causas foret causa efficiens numeranda et sic sequitur quod aliqua.
possit esse causa efficiens motus ; secundo sequitur . . .
Physics ii 3 (194^b 16–195^b 30). This *questio* ends f. 26^D with
the words : Et tantum de secundo Physicorum Aristotilis.

f. 26^D Circa tercium Phisicorum Aristotilis sit hec questio prima :
Utrum motus sit actus entis in potencia secundum quod ipsum
est in potencia ad tercium acquirendum. Quod non arguitur
tripliciter.
A long disquisition on the whole third book of the *Physics*. It
ends : Et patet super tercio Physicorum.

f. 38^A Utrum omnia temporaliter existencia sint in loco et quod non
arguitur tripliciter : primo enim sequitur quod aliquis foret locus,
secundo sequitur quod omnia localiter mota requirant locum
tamquam per se terminum sui motus et sic nichil in vacuo
moveretur, tercio et ultimo sequeretur ex hoc quod alia tempora-
liter existunt quod est tempus.
Physics iv 1 2.

f. 40^B Modo dubitatur utrum sit possibile quod sit aliquid in seipso et
videtur quod sic per Aristotelem, capitulo de loco. ubi concedit
quod agregatum ex amphora et vino sit seipso racione sue partis.
Istud eciam potest suaderi per racionem talem . . .
Physics iv 3 (210^a 13 ff., particularly 30).

f. 44^B Utrum omnis motus sit alteracio, augmentacio vel motus localis.
Data questione sequitur quod penes aliquid attenderetur species
motus. Quo dato sequitur quod alteracio esset una species
motus.
Physics v 1 2 (225^a 34–226^b 18).

f. 52^D Dubium est utrum omne tempus, magnitudo et motus diversifi-
cate seinvicem consequuntur. Si sic nullum talium foret indivi-
sibile, secundo posset aliquod spacium motu alico in tempore
pertransire, et tercio secundum proporcionem potencie ad
regulam pertransiretur uniformiter plus vel minus de spacio.
Physics vi, vii. The *questio* ends : Et tantum de sexto et
septimo.

f. 55^A Dubium concernens illum octavum est utrum simpliciter primum
sit infinite potencie, indivisibile, immobile et eternum, et quod
non arguo quadrupliciter : primo sequitur quod sit infinite
potencie, secundo, tercio et quarto quod sit indivisibile, immobile
et eternum.
Physics viii *per totum.*
The treatise ends on f. 58^D.

S. HARRISON THOMSON.

A STUDY OF THE CHESTER-BEATTY CODEX
OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES

THE recent publication of a large portion of the Pauline Epistles, to

be known as $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, recovered from its tomb in the desert, gives us an opportunity to examine what is perhaps the most solid contribution which the sands of Egypt have provided up to date.

It is no exaggeration to say this; for, in the amount of the material preserved, in the good condition of most of it, and in its early date we are fortunate indeed.

Sir Frederic Kenyon's complete edition of the 86 leaves has given us access to what remains of the whole original document in one compact and well-printed volume.[1] This includes Hebrews (placed, notably, between Romans and Corinthians), which we cannot traverse in this article.

The revised date suggested for the papyrus is *circa* A.D. 200. If we are startled by this early attribution, we have only to examine the text, in order to rest assured that we are in the presence of something which is contemporaneous with, or which may have preceded the compilation of, the Sahidic version; thus, the circumstantial evidence is definite, for this is generally attributed to a period *circa* A.D. 190.

To get behind the Sahidic is indeed a feat; for this liberates us from much reflex action on the Greek texts in Egypt, and leaves us in contact with the Sahidic *base* only, and with Old-Latin and Old-Syriac versions, which could have influenced our papyrus.

It is a most interesting proposition.

Kenyon's grouping of the Greek evidence, valuable and time-saving as it is, just stops short of allowing us to penetrate to the real heart of the issue, for the 'diplomatics' of the matter are of great importance.

We can begin to draw certain conclusions. The underlying sympathy ranges rather more with the base of the Bohairic than with that of the Sahidic. E.g., 2 Cor. vii 7 υπερ ημων for υπερ εμου, *pap*[46] alone with *boh* and *syr*. Also 1 Cor. xv 54, where *boh* agrees with *pap*[46] to omit one of the two clauses.

On the whole, by and large, there is very little Coptic reaction on the Greek, sparse Coptic order, and but scant grammatical sympathy. There is a tendency at times to exhibit Syriac order and occasionally Latin order.

The scribe seems to have made numerous blunders, but not quite as many as the footnotes suggest ; and these do not invalidate the drawing of certain deductions from detailed observation of other singularities, which are too numerous to come under the head of recurrent mistakes.

We are in the presence of a Greek document, *circa* 200, which is already a compound or composite vehicle of the Latin version and, possibly, of a Syriac version, both of which may have run concurrently with the Greek for some time. Beyond this, the largest sympathy is

[1] Emery Walker, London, 1936.

with the base of the Aethiopic version. I have counted over fifty cases of unique agreement of *aeth* with the papyrus.

We can work out the whole problem only by induction, and by the inductive process of prolonged experience. We cannot argue the whole subject out upon the basis of grammatical 'niceties'. Apparent 'crudities' may appear in this ancient text—[observe what Paul himself says of such 'roughnesses', or ambiguities, at 2 Cor. xi 6: 'ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ', and in that very verse the double use of ἵνα in two successive clauses !]—but our scribe was not a careless ignoramus, nor somnolent, nor inept, for most scribes, in my experience, are honourable copyists, and he is not an exception. He is, most evidently, concerned with a base which has, so far, been beyond our ken.

