

OXFORD

# The Early Text of the New Testament

Charles E. Hill,  
Michael J. Kruger



---

THE EARLY TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

---

*This page intentionally left blank*

---

# The Early Text of the New Testament

Edited by

CHARLES E. HILL AND MICHAEL J. KRUGER

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2012

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2012

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Data available

ISBN 978-0-19-956636-5

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

---

## *Acknowledgements*

For a book such as this one, in which many have been involved, there are many who deserve our thanks. We are grateful, first of all, for the privilege of working with the extraordinary group of experts who contributed the chapters to this book. We believe the painstaking labour they have bestowed on the critical topic of the scribal context and early textual history of the New Testament books will bear the fruit of greater understanding for many years to come.

The editors and production staff at Oxford University Press, including Tom Perridge, Lizzie Robottom, Anne Leask, Nicola Sangster, Jane Robson, and others unknown to us, have our thankful admiration for their thoroughness and perseverance through countless communications and revisions. We would like to thank translator Edwin Collado, bibliographer Greg Salazar, indexers Tim Muether, John Muether, David Veldkamp, and Annie Muether, librarians John Muether, Michael Farrell, and Laura Armstrong. We also wish to acknowledge Randy and Linda Randall, benefactors of the Randall Fund, and Burton and Betty McPheeters and Marcy Hill, benefactors of the McPheeters-Hill Fund, whose generosity helped make this project possible.

Finally, to our wives, who, for six and a half years have borne patiently with us through the seemingly unending stream of unforeseen stages of this book, we want to express our deepest appreciation. The long travail is finally over. At least until the next edition.

---

*This page intentionally left blank*

---

## Contents

<i>Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction: In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament <i>Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger</i>	1
<b>I. The Textual and Scribal Culture of Early Christianity</b>	
1. The Book Trade in the Roman Empire <i>Harry Y. Gamble</i>	23
2. Indicators of ‘Catholicity’ in Early Gospel Manuscripts <i>Scott Charlesworth</i>	37
3. Manuscripts and the Sociology of Early Christian Reading <i>Larry Hurtado</i>	49
4. Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts <i>Michael J. Kruger</i>	63
<b>II. The Manuscript Tradition</b>	
5. The Early Text of Matthew <i>Tommy Wasserman</i>	83
6. The Early Text of Mark <i>Peter M. Head</i>	108
7. The Early Text of Luke <i>Juan Hernández, Jr.</i>	121
8. The Early Text of John <i>Juan Chapa</i>	140
9. The Early Text of Acts <i>Christopher Tuckett</i>	157
10. The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews) <i>James R. Royse</i>	175
11. The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles <i>J. K. Elliott</i>	204



12. The Early Text of Revelation <i>Tobias Nicklas</i>	225
13. 'Where Two or Three Are Gathered Together': The Witness of the Early Versions <i>Peter Williams</i>	239
<b>III. Early Citation and Use of New Testament Writings</b>	
14. 'In These Very Words': Methods and Standards of Literary Borrowing in the Second Century <i>Charles E. Hill</i>	261
15. The Text of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers <i>Paul Foster</i>	282
16. Marcion and the Early New Testament Text <i>Dieter T. Roth</i>	302
17. Justin's Text of the Gospels: Another Look at the Citations in <i>1Apol.</i> 15.1–8 <i>Joseph Verheyden</i>	313
18. Tatian's Diatessaron and the Greek Text of the Gospels <i>Tjitze Baarda</i>	336
19. Early Apocryphal Gospels and the New Testament Text <i>Stanley E. Porter</i>	350
20. Irenaeus's Text of the Gospels in <i>Adversus haereses</i> <i>D. Jeffrey Bingham and Billy R. Todd, Jr.</i>	370
21. Clement of Alexandria's Gospel Citations <i>Carl P. Cosaert</i>	393
<i>Bibliography</i>	414
<i>Index of Biblical Citations</i>	451
<i>Index of Greek Manuscripts</i>	470
<i>Subject Index</i>	476

