

University of Wales, Trinity Saint David, Lampeter (United Kingdom)



**The Greek Text of the Gospel of Matthew:  
A Renewed Text-Critical Approach  
with a Focus on the Issue of Harmonisations in Codex Bezae**

A thesis submitted to the  
University of Wales, Trinity Saint David  
in fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2015

Laurent Pinchard



DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed .....

Date .....

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed .....

Date .....

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed .....

Date .....

## ABSTRACT

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis is an important early manuscript of the Greek New Testament, whose Gospel text has received relatively limited attention. Because Matthew was the most widely used Gospel among the first Christian communities, the study of its textual form is of utmost significance for the understanding of the early transmission of the New Testament.

The research proposed in this thesis is therefore to take a fresh look at the Bezan text of Matthew. It will challenge the commonly accepted view of its readings as reflecting scribal reworking, albeit performed at an early stage. A principal ground for viewing the text as secondary is the apparently extensive harmonisation between the Gospels. The approach adopted here has been to thoroughly re-examine the Greek text of Matthew, comparing its form in Codex Bezae with that of Codex Vaticanus, a manuscript generally accepted as having a greater claim to authenticity. After noting all the variant readings and classifying them according to the type of material they represent, the study pays particular attention to the significance of word order differences, applying the tools of discourse analysis. Thereafter, the focus of the thesis is on the issue of harmonisation, as all the instances of the feature noted in the current edition of the Greek New Testament are systematically scrutinised.

The results of this work suggest that the judgement that the Bezan text of Matthew has a harmonising tendency is predominantly based on external criticism, or on the choice of the particular passage with which there is alleged harmonisation. It will be suggested that the existence of common material in Codex Bezae where it is absent in other manuscripts may not be only a consequence of genuine harmonisation but also of the simple fact that the text was originally in agreement.

It is hoped that the research presented in this thesis may serve to advance the study of Matthew's Gospel, in particular with reference to harmonisation, in the field of New Testament textual criticism as well as in the related field of Synoptic studies.

## ABSTRACT IN FRENCH, MY NATIVE LANGUAGE

Le Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Codex de Bèze) est un des manuscrits grecs du Nouveau Testament les plus anciens et les plus importants ; or ses évangiles n'ont que peu retenu l'attention. Pourtant, l'évangile de Matthieu étant le plus largement utilisé dans les premières communautés chrétiennes, il est du plus haut intérêt d'étudier sa forme textuelle si l'on veut comprendre comment, à l'époque, fut transmis le Nouveau Testament.

L'objet de cette thèse est d'examiner d'un oeil neuf le texte de Matthieu dans ce manuscrit. Elle reconsidère la tendance courante consistant à croire que ses leçons variantes ne résulteraient que de l'activité de scribes des premiers siècles. Une des raisons principalement invoquées qui font prendre le Codex de Bèze pour un texte tardif est la fréquente utilisation du « phénomène d'harmonisation » entre les évangiles. L'approche adoptée a donc consisté à réexaminer minutieusement le texte grec de Matthieu, en comparant sa forme textuelle à celle du Codex Vaticanus, manuscrit auquel on reconnaît généralement grande valeur d'authenticité. Après avoir relevé toutes les leçons variantes et les avoir classées selon leurs spécificités, nous avons cherché, en utilisant les outils de l'analyse du discours, à comprendre l'importance conférée à l'inversion de l'ordre de certains mots. L'étude s'est focalisée ensuite sur le problème même des harmonisations, en passant en revue systématiquement tous les cas mentionnés dans l'édition courante du Nouveau Testament grec.

Les données de ce travail suggèrent que c'est avant tout sur l'application de critères externes, ou sur le choix autoguidé du passage des synoptiques en fonction de l'harmonisation présumée, que les leçons variantes du texte de Matthieu dans le Codex de Bèze sont identifiées comme harmonisantes. Entre autres, nous suggérerons que, si le Codex de Bèze présente des expressions communes avec les synoptiques là où d'autres manuscrits ne les ont pas, c'est en fait la conséquence, non pas d'harmonisations proprement dites, mais de ce que les évangiles étaient, en ces endroits, textuellement identiques.

Exprimons l'espoir que le travail de recherche exposé ici puisse faire progresser l'étude de l'évangile de Matthieu, notamment sur la problématique des harmonisations, que ce soit dans le domaine de la critique textuelle, ou dans le domaine connexe des études synoptiques.

## ABSTRACT IN POLISH, MY HEART'S LANGUAGE

*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (Kodeks Bezy z Cambridge) to wczesny, ważny a zarazem stosunkowo mało znany Grecki rękopis Nowego Testamentu. Ponieważ Ewangelia Św. Mateusza była najczęściej używanym tekstem w pierwszych wspólnotach chrześcijańskich, badanie jej tekstowych zapisów ma ogromne znaczenie dla zrozumienia wczesnego przekazu Nowego Testamentu.

Zaproponowana w niniejszej pracy badawczej teza, pozwala na inne - świeże spojrzenie na zapisy Św. Mateusza w Kodeksie Bezy. Podejmuje ona wezwanie wobec powszechnie przyjętego poglądu i odczytanie go na nowo, a odnoszącego się do ręcznie naniesionych w późniejszym okresie poprawek manuskryptu. Fundamentem pierwotnym do postrzegania tego tekstu jako wtórnego jest wyraźne, obszerne współbrzmienie pomiędzy Ewangeliami (tzw. 'harmonizacje'). Przyjęte tutaj podejście dotyczy ponownego, dokładnego zbadania greckiego zapisu tekstu Św. Mateusza, porównując ich formy w Kodeksie Bezy z powszechnie uznanym jako rękopis bardziej zbliżony do autentycznego czyli Kodeksem Watykańskim. Po przejrzaniu wszystkich wariantów pisowni i odpowiednim ich zakwalifikowaniu, poddano szczególnej analizie znaczenie kolejności wyrazów w odniesieniu do narzędzi analitycznych przyjętych w niniejszym badaniu. Dalszym etapem pracy była ocena zgodności jako dyskursu wystąpienia danej cechy odnotowanej w bieżących wydaniach greckiej wersji Nowego Testamentu.

Wyniki tej pracy sugerują, że w Kodeksie Bezy tekst Św. Mateusza ma tendencję do zgodności opartej przeważnie na tzw. zewnętrznej krytyce lub na wyborze tych poszczególnych pasażów w których jest domniemana zgodność. Praca sugeruje istnienie wspólnych płaszczyzn w Kodeksie Bezy a nieobecnych w innych rękopisach, co może być nie tylko konsekwencją pierwotnej zgodności - harmonizacji, ale także prostego faktu posiadania tego samego tekstu.