The question of genders requires intelligent and unbiased attention. There seems to have been confusion in those days, or perhaps latitude, as to the masculine or neuter gender of some nouns—since settled by lexicographers, one way or the other. The question arises several times. For instance, at Eph. iii 18 the papyrus has τι ο πλατος και μηκος και υψος και βαθος, apparently making all these nouns masculine, instead of neuter. This looks very unorthodox, but I notice that a Clement (of Rome), writing to the Corinthians, is found to employ exactly the converse method, making τυφος neuter instead of masculine; thus (xiii 1), . . . αποθεμενοι πασαν αλαζονειαν και τυφος και αφροσυνην και οργας . . .

In this connexion it is worth while, before accusing the *scribe* of *pap*[46] (and not his forerunners) of unscholarly carelessness, to examine the passages involving πλουτος (ο or το πλουτος), where the papyrus is extant, and to see the company which it keeps. I have put it into the note below.[1] From this it will be seen that *pap*[46] is easily the most

---

[1] Rom. ix 23 το πλουτος P[46]FG, τον πλουτον *rell*.

2 Cor. viii 2 το πλουτος P[46]א*BCP 17, 31 ?
        τον πλουτον *rell*. et *Euthal Thdt Dam*.

Eph. i 7 το πλουτος P[40]אABDFG.
        τον πλουτον א°D°KLΨ *rell et Patr mult*.

Eph. i 18 τις ο πλουτος P[46] *rell omn*[vld.] [Curiously enough, F[gr] G[gr] make the first τις into τι (τι εστιν η ελπις) but leave τις ο πλουτος with the rest.]

Eph. ii 7 το υπερβαλλον πλουτος P[46]א*ABD*FG 17 67** *Eus* 1/2 *Euthal, Orig* 1/2 (πληθος).
        τον υπερβαλλοντα πλουτον D°EKLP *al pl Eus* 1/2 *Orig* 1/2 *Thdt Dam*.

Eph. iii 8 το ανεξιχνιαστον πλουτος P[46]א*ABCD*FG 17 67** *Euthal*.
        τον ανεξιχνιαστον πλουτον א°D°EKLP *al pl. Dial Did Chr Cyr Thdt al*.
        (το ανεξ. πλουτον *Dam*[vld]).

Eph. iii 16 κατα το πλουτος P[46]אABCD*EFGP 67**116 *Ephr Ath*
        κατα τον πλουτον D°KL *al ps-Just Meth Ath Did Bas Chr Euthal Cyr*[bis]
        al mu. [Kenyon omits to chronicle this place.]

Phil. iv 19 κατα το πλουτος P[46]א*ABD*(FG)P17 31**67** *Euthal*.
        κατα τον πλουτον D[b et c]EKL *al pl Chr Cyr al*.

consistent witness, and this for the neuter—except at Eph. i 18 where *all* agree on the masculine ; whereas the lexicographers, together with the correctors of ℵ and D, consider πλουτος to be masculine, always.

Critics too often look askance at so-called 'barbarisms' and at the personal preferences or failings of writers—(how *all of us,* invariably, have certain frailties in the matter of composition)—as if the primitive texts were perfect and completely 'polished'; and they are apt to forget so frequently that all the attempted polishing, and the harmonizing for consistency's sake, took place later; so that, when we recover roughnesses of diction, doubtful grammar, or unacceptable constructions—judgement being passed in accordance with certain strict modern standards—we are, perhaps, more nearly approximating the primitive or the original text, than by setting down these things, forthwith, as pure errors of the pen or of the head of scribes and copymen. This must undeniably be the case, the farther back we go in our researches.

To take an example of such things, consult 1 Cor. viii. 1–3. Here it is found that the papyrus omits τι in verse 2, τον θεον and υπ' αυτου in verse 3. It reads, therefore : περι δε των ειδωλοθυτων, οιδαμεν οτι παντες γνωσιν εχομεν· η δε γνωσις φυσιοι, η δε αγαπη οικοδομει. It could not be more terse and graphic. We are therefore speaking of abstract knowledge, and of love in the abstract. There are no 'objects'. Paul continues : ει τις δοκει εγνωκεναι (*absque* τι) ουπω εγνω καθως δει γνωναι· ει δε τις αγαπα (— τον θεον) ουτος εγνωσται (— υπ' αυτου).

There is a space before ει δε τις and after εγνωσται, so that the sentence was considered complete. Since the scribe's day, τον θεον appears after αγαπα and υπ' αυτου after εγνωσται.

ℵ* 17 and *Clem*alex omit υπ' αυτου but retain τον θεον. The point to note is that other sympathisers with *pap*46 elsewhere are absent here, and they had probably received some 'polish' already, if we accept this dictum of our earliest witness as to loving *in the abstract,* and of the fact being recognized *by all and sundry.* It seems to be a splendid example of ' the shorter text' at its independent best.

There is another case where the 'object' is lacking, at 1 Cor. xi 22. The papyrus makes Paul say : τι ειπω υμειν ; επαινω (— υμας); εν τουτω

Col. i 27 τι το πλουτος P46ABDb et c EKLΨ al40Clem Eus Oec Thpl.
    το πλουτος FG, τον πλουτον Dgr* (*om.* τι *cum lat*).
    τις ο πλουτος ℵCP *al Chr Euthal Cyr Thdt Dam.*
Col. ii 2 εις παν πλουτος P46ℵ*B 67** (*vide Greg Emend*) Clem.
    εις παν το πλουτος AC 17 Sod182 *Euthal.*
    εις παν το πληθος Cyr.
    εις παντα τον πλουτον Dgr.
    εις παντα πλουτον ℵcDEKLP *al longe pl.* [*Hiant* FG].
    ει παντα *tantum* H, εις πλουτον Sod1066 (*olim* 71).

ουκ επαινω. Some have επαινεσω for επαινω *prim.*, but all have υμας, except *pap*[46].