---

## *Contributors*

**Tjitze Baarda**, Professor Emeritus, Free University, Amsterdam

**D. Jeffrey Bingham**, Chairman and Professor of Theological Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

**Juan Chapa**, Associate Professor of New Testament, Faculty of Theology, University of Navarra

**Scott Charlesworth**, Senior Lecturer, School of Theology, Pacific Adventist University, Papua New Guinea

**Carl P. Cosaert**, Assistant Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity, School of Theology, Walla Walla University

**J. K. Elliott**, Professor Emeritus of New Testament Textual Criticism, University of Leeds

**Paul Foster**, Senior Lecturer in New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, University of Edinburgh

**Harry Y. Gamble**, Chairman of the Religious Studies Department and Professor of New Testament Studies and Early Christianity at the University of Virginia

**Peter M. Head**, Sir Kirby Laing Senior Lecturer in New Testament, Tyndale House and Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge

**Juan Hernández, Jr.**, Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies, Bethel University

**Charles E. Hill**, Professor of New Testament, Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, Florida

**Larry Hurtado**, Emeritus Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, University of Edinburgh

**Michael J. Kruger**, Professor of New Testament, Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

**Tobias Nicklas**, Chair of New Testament Studies, University of Regensburg

**Stanley E. Porter**, President, Dean, and Professor of New Testament, McMaster Divinity College

**Dieter T. Roth**, Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz

**James R. Royse**, Visiting Scholar, Claremont School of Theology

**Billy R. Todd, Jr.**, Ph.D. student in Theological Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

**Christopher Tuckett**, Professor of New Testament Studies, University of Oxford

**Joseph Verheyden**, Professor of New Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, Catholic University of Leuven

**Tommy Wasserman**, Researcher at Høyskolen for Ledelse og Teologi, Stabekk, Norway

**Peter Williams**, Warden, Tyndale House, Cambridge

---

## Abbreviations

<i>Aeg</i>	<i>Aegyptus</i>
AGBL	Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel (= Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel). Freiburg: Herder, 1957–)
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
<i>Anton</i>	<i>Antonianum</i>
ANTT	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i>
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Australasian Theological Review</i>
<i>Aug</i>	<i>Augustinianum</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibS(F)	Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895–)
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>ByzNeugr Jb</i>	<i>Byzantinisch-neugriechischer Jahrbücher</i>
CADp	Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series latina. Turnhout, 1953–
CEBT	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CQ	<i>Church Quarterly</i>
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, ed. I. B. Chabot <i>et al.</i> Paris, 1903–
CW	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios Bíblicos</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>

<i>Exp</i>	<i>Expositor</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>FilNeo</i>	<i>Filologia Neotestamentaria</i>
<i>GTT</i>	<i>Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
<i>Herm</i>	<i>Hermanthema</i>
HTB	Histoire du Texte Biblique
HTKNT	Heders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
ICC	International Critic Commentary
IGNTP	International Greek New Testament Project
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MPIL	Monographs of the Peshitta Institute, Leiden
MthSt	Marburger theologische Studien
NA <sup>27</sup>	Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 27th edition
<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> , ed. G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn (North Ryde, NSW, 1981–)
<i>NedTT</i>	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus

NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
PapFlor	Papyrologica Florentina
PBA	Proceedings of the British Academy
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , ed. T. Kluser <i>et al.</i> (Stuttgart, 1950–)
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RE	<i>Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>
RevScRel	<i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</i>
RHA	<i>Revue hittite et asianique</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLNTGF	Society of Biblical Literature, The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
SC	Sources chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 1943–)
SD	Studies and Documents
SecCent	<i>Second Century</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	<i>Symbolae osloenses</i>
SPap	<i>Studia Papyrologica</i>
STAR	Studies in Theology and Religion
STP	Studi e testi di papirologia
StPatr	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
SSEJC	<i>Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity</i>
TC	<i>TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism</i>
TENTS	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> , ed. G. Krause and G.Müller (Berlin, 1977)
TS	Texts and Studies
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
TynBul	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UBS <sup>4</sup>	The Greek New Testament, United Bible Societies, 4th edition
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>

<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>WUNT</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>ZAC</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Christianity</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZKT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
<i>ZWT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