Podjęte założenia w zaprezentowanej pracy badawczej mogą służyć dalszemu rozwojowi studiów nad Ewangelią Św. Mateusza w szczególności w odniesieniu do oceny zgodności - harmonizacji tekstu Nowego Testamentu jak również na polu pokrewnych studiów synoptycznych.

## CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Abbreviations .....	xi
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
I. New Testament Manuscripts.....	1
II. Codex Bezae: A Manuscript and its Text.....	4
III. The Traditional Text-Critical Rules and their Challenges .....	4
IV. The Choice of Matthew.....	5
V. The Variant Readings in the Bezan Text of Matthew.....	5
V. 1. Present, Absent and Alternative Material .....	6
V. 2. The Special Case of Word Order Differences.....	7
V. 3. A Systematic Approach to Harmonisations .....	7
VI. Interest for Academia.....	10
Chapter 2 Overview of the Scholarship on Matthew's Gospel in Codex Bezae .....	11
I. Introduction .....	11
II. Key Works on Codex Bezae.....	12
II. 1. Scrivener's Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis.....	13
II. 2. Parker's <i>Codex Bezae</i> : A Modern Introduction to D.05 .....	14
II. 3. A Modern Scholarly Discussion of Codex Bezae: The Lunel Symposium.....	15
III. Individual Studies of the Greek Text of Matthew in Codex Bezae .....	20
III. 1. A Text-Critical Approach: Holmes' Study on Bezan Matthew.....	20
III. 2. A Literary Analysis Approach: Amphoux's <i>Évangile de Matthieu</i> – <i>Codex de Bèze</i> .....	27
III. 3. Other Text-Critical Works on Matthew in Codex Bezae.....	30
IV. Studies of Matthew in Individual Manuscripts .....	31
IV. 1. Matthew in Greek Papyri.....	31
IV. 2. Matthew in Greek Majuscules.....	35
V. Early Versions of Matthew and Their Influence on the Greek Text of Codex Bezae .....	39
V. 1. Syriac.....	40
V. 2. Latin.....	42
V. 3. Coptic.....	44
V. 4. Singular or Near-Singular Readings in Mt D.05 with Versional Support.....	45
Chapter 3 Linguistic Considerations on the Variant Readings between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in the Greek Text of Matthew .....	47
I. The Flexibility of Koine Greek.....	48
I. 1. Introduction to Koine Greek.....	48
I. 2. Atticistic Forms.....	48
I. 3. Unusual Forms .....	49
II. Orthographical, Lexical and Grammatical Differences.....	51
II. 1. Orthographical Differences.....	51
II. 2. Lexical Differences .....	67
II. 3. Grammatical Differences .....	71
II. 4. Conclusions .....	72

## CONTENTS

III. Presence or Absence of Words.....	73
III. 1. Presence of Words in Mt D.05 against Absence in Mt B.03 .....	73
III. 2. Absence of Words in Mt D.05 against Presence in Mt B.03 .....	74
III. 3. Conclusions .....	74
IV. The Specific Case of Word Order Differences .....	75
IV. 1. The Study of Word Order.....	75
IV. 2. Word Order in NT Greek .....	76
IV. 3. The Concept of Constituent Order and Markedness.....	77
IV. 4. Default Order Principles 1-4 .....	78
IV. 5. Marked Order Principles 5-6.....	80
IV. 6. Summary .....	82
IV. 7. Application to Variant Word Order in Mt D.05/B.03 .....	82
IV. 8. Conclusions .....	97
Chapter 4 Methodology in the Consideration of Harmonistic Readings in the Bezan Text of Matthew .....	99
I. Review of the Preceding Chapters, Limitations .....	99
II. History of Research on Harmonistic Variants .....	101
II. 1. Harmonisation as a Scribal Habit .....	102
II. 2. Vogels' Approach on Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew .....	104
II. 3. Holmes' Approach to Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew .....	106
III. Methodology for the Identification of Harmonistic Variants in NA <sup>28</sup> .....	106
III. 1. Explicit Indications of Harmonistic Readings in NA <sup>28</sup> .....	107
III. 2. Implicit Indications of Harmonistic Readings in NA <sup>28</sup> .....	109
III. 3. Special Cases: Harmonisation with the Septuagint and John.....	111
III. 4. Cases of Mixed Implicit and Explicit Harmonisations in NA <sup>28</sup> .....	112
IV. The Evolution Towards the Explanation of Variant Readings as Harmonisations in NA <sup>28</sup> .....	113
IV. 1. The Nestle-Aland Editions and Harmonistic Readings.....	113
IV. 2. Interaction between Vogels' <i>Harmonisitk</i> and Nestle-Aland's Suggestions of Harmonistic Variants .....	115
V. Conclusions on the Criteria for Harmonisation in Bezan Matthew .....	116
Chapter 5 The Study of Harmonistic Readings in the Bezan Text of Matthew with Parallels in One Gospel .....	119
I. Harmonisations within Matthew .....	119
I. 1. Reading Present in the Immediate Context .....	119
I. 2. Reading Present in More Distant Contexts.....	130
I. 3. Conclusions .....	135
II. Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew with Mark Only .....	135
II. 1. Validity of the Concept.....	135
II. 2. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Firm Markan Reading .....	137
II. 3. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Variant Markan Reading.....	147
II. 4. Conclusions .....	159
III. Harmonisation in Bezan Matthew with Luke Only .....	159
III. 1. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Firm Lukan Reading.....	159
III. 2. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Variant Lukan Reading.....	173
III. 3. Conclusions .....	186

## CONTENTS

Chapter 6 Apparent Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew with Parallels in Both Luke and Mark.....	187
I. Apparent Harmonisations of Mt D.05 with Both Luke and Mark in Repeated Wording.....	187
I. 1. Repeated Words or Expressions in Isolation.....	187
I. 2. The Case of Doublets.....	202
I. 3. Frequently Occurring Expressions.....	215
I. 4. Conclusions.....	236
II. Harmonisations of Bezan Matthew with Both Luke and Mark in Non-Repeated Expressions.....	237
II. 1. High Verbal to Verbatim Agreement.....	237
II. 2. Moderate Verbal Agreement.....	260
II. 3. Conclusions.....	283
Excursus - Application of the Nestle-Aland Criteria for Harmonisations in Matthew in $\aleph$ B.....	285
I. Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Sinaiticus.....	285
I. 1. Matthew/Matthew Parallels.....	286
I. 2. Matthew/Mark Parallels.....	287
I. 3. Matthew/Luke Parallels.....	288
I. 4. Matthew/Mark/Luke Parallels.....	290
I. 5. Conclusions.....	292
II. Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Vaticanus...	292
II. 1. Matthew/Matthew Parallels.....	293
II. 2. Matthew/Mark Parallels.....	293
II. 3. Matthew/Luke Parallels.....	296
II. 4. Matthew/Mark/Luke Parallels.....	296
II. 5. Conclusions.....	298
III. Conclusions on the Alleged Harmonistic Readings in $\aleph$ B.....	298
Chapter 7 Conclusions.....	299
I. Summary of the Preceding Chapters.....	299
II. Main Conclusions.....	302
II. 1. Prior Studies.....	302
II. 2. External Evidence.....	303
III. Further Considerations.....	309
III. 1. Consequences for the Synoptic Problem.....	309
III. 2. The Problem of Sources.....	310
III. 3. Further Research Areas.....	311
Bibliography.....	313
Appendix 1 Support of Early Papyri for Bezan Matthew.....	333
Appendix 2 Philological Aspects of Bezan Matthew.....	339
Appendix 3 Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Sinaiticus .	384
Appendix 4 Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Vaticanus.	389
Appendix 5 Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Bezae ....	393