If these studies mean anything and are not undertaken upon a purely academic basis, we must see that in this document we have not only an opportunity to exercise our critical faculties to the utmost, but in reality a chance to penetrate beyond the jungle of ecclesiastical comments—and, worse still, of fourth- and fifth-century standardization of a secondary text—and that it enables us to enjoy companionship with the *élite* of the second–third century, as we have here before us exactly such a document as was upon the desks of the worthies whose all too scanty remains have come down to us.   It brings us into the atmosphere and into the area of Clement of Alexandria, that linguist and traveller, who combined East and West; of others of an earlier date, and also into the heart of the Semitic background, before the text had been tortured in order to make it yield a smoother Greek than that which probably obtained originally.

I am sure that we have over-estimated Origen and Jerome as satis-factory guides ; but we are now on the ground occupied by critics at the time of the Muratorian Canon, and of Tatian ; on that of Hippo-lytus, Apelles, and Athenagoras; of Theodotus of Byzantium and Theophilus of Antioch ; of Polycrates of Ephesus ; of Melito of Sardis, and of Firmilian of Caesarea ; of Tertullian of Carthage ; and, without any question, we recede to a time before Pope Cornelius and Novatian had taken up their pens to write (in the mid-third century).   This is a privilege which has been denied to us, so far.

It seems certain that much editing took place.   Some Pauline prose rises to such poetic heights that ' improvements ' were not attempted at these places.   Other passages formed the subject of most unwelcome meddling.   All this has been hidden so far.   The papyrus now points an important finger in many helpful directions, and enables us to begin the adjudication of the issue.

Hort (*Select Readings*, p. 127, col. 2), on Colossians, speaks of ' primi-tive corruption '.   If by ' primitive ' he means ' *early* ', this agrees with what I have just written.   But *primitive* corruption is another matter. If we allow that, we can then disband our forces, for our enquiries will meet with a fog-bank at the very outset.

A debated reading, involving a single letter, at 1 Cor. xii 27 of μερους or μελους is apparently settled by *pap*[46] in favour of μερους, although the most ' primitive ' copies, if written from dictation, might easily confound the two letters.

Many of the Latin Fathers are, for the most part, out of Court. Tertullian and Ambrosiaster (occasionally Lucifer) alone reveal vestiges of the pre-third century text of the Pauline epistles, now that we can

confront their quotations with a document dating avowedly from the very beginning of the third century. We can, therefore, now brush aside a welter of the citations in Sabatier's great work (after a review of them), as beside the mark. We have to dismiss from our minds all preconceived ideas, and all conventional methods of judgement, if we are to assess *pap*⁴⁶ at its true value. This will apply particularly to the Epistle to the Hebrews, when some one is ready to dissect that part of the papyrus. There are about sixty unique omissions in those thirteen chapters, some of deep importance.

Certain passages involving a nominative, instead of an accusative, have been put down as errors, but, from the look of it, I am thinking that Paul was addicted to what we might call the 'colon' or 'videlicet' method, with an asyntactic plunge into a vivid continuation, irrespective of the previous construction, thus suddenly halted—to admit of a beautiful emphasis. Numerous cases of anacoluthon occur, but there is no room to discuss them separately. However, we should note quite specially: 1 Cor. i 24 Αυτοις δε τοις κλητοις Ιουδαιοις τε και Ελλησιν : X̅ρ̅c̅ Θ̅υ̅ δυναμις και Θ̅υ̅ σοφια . . . (with *Clem*ᴬˡᵉˣ), instead of the usual : χριστον . . . δυναμιν . . . σοφιαν of all other Greek witnesses, and of the Latins. Compare *sah boh syr aeth*, and note Tertullian's : 'Christus, Sophia et Virtus Dei', with the nominatives here of *Leo Mag, Hil, Victorin, Phoebad*, and *Auct de praedict.* referred to by Sabatier.

The 'direct' method is illustrated at Rom. xiii 9, where εν τω (*sec.*) is omitted before : αγαπησεις τον πλησιον. Here FG support *pap*⁴⁶ in omitting εν τω. To this procedure B is an accessory. So we have the two lines definitely merged here, 𝔓⁴⁶ + B = F + G. The supporters are *d e f g vg*, the Latins, *arm* and *aeth*, while, thereagainst, the Coptic knows of and inserts the εν τω, for the indirect method.

This digression leaves us still wrestling with the pre-third century possibilities and probabilities.

Here is a composite, where Lucifer of Cagliari holds the balance of power with *pap*⁴⁶. It occurs at 2 Cor. v 8. *Tert* writes : Fidentes autem et bonum ducentes, as if : θαρρουντες δε και ευδοκουντες, for which no Greeks are extant.

The usual Greek is : θαρρουμεν δε και ευδοκουμεν,
  but ℵ has : θαρρουντες δε και ευδοκουμεν,
  and *pap*⁴⁶ has : θαρρουμεν δε ευδοκουντες,
    as Lucifer : Audemus etiam bonum voluntatem habentes.

As to the latinity of *pap*⁴⁶, a distinct challenge seems to be patent when we consult Eph. iv 9. Here the papyrus not only omits μερη as to the nether regions, but also τα before κατωτερα. A consultation of the evidence here (see Wordsworth and White's *Vulgate* note) will explain what I intend to convey—all too briefly owing to lack of space.

This is bound up with not a little agreement on the part of Tertullian. See, in the immediate context, at Eph. iv 25—διο *pap*⁴⁶ with *Tert*, but *Tert*ᵇⁱˢ and *Lucifer*, only.

Note further 2 Cor. v 10 τα ιδια του σωματος with Latin [not *Tert* here] for : τα δια του σωματος, but alone among Greek MSS. Michaelis suggests an original : τα ιδια δια του σωματος.