---

# Introduction

## *In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament*

*Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger*

### INTRODUCTION

In 1979, after years of writing about what he called ‘The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism’, Eldon J. Epp published an even more dismal prognosis for scholars in this field in an article entitled, ‘New Testament Textual Criticism in America: Requiem for a Discipline’.<sup>1</sup> Despite Epp’s dire analysis, however, or perhaps partly because of it, the discipline slowly began to show signs of a turnaround. By 1999 Larry Hurtado could say that the patient ‘may be a bit healthier (particularly in the English-speaking countries) as we near the end of this century’.<sup>2</sup> Now, a decade into the twenty-first century, some might wish to grant the discipline of New Testament textual criticism a clean bill of health.

There is currently an undeniable flowering of interest in many aspects of research on the text and the manuscript tradition of the New Testament documents. One fairly dramatic sign of vitality is the phenomenal success of Bart Ehrman’s *Misquoting Jesus*,<sup>3</sup> which introduced, somewhat controversially, the formerly moribund discipline to the popular reading public. And on the other end of the spectrum, highly technical, scholarly volumes having to do in some way with the early transmission of NT documents are swelling

<sup>1</sup> E. J. Epp, ‘The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism’, *JBL* 98 (1979), 94–8.

<sup>2</sup> L. Hurtado, ‘Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism’, in D. G. K. Taylor, ed., *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 47.

<sup>3</sup> B. D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus: The Story behind Who Changed the Bible and Why* (San Francisco: Harper, 2005).



the catalogues of many an academic publisher. The continuing publication of newly edited papyri from Oxyrhynchus generates more interest than ever, particularly as high-resolution photographs and other tools for study have become available to scholars through the Oxyrhynchus website. One of the most spectacular stimulants to the scholar and the general public alike is the recent publication of the entire text of the famous codex Sinaiticus, a codex which has played so large a role in the construction of modern editions of the NT, on a well endowed website.<sup>4</sup>

While these and other developments signify a burgeoning of interest in the history of the NT text, the greatest injection of substantial *new* materials into the textual database for the discipline, and the greatest of several impetuses for this book, has come from the steadily accumulating papyrus and early parchment finds from Egypt. There are now, as we write, 127 catalogued papyri containing some portion of the New Testament writings. These range from large codices to tiny fragments of text. The early date of many of them, before the great uncial codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus of the fourth century, elevates them to an ‘automatic’ importance in the minds of many textual critics. But, as we shall see below, their real significance for the discipline of NT textual criticism is currently controversial.

While data from the study of these papyri have been mounting, gains have also been made in the understanding of scribal habits and methods of book production and distribution in antiquity. Significant research by Harry Gamble,<sup>5</sup> Kim Haines-Eitzen,<sup>6</sup> Larry Hurtado,<sup>7</sup> and James Royse,<sup>8</sup> among many others, has brought new insights to the attention of scholars dealing with Christian origins.

This growth in new knowledge unavailable to previous generations of scholars has arguably reached a ‘critical mass’. As far back as 1989 Kurt and Barbara Aland wrote, ‘Although many details are obviously still debatable, there can be no doubt that the earlier view of the textual situation before the rise of the major text types is now due for a radical and thorough review.’<sup>9</sup> With the influx of a substantial amount of new material and newer methods of research since 1989, the time seems ripe to make at least a first attempt at such a review.

*The Early Text of the New Testament* thus intends to provide an inventory and some analysis of the evidence available for understanding the pre-fourth-century period of the transmission of the NT materials. Any attempt to do this

<sup>4</sup> <http://codexsinaiticus.org>.

<sup>5</sup> H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

<sup>6</sup> K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

<sup>7</sup> L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). See also T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *New Testament Manuscripts* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006).

<sup>8</sup> J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>9</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 95.

at the present time, however, must recognize that the traditional conception of the task of NT textual criticism has been actively challenged in the past two decades or so, and for some remains in a state of flux.