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Textual Agreements between Mt D.05, Mt B.03 and Papyri.....	34
Table 2: Near-Singular Agreements in Mt D.05 with Versional Support .....	46
Table 3: Distribution of Itacistic Forms in Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 .....	53
Table 4: Distribution of Word Presence or Absence in Mt D.05 vs Mt B.03.....	74
Table 5: Harmonistic Readings in Early Manuscripts Indicated with a <i>p</i> )-Sign .....	107
Table 6: Combined Implicit and Explicit Harmonistic Readings in Early Manuscripts ...	111
Table 7: Unspecified References in Bezan Matthew in Vogels' Work .....	116
Table 8: Textual Comparison of Mt 5.25//Lk 12.58 in D.05 and B.03.....	162
Table 9: Textual Comparison of Mt 5.44//Lk 6.28 in D.05 and B.03 .....	164
Table 10: Textual Comparison of Mt 24.30-31 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03.....	170
Table 11: Textual Comparison of Mt 20.28//Lk 14.8-11 in Mt D.05 and B.03.....	180
Table 12: Textual Arrangement of Mt 24.40f//Lk 17.34ff in D.05 and B.03 .....	183
Table 13: Textual Variants of the Expression <i>Son of David</i> .....	193
Table 14: Textual Comparison of the Divorce Passages in D.05 and B.03.....	204
Table 15: Textual Comparison of the Sign of Jonah Passages in D.05 and B.03.....	214
Table 16: Textual Variants of the Expression <i>He Who Has Ears, Let Him Hear</i> .....	217
Table 17: Textual Variants of the Expression εἰς τὴν γένναν .....	221
Table 18: Distribution of the Expression βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γένναν in Mark.....	222
Table 19: Textual Variants of the Expression 'On The Third Day'.....	227
Table 20: Textual Variants of the Expression οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ).....	235
Table 21: Influence of a Neighbouring Pronoun on the Expression οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ).....	236
Table 22: Textual Comparison of Mt 9.15a and Parallels in D.05 and B.03.....	242
Table 23: Textual Variants of the Expression <i>To Command Silence</i> .....	246
Table 24: Textual Variants of ποιέω in Mt 21.13 and Parallels.....	252
Table 25: Textual Comparison of Mt 9.17 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03 .....	264
Table 26: Textual Variation of Mt 13.13 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03 .....	270
Table 27: Textual Comparison of Mt 28.8 and Parallels and Meanings .....	281
Table 28: Agreements of Harmonistic Readings in Mt 8.01/B.03/D.05 .....	286
Table 29: Agreements of Harmonistic Readings in Mt 8.01/B.03/D.05 .....	292



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Although this dissertation reflects a solitary work, I would like herewith to acknowledge for all the people who have accompanied me throughout these years.*

*I would like to first express my gratitude to Dr. Jenny Read-Heimerdinger for making this Ph.D. work possible in the fascinating world of Codex Bezae and Textual Criticism and for her patient supervision during this six-year activity. Without her guidance, encouragements, challenges and corrections, the present form of the work would not have been produced.*

*My utmost respect goes to Professors Christian-Bernard Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott. Their thought-provoking discussions, along with the reading of his scholarly works, were a deep source of inspiration in looking into alternative ways of exploring textual criticism. I am also obligated to Prof. Jean-Claude Haelewyck (University of Louvain, Belgium) for his always prompt and friendly replies to my queries and his broad knowledge in both Latin and Syriac.*

*Special thanks go to Dr. Steve Runge, Scholar in Residence, Logos Inc., for his patient support during our discussions on discourse analysis applied to the Greek New Testament.*

*My ultimate gratitude for her continuous technical support is given to Thérèse Delanoy, Senior Lecturer in French; to Henri Lamplé, former Librarian at the Faculty of Theology of Toulouse, who facilitated the access to thousands of publications with extreme flexibility; and finally to Olivier Sonnet, for his patient IT support.*

*I owe a great debt to all my family and friends, especially to my daughter, Laura, who supported me during this endeavour.*

*Thanks be to the Lord, Jesus Christ!*



*A ceux que j'aime*



## ABBREVIATIONS

### 1. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

- ALAND–ALAND, *Text* K. ALAND and B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (transl. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995).
- AMPHOUX, *Matthieu* C.-B. AMPHOUX *L'Évangile selon Matthieu, Codex de Bèze* (L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue: Bois d'Orion, 1996).
- BDAG W. BAUER, F. DANKER, W. ARNDT and F.W. GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew* W.D. DAVIES and D.C. ALLISON, *Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–1997).
- EPP–FEE, *Studies* E.J. EPP and G.D. FEE (eds), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993).
- HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity' M.W. HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984).
- METZGER, *Commentary* B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Second Edition. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).
- MIGNE, *PG* J.-P. MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca* (162 vols; Imprimerie Catholique: Paris, 1857-1886).
- MOULTON, *Grammar* J.H. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906); J.H. MOULTON and W.F. HOWARD, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 2, *Accidence and Word-Formation, with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929).

## ABBREVIATIONS

- NA<sup>27; 28</sup> B. ALAND, K. ALAND, J. KARAVIDOPOULOS, C.M. MARTINI and B.M. METZGER, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993<sup>27</sup>; 2012<sup>28</sup>).
- PARKER, *Codex Bezae* D.C. PARKER, *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae* D.C. PARKER and C.-B. AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- SCRIVENER, *Codex Bezae* S.H. SCRIVENER, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, Written Early in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza A. D. 1581* (Cambridge, 1864, reprinted by Pickwick Press, Pittsburgh, 1978).
- SWANSON, *Matthew* R.J. SWANSON, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Vol. 1, Matthew* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press; Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995).
- THAYER J.H. THAYER, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; repr. Hendrickson, 1996; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896).
- YODER, *Concordance* YODER, J.D., *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae* (NTTS 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961).

