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Introduction

La critique des textes est une discipline historique.
Jean Duplacy

The most problematic barrier facing NT textual criticism in the 21st
century is that which confronted scholars at the beginning of the
modern critical era: the status of the NT text in all its divergent forms
during the early transmissional stages of the second century2. The
researcher is hindered by a lack of evidence regarding NT textual
transmission in this era, whether one speaks in terms of extant papyri3.

---

2 Cf. L. VAGANAY, An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism, 2nd ed. rev. and updated by C.-B. AMPHOUX; English trans. J. HEIMERDINGER; English ed. amplified and updated by C.-B. AMPHOUX and J. HEIMERDINGER, Cambridge, University Press, 1992, p. 168 [hereafter VAGANAY–AMPHOUX]: ‘There is a stumbling block that remains, that is the history of the text before AD 200. There are only indirect witnesses for this period: a few Patristic quotations, early variants preserved in the Greek or in some versions, ... versions of the Diatessaron which are of varying degrees of trustworthiness, and that is about all’.
knowledge of letter-carrying, early translations into other languages, or even patristic quotations. The limited resources which we currently possess, while thought by some to be adequate to the task, are in reality quite inadequate for either determining the original form of the text of any given NT book (autograph or canonical), or for explaining the transmissional history of the text from its point of origin through the multifarious geographical and theological routes and byways in which the nascent NT text traveled during its first century and a half of existence. Apart from the discovery of significant new evidence, the best that one can presume will remain tied to speculative theory and accompanying hypotheses (of which many exist). That hypothesis which best accords with the known facts and which best can explain all extant data in light of its own speculations should generally be preferred, especially if that hypothesis requires the fewest intermediary steps or speculative possibilities (i.e., the principle of Ockham’s Razor).

The present writer favors the theory of Byzantine-priority, and considers that a case can be made for the Byzantine Textform to represent the overarching form of the NT text from which all other forms can be presumed to have derived. From this perspective it is

---


6 Cf. Vaganay-Amphoux, p. 89: ‘The history of the text during this period is as important as it is difficult to reconstruct. The ecclesiastical writers give very few clues. The historian finds himself like someone trying to do a jigsaw puzzle which has most of the pieces missing and some of the rest damaged. He has to settle for a rough outline, much of it guesswork’.

7 One may equally question whether the limited data dating from the end of the second century until the time of the legitimization of Christianity under Constantine fares much better. The data which we possess even in that era derives from geographical locales beyond the region in which Greek was the primary language (from modern Southern Italy, through Greece and Turkey, down to Antioch on the Orontes). Such may well reflect only localized (Egypt, Palestine) or translational (Western Europe, North Africa) variations, which themselves may not accurately reflect the status of the text in the primary Greek-speaking region from which there is but silence until the mid-fourth century.

assumed that the remaining texttypes represent early deviations from that original Textform, with such deviation apparently originating within the era of the second century. A necessary corollary to this theory requires that a case be established on the basis of the extant NT evidence that the resultant texts and individual readings of other competing texttypes are themselves secondary to that found within the Byzantine Textform. This paper presents a limited amount of evidence suggesting the likelihood that the presumed archetype of what is commonly termed the Alexandrian texttype was a 'longer' text more typical of what could be found in either the Byzantine Textform or the 'western' or 'mixed' types of text found among many of the extant Egyptian papyri. In this regard, some concurrence may be found from eclectic defenders of a generally 'longer text' tradition as well as from those who advocate the originality of a generally 'western' text yet without committing partisans of those positions to any essential agreement with the present writer's own hypothesis.

The Alexandrian Texttype considered in relation to its Archetype

Der Vorläufer eines Textzustandes wird dem Nachfahren außerordentlich ähnlich sein.
Gerd Mink

If the Alexandrian texttype is viewed as either a localized regional variant which happened to diverge from the original form of the text through some sort of corruptive 'process' or as the product of

9 E.g., J. K. Elliott, 'Keeping up with Recent Studies: New Testament Textual Criticism', ExpT 99 (1987/8), p. 43, 'My own observation is that in general it is the longer text that is original'.

10 E.g., Vaganay Ampoux, p. 93-94, where one is urged 'to consider the alternative ..., that is the possibility of the priority of the 'Western' text'; also that 'the hypothesis of the priority of the 'Western' text ... is assumed to represent the text as it was before any recension'. Their concomitant rejection of the present writer's Byzantine-priority hypothesis (inaccurately termed 'the defence of the "textus receptus"') should not be ignored: 'From time to time there were some obscure pleas raised in its [the Byzantine Textform's] favour. Today, it seems that this notorious text is now dead, it is to be hoped for ever' (p. 152). The present writer obviously differs regarding this point.


12 See E. C. Colwell, 'Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts', in his Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New Testament Tools and Studies 9), Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1968, p. 53: 'A text-type is a process, not the work of one hand' (emphasis original); idem, 'Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program', ibid., p. 164: 'The story of the manuscript tradition of the New Testament is the story of progression from a relatively uncontrolled tradition to a rigorously controlled tradition' (emphasis
deliberate recensational activity\textsuperscript{13}, traces of such alteration may be expected to leave their footprints scattered among its extant documents, whether these be Greek manuscripts or localized vestitional (primarily Coptic) witnesses\textsuperscript{14}. The best traces of the Alexandrian archetype should be discernible within its witnesses when they are significantly united, since a reading found in but a single witness or even two or three may reflect an independent alteration made at a subsequent stage of corruption rather than what may have derived directly from the archetype\textsuperscript{15}. Thus, singular readings of B, Ἄ, or other Alexandrian witnesses should be excluded from archetype consideration, even when current critical editors might consider such to be primary (i.e., as the main text of NA\textsuperscript{27} or UBS\textsuperscript{4})\textsuperscript{16}. For the present study, those readings which possess a

\textsuperscript{13} See VAGANAY - AMPHOUX, p. 98, 107-109. Amphoux in particular suggests (p. 98) that the original Alexandrian recension 'would have been made ... by Pantaenus, the founder of the Alexandrian school, towards AD 175' and that 'this would be the origin of the text type of  \gamma and B'. The present writer makes no assumption regarding the originator of the Alexandrian text, but suggests an earlier date for such revision to have occurred, perhaps as early as the beginning of the second century, at a point shortly after the Gospels and (at least) the Pauline Epistles began to circulate in their respective collections within a canonical or quasi-canonical corpus. VAGANAY - AMPHOUX suggest (p. 98) that 'following AD 135, the recensions proliferated with a resultant textual diversity which reached a peak before the year 200' - a date coincidently coeval with that suggested by Colwell as the point by which most if not all of the significant variants in the NT had arisen (E. C. COLWELL, 'Nature of Text-Types', \textit{art. cit.}, p. 55: 'The overwhelming majority of readings were created before the year 200' [emphasis original]). VAGANAY - AMPHOUX then suggest (p. 107) that 'As early as AD 200,  \gamma attests certain of the readings of this [Alexandrian] recension, and several years later  \gamma also attests most of the ones in Luke and John', although they allow that the initial Alexandrian recension 'was later subjected to further alterations, sometimes being embellished, sometimes being pruned'.

\textsuperscript{14} VAGANAY - AMPHOUX, p. 2, note that 'there is no hope of recognising all the errors which may have found their way into a text during a period for which no witnesses remain'; such, however, does not preclude the recognition of at least some of the errors which may have occurred within a given texttype during the transmissional process.

\textsuperscript{15} For example, in Mt 16, 9-20, the Alexandrian archetype can likely be reconstructed apart from Ἄ and B (which omit the passage) by the general consensus of the readings of C L W Ψ 099 33 579 892 2427.

\textsuperscript{16} J. C. O'NEILL, 'The Rules followed by the Editors of the Text found in the Codex Vaticanus', \textit{NTS} 35 (1989), p. 218-228, suggests specific editorial activity as well as accidental
significant amount of 'Alexandrian' support will be considered to be
determinative — at least in part — for establishing the original archetype
reading which may have given rise to the prevailing Alexandrian reading
in any given instance\textsuperscript{17}.