### EARLY TEXT AND 'ORIGINAL' TEXT

Looming large in discussions over the last generation is the viability and relevance of the concept of an 'original' text.<sup>10</sup> Although the traditional treatments of textual criticism—including those of Hort,<sup>11</sup> Gregory,<sup>12</sup> Kenyon,<sup>13</sup> Lake,<sup>14</sup> Metzger,<sup>15</sup> and the Alands<sup>16</sup>—have generally pursued the goal of recovering the original text, they have offered little sustained treatment about the complexities involved in defining the term. More recent writers have not only begun to raise questions about the meaning of the term, but also about whether establishing the original text should even be the goal of the discipline. Ehrman, commenting on past attempts to recover the original text, declares, 'It is by no means self-evident that this ought to be the goal of the discipline . . . there may indeed be scant reason to privilege the "original" text over forms of the text that developed subsequently'.<sup>17</sup> Others have been keen to raise concerns about how close we can really get to the 'original' text even if we wanted to do it. Helmut Koester argues that the papyri themselves are at least a century removed from the original publication of the New Testament text and thus provide no real assurance that the earliest text looked anything like our extant papyri.<sup>18</sup> Similar sentiments are expressed by Petersen, Parker, and Epp.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The most detailed overview of the recent debate can be found in E. J. Epp, 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism', *HTR* 92 (1999), 245–81.

<sup>11</sup> B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1881), 2.1.

<sup>12</sup> C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), 485.

<sup>13</sup> F. G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1926), 1–2.

<sup>14</sup> K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament* (London: Rivingtons, 1913), 1.

<sup>15</sup> B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York: OUP, 1992), 150.

<sup>16</sup> Aland and Aland, *Text*, 291–2.

<sup>17</sup> B. D. Ehrman, 'The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 361 n.1. Ehrman's position was anticipated many years earlier by D. W. Riddle, 'Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline', *ATR* 18 (1936): 221; and M. M. Parvis, 'The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal', *JR* 32 (1952): 172.

<sup>18</sup> H. Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19–37. Differing from Koester are F. Wisse, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions of the Second Century* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989), 39–53; and J. Delobel, 'The Achilles' Heel of New Testament Textual Criticism', *Bijdragen, International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*, 63 (2002): 3–21.

<sup>19</sup> W. L. Petersen, 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church*

In a number of ways, the recent attention to the concept of the ‘original’ text is a welcome development. No doubt the term has been used far too long without appropriate nuance and qualification.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, given the complexities of the textual history of some of the New Testament writings (in particular, Acts), and the limited number of early papyri we possess, we should not be overly confident that our reconstructed critical text is equivalent to what was originally written. Such a cautionary approach has been exemplified by the Metzger-Ehrman volume which does not claim textual critics can recover the original text, *per se*, but rather the text ‘regarded as most nearly conforming to the original’.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, the present volume has attempted to strike a cautionary tone in its very title, *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Our concern here is not so much a recovery of the original text, but an analysis of the ‘early’ text and its transmission.

However, while the complexities in recovering the original text need to be acknowledged, that is a separate question from whether the *concept* of an original text is incoherent and should therefore be abandoned as a goal of the discipline. Unfortunately, these two questions are often mingled together without distinction. Although recovering the original text faces substantial obstacles (and therefore the results should be qualified), there is little to suggest that it is an illegitimate enterprise. If it were illegitimate, then we would expect the same would be true for Greek and Roman literature *outside* the New Testament. Are we to think that an attempt to reconstruct the original word of Tacitus, or Plato, or Thucydides is misguided? Or that it does not matter? Those who argue that we should abandon the concept of an original text for the New Testament often give very little (if any) attention to the implications of such an approach for classical literature. Indeed, Parker gives the impression that concern for the original text is simply a *religious* phenomenon, driven by pressure from churches who desire an ‘authoritative text’.<sup>22</sup> It is doubtful that the scholars devoting their careers to recovering the original text of classical works would agree. To them, a text does not have to be sacred for its original wording to matter.

There appears to be little reason, therefore, to relinquish the traditional goal of textual criticism (even if that goal cannot always be reached with the precision we desire). That said, retaining this goal does not preclude the existence of other valuable goals for the discipline—recovery of the original

*History* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 136–52; D. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 203–13; Epp, ‘Multivalence’, 261–4.