## 2. PERIODICALS, REFERENCE WORKS AND SERIALS

- ABCat–PAM Associació Bíblica de Catalunya: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat
- ANRW Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
- ANTT Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
- AUSS Andrews University Seminary Studies
- BABELAO Bulletin de l'Académie belge pour l'étude des langues anciennes et orientales
- BBC Bulletin of the Bezan Club
- BCNH.E Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Etudes
- BETL Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
- BiTS Biblical Tools and Studies

## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BibOr</i>	Biblica et Orientalia
BLGS	Biblical Languages, Greek Series
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<i>CCO</i>	Collectanea Christiana Orientalia
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
<i>CQR</i>	Church Quarterly Review
CRB	Cahiers de la Revue Biblique
CRThL	Cahiers de la Revue Théologique de Louvain
<i>DBSJ</i>	Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal
D.RLAR	Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion
ECIHC	Early Christianity in its Hellenistic Context
ER	Ecumenical Review
<i>EstB</i>	Estudios biblicos
<i>ETL</i>	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
<i>ExpTim</i>	Expository Times
FGS	Functional Grammar Series
<i>FilNeo</i>	Filologia Neotestamentaria
HOHO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
<i>HTR</i>	Harvard Theological Review
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IRSt	Issues in Religious Studies
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature
<i>JCS</i>	Journal of Coptic Studies
<i>JSHJ</i>	Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus
<i>JSJ</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSNT</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	Journal of Theological Studies
LingBS	Linguistic Biblical Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LOAPL</i>	Langues Orientales Anciennes Philologie et Linguistique
MSC.CP	Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Coptic Papyri
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NovT</i>	Novum Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	New Testament Studies
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements

## ABBREVIATIONS

NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
PRS	Pittsburgh Reprint Series
<i>RCT</i>	Revista Catalana de Teologia
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique
<i>RivBib</i>	Rivista Biblica
SB	Scripta Biblica
SBF	Studium Biblicum Franciscanum
SBL.SCSt	Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SBLSPS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SD	Studies and Documents
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
StANT	Studien zum alten und neuen Testament
SVigChr	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
TaS.ThS	Texts and Studies. Third Series
<i>TC</i>	Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism
<i>TMSJ</i>	The Master's Seminary Journal
TS	Texts and Studies
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>TynB</i>	Tyndale Bulletin
<i>TZ</i>	Theologische Zeitschrift
<i>USQR</i>	Union Seminary Quarterly Review
VL.AGLB	Vetus Latina, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel
VCSS	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements Series
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>ZTK</i>	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

### 3. MISCELLANEOUS

⋈.01	Codex Sinaiticus
B.03	Codex Vaticanus
D.05	Codex Bezae
d5	Latin pages of Codex Bezae
CE	the common era
ed(s)	edited by, editor(s)
edn	edition
f, ff.	following page(s), verse(s)



## ABBREVIATIONS

LXX	Septuagint
ℳ	Majority Text
MS	Manuscript
MT	Masoretic Text
MwQH	Matthew without 'Q' Hypothesis
n.	note
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (1989)
NT	New Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version
s.v.	<i>sub voce</i>
<i>vl (vll)</i>	variant reading(s)

The English translation of the biblical text will be the RSV unless otherwise mentioned. Standard abbreviations of biblical books are used.



# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

### I. New Testament Manuscripts

In the quest for the origins of the New Testament, the first documentary evidence of early Christianity available today is manuscripts, whether as scrolls or book-form codices, on papyrus or parchment.

Apart from papyrus fragments dating from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries, the earliest more substantial manuscripts in Greek date from the mid to end 4<sup>th</sup> century. Among the first Greek parchment codices written in uncial script, Codex Bezae appears to be one of the earliest witnesses to the New Testament, written around 50 years after Codex Vaticanus (B.03, 350 CE) and Codex Sinaiticus (ℵ.01, 360 CE).<sup>2</sup> Identified as D.05 in the Gregory-Aland numbering,<sup>3</sup> *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* is a bilingual Greek/Latin codex on vellum currently housed in the University of Cambridge (United Kingdom) and retrieved from Lyons (France) by the Protestant scholar Theodore Beza in 1562. It contains the four Gospels and Acts with lacunae, a small fragment of the Third Epistle of John, and can be dated to around 400 CE.<sup>4</sup> Written in one column per page, it contains 406 parchment sheets (26 x 21.5 cm) out of, perhaps, an original 534.<sup>5</sup>

The large amount of manuscripts of the New Testament (more than 5,000 available in Greek today) soon called for their classification and a study of their relationships. Until recently, it was customary to divide manuscripts into text-types: Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean<sup>6</sup> and ‘Western’ – with Codex Bezae belonging to the latter.<sup>7</sup> ‘Western’

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by Dr. Jody Barnard in correcting the English of this thesis. I take the responsibility for any mistakes remaining in the final draft.

<sup>2</sup> The dates are proposed by Cavallo in a 1967 contribution for both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, while Kenyon proposes 4<sup>th</sup> c. CE. See J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,’ in J.K. ELLIOTT (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010) 65–78 [65].

<sup>3</sup> Gregory’s somewhat arbitrary numbering (1908) divides all manuscripts into four groupings (papyri, majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries). This codification is still used today. See ALAND–ALAND, *Text*, 72–3.

<sup>4</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 281.

<sup>5</sup> ALAND–ALAND, *Text*, 109–10. Interestingly, the major lacunae of 67 missing folios (ff. 348–414) between Mark 16 and 3 John in Codex Bezae was tentatively identified by French scholar Amphoux as being James, 1-2 Peter, Hebrews, 1-3 John; cf. C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘La grande lacune du Codex de Bèze,’ *FilNeo* 17 (2004) 3–25.

<sup>6</sup> The existence of the Caesarean text-type is debated: G.D. FEE, ‘Textual Criticism in the New Testament,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 7–8). The term was coined by B.H. STREETER (*The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* [London: Macmillan, 1924] 69). Most recent works on the Caesarean text-type can be read in C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘Qu’est-ce que le type de texte “césarien”?’ in C.-B. AMPHOUX, B. OUTTIER and J.K. ELLIOTT (eds), *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels – Recherches textuelles sur les psaumes et les Evangiles. Papers from the Tbilisi Colloquium on*

witnesses always attracted interest because of their highly distinctive variant readings when compared with other manuscripts, especially Codex Vaticanus. Actually, ‘Western’ is something of a misnomer, as it neither designates a text-type – i.e. with inner consistency among the witnesses – in itself but a *group of texts*, nor are its witnesses confined to the West: the label was originally linked to variant readings often attested in the *Vetus Latina* (Old Latin) or Latin Church Fathers (Cyprian, Tertullian) or Irenaeus, as well as in manuscripts that circulated in North Africa, Italy and Gaul.<sup>8</sup> However it should not be forgotten that certain Syriac and Palestinian manuscripts and texts found in Egypt (Ⲡ<sup>66</sup>, or parts of Codex Sinaiticus [Jn 1-8] and Codex Washingtonianus [Mk 1-5], majuscule 0171) and other regions are also grouped in the ‘Western’ category, thereby offering testimony from a wide geographical area. Nevertheless, the term ‘Western’ will be used in this work for the sake of convenience.