A real *anceps* place occurs at 1 Cor. xvi 12, involving many versions (*goth* : ' bithe ', with *sah boh*. ειϣωπ and *arab* (�اذا)) where *pap*⁴⁶ writes εαν—alone among Greeks—for οταν, and this εαν is now established as probably preceding οταν. Another probably lurks at Gal. ii. 12 τινα for τινας. Consult Latin : venisset (or veniret) quidam, while Bohairic distinctly has τινα.

At Gal. ii. 1 Βαρναβας (' μετα Βαρναβας ') is treated as indeclinable. This agrees with *sah boh* (against *lat syr*) and is one of the few definite places of Coptic sympathy.[1] Πλησιον also remains indeclinable [Rom. xiii 10 (against FG)], which exempts the scribe from tampering with his copy.

The singular δομα for δοματα at Eph. iv 8 is exceptional and might trace to an unpointed Syriac, while, in this connexion, note 2 Cor. vii 5 φοβος (*pro* φοβοι) with *syr Tert* only, and Phil. iv 15 μονον (*pro* μονοι) as *syr* (*hiat Tert*).

At Eph. ii 4 we have the outstanding variant in *pap*⁴⁶ of ηλεησεν for ηγαπησεν, unknown to other Greeks, but very well known to *all* the *Latins*, against the serried ranks of *gr syr goth sah boh aeth*. It is an exceptionally interesting place.[2]

In the very next verse (ii 5) we find unique agreement between Bᵍʳ+ και ταις επιθυμιαις, with the famous *vg cod*. Armachensis + et concupiscentiis, which, perhaps, throws light on the origin of ηλεησεν in the previous verse by *pap*⁴⁶.

Now we can see plainly a Graeco-Latin already at work, influencing also Bᵍʳ (whose reading Hort put aside), and influencing *pap*⁴⁶ as well, only a few lines previously.

Syriac order does not intrude in this epistle (Ephesians) in *pap*⁴⁶, but is to be found in 2 Cor. xiii 10 a few pages previously (for in the papyrus Eph. succeeds 2 Cor., not Galatians), where we read : απων

---

[1] Add these places : 1 Cor. x 4, 21 ; Gal. vi 14 ; the exceptional order at 1 Cor. xi 24 of εστιν μου το σωμα ; and note Rom. x 15 + οτι with *sah boh syr*.

[2] Eph. ii 4/5, where *pap*⁴⁶ reads ηλεησεν for ηγαπησεν, and where B adds και ταις επιθυμιαις, there is space for either in F, where large blanks are left. The reader will do well to consult the edition of F. The MS G shows the same blank in the Greek, but above the blank is written : misertus est nostri, *following* dilexit nos (over ηγαπησεν ημας). Tisch. does not give this conflation, but White does. The mix-up may have originally extended to and involved παραπτωμασιν/σωμασιν and επιθυμιαις.

ταυτα *pap*⁴⁶ *Sod*²⁵⁷ and *syr* (for ταυτα απων all the rest). Also : πραξιν εχει Rom. xii 4, αρτι υμας 1 Cor. xvi 7. The matter merits grave attention when coupled with the following :

1 Cor. i 28 καταργηση τα οντα *pap*⁴⁶ *syr copt aeth Tert*
1 Cor. xii 8 διδοται δια του πνσ *pap*⁴⁶ *syr, latt aliq. et Tert*
1 Cor. xiv 36 εξηλθεν ο λογος του θυ *pap*⁴⁶ *syr aeth* only.
2 Cor. v 6 εν τω σωματι ενδημ. *pap*⁴⁶ *syr boh Tert* 1/2 *Pac.*
2 Cor. xii 14 θησαυριζειν τοις γονευσιν *pap*⁴⁶ *Sod*⁷⁸ *syr copt* [*non gr lat goth*], all in the Syriac order.

Note also a curious place at Eph. vi 20, where *pap*⁴⁶ and B agree together to write αυτο for εν αυτω. Refer to Syriac and you find it there ! But the Syriac adds αυτο again at the end of the verse (so also *sah*). Curiously enough, *arab*int also says : 'ut patefaciam *illud*, sicut oportet me loqui *de ipso*', but in Arabic the word for '*illud*' is the same in both places (ﻪ). (Hort threw away this reading of B, although it is a vivid one, relating to το μυστηριον του ευαγγελιου, or, as BFG *Vict* have it, to το μυστηριον alone, for they omit του ευαγγελιου).

Add to this Rom. xi 6, where *pap*⁴⁶ writes ουκ for ουκετι in the first instance : ει δε χαρις ουκ εξ εργων επει η χαρις ουκετι γεινεται χαρις, differentiating in the respective positions between the two expressions. This is found in *syr* and in *d e Pelag* and in half of the Vulgate MSS. No Greeks beside *pap*⁴⁶ have it thus, nor will the reading be found noticed in Tischendorf or von Soden.

Add again Rom. xiv 4 (occurring close to the above), where *pap*⁴⁶ says : η στηκει η πιπτει. With what authority, it may be asked. Once more with Syriac, and only Ambrosiaster in support. This instead of στηκει η πιπτει of the rest. Another variant unknown to Tischendorf, Scrivener, von Soden, and the rest of the editors.

This style is repeated (alone) at Rom. xvi 17 with : η λεγοντας η ποιουντας against the λεγοντας η ποιουντας of DFG, while most omit λεγοντας και.

Close by, again, *pap*⁴⁶* omits μου in Rom. xv 31, in the phrase : και η διακονια (μου) η εις ιερουσαλημ ευπροσδεκτος δια των αγιων γενηται. This is agreed to by *syr*, but it is absolutely against the usual Syriac usage, for *syr* has a redundancy of μου and *inserts* the possessive very frequently elsewhere !

At 1 Cor. xv 58 we notice that Kenyon says '*μου* 2° add. per errorem'. He refers to : '*ωστε αδελφοι μου, αγαπητοι μου*', but this is legitimate, and is again found in the Syriac.