<sup>20</sup> One thinks especially of the title of Wescott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. However, they also qualify their goal by noting that they seek the original texts ‘so far as they can now be determined from surviving documents’ (2.1).

<sup>21</sup> B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), p. xv.

<sup>22</sup> Parker, *The Living Text*, 209.

text need not be the *only* goal. The work of Ehrman (and others) reminds us that textual variants need not be relegated to the status of scraps on the cutting room floor, but can also function as ‘windows’ into the world of early Christianity, its social history, and the various theological challenges it faced.<sup>23</sup> Such discussion of theologically motivated scribal changes can be traced back to Kirsopp Lake and J. Rendel Harris, and more recently to scholars like Eldon J. Epp and his well-known book, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Cantabrigiensis in Acts*.<sup>24</sup> Recognizing the historical value of such scribal variations need not be set in opposition to the goal of recovering the original text. These two aspects of textual criticism are complementary, not mutually exclusive. Indeed, it is only when we can have some degree of assurance regarding the original text that we are even able to recognize that later scribes occasionally changed it for their own theological purposes. Without the former we would not have the latter.

### THE POPYRI AND THE EARLY TEXT

To many, the fresh discoveries of New Testament papyri, offering something both new and old, hold an inherent attraction. But despite the interest they have generated, the significance of the papyri for textual scholars is still quite debated. Over two decades ago Epp noted that the early papyri ‘contribute virtually no new substantial variants’ to the collection of variants already known from the later tradition.<sup>25</sup> Even with the discovery of many more papyri the situation has not changed.<sup>26</sup> Thus, it is not uncommon for experts to observe that, in spite of the mounting evidence from the early period, the critical editions of the NT have changed relatively little since the work of

<sup>23</sup> Ehrman, ‘The Text as Window’, 361–79.

<sup>24</sup> K. Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Oxford: Parker & Son, 1904); J. R. Harris, ‘New Points of View in Textual Criticism’, *ExpTim* 7 (1914): 316–34; E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: CUP, 1966).

<sup>25</sup> E. J. Epp, ‘The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission’, in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 101. He continued by saying that this suggests ‘not only that virtually all of the New Testament variants are preserved somewhere in our extant manuscript tradition, but also that representatives of virtually all textual complexions have been preserved for us in the papyri’.

<sup>26</sup> Affirmed in 1994 by B. D. Ehrman, ‘The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century’, in D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 100. Affirmed by J. K. Elliott, in full view of the papyri numbered up to Ɔ<sup>116</sup>, in ‘The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century’, in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 16.

Westcott and Hort.<sup>27</sup> Since ‘earlier is not necessarily better’, Keith Elliott has even criticized a tendency on the part of editors to give too much weight to the papyri in their critical editions of the NT.<sup>28</sup>

Yet the non-revolutionary nature of the texts contained in the papyri recovered so far is itself worthy of comment. According to Ehrman, the papyri have had the effect ‘of showing that while aspects of our textual theories needed to be modified, the basic physiognomy of our reconstructed originals was altogether on target’.<sup>29</sup> It also means that the fourth-century ‘best texts’, the ‘Alexandrian’ codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, have roots extending throughout the entire third century and even into the second. Even so, vigorous debate continues about how to analyze and classify the readings of the papyri and about their potential to deliver an accurate picture of the development of the NT text in the early period.

### Classifying Early Papyri Readings: Text Type or Type of Text?

Since the nineteenth century the textual criticism of the New Testament has rested mainly upon the great fourth- and fifth-century uncials,  $\xi$ , A, B, C, D, and W and on the classification of the manuscripts of the textual tradition according to text types. (In the classic formulation of Colwell, a ‘text type’ could be defined as ‘a group of manuscripts that agree more than 70 per cent of the time and is separated by a gap of about 10 per cent from its neighbors’.<sup>30</sup>) At the beginning of the twentieth century only nine papyri were known. Then came a number of exciting discoveries from Oxyrhynchus and the appearance of the Chester Beatty and Martin Bodmer collections. Little by little, the accumulating papyri, some of which contained substantial portions of text, allowed scholars a glimpse of the text of the New Testament writings before the time of the esteemed uncials. In 1957 Jack Suggs made an acute observation about the papyri and posed a question: ‘The papyri texts frequently give the appearance of being “mixed” texts. But how can second- and third-century texts be derived by mixture of later texts?’<sup>31</sup> Clearly, they cannot. Either the ‘later texts’ are actually earlier than imagined, or the effort to classify