Because of the significant amount of variant readings in Codex Bezae compared with the manuscripts of the Alexandrian tradition, D.05 is identified as the chief representative of the ‘Western’ group of texts. It is also the only Greek manuscript of any size in the group. Although it is an early representative of the NT textual tradition, Codex Bezae is regularly neglected in the search for the ‘original text’ or the ‘reconstruction of the earliest attainable text.’<sup>9</sup> Most of the time, and specifically since Westcott and Hort’s overt preference for the Alexandrian text-type, Codex Bezae is considered to transmit a late and highly corrupted text,<sup>10</sup> although some scholars have challenged this conclusion and regard Codex Bezae as a valuable witness with early or even authentic readings.<sup>11</sup>

---

*the Editing and History of Biblical Manuscripts – Actes du Colloque de Tbilisi, 19-20 septembre 2007* (NovTSup 142; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2012) 73–87; D. LAFLEUR, ‘Les relations, au sein du groupe “césarién”, entre le Papyrus Chester Beatty (Ⲡ<sup>45</sup>) et la Famille Ferrar (*f*<sup>13</sup>), dans L’Évangile de Marc,’ in *ibid.*, 289–306; D. LAFLEUR, ‘Le Codex de Koridethi (Θ.038) et la famille 13: une nouvelle collation de L’Évangile de Marc,’ in *ibid.*, 89–112.

<sup>7</sup> This designation is still found in most scholarly papers although since the publication of Epp’s 1988 paper there has been a shift from speaking about ‘text types’ that bear geographical overtones to speaking about ‘A-text-group’ (i.e. the majority type or Byzantine text-type), B-text-group (including Ⲡ<sup>75</sup> and Codex Vaticanus, i.e. the Alexandrian text-type), C-text-group (Ⲡ<sup>45</sup>, W and others, i.e. the Caesarean text-type), D-text-group (including Codex Bezae, i.e. the ‘Western’ group). See E.J. EPP, ‘The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 274–97). I will stick to the older designation of text-types bearing in mind the absence of a direct geographic link.

<sup>8</sup> B.M. METZGER and B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 277.

<sup>9</sup> In recent years, the study of the variant readings by textual critics shifted from the identification of the ‘original’ to the ‘initial text’ (*Ausgangstext* in German) or the ‘best attainable text’ selecting thereby variants that are more likely to be original. See M.W. HOLMES, ‘From “Original Text” to “Initial Text”: The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion,’ in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 637–8 and ELLIOTT, *Thoroughgoing Eclecticism*, 127.

<sup>10</sup> See specifically Hort’s comment on the characteristics of the Western text, quoted in C.-B. AMPHOUX, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; trans. Jenny READ–HEIMERDINGER; English ed. amplified and updated by Amphoux–Heimerdinger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 150.

<sup>11</sup> Without naming them specifically, Parker notes ‘a minority of scholars have maintained that Codex Bezae is not a free text, but the oldest and most authentic.’ Others have argued that it *sometimes* pre-

The difference in views for or against Codex Bezae sometimes arises from the methods that are used to determine whether a reading is more likely to be original or secondary. As Epp summarises, there have been several scientific attempts in the quest for the original text: the historical-documentary method, ‘thoroughgoing eclecticism’ and ‘reasoned eclecticism.’<sup>12</sup>

The first method gives emphasis to the external evidence (manuscript quality) and can still be found in comments on the ‘overall quality’<sup>13</sup> of the Alexandrian witnesses in general and Codex Vaticanus in particular. Furthermore, their often common readings with the early papyri (specifically  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  with Codex Vaticanus)<sup>14</sup> have given cumulative credit to their possible originality.<sup>15</sup> Conversely, since Codex Bezae appears to be so consistently different from Codex Vaticanus, and since its readings can potentially be mostly explained as free changes from earlier witnesses, and usually contravene the aforementioned canons,<sup>16</sup> Codex Bezae is customarily regarded as secondary. However, when Codex Bezae supports Codex Vaticanus against other manuscripts, D.05 is regarded as an early and important manuscript of distinctive quality.

The second methodology, championed by Kilpatrick and Elliott,<sup>17</sup> gives less emphasis to external evidence to the profit of internal evidence, i.e. the importance of the author’s language or the underlying theology. As a consensus, ‘reasoned eclecticism’<sup>18</sup> corresponds to a third method that seeks to give equal importance to both external and internal evidence.

Beyond these three methods, other scholars have selected Codex Bezae as a manuscript in its own right and sought its inner coherence, examining each variant reading finding not so much scribal emendation as editorial choice.<sup>19</sup>

---

sents ‘the best text’ (D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* [Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997] 201).

<sup>12</sup> E.J. EPP, ‘Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 17–44 [32–6].

<sup>13</sup> B.D. EHRMANN, *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 33; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2006) 5.

<sup>14</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ , and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 247–73.

<sup>15</sup> Petzer summarises ‘the vast majority of textual scholars today agree that the Alexandrian text is most probably the closest representative of the original text available today.’ See J.H. PETZER, ‘The History of the NT Text – Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism’ in B. ALAND and J. DELOBEL (eds), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History. A Discussion of Methods* (CBET 7; Kampen: KOK Pharos, 1994).

<sup>16</sup> ‘The chief characteristic of Western readings is fondness of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences are freely changed, omitted, or inserted. Sometimes, the motive appears to have been harmonization, while at other times it was the enrichment of the narrative by inclusion of traditional or apocryphal material,’ in METZGER, *Commentary*, 6\*.

<sup>17</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism,’ in B.D. EHRMANN and M.W. HOLMES (eds), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (NTTSD 42; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013) 321–3.

<sup>18</sup> EPP, ‘Decision Points in New Testament Criticism,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 34.

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 26–63.

## II. Codex Bezae: A Manuscript and its Text

As a late 4<sup>th</sup>-early 5<sup>th</sup> c. CE manuscript, Codex Bezae is regarded by most scholars as a late manuscript by definition, as opposed to Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus or the early papyri. However, it should be remembered that the majuscules  $\aleph$ BD are roughly contemporaneous, a fact that should encourage us to value all three manuscripts equally when determining the development of the New Testament text. Moreover, there should be no confusion between the *copy* of Codex Bezae that dates around 400 CE, and the text of Codex Bezae that is *per se* earlier.