At 2 Cor. vii 7 *pap*⁴⁶, after τον υμων ζηλον, substitutes υπερ ημων for υπερ εμου. This might be considered a slip, as υμιν, ημιν, and υμων occur previously in the verse, but Syriac supports this υπερ ημων of *pap*⁴⁶, and is alone in doing it, with *boh* [*non sah, non al.*].

A word here as to the *Gothic* version, which is extant for a large part of the Epistles.

The text seems to have been brought into conformity with a fourth-century standard, somewhat resembling the operation carried out in connexion with the Greek MS B [as against what we find of much more mixture in W], but, occasionally the Gothic offers valuable hints as to the older texts, which it weighed, assimilated, and apparently ' neutralized '.[1]

Thus, at Romans xv 12 our *pap*[46] reads quite alone : και ο νισταυο-μενος αρχει (for . . . αρχειν of all the rest). We find support alone in *goth*, which has ' reikin*oth* ', not ' reikin*ôn* '.

Similarly, at 1 Cor. xv 31 *pap*[46] reads (with 17 and two other cursives) αποθνησκων for αποθνησκω.[2] Kenyon says *per errorem*, but *goth* has ' gasviltands ', and it indicates that ' I " (am) dying " daily ' ; for, compare *syr (trsp. in fin.)* : ' οτι καθ' ημεραν αποθνησκων εγω ', with a kind of nominative absolute. [See Schaaf *Lexicon*, p. 304.]

There may be other present participles lurking in the primitive Greek text. Another (hidden) example occurs at 2 Cor. xi 2 where no MSS read ζηλων for ζηλω, but in Lucifer's and in Ambrosiaster's texts it is found in the Latin (*aemulans* and *zelans* respectively). *Pap*[46] is unfortunately mutilated here, or might shew it. When we turn to *goth* we find it, however : *aljanonds*, and not *aljano*.

In this connexion observe 2 Cor. vii 8 : βλεπων for βλεπω (with *vg* only. Cp. Hort *Select Readings* p. 120); αγαπων for αγαπω at 2 Cor. xii 15, this time with BDFGⲄ, and *syr* evidently (αγαπων εγω); also ανταναπληρων at Col. i 24 by *pap*[46] alone, not found here in the *gothic*, but definitely in *syr*, where a double ' mim ' is found at the beginning of the word. See Schaaf's *Lexicon*, p. 312, the word being given as *supplens* or *implens*. Note also Hilary's *adimplens*.

Observe also, in connexion with the occasional occurrence of the participial form in the Gothic, dealt with above, that it is anything but a settled practice with that version, and not *ex usu* or *ex ingenio linguae*.

---

[1] This is noticeable at Eph. iv 9 in the verse : τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη [πρῶτον] εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς.

If you look at Kenyon's notes you will find : '*κατεβη* cum ℵACDFG, +πρωτον BⲄ'. The whole story is that +πρωτον is read by B *goth* (and *sah* 3/4 *syr arm c f t vg*), with the correctors of ℵ and C, plus KLP and *Eus* 1/2 *Dam Thdt* 1/2 *Ambrst*. The Papyrus, however, *omits* πρωτον (against B *goth* Ⲅ etc.) with the group mentioned by Kenyon, making it, however, ℵ*AC*DF*ᴳG, plus Oᵇᵛ 17 *al*⁴ *d e g v*ggA*HN *boh sah* 1/4 *aeth*, *Iren*ⁱⁿᵗ *Theodot* (*ap. Clem*) *Orig*ᵉᵗ ⁱⁿᵗ *Eus* 1/2 (*Chr*) *Euthal*ᶜᵒᵈ *Cyr Thdt* 1/2 *Oec Tert*ᵇˡˢ *Lucif Hil*ᵗᵉʳ *Victorin Avit Vien Aug*ᵇˡˢ *Hier Pel*ᴬ.

Note.—In this verse *pap*[46] reads οντι for οτι (alone). It might be an error or modification of οντως, or possibly οντως οτι, this οντως (verily) being an original, from which sprang πρωτον later on. Compare *sah* and *boh*.

[2] Νη follows αποθνησκων, but is not responsible. *Pap*[46] has a dash after αποθνησκων.

This can be controlled at Gal. i 23, where ὅτι ὁ διωκων ποτε is rendered by: 'thatei vrak uns simlê', using the perfect (or pluperfect) *vrak* instead of this present participle διωκων (= 'he who was in the habit of harrying us formerly ').

Further, at 2 Cor. xii 5 *goth* is definite for οὐδεν of *pap*⁴⁶ (against ου of all others) with 'ni vaiht', and this agrees with *latt vett* [*exc. g*] and *vgg* [*exc.* P R] 'nihil', all not yet called to our notice as regards *pap*⁴⁶. No Greeks had heretofore exhibited it, nor *aeth*, nor *Ambr*, nor *Ambrst*, who quote the passage.

Note also Gal. ii 15, the +οντες of *pap*⁴⁶ (not found in other Greeks) with *goth* + visandans, agreeing with *syr aeth copt* [*non latt*].

Observe, lastly, Col. iii 23, where the group *pap*⁴⁶ B *Sod*⁷⁸ ¹⁰⁶ *sah* and *goth* stand together for the reading : εργαζεσθε ως τω κυριω, ουκ ανθρωποις, suppressing και before ουκ ανθρωποις, a kind of parataxis for which the Coptic method is famous, but quite unusual and unexpected in the Gothic.

Hort forsook B here and has nothing in his margin ; yet the terseness of it should have appealed to him, and the combination for this, the 'shorter' text again, demanded respectful attention ; but, of course, he knew nothing of von Soden's two supporters, nor of *sah*, and probably not of the *Gothic*, since Tischendorf did not report it.