<sup>27</sup> B. Aland, ‘The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History’, in Charles Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels*<sup>5</sup> (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 108; B. Ehrman, ‘The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism’, in Aland and Delobel, *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, 122 n. 15.

<sup>28</sup> Elliott, ‘The Nature of the Evidence’, 11.

<sup>29</sup> Ehrman, ‘Patristic Evidence’, 119.

<sup>30</sup> See E. C. Colwell, *Studies in the Methodology of the Text Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 59.

<sup>31</sup> M. J. Suggs, ‘The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text’, *NTS* 4 (1957–8): 145.

the papyri according to text types which only emerged later is backwards. These two explanations have become fountainheads for two streams of analysis of the papyri which continue up to the present.

In the second edition of his book on textual criticism in 1968 Bruce Metzger included in his descriptive list of the NT papyri an assessment of the text type to which they corresponded. He did not hesitate to characterize some of the early papyri as having the sort of 'mixed' texts which Suggs had questioned. Kurt and Barbara Aland responded specifically to Metzger in their handbook on textual criticism, warning that 'Descriptions in such terms as "mixed text," "partly Alexandrian, partly Western (pre-Caesarean) text," etc., to describe manuscripts of a period when these groups had not yet developed and could hardly be "mixed" contribute nothing to clear thinking.'<sup>32</sup> Even in the 2005 fourth edition of Metzger's *Text*, however, he and Ehrman continue to affirm the existence of two major text types, Western and Alexandrian, in the second century.<sup>33</sup> They continue to speak of  $\mathfrak{A}^{45}$  as 'intermediate between the Alexandrian and the Western'<sup>34</sup> and of  $\mathfrak{A}^{66}$  as 'mixed, with elements that are typically Alexandrian and Western'.<sup>35</sup>

Based on Metzger's evaluations, Eldon Epp in 1989 argued that the textual characters of the papyri placed most of them into four constellations which corresponded to the major text types.<sup>36</sup> Well aware that there were those who 'eschew the identification of text-types in the early period', Epp still maintained that three of these types were in existence by around 200 CE or shortly thereafter, and that the  $\mathfrak{A}^{75}$ -B text clearly existed in the second century. He described an 'A' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Byzantine type and connect to Alexandrinus (A) (in the Gospels); a 'B' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Alexandrian type and connect to Sinaiticus (a) and Vaticanus (B); a 'C' Group, texts which show a mixed type, between the B and D groups, and connect to Washingtoniensis (W); and a 'D' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Western type and connect to Bezae (D). Epp reaffirmed the groupings in 1995<sup>37</sup> and defended them as 'constellations' in a Society of Biblical Literature paper in 2008. We may chart his constellations as in Table I.1.

<sup>32</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn., tr. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, 1989; 1981 German original), 59.

<sup>33</sup> Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*, 278.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. 54.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. 67.

<sup>36</sup> Epp, 'The Significance of the Papyri'.

<sup>37</sup> E. J. Epp, 'The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 17–18, repeated in 2004, with the statement that they were 'highly provisional', in Eldon Jay Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), ch. 13, esp. 380–1.