Among scholars who do not have an *a priori* preference for the Alexandrian text, there is a general consensus on a date before 200 CE for at least a significant part of the text reproduced in Codex Bezae: Amphoux speaks of a date ‘before 150,’<sup>20</sup> which is confirmed by Petersen’s work on Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, since pre-200 CE authors like Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus and Marcion, ‘frequently cite the canonical gospels in the form of [the] ‘Western’ text.’<sup>21</sup> For the specific case of the Bezan text of Acts, Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps have argued for a date within the first century, without going as far as to suggest that the text ‘transmits the original autograph of Luke.’<sup>22</sup> Although Epp regards an early 2<sup>nd</sup> c. date for the text of Codex Bezae as ‘quite inconceivable,’<sup>23</sup> he accepts that  $\aleph^{29}$ ,  $\aleph^{38}$ ,  $\aleph^{48}$  (3<sup>rd</sup> c.) are ‘pre- or proto-D texts akin to the D-text.’<sup>24</sup>

## III. The Traditional Text-Critical Rules and their Challenges

The existence of variant readings in the New Testament text has naturally led scholars to establish a series of principles or ‘canons’ to determine which reading is most likely to be ‘original.’<sup>25</sup> Such canons devised by Bengel and expanded by Griesbach and others at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>26</sup> are referred to as ‘axioms,’ ‘rules’ or ‘principles’ that aim to offer guidance in the selection of readings rather than a firm conclusion. Nevertheless, in most cases and on these grounds, Alexandrian readings appear ‘more likely’ to be original than the alternative ‘Western’ ones, specifically those found in Codex Bezae. Although they do not lead to firm conclusions, these principles continue to be used by

---

<sup>20</sup> C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘La révision marcionite du “Notre Père” de Luc (11,2–4) et sa place dans l’histoire du texte,’ in R. GRYSON and P.-M. BOGAERT (eds), *Recherche sur l’histoire de la Bible latine* (CRThL 19; Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de la Faculté de Théologie, 1987) 105–21 [106].

<sup>21</sup> W.L. PETERSEN, *Tatian’s Diatessaron Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (SVigChr 25; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 11.

<sup>22</sup> J. RIUS-CAMPS and J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition. Volume 1. Acts 1.1-5.42: Jerusalem* (JSNTSup 257; London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 3

<sup>23</sup> EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 29. However see a different conclusion in D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 314.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 42.

<sup>25</sup> See note 9 on the use of this term in inverted commas.

<sup>26</sup> E.J. EPP, ‘The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?,’ in EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 141–73 [142].

scholars to identify ‘original’ readings as opposed to modified readings. Among these principles, *lectio difficilior potior* (‘the more difficult reading is the stronger’),<sup>27</sup> and *lectio brevior potior* (‘the shorter reading is the stronger’) remain well-established rules, although specifically the latter has recently been challenged, if not invalidated.<sup>28</sup>

#### IV. The Choice of Matthew

Because the manuscripts that differ the most from one another are Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae, the comparison of these two manuscripts constitutes an ideal test-case in the process of understanding the history of the New Testament text. Although the entire New Testament would make the most ideal sample, Codex Bezae does not contain the entire New Testament, and such a study would be beyond the scope of this work. Consequently, I have selected one Gospel only, Matthew, and compared its text in B.03 with that of D.05. Matthew has a unique status in the early Church as the most widely used Gospel. It is also the longest gospel in the New Testament thereby providing a large ‘battlefield’ in one block, and it is part of the Synoptics and therefore constitutes a fruitful ground for potential harmonisations. In the overview of scholarship in the next chapter, I will therefore first review the existing scholarship on Bezan Matthew in the light of the broader research on Codex Bezae.

#### V. The Variant Readings in the Bezan Text of Matthew

Throughout the present work, I will use the widely adopted Greek text of the New Testament that is available from the 28<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Its text reflects the application of the above mentioned principles and its critical apparatus conveniently lists a large number of variant readings and their support. Its authority is immense, since all readings that differ from the one selected in the main text, are judged as secondary by the majority of textual critics, and therefore exegetes, as we will see this throughout this work. However, the criteria for selecting the preferred reading are not always clear and have been challenged<sup>29</sup> and this work will suggest some weaknesses with particular reference to the choice to present certain variant readings as harmonisations in particular.

When comparing manuscripts, an objective way is to speak about differences in terms of the use of (i) more words or (ii) less words, or (iii) a different word, or (iv) words in a different order, or in Parker’s words for the three first classes (i) the presence

---

<sup>27</sup> ALAND–ALAND, *Text*, 281.

<sup>28</sup> Royle proposed to be careful with this long-believed axiom specifically in early papyri where the longer reading is more likely to be original. Elliott broadened this conclusion to all the manuscripts. See J.R. ROYSE, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2008); more generally, Elliott revisits the *lectio brevior* principle in suggesting that ‘it is more common to find that an originally longer text was accidentally shortened than that an originally short text was deliberately expanded e.g. out of a desire to add explanatory glosses’: ELLIOTT, *Thoroughgoing Principles*, 276.

<sup>29</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘A New Edition of Nestle–Aland, Greek New Testament,’ *JTS* 64 (2013) 47–65.

of text in one witness or more which is absent in one or more other witnesses, (ii) the absence of text in one witness or more which is present in one or more other witnesses, (iii) a different word than those found in one or more other witnesses.<sup>30</sup> However, due to the popularity of the aforementioned canons, such variant readings are more commonly<sup>31</sup> identified as (i) additions or (ii) omissions or (iii) substitutions, (iv) word order changes,<sup>32</sup> terminology which subconsciously implies that the other manuscript has been classed *a priori* secondary and that the first one is original or ‘more likely to be original.’ Such judgements are in evidence in most, if not all, exegetical works, since they are based on the Greek text of Nestle-Aland. E.C. Colwell was one of the first scholars to pave the way to the question of what a variant truly is:

‘When one speaks of variant readings, he is immediately confronted with the question, “variant from what?” The very words ‘variant’ implies a deviation or change from something less taken for a norm.’<sup>33</sup>

A further consideration, giving rise to a fifth class of variant reading, is when the alternative wording is closer to a parallel passage (whether the Septuagint or the Gospels) than it is to the selected reading. This type of variant is usually identified as a ‘harmonisation,’ and is typically regarded as secondary. Indeed, it is assumed that scribes would naturally tend to correct and align readings rather than deliberately dissimilate.

The first four categories of variant reading will be examined in Chapter 3 while I will dedicate more space to the last class, harmonisation (Chapters 4-6), as presented in the following sections.