About a dozen solecisms in *pap*⁴⁶ remain unaccounted for (e.g. μετα-κινητοι Col. i 23, αγαπη *pro* φοβω 2 Cor. vii 1 *fin.*, + βλεπετε Phil. iii 18), and it is exceedingly strange that no trace of these and a few other things appears elsewhere among the Greeks, which strike us moderns as novelties.

We have no resource, at present, so far as I know, for tracking the origin and the subsequent dropping of such variants, except the supposition that several well-meaning busy-bodies intervened, and reviewed and revised. We cannot well have recourse to the known Versions (Latin and Syriac), which could have preceded *pap*⁴⁶ in these matters, for, if they were involved in the proceedings, traces would surely linger.

Greek B comes out of the ordeal in the Pauline epistles rather well, although the *pap*⁴⁶–B combination is quite eclectic, and, as FG are frequently found with *pap*⁴⁶ *against* B, it is evident that there were drastic revisions subsequent to the date of the papyrus text; but it is the revision which *preceded* the papyrus text which concerns us most.

At 2 Cor. vi 15 the papyrus and B divide squarely, the former for πιστω μετα απιστου, and the latter for πιστου μετα απιστου. Besides, B has a notable *conflation* at Col. i 12 of: τω καλεσαντι και ικανωσαντι, while *pap*⁴⁶ holds the τω ικανωσαντι half of it. At 2 Cor. x 7 *pap*⁴⁶ knows nothing of B's δοκει πεποιθεναι for πεποιθεν. Nor at Rom. xiii 13 *fin.*, where B says εν ερισι και ζηλοις (for εριδι και ζηλω), being unwilling to

interrupt the preceding series of plurals—an old and well-worn method of B ; but *pap*⁴⁶ is clear against it. Compare Paul's mixed numbers elsewhere at 2 Cor. xi 27, xii 20, Gal. v 20.

From the number of times that *pap*⁴⁶ is associated throughout with an FG group (*cf.* Eph. iv 9 — μερη, Eph. ii 19 apa *minus* ουν, and the famous — κακην at Col. iii 5) against a B- or an ℵ-grouping, it may be said with confidence that the stem of the papyrus shews forth a text which had not then 'gone apart', as it did subsequently, and our contention as to drastic revision is apparent and confirmed.

Note very particularly another association of B alone with FG at Eph. vi 19, in omitting του ευαγγελιου after το μυστηριον. *Pap*⁴⁶ here is mutilated and lacks four lines, but my calculation shews that there would be no room for του ευαγγελιου, and Kenyon, when appealed to, confirms me.

At any rate, we can take FG back from the ninth to the fourth century at Col. iii 14, where they read ενοτητος (with D) for τελειοτητος, as *Ambrst* quotes : quod est vinculum *unitatis*.

DOCTRINAL VARIANTS

But few important doctrinal matters seem to be really involved in this new document—(see, however, Eph. i 5 — δια, Eph. ii 5 σωμασιν, Col. iii 22 — κατα παντα)—but one, nevertheless, demands most careful consideration, and occurs at Col. iii 5.   Did Paul say επιθυμιαν κακην or επιθυμιαν?   *Pap*⁴⁶ omits κακην with F^grG and Hilary.[1]

St Paul is very emphatic in this verse.   He says :

'Kill off, therefore, your members which are on the earth : fornication, uncleanness, passion, desire, and the covetousness which equates idolatry.'

Now μελη, to begin with, is an important word—[cf. Eph. v 30 : οτι μελη εσμεν του σωματος αυτου]—meaning 'limbs'.   Metaphorically used of the Sun and of the Moon, of philosophical intricacies, of parts of a sentence, of the Law, and, I think, of the physico-psychic subdivisions or 'qualities' in the Hindu classification of the body and soul.

As to παθος—this is one of the famous Qualities in Hindu terminology :

SATTWAN . . RAJAS . . TAMAS

SOOTHFASTNESS . . ΠΑΘΟΣ . . DARKNESS

Then, επιθυμια, DESIRE (of every kind), is *the* one thing to be 'killed off' in this our mortal career, if we are to become really purified and emancipated.

[1] Sabatier quotes Hilary definitely for the omission, but the Vienna Corpus includes the word.

Therefore, the absence or presence of κακην in Col. iii 5 appears to me to be of great importance. If the word be rightfully absent in St Paul's philosophy, as *pap*[46] asserts—(and nowhere else in the twenty-five-fold N.T. use is επιθυμια qualified by κακη)—then Christianity and Brahminism draw much closer together than has been supposed.

The fact that the omission in *pap*[46] finds support only in FG is not in itself significant of a weak link in the chain. What it shews is, that between the ninth-century codices FG and this papyrus of the early-third century there *intervened* the recensions of B, of ℵ, of A, of C, of D, of E, of H, of Coptic, of Gothic, which *added* the word.

Note at Gal. iii 19 *pap*[46] goes with FG *d e g m Iren* and *Ambrst* for the simpler πραξεων, instead of παραβασεων of the rest. Note also Rom. vi 11 and 12 as to 'the shorter text'. These matters can be followed and checked in Kenyon's notes.

What remains for me to do, after making the foregoing statement as to FG, is to provide some key which will open the door of the connecting passage between the two groups; some stepping-stones, which will enable us to cross the intervening torrent. These are now forth-coming in Ψ and *von Soden* α78, MSS of the eighth to the tenth century, both at Athos, in the library of the Laura, and quite unknown in the Pauline epistles to Tischendorf and Hort, and apparently unknown to White.

With these stepping-stones—grown into a bridge, by a legitimate inductive process—we can see, and beyond any peradventure, that the agreements between *pap*[46] and the group FG plus the Itala and others, are by no means fortuitous, and that the elder group of Greek uncials on parchment—hitherto our mainstay—*represents only two-thirds of the ancient text.*

I think this will be found to be a fair statement, in the light of the statistical situation, supplied by Kenyon on pages xv, xvi, of his Introduction.