Table I.1. Epp's Classification of the Papyri in 1989

Century	'A' Group	'B' Group <sup>a</sup>	'C' Group <sup>b</sup>	'D' Group <sup>c</sup>
2nd		ⲡ <sup>52</sup>		
2nd/3rd		ⲡ <sup>46</sup> , ⲡ <sup>64+67</sup> , ⲡ <sup>66</sup>		
3rd		ⲡ <sup>1</sup> , ⲡ <sup>4</sup> , ⲡ <sup>15</sup> , ⲡ <sup>20</sup> , ⲡ <sup>23</sup> , ⲡ <sup>28</sup> , ⲡ <sup>39</sup> , ⲡ <sup>40</sup> , ⲡ <sup>47</sup> , ⲡ <sup>49</sup> , ⲡ <sup>53</sup> , ⲡ <sup>65</sup> , ⲡ <sup>75</sup> , ⲡ <sup>91</sup>	ⲡ <sup>45</sup> (most of Mark), ⲡ <sup>27</sup>	ⲡ <sup>5</sup> , ⲡ <sup>29</sup> , ⲡ <sup>48</sup> , ⲡ <sup>69?</sup>
3rd/4th		ⲡ <sup>13</sup> , ⲡ <sup>16</sup> , ⲡ <sup>72</sup> [in Peter], ⲡ <sup>92</sup>	ⲡ <sup>37?</sup>	ⲡ <sup>37?</sup> , ⲡ <sup>38</sup> , ⲡ <sup>72</sup> [Jude], 0171
4th		ⲡ <sup>10</sup> , ⲡ <sup>62</sup> , ⲡ <sup>71</sup> , ⲡ <sup>86</sup> ⲡ <sup>8</sup> , ⲡ <sup>35</sup>	ⲡ <sup>25?</sup>	
4th/5th		ⲡ <sup>50</sup> , ⲡ <sup>57</sup>		ⲡ <sup>19?</sup> , ⲡ <sup>21?</sup>
5th		ⲡ <sup>14</sup>		
4th/6th		ⲡ <sup>56</sup>		
6th	ⲡ <sup>84</sup>	ⲡ <sup>33+58</sup>	ⲡ <sup>36</sup>	
6th/7th		ⲡ <sup>3</sup> , ⲡ <sup>43</sup> , ⲡ <sup>44</sup> , ⲡ <sup>55</sup>		
7th	ⲡ <sup>68</sup> , ⲡ <sup>74?</sup>	ⲡ <sup>11</sup> , ⲡ <sup>31</sup> , ⲡ <sup>34</sup>		
7th/8th	ⲡ <sup>42</sup>	ⲡ <sup>60</sup> , ⲡ <sup>61?</sup>		ⲡ <sup>41</sup>

<sup>a</sup> In 'Papyrus Manuscripts', 17, he added L and 33 and pointed to a connection between P46 and 1739 for Paul.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. he mentions also f<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. he mentions only ⲡ<sup>48</sup>, ⲡ<sup>38</sup>, ⲡ<sup>69</sup>, 0171, and perhaps ⲡ<sup>29</sup>, and connects them to D and to 1739 in Acts, 614, and 383.

But while some text critics were comparing manuscripts with each other to find similarities and groups, the Alands at the Münster Institut were comparing manuscripts with their presumed archetypes, and with the 'original' or *Ausgangstext*, the text which first circulated. The Alands have maintained unwaveringly that text types as such did not exist in the second century.<sup>38</sup> What the complexities of the earlier papyri showed instead was the freedom of the text in that period. Even the very close correspondence between ⲡ<sup>75</sup> (Luke and John) from around 200 and the Gospel text of Vaticanus from the mid-fourth century does not signify a text type, resulting from a deliberate

<sup>38</sup> Aland and Aland, *Text*, 64 (among many other places). It is notable that the Coherence Based Genealogical Method developed by Gerd Mink—which allows scholars to develop genealogical trees of MSS—is not built on the traditional text-type model and is now being used to reconstruct textual flow by the editors of the *Editio critica maior* (G. Mink, 'Ein umfassende Genealogie der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung', *NTS* 39 (1993): 481–99; see discussion in Parker, *New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, 169–71, and note the series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1987–). As a result, some scholars, like Holger Strutwolf, have begun to suggest that the traditional text-types should be abandoned entirely (Strutwolf's comments were made in a paper delivered at the Nov. 2006 SBL annual meeting in Washington, DC).