The extant NT papyri — all of which derive from Egypt — tend to
reflect a generally 'mixed' text rather than a predominantly 'Alexandrian'
texttype form\textsuperscript{18}. This is not unexpected, since it is reasonable to suppose
that manuscripts produced within a local region, remote from the site
of autographic origin, would tend to diverge from that autograph to
some degree, particularly during the early centuries. The disparate texts
found even among the Egyptian papyri certainly serve as examples of
this phenomenon: the B \textit{N} type of text really received no real
confirmation until the discovery of \textit{P75} in 1955. Previous to that time,
the various papyri which had been discovered showed only texts of
widely differing character, none of which was readily identifiable with a
known texttype as classified from the researches of the preceding
century. At best, one could declare that the early papyri discovered prior
to \textit{P75} had a 'mixed' type of text, comprising elements otherwise typical
of Alexandrian, 'Western', Caesarean, and even Byzantine forms of text.
How these 'mixed' texts came to predominate in the early transmissional
tradition in Egypt is not much of a mystery, given the 'uncontrolled
popular text' syndrome known to have existed in the early centuries
before the legitimization of Christianity under Constantine: texts to
varying degrees were fluid\textsuperscript{19}, with insertions, omissions, transpositions,
and substitutions being made according to the whim of the individual scribe\textsuperscript{20}, even though in the main all such manuscripts generally reflected the overarching original text which itself had derived from the autograph (else the NT papyrus fragments would have become wholly unrecognizable as NT documents).

Whatever form the autograph text may have had, these popular and uncontrolled mixed texts would have differed from that autograph in their own particular ways, primarily through expansion and paraphrase in order to produce a more readable text. Scribal error also would prevail, however, and in this sense some good readings would similarly be altered so as to produce nonsense; other good readings would simply be lost through careless omission, while yet other good readings would be changed for no obvious reason\textsuperscript{21}.

In this light, it would not be surprising had the Alexandrian archetype itself been prepared from one or more typical early second century exemplars which resembled the extant ‘mixed’ NT papyri that we currently possess from the Egyptian region, even though none of the extant documents is itself that actual Alexandrian archetype. If such a ‘mixed text’ archetype possessed corruptions typical of what we see in the current early ‘mixed’ papyri from Egypt, it would be no wonder if, when preparing a supposedly ‘better’ recensional edition, not only those readings which were considered erroneous would be repaired and improved, but that additional editorial revision similarly would occur.

One item which might be otherwise overlooked in such recensional activity would be those places where the archetype could not readily be repaired or restored due to accidental omission which resulted in a

---


\textsuperscript{21} As P. M. HEAD, ‘Observations’, 	extit{art. cit.}, p. 247, n. 56, clearly notes, there remains ‘a caution—scribal additions have been shown to occur, although with less frequency than omissions. In the final analysis, of course, each variant must be assessed on its own merits’.
‘sensible’ reading. Indeed, such omissions would be among those errors which would be virtually impossible to detect, so long as the resultant reading made sense. Even if an omission of a word or phrase produced nonsense, corrective attempts to remedy the difficulty still might not restore the original text, but might only create a text which would be reasonable and readable. Certainly comparison with several other exemplars would help cure this type of problem, but how often such comparison was made is problematic. One might wonder that transcriptional error would remain unremedied, particularly if cross-comparison of a copy against a different exemplar had taken place. Subsequent correction by means of a second or even third copy would seem to be a primary preventative against the vagaries of transcriptional omission. Nevertheless, such does not appear to have occurred as a matter of course among the early papyri. Among the pre-fourth century manuscripts, one finds clear evidence of correction from a second exemplar primarily in \( \text{\footnotesize P66} \), but this does not appear to have been the prevailing case with most ancient NT papyri. Rather, in most cases the scribe appears to be his or her own διαγράφων, correcting as a rule at most the obvious errors which tended to produce nonsense. Even the scribe of \( \text{\footnotesize P75} \) failed to correct a number of personally-created errors through either a failure to notice such or failure to compare personal copying against an exemplar secondary to that from which the copy was made (the initial exemplar already would have had errors due to its own scribal activity). The present writer’s collation research within the pericope adulterae (where the potential for cross-comparison and correction was extremely high due to the wide amount of textual variation) indicates that cross-comparison and correction did not occur in a quantity

\[\text{\footnotesize 22 J. R. ROYSE, \textit{art. cit.} (n. 19), p. 246, presents data which ‘suggest strongly that the general tendency during the early period of textual transmission was to omit’.}\]


\[\text{\footnotesize 24 E. C. COLWELL, ‘Scribal Habits’, \textit{art. cit. (supra, n. 20), p. 117-118, notes that neither \( \text{\footnotesize P66} \) nor \( \text{\footnotesize P75} \) appear to have been corrected by a second exemplar or other party, although \( \text{\footnotesize P66} \) clearly evidences such. Cf. also on this head G. D. FEE, \textit{Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics (Studies and Documents 34), Salt Lake City, University of Utah, 1968, p. 57-75; IDEM, ‘The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission’, NovT 7 (1964/5), p. 247-257.}\}

\[\text{\footnotesize 25 Cf. E. C. COLWELL, ‘Scribal Habits’, \textit{art. cit., in regard to the errors found in \( \text{\footnotesize P75} \): itacisms, p. 110-111; nonsense readings, p. 111; homoioteleuton and ditography, p. 112; remote harmonization, p. 113; harmonization to the immediate context, p. 113; influence of similar forms, p. 115; single letter errors, p. 116. In each category, the scribes of \( \text{\footnotesize P66} \), \( \text{\footnotesize P66} \), and \( \text{\footnotesize P75} \) are cited separately in regard to their propensity toward such errors.}\]
sufficient to alter the otherwise relatively independent streams of textual
descent.\textsuperscript{26} It thus would be no surprise to find that the early papyrus
documents used as the basis of the Alexandrian archetype for each NT
book were for the most part left uncorrected in regard to transcriptional
error, particularly in cases where the resultant reading was sensible.

The present focus: errors of omission caused primarily by homoio-
teleuton

\begin{quote}
The kind of mistake which has most affected the
text of the New Testament is accidental omission
though homoioteleuton and the like.
G. D. Kilpatrick\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

One case of error which perhaps is easier to detect than others is
accidental omission caused by skipping forward to an identical letter or
combination of letters. Backward skips of course produce what all term
‘dittography’, while forward skips result in the more precise categories of
‘haplography’, ‘homoio teleuton’, and ‘homoioarcton’. For the present
study all such leaps forward which result in the loss of letters, syllables,
words, or phrases will be termed ‘homoio teleuton’, even if such is not
always technically correct.\textsuperscript{28}

If the exemplar utilized as a base for the Alexandrian recension con-
tained transmissional corruptions and errors which left sensible resultant
readings, typical of what might be found in the ‘uncontrolled popular
manuscripts’ of the second century, one should not be surprised to find
various expansions, stylistic alterations, and otherwise sensible readings in
the recensional product which did not originate with the revising editor,
but which were already present in the preceding ‘mixed text’ exemplar\textsuperscript{29}. This also would include in particular many cases of homoio teleuton,

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{26 See M. A. ROBINSON, ‘Preliminary Observations on the
Pericope Adulterae based on Complete Collations of All Available Continuous-text Manuscripts and over 100 Lectionaries’, forthcoming in \textit{Filologia Neotestamentaria}.}


\footnote{28 Perhaps Kenyon’s simple abbreviated ‘hom.’ would be preferable; however, even this remains questionable as a technical term since it fails to distinguish between simple haplography of repeated letters, syllables, words, or phrases and cases where identical forms of text are more widely separated.}

\footnote{29 Cf. J. DULAC, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 129: ‘Leurs ressemblances supposaient une certaine communauté d’origine’.
}
omitting short words, phrases, syllables, and letters, as demonstrated within the early papyri found in Egypt during the later second and third centuries.\(^{30}\)

In cases where several Alexandrian witnesses share an error which could be explained by homoioteleuton, a strong presumption exists that such an error was originally present in the archetype exemplar and was not merely coincidental to the scattered witnesses which contain it.\(^{31}\) Of course, the more Alexandrian manuscripts which might witness to such a possible error, the stronger the case will appear to be. Lack of numeric support, however, does not necessarily imply the absence of the error in the archetype, since it is highly possible that in the course of time individual scribes were able to repair the damage and restore the missing portion of text either by comparison with another manuscript or from familiarity with a specific wording which would prompt the repair of a defective text.\(^{32}\) Similarly, cases of possible error of this category with support from manuscripts representing divergent texttypes does not negate the hypothesis as applied to the Alexandrian archetype, but serves only to demonstrate that 'some types of errors are natural enough that they could have been made by more than one scribe at the same variant.'\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{30}\) See on this point in particular J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', *art. cit. (supra, n. 20); also IDEM, 'Scribal Habits', *art. cit. (supra, n. 20), p. 153-154; IDEM, 'Scribal Tendencies', *art. cit. (supra, n. 20), p. 242-244; also P. M. HEAD, 'Observations', *art. cit. (supra, n. 20), p. 247, who concludes 'in support of Royse's thesis, that in fact omission is the more common scribal habit' and that 'we should not prefer the shorter reading, but rather prefer the longer reading (other factors being equal).