I have no room to amplify this theme here, but an interesting and square division can be signalled at Col. iii 21, where Kenyon reports *pap*[46] BϚ for ἐρεθιζετε. To this evidence now add Ψ 78 (besides *Clem. Thdt*[ed] and *Dam*), against the παροργιζεσθε of the rest. This division abundantly justifies Ψ 78 as balancing factors—in this case *opposing* FG.

Thereagainst, observe Rom. xv 31 ἡ διακονια by *pap*[46] *plur.* and Ψ 78, as opposed to ἡ δωροφορια of B*D*FG.

Then again, FG conspire in a good many other places to exhibit valuable readings, not found in the rest of the Greek uncials, but which have support from Tertullian and others.

Compare, for example, 2 Cor. xiii 2, where we find εἰς το (before παλιν) lacking in *pap*[46] FG *lat syr arm goth*. The verse, in English, is:

'I announced previously and foretell (you), as if I were present the second time; and being absent now, (I write) to them who heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again I will not spare.'

There is nothing abhorrent in English about saying 'in the future' for εἰς τὸ πάλιν, but the translators, both of A.V. and R.V., ignored this εἰς τὸ of the Greek. They rendered, as the Latin : *iterum* or *rursum*, and many other versions adopt the same attitude, if εἰς τὸ were in their foundation exemplars.[1]

Now the absence of εἰς τὸ can make πάλιν apply, either to this other visit, *or* to οὐ φείσομαι, viz. that another time he would not spare. Possibly εἰς τὸ was *introduced* for a purpose. [Compare ἂψ πάλιν in Homer, both of actions and of place.] The Coptic is rather more definite :

Sah = 'that if I should come another time, I shall not spare ',
Boh = 'that if I should come this other time, I will not spare any more ', for *boh* adds a ⲝⲉ at the end.

The Syriac, which we have, says : ܬܘܒ, which Leusden and Schaaf translate *denuo*, but which the Walton polyglot translator renders *amplius* ! The word can mean *amplius*, *rursum* (or *iterum* or *denuo*), *adhuc*, *deinceps*, *ulterius*, *praeterea*, *adeo*. From this kettle of fish translators have to draw their deductions. Schaaf therefore made it :

' Si venero denuo non parcam ', but the Polyglot[int] :
' Si venero amplius me non parciturum '.

Here we have a light on the uses of the Versions, and also on their limitations. This place is rather a crux.

[Note that *pap*[46] takes its own considered line (alone) just above, at 2 Cor. xii 19 with οὐ πάλαι for the πάλαι or πάλιν of the rest.]

However, whatever may be the rights of the case in 2 Cor. xii 19 and xiii 2, we have a remarkable side-light about the matter of ἐπιθυμία, suddenly falling from a clear sky ; because the great authority B—(paramount in the Epistles, until the advent of *pap*[46])—actually substitutes ἐπιθυμίαις for ἁμαρτίαις in Eph. ii 1 : ' καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ὑμῶν', which is not to be found in *pap*[46], nor anywhere else. [Hort's margin is silent.]

In *aeth*, to which we always turn for most valuable clues in such matters—[observe that it *omits* πάλιν at 2 Cor. xiii 2]—we find plain omission of : καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, which indicates something pre-B and pre-*pap*[46], for *pap*[46] amplifies (with *syr boh*) by : τοῖς παραπτώμασιν ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν ; and when we turn to *Tertullian*[Marc], we merely find ' Dicit : illos delictis mortuos, in quibus ingressi erunt', as

---

[1] There does not appear to be another case of εἰς τὸ πάλιν in the N.T. but εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω occurs, and εἰς ὕψος, εἰς φανερόν without τὸ or τόν. We do find, however, εἰς τὸ παντελές at Heb. vii 25 and Luc. xiii 11.

if the verse in his copy might also have had a shorter form. In *Sod* 65 (a MS at Grottoferrata) the order is changed to: τη αμαρτια και τοις παραπτωμασιν, as in *syr* and *arm*.

Observe, further, that B *repeats, emphasizes, and confirms* his previous reading only four verses later, viz. at Eph ii 5, where that MS alone writes : εν τοις παραπτωμασιν και ταις επιθυμιαις, and where the others merely fluctuate *between* 'trespasses' and 'sins'; or as Ψ, *Hier*, and *Basil* inanely repeat ' trespasses *and* sins ' (from verse 1). Here *pap*⁴⁶ substitutes τοις σωμασιν for τοις παραπτωμασιν, without any support, so far (cf. FG at Phil. iv 7, which substitute τα σωματα for τα νοηματα); but White now reports *vg*ᴰ for *concupiscentiis*, which equates Bᵍʳ. This *vg*ᴰ MS, together with *vg*ᶻ* will bear watching in other connexions. [Hortᵐᵍ is again silent as to B.]

Before leaving this matter of doctrinal variants, we may note a reading in *pap*⁴⁶ at 1 Cor. i 8—(as peculiar to *pap*⁴⁶ there, as the one above is to B in Eph. ii 1)—of: ' τελειους ' for ' εως (or αχρι) τελους ' of the other MSS and versions. And compare *Didache* (vi 2): ει μεν γαρ δυνασαι βαστασαι τον ζυγον του κυ τελειος εση.

In view, therefore, of the omission of κακην at Col. iii 5, we have been at the pains to investigate all the unusual omissions in the text of our papyrus. But, before leaving the question, we have this to add as to the absence of κακην. If the reader will look four verses beyond he will find, in verse 9, curious and unexpected corroborative testimony from *Clement*ᴬˡᵉˣ, who read there in his copy: απεκδυσαμενοι τον παλαιον ανθρωπον συν ταις επιθυμιαις, instead of the usual: συν ταις πραξεσιν αυτου !

