interpreting and altering the

---

<sup>93</sup> W.R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (SNTSMS 25; Cambridge: CUP, 1974) 15; following J.E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: CUP, 1906, 2nd ed.) 105-135.

<sup>94</sup> Zenodotus on *Iliad* 3.423-6; 4.88; Aristophanes on *Odyssey* XV.19, 82, 88; XVIII.281.

<sup>95</sup> L.D. Reynolds & N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974, 2nd ed.) 12. Of the 413 alterations proposed by Zenodotus only 6 are found in all the MSS and only 34 in the majority, 240 are never found. Similar figures could be given for Aristophanes and Aristarchus; see T.W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1931, vol. 1/3) 199-202; and R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 105-121, 171-209, 210-233.

<sup>96</sup> See S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 100-124.



Gospel texts in accordance with their own Christological positions. This type of activity can be seen in other forms of Gospel-redaction: in the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and to some extent in Tatian's redaction of the Diatessaron. In addition we know that some Christians altered the OT text to make it speak more clearly of Christ (e.g. Justin, *Apol.* I.41; cf. *Dial.* 73);<sup>97</sup> and that Christians appear to have altered and annotated various Jewish writings (now called the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha).<sup>98</sup> In this context, the textual adaptation observed in this article seems to reflect a broader pattern of appropriation and re-presentation of sacred texts in support of then-current christological beliefs.<sup>99</sup> It is noteworthy that in the scribal tradition this "adaptation" is much more conservative than in the production of apocryphal gospels. The scribes were interested in "transmission" of texts, rather than in the creation of new texts. Nevertheless the transmission of gospel texts should not be seen as a neutral activity. The scribe of the NT was a participant in the life and faith of the church, and this life and faith clearly influenced the process of transmission. This is extremely clear in the later illuminated manuscripts which are acts of devotion and proclamation. That the early scribes were no less motivated by devotion and proclamation seems clear.<sup>100</sup> It is to their credit that, with some exceptions, most of them withstood the temptation to

<sup>97</sup> This concerns the addition of ἀπὸ τοῦ ζύλου το ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν in Ps. 95:10. Justin accused the Jews of maliciously expunging such passages from the text. Manuscript evidence for such a reading is, however, limited to some Coptic and Latin versions. On Christian influences on the texts of Ps. 13:3; 50:9; 37:14; & 49:6 see A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis, Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis X* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931) 30-32.

<sup>98</sup> See J.H. Charlesworth, 'Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings', *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (ed. E.P. Sanders et al; Phil: Fortress, vol. 2, 1981) 27-55, 310-315. He deals with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah, 4 Ezra, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Hellenistic Synagogue Prayers. He concludes that (among other things) 'early Christians read ancient prayers and narratives in light of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they claimed to be Christ' (p. 54).

<sup>99</sup> It is interesting that in a general survey of second century (secular) Greek literature the conclusion is drawn that such writers were basically imitative rather than creative (see B.A. von Groningen, 'General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D.', *Mnemosyne* Series IV. Vol. 18 [1965] 41-56).

<sup>100</sup> Among other studies see K. Aland, 'Bemerkungen zum Alter und zur Entstehung des Christogrammes anhand von Beobachtungen bei P<sup>66</sup> und P<sup>75</sup>', *Studien zur Ueberlieferung des NT und seines Textes* (ANTTF 2, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 173-179.

“improve” the Gospel texts. The “improvements” examined here have not affected the general reliability of the transmission of the texts in any significant manner; they do, however, point to the scribe’s involvement in his work understood as an act of devotion to the divine Christ.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> An earlier form of this paper was read to Dr. E. Bammel’s Seminar in Cambridge in Oct. 1989. Thanks are due to the members of that seminar for helpful discussion.