\(^{31}\) E. TOV, 'Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules', *HTR 75* (1982), p. 441, correctly notes that cases of 'scribal haplography and homoioteleuton/homoioarcton (parablepsi)' are not covered by the supposed 'rule' of the shorter reading being preferred, and also adds in regard to shorter readings in general that 'it is often hard to distinguish between a scribal phenomenon and a content addition/omission'. Thus, while the examples listed herein might for the most part have derived from accidental omission as suggested, in some cases deliberate recensional alteration may perhaps be postulated with merit as an alternative explanation.

\(^{32}\) Singular readings of various manuscripts remain excluded from the present study for reasons noted above, since these cannot demonstrate 'archetypal integrity' due to their singular nature.

\(^{33}\) J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', *art. cit.,* p. 542. As Royse also notes on the same page, 'the possibility of a scribal leap exists at any time within the transmission of the text,' and 'agreement in omission by various witnesses can be nothing more than coincidental agreement in error', which has a high likelihood of occurrence 'even in manuscripts of high quality. Royse concludes from this that 'the frequency of errors caused by leaps was so high in at least some manuscripts that coincidental agreement is not only possible, but even certain', citing manuscripts \& and B in particular. He then states (p. 543) that 'given the evident frequency with which scribes even of manuscripts possessing the 'age and quality' of
The examples herein submitted are those which appear to reflect errors stemming from the presumed Alexandrian archetypal papyrus exemplar, which errors were present in that archetype manuscript before the recensional process began that led to the $\Psi^75$ / B type of text. These errors remained uncorrected due to the resultant reading 'making sense' of a reasonable sort. Since such errors would be less likely to be corrected, their perpetuation in later representatives of that texttype is not surprising, even though not all manuscripts of that texttype might retain the primitive error of the archetype.\footnote{As noted by J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', \textit{art. cit.}, p. 542, 'where the chief evidence for omission is only a few Alexandrian manuscripts, this agreement may well be due simply to the fact that their common ancestor made the leap, which remained uncorrected in the transmission to the later manuscripts. ... When the few manuscripts involved are themselves early... the hypothetical ancestor must naturally be very early indeed'. Yet, Royse notes that it is equally true that 'the resulting omission could survive in manuscripts of various ages and textual types', and may reflect some independent instances of the identical error occurring among those witnesses (p. 543).}

The examples of error by homoiooteleuton are separated into various categories which reflect those cited by Colwell\footnote{36 E. C. COLWELL, 'Scribal Habits', \textit{art. cit. (supra), n. 20}, p. 116, suggests that many transpositional variations appear to have arisen from homoiooteleuton and attempted restoration: 'by a leap the scribe jumps over a word, copies the following word, looks back at his exemplar, catches his error, and writes in the omitted word out of order'. From this Colwell maintains that 'it may be assumed that most changes in word order are due to scribal error'. Since the cause and correction of transpositional rearrangement is more problematic, such cases are not a focus in the present paper, nor the other types of errors noted by Colwell, including what he terms 'the larger common error: the omission of short words' (p. 120).}, Royse, Head, and others\footnote{37 E. C. COLWELL, 'Scribal Habits', \textit{art. cit.}, discusses leaps from the same to the same, the omission of short words (p. 112), and the tendency of different scribes to omit single letters, syllables, short words, or phrases (p. 116). J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', \textit{art. cit.}, does not.}. These current examples suggest that the Alexandrian archetype
reflects many differing categories of omission-length, and it is not necessarily possible to categorize the scribe(s) of that papyrus archetype as tending more toward one length of omission more than another.

Certainly, the suggestion regarding accidental error, particularly by homoiooteleuton, is but one factor which may have affected the transmissonal development of the Alexandrian archetype reading. In many instances other factors may have affected the transmissonal causes of any given example within a variant unit. No attempt is made within this paper to offer a complete conspectus of the arguments which might be brought to bear upon each cited variant; in a few cases further discussion is provided in a footnote, suggesting other proximate causes of variation beyond the accidental transcriptional factors which here function as the primary material under examination.

Possible cases of homoiooteleuton in the Alexandrian archetype

An argument based on a mechanical error, such as haplogy, is always better than an argument based on a deliberate change in the text.

David Noel Freedman

In the following examples, it is suggested that the Alexandrian archetype was a papyrus manuscript which in the process of transmission had lost portions of text due primarily to scribal error, and in particular to homoiooteleuton. Some instances of omission may derive from errors

---

consider length of omission the primary factor, but that 'sameness or close similarity in any two portions of text would be sufficient to facilitate such a leap' (p. 545).

38 J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', art. cit., p. 551, n. 39, does suggest that 'leaps omitting entire words probably have a better chance of going unnoticed by the scribe himself or by later correctors or copyists'.

39 As J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', art. cit., p. 542, notes, 'the probability of omission by a leap in a given case may be considered higher or lower by various scholars when the full range of evidence and relevant issues is examined'.

40 J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', art. cit., p. 551, n. 32, correctly notes that 'The (prior) question is not which variant is authentic, but what transcriptional errors are possibilities to be considered'.

41 As VAGANAY - AMPHOUX, p. 55, warn in regard to cases of haplogy, homoiooteleuton, or ditography, 'a hastily formed judgement about their cause could lead to wrong conclusions'.


43 It is recognized that the reading of the majority Byzantine Textform could be alleged in places to result from omission by homoiooteleuton (e.g., in Jude 15, the Byzantine reading διακλητων ων [it is betrayed ων] could have derived from the Alexandrian διακλητων λογων ων [it is due to ων]. However, it is transmissionally unlikely that an error of homoiooteleuton would fail to be corrected within the dominant
made by previous scribes who were part of the same line of transmission in that region. The overriding principle remains that errors of omission which produce sensible readings are those least likely to be corrected during the transmissional process. In the examples provided, the reading of the Byzantine Textform (generally subsumed in NA within the Π siglum) is considered to be the base text from which the error of omission occurred; shorter readings which dominate among Alexandrian witnesses but which differ from Π reflect (under the present theory) the Alexandrian archetype as it stood following the accidental omission but before recensional activity occurred relevant to that archetype.

An illustrative example of the phenomenon appears in Jude 15, where NA and Π agree, but where each of the shorter readings appears to have arisen by homoioteleuton from either the majority reading or an assimilated variant thereof (suggested instances of homoioteleuton are indicated by an arc [∩]):

Jude 15 παντὸς τῶν εργῶν ασβείσις αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν Π NA A B 33 vg sy bo
παντὸς τῶν εργῶν αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν C 1243 1846 pc vg
παντὸς τῶν εργῶν αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν 522 323 1241 1739
παντὸς αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν 1881 2298 pc sy
παντὸς τῶν εργῶν αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν Ψ 630 1505 1852 pc (ὑγ)
παντὸς τῶν εργῶν αὐτῶν ὑγ ησθήσαν ὑγ (ὑγ)

stream of transmission, especially when the scribes responsible for the preservation and perpetuation of that stream are considered to have preferred a smoother and fuller text. In the case of Jude 15, the Alexandrian revisers apparently opted for a smoother explanatory phrasing over against the more abrupt and syntactically harsher majority tradition.

See in this regard L. Kalevi Loimaranta, 'The Gospel of Matthew: Is a Shorter Text Preferable to a Longer One? A Statistical Approach', in J. Neusner, ed., Approaches to Ancient Judaism, Volume X, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997, p. 171-187. Loimaranta specifically notes (p. 179) that 'The Alexandrian manuscripts Ρ and B, and with them the texts of W/H and UBS, are characterised by a great number of omissions of all lengths' and that 'The great majority of these omissions are obviously caused by scribes' negligence'.