Now Clement's active life coincides precisely as to date with the presumed period of our papyrus. He was made presbyter in 190 and died in 220. Thus we might say that the reading was Alexandrian, but *syr*ʰ comes in here to affirm the reading and to confirm it.[1]

In von Soden's N.T. series of footnotes there is no reference to this, although it is noticed on p. 1961 of his introductory volumes. I do not know whether Mr Sparks[2] will call attention to it in the apparatus to the Vulgate. In the Latins we find only :

actibus *Ambrst Hil* 1/3 *Ambr* 4/4 *Faust Vigil, it vg.*
operibus *Iren*ⁱⁿᵗ *Hier* 3/3
gestis *Hil* 1/3
peccatis *Hil* 1/3

[1] *Tisch.* uses *syr*ᵖ for *syr posterior* or Harkleian, and *Soden* uses *syr*ᵖ for the Peshiṭta and *syr*ʰ for the Harkleian.

[2] The Rev. H. F. D. Sparks, who is now editing the remaining books in the Wordsworth and White Vulgate, has very kindly replied to some questions which I put to him.

Schaaf translates syr pesh: 'moribus'. The word used means: mores, conversationes, or actiones.

The Gothic uses *tôjam*, rather more '*moribus*' than '*actibus*'. The Sahidic has the equivalent of *operibus*, and the Bohairic transliterates the Greek πραξις, but has it in the singular.

Therefore, if we combine Eph. ii 1 and Col. iii 9, we find that B remains alone with *Clem* and the Harkleian Syriac, but always without the κακος (of Col. iii 5).

Now it is almost self-evident that, if you have settled down into the community-life of the early Christians, ' Desire ' has been put aside; that individual desires—whether bad, harmless, indifferent, or good—have been subordinated, put into the background, ' killed-off'. Hence, am I not right in coupling Paul's teaching with Barnabas' teaching, and with the theme of the Didache, of the Ecclesiastical Canons, and of the Apostolic Constitutions, as to EΠIΘYMIA of any kind being taboo?

The keys are in Romans vii 7/8, Gal. v 24, Eph. iv 22, James i 15, and 1 John ii 17.

Compare also Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* ii 1-2.

We now come to the final five words of

> 1 Cor. xv 54: κατεποθη ο θανατος εις νικος
> and 55: που σου, θανατε, το νικος;
> and 57: τω διδοντι ημιν το νικος.

Epenthesis, if it may be so designated here, is common throughout *pap*[46]: υμειν, γεινονται, πεινων, Πρεισκας, and so forth, culminating here in 1 Cor. xv, where *pap*[46], in all three places, writes νεικος, so that we are no farther advanced as to whether Paul meant *victoria*, or *contentio*, or *potentia* (as *Tert*[uno loco]), and *Tert*[Marc] cleverly turns the difficulty by doubling up with: *Ubi est mors victoria vel contentio tua? Ubi est mors aculeus tuus?*

But νεικος is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor νείκη, as far as we know.

The notes to the edition of *pap*[46] indicate a large number of omissions, assumed to be due to homoioteleuton. How far this apparent carelessness invalidates *other* omissions is a grave and pertinent question. I had prepared a list of the rarer omissions, but there is no room for it here. It replies very fully to this extremely relevant question, and covers some 260 cases, fully reported, with the evidence in each place.

I do not suppose that any competent critic will say that these omissions are due to pure chance, for to the long list must be added at least twice or thrice as many more, where larger support is forthcoming.

It is quite true, speaking mathematically—as the N.T. documents have been copied and reproduced so often—that fortuitous mistakes

have crept into many manuscripts *at the same places*. We had cited all the cases, which we could notice, of support from single documents, besides groups, whether fortuitous or not. But this great list is too long for us to question the genuine character of a number of these omissions.

As the whole object of the enquiry is to assess and establish the credibility of the witness, we had ransacked the subsidiary evidence, where available, and the tabulation does not present as arid a field as might be supposed, when we turn to the context, and check each series.

Upon the veracity of *Papyrus*⁴⁶, upon the law of probability regarding many or most of its omissions, hanging upon a faithful copying of the original (and that original having, in turn, duly and properly recorded the 'shorter' text), depends the real problem of the *primary* text.

H. C. HOSKIER.

NOTE.—The author of this article has arranged to print the list of omissions referred to above. On application to Dr H. C. Hoskier a copy may be obtained free of charge to subscribers to the JOURNAL; price 1s. post free to others.

NOTES ON THE MINOR PROPHETS

1. *Hosea* xii 1

וִיהוּדָה עֹד רָד עִם־אֵל וְעִם־קְדוֹשִׁים נֶאֱמָן

THERE is no need to emend this verse, if once it be realized that קְדֹשִׁים denotes the 'heathen gods', as again in Ps. xvi 3 according to the interpretation of Gunkel and Junker.[1] Then the words רָד and נֶאֱמָן are antithetical, the former being the participle Qal of רוד 'to tremble, waver'. Thus the meaning is: 'But Judah still wavers where God is concerned, yet is firm enough where heathen gods are concerned.'

2. *Micah* v 13

וְנָתַשְׁתִּי אֲשֵׁרֶיךָ מִקִּרְבֶּךָ וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי עָרֶיךָ

The word עָרֶיךָ is usually emended to עצביך 'thine idols', but there is no need for any change. In one of the Ras Shamra texts (s. *J.R.A.S.* 1936, p. 226, l. 2 and n. on p. 229) the word עֵר[2] stands parallel to פסל 'graven image'. It is obviously the Arabic غَرِيّ 'bedaubed stone' (on

---

[1] So קרישין often denotes 'demons' in Aramaic incantation texts!

[2] For the loss of the final weak letter, the Ugar. פר (= Hebr. פרי) 'fruit and שׂד (= Hebr. שׂדה) 'country' may be compared.