## V. 1. Present, Absent and Alternative Material

As a result of the aforementioned classification, my first step was to set out side by side the two texts of Matthew in both manuscripts to assist in the identification of variant readings.<sup>34</sup> All the variant readings are discussed in Chapter 3 sections I-III according to their nature, whether orthographic, lexical or grammatical. However, I use the less subjective terminology of *presence* and *absence* instead of *additions* and *omissions* in order to avoid the implicit assumption that one of the readings is secondary. Likewise, I have categorised and ordered the differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 that correspond

---

<sup>30</sup> PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*, 159.

<sup>31</sup> A fifth one potentially exists (transposition) but is actually an overlap of the three first ones as described in EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 63.

<sup>32</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation,’ in EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 62-79 [63-64].

<sup>33</sup> E.C. COLWELL, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969) 96.

<sup>34</sup> I had initially based the identification of variant readings in Mt B.03 *contra* Mt D.05 from my own side-by-side layout of these two texts. This preliminary work will not be presented here as originally thought because of the publication of a similar synopsis in the meantime: J. READ-HEIMERDINGER and J. RIUS-CAMPS, *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus* (NTTSD 45; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2014).



to *alternative wording*, instead of naming them *substitutions* as usually referred to, because of the implicit assumption that one of the readings corresponds to a deliberate correction of the other.

## V. 2. The Special Case of Word Order Differences

In a class of its own are differences in *word order* between two readings, which are not always mentioned in text-critical works or even in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. These will be examined in Chapter 3. IV. on the basis of recent developments in linguistics, i.e. the tools of discourse analysis. This branch of linguistics analyses how a discourse is constructed, and analyses the articulation of words, connectives and other linguistic markers at the extrasentential level as opposed to an atomistic consideration of variant readings. The tool has proven useful in such things as the identification of words that, despite their apparent interchangeable character with others read by other manuscripts, may reflect the very conception of a text or discourse by its author as he addresses his audience. Applied to the text of the New Testament, it offers a possible explanation as to why one word is preferred over another in certain textual traditions.<sup>35</sup>

In this thesis, discourse analysis will be applied to the word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 in order to assess the potential underlying reason for there being a different word order, specifically when the meaning remains unaffected, a phenomenon that is usually unexplained in text-critical studies.

## V. 3. A Systematic Approach to Harmonisations

The last angle for approaching and understanding the various classes of variant readings between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew will lead to a fifth class which involves all the aforementioned possible differences: harmonisations (Chapters 4-6). It involves the four other categories when, as happens frequently, the alleged harmonisation may have more or fewer words or differences in lexis or grammar or, indeed, word order.

With the extensive editing activity in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE,<sup>36</sup> it is said that interactions between parallel narratives ('harmonisation') crept naturally into the final manuscript<sup>37</sup> as a consequence of editorial vitality rather than of deliberate corruption.<sup>38</sup> The verbal proximity within the synoptic Gospels makes inter-Gospel cross-contamination inevitable.

---

<sup>35</sup> I summarised a few characteristic examples of this kind in the review of J. Read-Heimerdinger's and Rius-Camps' four volume study of the Bezan form of the book of Acts in L. PINCHARD, 'Review of J. Rius-Camps and J. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (4 vols),' *FilNeo* 25 (2012) 164–84.

<sup>36</sup> See L.W. HURTADO, 'The New Testament in the Second Century: Text, Collections and Canon,' in J.W. CHILDERS and D.C. PARKER (eds), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (TaS.ThS 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006) 3–27.

<sup>37</sup> J.R. ROYSE, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Boston: E.J. Brill, 2008) 690–8.

<sup>38</sup> 'Le texte de la Bible est, par essence, un texte variant; parce qu'il est le reflet et l'expression d'une traduction vivante, c'est un texte en perpétuelle évolution,' in C.-B. AMPHOUX, 'Les premières éditions de Luc, I, L'histoire du texte au II<sup>e</sup> siècle,' *ETL* 68 (1992) 38–48 [47].

ble, a process which textual critics call *harmonisation*.<sup>39</sup> Specifically, Codex Bezae is generally understood to be highly harmonistic,<sup>40</sup> or at least more harmonised than any other manuscript.<sup>41</sup>

An influential study published by Vogels in 1910 reviewed 1,278 readings in Codex Bezae identified by the author as harmonisations, among these 220 in Matthew.<sup>42</sup> He classifies them into four types: harmonisations in objective difference, in transition passages, parallel variants, others. While his identification goes far beyond the critical apparatus of Nestle-Aland, his classification is quite subjective in assigning almost every Bezan reading to a potential assimilation; this is an inevitable result given the large amount of shared wording in the Synoptics. Besides, it plainly assumes the printed text of the Westcott and Hort as the reference point. His investigation in fact encompasses a compendium of harmonistic readings listing Bezan variants whose origin is explained by an influence from a harmony:

Der Beweis dass der Bezatext durch eine Evangelienharmonie beeinflusst wordern ist, wird noch viel eindrucksvoller durch die Beobachtung dass an vielen Stellen Lesarten eines der vier Evangelien, die offenbar nicht in den Text hineingehoeren, an einer Parallelestelle im Cantabrigiensis, wo sie ebenso wenig Existenzberechtigung haben, wieder auftauchen.<sup>43</sup>

His work is regarded as a leading one on the subject of harmonisation in Codex Bezae.<sup>44</sup>

Conversely, Delobel, while recognising the harmonising tendency of Codex Bezae as a ‘well-known phenomenon especially in Luke,’ finds in Mt D.05 only a ‘few variants,’ and concludes ‘one can hardly speak of harmonisation [in Matthew].’ He counts as harmonistic variants readings as few as six in Matthew, eight in Mark, 21 in Luke and only two only in John: ‘the degree of harmonisation in the narrative material is scanty in Mt, more extensive in Mk, and very strong in Lk.’<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonisation in the Gospels,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 174–82 [175].

<sup>40</sup> B.F. WESTCOTT, and F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Harper & Bros: New York, 1882) 124–5; M.W. HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 124;; PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 189; J. DELOBEL, ‘The Sayings of Jesus in the Textual Tradition. Variant Readings in the Greek Manuscripts of the Gospels,’ in *ibid.* (ed.), *Logia, les paroles de Jésus, the Sayings of Jesus* (BETL 59; Leuven: 1982) 431–57 [442].

<sup>41</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 133, n.33 for further references, and specifically Vogels’s comment ‘Der Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis ist durch eine Evangelienharmonie – ein Diatessaron – stark beeinflusst’ (VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 2).

<sup>42</sup> H.J. VOGELS, *Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1910) 45–55.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>44</sup> BIRDSALL, ‘After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, xxvi; W.L. PETERSEN, *Tatian’s Diatessaron. Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship* (VCSS 25; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 158.