L. K. Loimaranta, art. cit., p. 176, not only notes that 'homoioteleuton is an important cause of many omissions', but concludes that 'The canon lectio brevior potior is definitely erroneous' (p. 177, emphasis original).

In many cases, Π and NA agree regarding the original form of the text, while a reading found in the apparatus reflects the Alexandrian archetype as occasioned by an accidental omission. In some cases the NA reading is enclosed in brackets [ ] to indicate text-critical uncertainty concerning the original reading, even though the reading given in the text 'shows the preference of the editors' (NA, p. 49). When such uncertainty is indicated, Alexandrian omission by homoioteleuton should have been a considered factor where applicable.
Another example is 1 Pet 3.1, where NA²⁷ and Ψ again agree: here the Alexandrian archetype and subsequent omission in its successors readily can be traced:

1 Pet 3.1

\textit{υνα καὶ εὐληνες} Ψ ᾽Ρ A P Ψ 33 τὸς Κ NA²⁷
\textit{υνα εἰ καὶ τινες} C K 69 945 1241 1739 \textit{al} (this transposition reflects the Alexandrian archetype)
\textit{υνα εἰ τινες} Ψ\textsuperscript{84} B 614 630 630 τὸς \textit{al} τὸς \textit{sy} \textit{cop Spec (λ ἐν)}

The examples which follow reflect various categories of homoioteleuton-based omission, ranging from a single letter lost by haplography to the omission of whole words, phrases, and longer passages.\textsuperscript{48} This phenomenon is readily demonstrable throughout the NT.

**Loss of a single letter:**

Lk 17.24

\textit{αὐτοῦ πη πατταύναια} Ψ ᾽Ρ A D Ψ\textsuperscript{75} B L N W Γ Θ Ψ f¹ 579 892 1241 2542 \textit{al} NA²⁷ (η ἐν η)

1 Thes 5.2

οτὶ \textit{ἡ μεμέρα} Ψ ᾽Ρ A Ψ 0278 1881
οτὶ \textit{ἡ μεμέρα} Ψ ᾽Ρ A D F G P 33 81 1739 2464 \textit{pc} NA²⁷ (η ἐν η)

**Loss of a single syllable or short section within a word:**

Lk 6.3

ο ἐπισεῖνοι Δαυδ ὁποτε ἐπίσεῖνοι Ψ ᾽Ρ A Θ f¹

Lk 15.9

συγκαλεῖται \textit{αὐτος} Ψ ᾽Ρ A D W f¹ f¹

Lk 24.40

ἐπισκεπτεῖεν Ψ ᾽Ρ A W Θ Ψ f¹

\textsuperscript{47} The remaining readings \textit{υνα καὶ εὑληνες} (81 1881) and \textit{υνα εὑληνες} (1505 \textit{pc} \textit{sy}) reflect respectively a corruption of the base text and a likely corruption of the Ψ\textsuperscript{84} B resultant text.

\textsuperscript{48} Minor variations which are not directly related to homoioteleuton or the Alexandrian archetype are generally omitted from the citations.

\textsuperscript{49} In the phrase concluding the preceding verse, \textit{μὴ καθηκαί \mu} ὑδ \textit{δωκῃ} (read by both Ψ and NA²⁷), some of the same manuscripts cited for omission of η also appear to omit by what is apparently 'phonic homoioteleuton'; Ψ\textsuperscript{75} B and f¹ \textit{omt} \textit{κηκαί ηδ \δωκῃ}, apparently by η \textit{ἐν}.

\textsuperscript{50} Although homoioteleuton is suggested, the NA²⁷ reading also harmonizes with the parallels Mk 2, 25 and Mt 12, 3 (not mentioned in the NA²⁷ apparatus when its main text is in view). This further indicates its secondary nature in Lk. Cf. also the NA²⁷ bracketed [οὐνες] at the end of this phrase in Lk (supported by Ψ A C Ψ f¹): its omission in Ψ\textsuperscript{84} B D L W Θ f¹ 33 579 700 892 1241 2542 \textit{pc} parallels Mk 2, 25 and Mt 12, 3, while the Ψ reading remains non-harmonizing.

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. Lk 15, 13, where Ψ/NA²⁷ read συναγαγων, but Ψ\textsuperscript{25} \textit{pc} read συναγων (γ ἐν γ).

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Lk 15, 22, where Ψ/NA²⁷ read \textit{ἐνεγκαται}, but Ψ\textsuperscript{75} 579 1241 \textit{read} \textit{ἐνεγκαται} (ε ἐν ε).
Lost of a single word of one or more syllables:

Mt 5,13 ἐξω καὶ καταπατεῖσθαι ἔρως καταπατεῖσθαι

Mt 5,22 αὐτοῦ εἰκή εὐνόξεσ φαντασμοῦ εὐνόξεσ

Mt 11,8 εἰ δακρόκως ὑματίως ἑμφανέσθων

Mt 11,15 o εὐχων ὡτα ἀκοουὲν ἀκοουὲν

Mt 11,17 εἰρθηρισμένον ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρθηρισμένον καὶ

Mt 18,19 οἱ εὐσκοτήτων οἱ εὐσκοτήτων

Mt 23,3 εἰσίσων ὑμῖν τῷ ἐπισκοπήνειν

Mt 28,14 πεισομένειν αὐτοὺς καὶ πεισομένειν καὶ

---

53 Contrary to the usual explanation favoring the Alexandrian reading, it is far easier to postulate an independent omission by homoioteleuton in a very small handful of witnesses than to presume a deliberate recensional alteration intended to mollify the stringency of the command.

54 The NA27 apparatus suggests that ἔρως harmonizes to Lk 7,25; however, the differences which remain between the texts tend to preclude a single-word harmonization. Compare the divergences in ἔρως of each passage: Mt 11,8, ἔξηθατε· τὰ μαθαία φοροῦσαι; ὁ ἐμαυθαλώς ἐπιτρέπονται; ἐπιτρέπονται; ἐπιπλακοῖς; Lk 7,25, ἐξηθαθατε; ἐν ματίσιν ἐπιβλέπων καὶ τρίφυλεσ εἰρθημένον; τριφυλεσ. Note that NA27 in Lk, by reading ἔηθατε (Θ) 221, A B D L W Σ (f) 113 33 565 579 [700 892, δικτε] 1241 1424 2542 αλ, reflects Alexandrian harmonization to the Matthean parallel, yet ἔηθατε in Lk (Θ Ψ) resists any trend toward harmonization.

55 The fact that this particular omission occurs three times in Matthew suggests recensional activity rather than accident in the archetype. Cf. Mt 13, 9 and Mt 13, 43. Yet, apart from B, no other manuscript appears to read the omission in all three places. Lk 8, 8, 14, 35, read the δρ form without significant variation (Mk 4, 9 has ὡς eχει for o εχουν and Mk 4, 23 has ἐλ τις εχει). Yet in Mk 7, 16 the entire phrase (beginning with eι τις εχει) is omitted by B L Δ* 0274 28 2427 sa sm bo while included by A D W Θ j 13 33 latt sy sa sa bo. In Mt 25, 29, the phrase is not present in δρ, but has been inserted from lectionary usage by C H 892 pc (added post Mt 25, 30 by T j 11 pc). Similar lectionary-based insertions occur in a few manuscripts following Lk 21, 4 (Γ j 11 892 al) and Lk 12, 21 (U j 13 579 892 al). Not to be neglected are the seven occurrences in the Apocalypse (2, 7, 11, 17, 29, 3, 6, 13, 22) with the unique form o εχουν ως ἀκουοντα τι το πνεῡ λεγει τας ἐκκλησιας; also Rev 13, 9, eι τις εχεις ως ακουοντος (cf. Mk 4, 23, 7, 16!). These offer some impetus for the omission of ακουειν in the Matthean passages.

56 Cf. the parallel Lk 7, 32, with many of the same witnesses omitting. The presence or absence of υμῖν is consistent in either the NA27 or δρ texts, regardless of parallels.