recension, but only a line of strictly copied texts executed with great care.<sup>39</sup> Manuscripts which did not conform to this careful or strict line of copying were simply the result of scribal ‘freedom’. Thus, what may look like early forms of the ‘Western’ text anticipating codex D are not the products of a recension but of a certain negligence in copying.<sup>40</sup>

The Münster approach then is to attempt to classify early manuscripts in three major groups ‘strict text’, ‘normal text’, and ‘free text’ (sometimes with further modifications: ‘at least normal’, ‘like D’), according to how closely they mirrored the original or *Ausgangstext*—assumed for practical purposes to be the text now established by over a century of text critical work, the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graeca* (now the 27th edn.).<sup>41</sup> Critics are correct to point to the circularity of this approach.<sup>42</sup> Yet, because the vast majority of textual critics<sup>43</sup> seem to agree that the current editions (NA<sup>27</sup> and UBS<sup>4</sup>) reproduce a text which must be close to the original or *Ausgangstext*, using the method as a working hypothesis<sup>44</sup> seems unobjectionable to many, at least as a point of departure.

### Text Quality: The Early Text as ‘Free Text’?

Throughout much of the twentieth century it appeared that the text of the early period exhibited a much greater ‘freedom’ than in the later period, when

<sup>39</sup> See also G. Fee, ‘The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria’, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 272; originally publ. in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974). Echoing Hort’s judgments of a century earlier, Fee claimed that  $\text{A}^75$  and B ‘seem to represent a “relatively pure” form of preservation of a “relatively pure” line of descent from the original text’ (272).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. B. Aland, ‘Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früherer Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium’, in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch, eds., *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 37.

<sup>41</sup> Aland and Aland, *Text*, 93–5; cf. K. Aland, ‘Der neue “Standard-Text” in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln’, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: OUP, 1981), 257–75; J. H. Petzer, ‘The History of the New Testament Text: Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism’, in Aland and Delobel, *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, 32; B. Aland, ‘Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments’, in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 1–13.

<sup>42</sup> B. D. Ehrman, ‘A Problem of Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts’, *Biblica*, 70 (1989): 381; Epp, ‘Papyrus’, 15; B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 290 n.1. The evaluation of William L. Petersen is less charitable: ‘A more unscientific, hubris-filled, and self-serving approach to scholarship is hard to imagine’ (W. L. Petersen, ‘The Genesis of the Gospels’, in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 60 n. 89).

<sup>43</sup> Notwithstanding what he would later say in *Misquoting Jesus*, 58, Ehrman wrote already in 1994, ‘Our surviving evidence can take us back . . . to the point of being reasonably certain that we have before us a close approximation of the original text’ (‘Patristic Evidence’, 122 n. 15).

<sup>44</sup> This is what Barbara Aland has maintained that it is (e.g. B. Aland, ‘Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten’, in J.-M. Sevrin, ed., *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 26–7 and elsewhere).



---

sample content of The Early Text of the New Testament

- [read online Unsolved Mysteries of the Old West pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [Juan Carlos here](#)
- [click George Eliot \(Authors in Context\) \(Oxford World's Classics\) online](#)
- [download The Source \(Witching Savannah, Book 2\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [Shakespeare's Local: Six Centuries of History Seen Through One Extraordinary Pub pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [click Encyclopedia of European Social History pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
  
- <http://ramazotti.ru/library/The-100--Count-ONLY-Sugar-Calories-and-Lose-Up-to-18-Lbs--in-2-Weeks.pdf>
- <http://growingsomeroots.com/ebooks/Cabin-Fever--The-sizzling-secrets-of-a-Virgin-air-hostess.pdf>
- <http://www.celebritychat.in/?ebooks/George-Eliot--Authors-in-Context--Oxford-World-s-Classics-.pdf>
- <http://fortune-touko.com/library/Football-For-Dummies--UK-Edition-.pdf>
- <http://weddingcellist.com/lib/Shakespeare-s-Local--Six-Centuries-of-History-Seen-Through-One-Extraordinary-Pub.pdf>
- <http://www.cafesystemcanarias.com/books/Hunted--Brides-of-the-Kindred--Book-2-.pdf>