---

The NEW TESTAMENT TEXT IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY (HTB 6)
Mk 1,4 καὶ κηρύσσων ἦν τῇ ἐρμήῳ. ΒΔΘ 28 33 700 2427 ε-2211 πκ λατ sy² bo\textsuperscript{ma} (κ κ) 57

Mk 1,13 τὸν εἰκόνα ἐν τῇ ἐρμήῳ. ΒΔΘ 28 33 700 2427 ε-2211 πκ λατ sy² bo\textsuperscript{ma} (κ κ) 57

Mk 8,16 αλληλούς λεγοντες οτι ΒΔΑCLΩ 0131 f113 33 αυτ f1 vg sy bo

Mk 13,7 δεις γαρ γενεσθαι ΒΔΑCLΘ f1 f113 33 lat sy² bo\textsuperscript{ma} bo\textsuperscript{ma} (γ γ) 59

Mk 15,39 στους κραζας εξεπευσεν ΒΔΑCLΘ f1 f113 33 2427 lat sy² 60

Lk 2,38 καὶ αὐτὴ της ὥρας ΒΔΑCLΘ Ψ 0130 33 579 ε-844 ε-2211 πκ NA² (αυτη αυτη) 57

Lk 2,38 λυτρωσιν εν λειωσελην ΒΔΑCLΘ Ψ 0130 f1 33 sy² 60

Lk 2,40 εκραταιοντο πτω πληρουμενου ΒΔΑCLΘ Ψ f1 33 1565 pc lat sy² cop ιν ιν NA² (ν ν) 59

Lk 2,51 ταυτα τοις σαββαστι ΒΔΑCLΘ Ψ f1 33 33 lat sy² 60

Lk 6,2 τι ποιεῖτε αὐτοι ἐξεστίν ποιεῖν τοῖς σαββαστι ΒΔΑCLΘ Ψ f1 q (sy²) sy² bo\textsuperscript{ma} 60

57 While the \textit{μ} reading could be alleged as conflation due to the minority \textit{μ} εἰκόνα (K f1 69 565 700 1424 2542 al sy²), such would be unlikely given the overall late dates of the latter Greek manuscripts (sy²), while early, apparetly reflects an independent situation. The omission of εἰκόνα may be stylistic, removing a redundancy (cf. \textit{Mk} 1, 12, εἰς την ἐρμήν). 58 NA² suggests assimilation to \textit{Mt} 16, 7, but \textit{μ} is otherwise not parallel: \textit{Mk} in \textit{M} reads καὶ διελυγόμενος πρὸς αλλήλοις λεγοντες οτι αυτοις αὐτοις εὐχαριστεοῦσα. \textit{Mt} in \textit{M} reads εἰς διελυγόμενος εἰς εὐαγγελιστι λεγοντες οτι αὐτοις εὐαγγελισαν. Were harmonization indeed a factor in \textit{Mk}, it becomes surprising that the remaining differences were left unharmonized. 59 The \textit{μ} harmonization alleged in NA² is impossible: \textit{Lk} 21, 9 reads δεις γαρ ταυτα γενεσθαι, while \textit{Mt} 24, 6 in \textit{M} Κ W 0102 f1 33 sy² sy² reads δεις γαρ ταυτα γενεσθαι. Παντα or ταυτα were more likely to have been harmonized rather than the simple connective γαρ. 60 Although some might allege \textit{μ} to be the result of conflation, the fact that one of the needed pre-conflationary elements exists primarily in later Caesarea witnesses tends to negate this possibility. 61 The parallel alleged by NA² to \textit{Mt} 12, 2 is not convincing. In \textit{Mt} the issue is a statement, while in \textit{Lk} it appears as a question with a change from third person in \textit{Mt} to second person in \textit{Lk}. Of the two parallel phrases in \textit{μ}, only the words αὐτοις ἐξεστίν ποιεῖν agree. A claim for harmonization is not enhanced by urging a one-word parallel from two quite disparate sentences. Accidental omission by homoioteleuton is clearly the stronger case (the Markan parallel, \textit{Mk} 2, 24, lacks all forms of ποιεῖτε).
Lk 10,42 αφαίρεσον τας απ’ αυτής ᾿Ιωάννας \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{75}\) ΑΣ\(^{73}\) ΠΟΣ\(^{75}\) f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 lat αφαίρεσον τας απ’ αυτής \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{75}\) ΒΔL 579 pc it Cl Or NA\(^{27}\) (α γινομεν)

Lk 11,34 οταν ου\(^{2}\) ο οφθαλμός \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{f1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 sy οταν ο οφθαλμός \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{f1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 sy

Lk 19,15 υπάνου σις τις διεπρ. \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{047}\) f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 lat sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{b}\) υπάνου τις διεπρ. \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{047}\) BDL Ψ 579 e sy\(^{2}\) NA\(^{27}\) (τις διεπρ.)

Lk 22,18 εως οτου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{ADW}\) Ψ\(^{f1}\) εως ου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{BC\epsilon\cd} \) Λ f\(^{1}\) 579 892 2542 pc NA\(^{27}\) (ο γινομεν)

Lk 23,8 ακοινων πολλα περι αυτου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{ADW}\) Ψ\(^{f1}\) sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{b}\) ακοινων περι αυτου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{ABD\epsilon\cd}\) KLT Ψ 070 f\(^{1}\) 579 1241 2542 al sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{f}\) cop NA\(^{27}\) (τις διεπρ.)

Lk 24,12 οθονα κειμενα μονα και \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{07}\) f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 lat sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{b}\) bo\(^{ma}\) οθονα μονα και \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{07}\) Ψ\(^{f1}\) BΩ 070 sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{f}\) cop NA\(^{27}\) (α γινομεν)\(^{63}\)

Jn 6,36 \(\epsilon^{3}\) επεν δε \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{A}\) f\(^{1}\) sy\(^{h}\) επεν ουν \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{DN\epsilon\cd}\) Ψ\(^{f1}\) 33 1241 \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{f1}\) 2211 al sy\(^{2}\) sa\(^{ma}\) επεν \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{75}\) BDLT 579 pc it sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{f}\) cop NA\(^{27}\) (υ γινομεν)\(^{54}\)

Jn 10,31 εβαστασαον ουν παλιν λιθους \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{66}\) f\(^{f1}\) f\(^{13}\) sy\(^{h}\) sa\(^{ma}\) εβαστασαν παλιν λιθους \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{66}\) D f\(^{44}\) pc it vg\(^{h}\) sa\(^{ma}\) bo (υ γινομεν) εβαστασαν λιθους θεου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{6}\) θεου \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{6}\) 2211 pc sy\(^{2}\) sa\(^{ma}\) ac\(^{2}\) NA\(^{27}\) (υ γινομεν)

Jn 19,7 κατα των νομων ημων οφειλει \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{40}\) 33 33 q sy cop κατα των νομων οφειλει \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{40}\) BDLT 579 pc it sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{f}\) cop NA\(^{27}\) (υ γινομεν)

Jn 20,19 οι μαθηται συνηγμενοι δια \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{27}\) 33 0250 f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) it vg\(^{h}\) sy\(^{h}\) bo οι μαθηται αυτου συνηγμενοι δια \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{27}\) Λδ 33 al fsa οι μαθηται δια \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{27}\) ΑΒΔ\(^{2}\) Ψ\(^{27}\) 078 pc lat sy\(^{2}\) sy\(^{f}\) ac\(^{2}\) bo NA\(^{27}\) (υ γινομεν)\(^{65}\)

Acts 4,17\(^{66}\) λεων ταις απολει απελευθημεθα \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{40}\) 33 sy\(^{b}\) λεων απελευθημεθα \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{40}\) Ψ\(^{2}\) Α Β Δ 323 614 945 1739 pc lat NA\(^{27}\)

Acts 17,26 εξ ενος αματος παν εθνος \(\epsilon^{3} \) Ψ\(^{40}\) Ψ\(^{2}\) Α Β Δ 323 81 323 1175 1739 pc vg cop NA\(^{27}\) (-ος οι-οι)

---

\(^{62}\) NA\(^{27}\) suggests that Ψ is due to harmonization. However, Mt 6, 22 does not suggest harmonistic accommodation: Lk has οφθαλμος ς ωταν ουν while Mt reads οφθαλμος εους ουν.

\(^{63}\) The NA\(^{27}\) apparatus treats the presence or absence of μονα as a separate variant. In view of homoioteleuton, the evidence cited reflects a compilation from the separate units presented in NA\(^{27}\).

\(^{64}\) NA\(^{27}\) appears to derive by homoioteleuton from an archetype containing ουν. It is irrelevant whether ουν is a synonym substitution for an original δε or is itself original.

\(^{65}\) While either reading could have been the source of the homoioteleuton, the longer reading appears to reflect the Alexandrian archetype.

\(^{66}\) While Ψ could be claimed as a dittography, this is unlikely in view of the apparent Alexandrian pattern of omission by homoioteleuton.
Rom. 12, 15 χαροτριτων και κλαειν ἐκαθήμεν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐν χαροτριτων κλαειν ὡς A D⁴ sy⁶ Tert (Ψ in hom.) ὡς 66 B D⁴ F G 6 1505 1739 1881 pc latt sy⁵⁹ NA²⁷ (κύνικι).

Rom. 13, 1 άι δε ωσια έδωσασι υπό υπο άι ωσια ως A D⁴ Ψ 33 sy

1 Cor. 11, 27 τον αρτον τον αρτον

1 Thes. 2, 15 τοσον ἴδιον προφήτας τος προφήτας ὡς D⁴ Ψ sy Marcion¹·

1 Thes. 4, 10 τος αδελφος τος εν τοις αδελφος εν ὡς 86 B D⁴ Ψ 33 sy 33 1175 1505 1739 2464 pc latt sy⁵⁹ cop Or NA²⁷ (ους πους).

1 Thes. 4, 11 τας ἴδιας χεραν τας χεραν ὡς 86 A D³ sy 33 [NA²⁷]

1 Thes. 5, 27 τοις αγιοις αδελφος τοις αδελφοις ὡς 86 B D F G 328 pc it sa Ambst NA²⁷ (ους αι-ους ας)³⁶

1 Pet. 4, 1 ο παθων εν σαρκι ο παθων σαρκι ὡς K P 69 sy να ὡς 86 A B C I L Ψ 0285 33 81 323 614 630 1241 1505 1739 NA²⁷ (νυν) (negative apparatus)

Jude 25 μονοι σομοι ξωθοι ξωθοι ὡς P ὡς 86 A B C Ψ 33 81 323 630 1241 1505 1739 al latt sy cop (ω

Loss of portions of two consecutive words:

2 Tim. 2, 3 συν ουν κακοπαθησον συνκακοπαθησον ὡς C 86 D¹ H¹ Ψ 1881 sy⁶

50-51, 57²-59². The NA²⁷ text reading therefore was calculated manually from the 'consistently-cited witnesses', eliminating those not extant for this passage. The witnesses listed should be correct, but further verification may be necessary.

69 This variant unit is presented as a 'negative apparatus' in NA²⁷ (see NA²⁷, introduction, 50-51, 57²-59²). The NA²⁷ text reading therefore was calculated manually from the 'consistently-cited witnesses', eliminating those not extant for this passage. The witnesses listed should be correct, but further verification may be necessary.

70 NA²⁷ suggests that the Μ reading harmonizes to Rom. 16, 27; however, the texts in these passages differ substantially. The phrase in Rom is followed by δια των χων ως δοξα εις τοις αιωνοις, while in Jude the phrase is followed by σωτηρι πιστων and (in Μ) δοξα και μεγαλωσυνη. It is far easier to assume that a minority archetypal homoioiteleuton than to presume an incomplete harmonization to a remote parallel.

71 While NA²⁷ prints συγκ- instead of συνκ-, the manuscripts vary. One should compare the spelling in various ancient manuscripts, particularly regarding Egyptian orthography. Note that manuscript 1881ʰ⁷⁶ reflects an extended case of homoioiteleuton.
**Loss of various items within lists (virtues, vices, people, events, commands):**

_Mt_ 24.7

εσώται λίμοι καὶ λοίμοι καὶ σεισμοὶ  Mt C Θ 0102.f 17 h q sy v
εσώται λίμοι καὶ σεισμοὶ  B D 892 ἡ b fr e f' sy' sa NA 52 (λίμοι καὶ σεισμοὶ)
εσώται λίμοι καὶ λοίμοι  565 (λίμοι καὶ σεισμοὶ)

_Mt_ 26.3

οἱ αρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι  Mt it sy v
οἱ αρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι  N L O 0293 f 17 115 33 565 700 892 1424 al lat sy'
cop NA 52 (αρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι)

_Mk_ 3.32

ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ αδελφοί σου καὶ οἱ αδελφοί σου  A D Θ 700 pm it
ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ αδελφοί σου  Θ f 12 11 28 33 565 892 1241 1424 2542
pm lat sy (σου τί σου)

_Lk_ 2.15

οἱ αγγέλοι καὶ οἱ κύριοι οἱ ποιμενεῖς  Mt A D Ψ f 17 33 q sy v
οἱ αγγέλοι οἱ ποιμενεῖς  N B L W Θ Ξ 1 565 579 700 lat sy v
cop Or 46 Eus NA 27 (οἱ κύριοι οἱ ποιμενεῖς)

_Rom_ 1.29

ἀδίκα πορνεία πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία  Mt Ψ (q p)
ἀδίκα πορνεία πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία  B 1072 co 1739 1881 pm ΝΑ 27 (α δίκ α πορνεία πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία)
ἀδίκα πορνεία πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία  P (4α πο- τι- τι- τι-
ἀδίκα πορνεία πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία  K (κα δικ α τι- τι-

_Rom_ 1.30-31

ἀπειθεῖς ασυνετος ασυνεθές αστοργος ασπονδος ανελεημονας  Mt Κ' C D' Ψ (- ασπονδος αστοργος 33) 1881 vg sy
ἀπειθεῖς ασυνετος ασυνεθές αστοργος ανελεημονας  N A B D G 6 1506 1739 pm it bo Le Ambst NA 27 (οι ασυνεθε ώι ασυνετε)

---

72 NA 27 suggests that Mt harmonizes. Yet Lk 21, 11 reflects quite a different order in Mt (σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι κατὰ τοποὺς καὶ λίμοι καὶ λοίμοι εσώται). Similarly, Mk 13, 8 in Mt reads καὶ εσώται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τοποὺς, καὶ εσώται λίμοι καὶ ταραχῆς (the Alexandrian witnesses in Mt omit κατὰ τοποὺς). There are far more differences than similarities; harmonization by Mt is thus a lesser possibility than accidental omission in the Alexandrian archetype.

73 Recensional excision may have occasioned this omission, since Mt is quite liable to misinterpretation, particularly in oral reading when no punctuation exists (εἰς τοὺς οὕτων οἱ αγγέλοι καὶ οἱ αὐθώντωι οἱ ποιμενεῖς).

74 Various minority transpositions occur, each omitting one element by homoioteleuton; e.g., ἀδίκα κακία πονηρία πλεονεξία (C D 32 33 81 1506 pe); ἀδίκα κακία πορνεία πλεονεξία (D θ' G [vg]); and ἀδίκα πορνεία κακία πλεονεξία (N A).

75 NA 27 suggests that Mt harmonizes to a similar list of vices in 2 Tim 3, 3. However, the grammatical cases and the lists themselves differ significantly. Partial harmonization of a single item seems doubtful. 2 Tim 3, 2-3 in Mt reads as follows, with the terms identical to Rom 1, 30-31 (except for case and order) underlined: γονεον απειθεν αγαθατον αυστογον ασπονδον διαβολον ακρατεον ανελεημονον αφιλαγαθον. Given the lack of agreement,
Gal 5.21 φήσονι φήσονι μεθαί 
φήσονι μεθαί

Mt 22,35 πειραζών αὐτῶν καὶ λεγών διδάσκαλε
gal D W @ 0161 f 11 it sy
sy p sy p sa sa
mae sa
B L 33 892

Mt 1,14 το εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θυ
to εὐαγγελίῳ

Mt 1,28 αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς εἶ
gal A D lat sy

Mt 1,40 παρακαλῶν αὐτῶν καὶ γονιμοτευχόν αὐτῶν καὶ λέγων
παρακαλῶν αὐτῶν καὶ γονιμοτευχόν καὶ λέγων

it would be remarkable if any harmonization had occurred as claimed. Also, in 2 Tim 3, 3, ε omits στοργοι due to -οι ασ- η-οι ασ-, and 431 sy omit both στοργοι and στονομοι due to -η-οι. The ease of such errors strongly suggests a similar homoiooteleuton in Rom 1, 31 within the Alexandrian archetype.

While catalogs of virtues or vices could easily be modified to accord with a scribe’s preferences, most additions or omissions made by individual scribes are limited in transmittal scope and fail to perpetuate to any significant degree. Minority alterations at the texttype level reflect a wider degree of dispersion, and point to an archetypal origin of such, with the original text restored from beyond the error of the archetype. A minority accidental omission where homoiooteleuton is a factor is far more compelling than the counter- assumption that the vast majority of scribes acquiesced in concert to sporadic major alterations within particular lists.

While both ‘the gospel of God’ and ‘the gospel of the kingdom of God’ are otherwise foreign to Mark, the former expression is not found within the gospel tradition, but only in Paul (Rom 15, 16; 1 Thes 2, 2, 8, 9); Mt in contrast uses ‘the gospel of the kingdom of God’ three times, including the important non-identical parallel, Mt 4, 23. Mk 1, 15 further supports the longer reading in 1, 14 by stating ἑγγείκεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θυ.

The cause of the omission is dependent upon the reading from which it derived. If from the gal text, ε- η applies, but if (as more likely) the omission derived from what appears to be a conflated Alexandrian archetype, then -οι ε- η reflects a more likely cause of error among the Alexandrian witnesses.

The situation is aggravated by the two occurrences of -οι αὐτῶν καὶ.
THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY (HTB 6)

Mk 2,22 ὁ οὐνὸς ὁ νεός τοὺς ἁσκόνυς ἦ ἁ Α.C 33 f 1 e f sy ὁ οὐνὸς τοὺς ἁσκόνυς φ 68 Β Κ C 3 D L O f 13 28 565 579 700 892 2427 al c ἡ φ 2 q lat sy sy sa Ῥ μ 22 (οὐ γνῶς)

Mk 4,24 μετρηθηται ὑμῖν καὶ προστῆθηται ὑμῖν τοὺς ἁκόουν ν ἦ ἁ Α 0107 0167 f 1 f 13 33 q sy sa Ῥ μ 22 (οὐ γνῶς)

Mk 12,27 ζωτων ν μείεις οὐν πολὺ ἦ ἁ Α D Θ f 13 33 lat sy sy 2 ζωτων πολὺ Β Κ C L W Δ Ψ 892 2427 k cor N μ 27 (οὐ γνῶς)

Lk 4,5 αναγαγὼν αὐτον ὁ διαβόλος εἰς ορος ψηφιον ἦ ἁ Α Θ Ψ 0102 33 it vg sy sy bo sa μ 22 (οὐ γνῶς)

Lk 10,38 Μαρθα ὑπεδέξατο αὐτον εἰς τοὺς ὁκόν αὐτῆς ἦ ἁ Α D W Θ Ψ 070 f 1 f 13 lat sy bo Bas

Lk 16,21 χορτασθήναι ἀπο τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν πιπτοντων ἦ ἁ Ν 2 (D) W Δ Θ Ψ f 13 33 lat sy sy sy sa bo sa μ 22 (οὐ γνῶς)

but also the closing boundary word. J. R. ROYSE, 'Scribal Leaps', art. cit. (supra, n. 20), p. 545-548, complains severely about this type of omission being claimed as due to homoioteleuton (and in particular indicts Metzger for not adhering to the proper definition). Yet it remains the case that the leap from same to same, plus omitting the closing boundary word, does occur frequently within the manuscript tradition. It thus should be classed as a separate type of transcriptional error. Royse not only begs the question when he lumps this type of error among 'unexplained scribal lapses' (545), but he is clearly wrong to suggest that 'inclusive homoioteleuton', omitting the closing boundary word, is 'an impossible transcriptional error' (p. 546). Quite definitely, 'inclusive homoioteleuton' is reasonably common. Note that NA 27 suggests the omission in B 2427 sa 3 to reflect harmonization to a parallel; however, the direct parallels do not lend themselves to such, but clearly support prostration by the leper: Mt 8, 2 reads προσκυνεῖ αὐτῷ, and Lk 5, 12 reads προσέχεις εἰς τὴν προσώπον.

81 NA 27 suggests that ΜΡ harmonizes to Mt 4, 8. However, this would be problematic since ΜΡ would adopt five words from Mt, yet fail to include the particularly descriptive λαῦν (inserted here only by f 13 and D). Byzantine harmonization is far less likely than Alexandrian archetypal omission by homoioteleuton.

82 Here a smaller Alexandrian group deviates by homoioteleuton from a longer text in the Alexandrian archetype. The larger and stronger group of Alexandrian witnesses supports the longer reading; the text of 55 73 is secondary to that archetype.

83 Accidental omission in the Alexandrian archetype is more likely than the NA 27 suggested harmonization to Mt 15, 27, especially when other Alexandrian witnesses read with ΜΡ.
Lk 17, 4 επτάκις τῆς ἡμερᾶς ἐπιστρέφθη 
επτάκις επιστρέφθη .Exceptions: AW TH f:\f.13 lat sy\h sa bo\p.
NB DL Ψ 892 1241 2542 ρχ it sy\h bo\p Cl
NA\p. (<\s -(\>\s)

Lk 17, 9-10 διαταχθεῖτα ὑπὸ δοκοῦ οὕτως  διαταχθεῖτα οὕτως

Lk 19, 5 ὁ ὅ τι εἰδεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰπὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ὅ τι εἰπὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν

Lk 24, 42 μέρος καὶ απὸ μελισσοῦ κηρύ καὶ λαβὼν μέρος καὶ λαβὼν

Lk 24, 46 οὕτως γεγραπταί καὶ οὕτως εἶδεν παθεῖν

Jn 10, 26 τῶν προβατῶν τῶν εμῶν καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν τῶν προβατῶν τῶν εμῶν

Jn 11, 11 λύθων ὁ ὅ τι θεοῦ με τελευτᾷς κειμένος τὸ δὲ τοῦ ὅ τι λύθων ὁ ὅ τι

Jn 12, 1 οὗτος ὃτι Δασάρος ὁ ὃ τις μών οὐν εὑρέθην

Jn 19, 16 τοῦ ὑπὸ καὶ ἡγαγόν καὶ βαστάζων τοῦ ὑπὸ καὶ ἡγαγόν καὶ βαστάζων τοῦ ὑπὸ καὶ βαστάζων τοῦ ὑπὸ καὶ βαστάζων

1 Cor 5, 7 πασχά ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐνευθέν 
πασχά ἡμῶν ἐνευθέν

2 Cor 5, 17 ἔδω γεγονὼν καίνα τὰ παντὰ τα χαὶ παντὰ ἔδω γεγονὼν καίνα τὰ χαὶ παντὰ

84 Cf. also Ἡ at Jn 11, 39, τῆς ἡμερᾶς τοὺς τεθυματικοὺς. Swanson there shows Ἡ to be supported by C M U L Δ Λ f:\f.13 228 579 700 1071 1424, while the NA\p. text is supported by (ὑ\p. Ἡ\p. (ὑ\p. (ὑ\p. A B C D F G) 33 81 1175 1739 997 latt bo Cl Epiph NA\p. (ἡμῶν τῆς ἡμῶν)

85 One segment of the Alexandrian manuscripts (6 33 81 614 630 1241 1505 1881 pm a b ὑπ.) transposes to τα χαὶ παντὰ καίνα, while the other branch (ὑ\p. A B C D F G) 048 0243 365 629 1175 1739 997 2949 ρχ it χαὶ παντὰ ἐνευθέν cop Cl (ὁ τῆς ἡμῶν)
Col 1,20 σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ εἰτε Ἡ 35 Ἀ. C. D. 1 Ψ 048 ed 16, 33 sy bo Hil [NA27] εἰτε B D* F G I L 075 0278 81 104 1175 1241 1739 1881 2464 al latt sa Or (αὐτοῦ | αὐτοῦ)

Jas 4,4 μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες Ἡ 35 Ν. Ρ. Ψ sy b μοιχαλίδες Ν. Α. B. 33 81 1241 1739 pc latt sy9 NA27 (μοιχ/μοιχ) 86

1 Pet 4,3 χρόνος του βλου το Ἡ 35 Ρ 049 χρόνος το Ρ 011 Ν. Α. B. C. Ψ. 33 81 323 614 630 1241 1505 1739 al latt sy cop Cl NA27 (το | το)

*Lengthy omissions more likely due to homoioiteletuon than any other cause:*

Mt 28,8-9 εδραμον απαγγελαι τοις μαθηταίς αυτού ως δε επο- πευνοντο απαγγελαι τοις μαθηταίς αυτού και ίδου [1424] εδραμον απαγγελαι τοις μαθηταίς αυτού και ίδου [1424] f 1 (το) (ο) sy b

Μk 11,25-26 ην καὶ ὁ παρ εἰμιον ον εν τοις ουρανοις αφη μιν τα παραπτωματα μιμν ει δε μιμις ουκ αφιετε ουδε ο παρ εἰμιον ον εν τοις ουρανοις αφηςει τα παραπτωματα μιμν [33] lat sy2 sy3 bo5 Cyp ην καὶ ὁ παρ εἰμιον ον εν τοις ουρανοις αφη μιν τα παραπτωματα μιμν [33] lat sy2 sy3 bo5 Cyp ην καὶ ὁ παρ εἰμιον ον εν τοις ουρανοις αφη μιν τα παραπτωματα μιμν [33] lat sy2 sy3 bo5 Cyp

Lk 23,16 απολυσω αναγκην δε ειχεν απολυσω αυτοις κατα εορτην ειναι ανεκραζαν απολυσω [565] 700 892 2427 pc l sy3 sa bo5 NA27 (τα παραπτωματα μιμν | το)

86 The longer reading is supported by D. N. Freedman, art. cit. (supra, n. 42), p. 43, who pointedly states, 'the shorter reading ... is extremely difficult to explain or even understand. ... To avoid this problem, most translations translate the word, not as adulteresses, but as adulterers, as if the Greek included both genders. But in antiquity, and particularly in the Bible, this is unheard of. ... To claim that the author is either excluding men from consideration here, or that men are subsumed under the feminine term for adulteresses, is unjustified by usage or evidence'. Freedman considers the NA27 reading to be 'simply another case of haplography [which] ... almost inevitably leads to a more difficult, if not completely incomprehensible, text', and urges that 'the so-called shorter and more difficult text is wrong and should be corrected'.

87 While any of the longer readings could have permitted homoioiteletuon in the Alexandrian archetype, the paucity of support for the readings in parentheses leaves Μ[72] as the most likely candidate for the source reading. NA27 suggests harmonization with a parallel, but this is far less likely than simple homoioiteletuon in the Alexandrian archetype. No parallel passage is sufficiently close in wording or in order of words to that found in Mt. Note Mt 27, 15, κατα δε εορτην εισθε ο παλαιον απολυσω ειναι τω οχλω; Mk 15, 6, κατα δε εορτην απελευν αυτοις ειναι; and Jn 18, 39 (in direct discourse), εστιν δε συνθεθαι μιν ειναι ειναι μιν απολυσω ειναι τω πασχα.
Loss of one or more nomina sacra:

Mt 8.29\(^{88}\) οὐλῦς ὑλεῖ τὸν δύναμιν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Θεοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Exeg W Θ 0242\(^{2nd}\) f\(^{13}\) it vg sy sy\(^{b}\) sa bo\(^{24}\)

Mt 28.6 ὀποφθερεὐάτο ὁ Ἔξουσις καὶ τὰ χαρίστης ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν Ἤξουσιος καὶ τὰ χαρίστης ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν. B C D L W 0148 f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) lat (sy\(^{b}\)) sy\(^{b}\)

2Cor 13.13 ἕχαριστας τοῦ Ἱωάννου καὶ ταχυ τοῦ Ἱωάννου καὶ ταχυ. B Ψ 323 1881 ρελ (= v ∩ u)

Phlm 1.6 ἕτσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῷ Πάππῳ τῷ Ἱούλιον. M N D F G Ψ 0278 1739 1881 lat (sy\(^{b}\))

Jude 4 ἔπεσαν παῦν τῷ Ιησοῦ καὶ τῷ Παῦλῳ. M N D B L T W 078 0281 f\(^{1}\) 700 892\(^{n}\) 1241 bo NA\(^{27}\) (v ∩ u)

Loss of o Ιησοῦς as a nomen sacrum:

Numerous instances occur in which the nomen sacrum o τῶν ἀνθρώπων is lost\(^{91}\). Note that the NA\(^{27}\) text does not include all such cases\(^{92}\). Typical examples include the following:

Mt 4.12 ἔτσι τῷ Ιησοῦ καὶ τῷ Παῦλῳ. M N D L W Θ 0233 f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) it vg sy sy sy bo\(^{27}\)

Mt 18.2 πρόσκλησιν Ιησοῦ τῶν πιστῶν. M D W Θ 078\(^{n}\) f\(^{1}\) lat sy sa bo

Jn 8.21 αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰησοῦ εὐχαριστήσεως. M N D Ψ 070 0250 f\(^{1}\) f\(^{13}\) 33 lat sy sa bo

---

\(^{88}\) Note the αὐστικό - potential for double homoioteleuton (v ∩ t and u ∩ v). Cf. also the parallels Mk 5, 7 (no variant cited) and Lk 8, 28, where ὑλεῖ is similarly omitted by a different combination of witnesses (Ψ\(^{59}\) D f\(^{1}\) 579 at e bo\(^{26}\)).

\(^{89}\) Another instance of apparent double homoioteleuton: θεοῦκαόντος, first skipping from k 1 k and then dropping (perhaps intentionally) one of two consecutive omicrons.

\(^{90}\) Let Θ be dismissed as merely 'pious expansion', note the previous variant in the same verse, where M and NA\(^{27}\) read ἀγαθον τοῦ, but Ψ\(^{61}\) A C 048 33 629 f vg\(^{59}\) omit τοῦ by homoioteleuton (v ∩ u). Except for Ν\(^{8}\), all the Greek witnesses omitting ὑλεῖ also omit τοῦ due to a similar cause.

\(^{91}\) See in addition to the examples cited, Lk 24, 36; Jn 13, 3; 18, 5; 20, 21.

\(^{92}\) Cf. Tischendorf and von Soden in Mk 11, 14 and Lk 7, 22, where θεοῦ reads καὶ ἀποκρίθησαν o τῶν while NA\(^{27}\) omits the nomen sacrum without comment (s ∩ s), even though o τῶν is present in the parallel Mt 11, 4.
The books which were to form the New Testament were composed in the first century, but changes to these writings were introduced by scribes during many centuries of copying by hand. Some of these changes even affected the theology or meaning of the contents; other were stylistic or grammatical alterations.

The art of textual criticism attempts to identify, describe and explain those changes, usually in order to recover the original words of the Biblical authors.

At an important conference held in Lille in July, 2000 a group of scholars from several countries met to assess the significance of these textual variants in the earliest Christian centuries. The relevance of their contributions was readily recognized and this book represents an edited version of the papers presented in Lille.

The articles in this volume assess work already achieved in the field and point forward to new projects and exciting research on these fundamental and foundational texts.

Les livres qui allaient former le Nouveau Testament ont été écrits au premier siècle. Cependant, au cours des siècles, les scribes qui ont copié ces textes y ont apporté des changements. Certaines de ces interventions affectent le sens et l'interprétation théologique des écrits, d'autres visent à en améliorer le style ou la grammaire.

La critique textuelle a pour tâche d'identifier, de décrire et d'expliquer ces changements. Et elle tente, dans la mesure du possible, de retrouver les termes originaux des auteurs bibliques.

En juillet 2000, des spécialistes du monde entier se sont retrouvés à Lille afin d'évaluer les modifications que le texte néotestamentaire a subies au cours des premiers siècles et pour en explorer le sens. Le volume livré ici au public réunit les contributions présentées lors du colloque.

Les articles de ce volume examinent le travail déjà accompli dans le domaine de la critique textuelle et ouvrent de nouvelles pistes pour investiguer l'histoire de ces textes fondamentaux et fondateurs.

La collection Histoire du texte biblique (HTB) réunit des monographies et ouvrages collectifs consacrés à l'étude de la constitution, de la transmission et du cheminement du texte biblique à travers l'histoire. Elle souhaite renouveler et intensifier les échanges entre les spécialistes de domaines de recherche trop souvent séparés, tels que la critique textuelle, la paléographie, la philologie, l'histoire des communautés religieuses, la liturgie, la patristique, l'exégèse.