<sup>45</sup> DELOBEL, ‘Sayings,’ *ibid.* (ed.), *Sayings of Jesus* (BETL 59; Leuven: 1982) 443 n. 38.

Other scholarly works draw on Vogels' thesis on the harmonistic tendency of Codex Bezae and it is not uncommon to read text-critical comments describing a variant as being 'obviously' or 'naturally' a harmonisation from e.g. Luke or Mark to describe a, most of the time, non-Alexandrian assimilation.<sup>46</sup>

More recently, Paulson concluded his study on scribal habits in Matthew in early codices including Codex Bezae by saying that 'many of the singular readings seem to have been influenced by the preceding text, rather than remote gospel harmonization.'<sup>47</sup>

Defined as a scribal tendency aimed at reconciling parallel passages where they would have been originally discordant, and therefore producing readings more likely to be secondary,<sup>48</sup> harmonisations constitute a combination of grammatical, lexical and word order differences—which will be reviewed in chapter 3—between manuscripts as well as more or less material. While Holmes dedicated an entire chapter to the subject in his dissertation, it appears that he concentrated only on verses 'of representative length';<sup>49</sup> in contrast, the present study seeks to bring a more holistic approach to *all* potential harmonisations in Mt D.05 as noted by NA<sup>28</sup>.

In order to achieve such an analysis, I consider the question of the methodology to be used for approaching harmonisation in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will detail the agreements within Matthew ('vertical harmonisation,' my own designation, i.e. harmonisation with the immediate or intermediate context) and between Bezan Matthew and a parallel passage of a single Gospel only (i.e. a 'horizontal harmonisation' in Luke and Mark), while those allegedly harmonising with more than one Gospel will be examined in Chapter 6. Each variant reading will be investigated from an external (manuscripts) and internal (context, language) point of view. Further, the exact correspondence between the verse in Matthew and its parallel will be discussed in terms of its verbatim or partial agreement, and whether the parallel itself contains variants or not. The reason for such a study is that text critical studies tend to conclude that a variant reading is a harmonisation when that reading 'resembles' the one in a parallel passage but without studying further how close it is in actual fact and whether the parallel passage itself contains variants or not. Indeed, it is quite usual to read that a variant is 'clearly imported' from e.g. Luke or 'an obvious harmonisation' with e.g. Mark. It is plain that it is common among

---

<sup>46</sup> See e.g. 'The bulk of these [minor interpolations], some 75%, are obvious harmonisations to a parallel passage [...]' in F. WISSE, 'Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts,' in W.L. PETERSEN (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century. Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (CJAS 3; Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1989) 39–53 [48–9]. He lists fifteen references in Matthew: Mt 5.44, 5.13, 17.21, 18.11, 19.9, 20.16, 20.22–23, 21.44, 23.14, 25.13, 26.39, 27.35,49.

<sup>47</sup> G.S. PAULSON, 'Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Ephreami, Bezae and Washingtonianus in the Gospel of Matthew' (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2013) 126. Accessible from <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/8957/2/Paulson2013.pdf>

<sup>48</sup> 'The harmonization of the Evangelists, whether done by scribes deliberately or unconsciously, is by definition a secondary process.' in METZGER–EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament*, 335.

<sup>49</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity,' 138.

studies of the Synoptics to find that some inter-Gospel textual interactions<sup>50</sup> and ‘harmonistic tendencies’ are deduced from external criteria alone.

In no way does the present work seek to demonstrate any preference for either Codex Bezae or Codex Vaticanus; on the contrary, it will look at both manuscripts as bearers of readings in their own right. The reasoning that a variant reading is to be accepted or rejected because either it is more likely that Codex Vaticanus has not undergone textual variation during the transmission process, or that Codex Bezae is more likely to have been subject to scribal emendation, will not be used.

## VI. Interest for Academia

This work will reconsider the *status quo* with regard to the Bezan readings in Matthew as an alternative form of text, without presupposing its secondary or primary character, and with a focus on intra- and inter-Gospel harmonisations. While a wide range of methodologies were developed by scholars in order to identify the most likely original form between several variant readings (‘historical-documentary method,’ ‘rigorous eclectic method,’ ‘reasoned eclectic method’),<sup>51</sup> the goal here will be to challenge the alleged objectiveness of the secondary character of variant readings in Bezan Matthew by reviewing them in a detailed manner.

Finally, and as Fee notes, textual criticism is intricately linked to the Synoptic problem.<sup>52</sup> The present study will reinforce this very point in claiming that the secondary character of the Bezan text of Matthew is not as obvious as it seems. As an illustration of the application of its findings to Synoptic studies, it may be mentioned that the hypothetical document called ‘Q,’ corresponding to the possible source of the common material shared by Matthew and Luke, is reconstructed from the text of the Nestle-Aland edition;<sup>53</sup> and it is worth keeping in mind that its form would be different if, for instance, the Bezan text of Matthew and Luke were used as a base. The delineation of Matthew, Luke and Mark in their Bezan forms may raise further question marks as to how the texts interacted during the early transmission of the Gospels, and call into question the notion that harmonisations are simply the consequence of scribal emendation aimed at bringing one passage into conformity with another.

---

<sup>50</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 174–82 [174].

<sup>51</sup> E.J. EPP, ‘Decision Points,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 17–44 [32–34].

<sup>52</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 174.

<sup>53</sup> See ‘The text [=NA<sup>28</sup>] is presented as if this were *the* text of the New Testament’ (S.E. Porter, ‘Reconstructing Early Christianity from its Manuscripts,’ in S.E. PORTER and E.J. SCHNABEL, *On the Writing of New Testament Commentaries: Festschrift for Grant R. Osborne on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 43.

## Chapter 2

### OVERVIEW OF THE SCHOLARSHIP ON MATTHEW'S GOSPEL IN CODEX BEZAE

#### I. Introduction

While a sizeable body of literature has been produced on either the Gospel of Matthew<sup>1</sup> or Codex Bezae as a manuscript,<sup>2</sup> specific research dedicated to the Bezan text of Matthew is scarce; where it does exist, it is generally incorporated into more extensive commentaries on the Gospels, whether these represent redaction-critical or literary-critical approaches.<sup>3</sup> Notable exceptions are two separate studies conducted by M.W. Holmes<sup>4</sup> in 1984 and C.-B. Amphoux<sup>5</sup> in 1996. However, considering the importance of the first

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer the reader to the impressive bibliography given by DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew* and D. SENIOR, *What Are They Saying about Matthew?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1996) xxi–xlvi. For other key works on Matthew, see M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1923); D.J. HARRINGTON, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991); R.H. MOUNCE, *Matthew* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991); C. BLOMBERG, *Matthew* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992); L. MORRIS, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992); J. GLINKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1992–93); D.A. HAGNER, *Matthew 1–13* (Word Biblical Commentary; Dallas: World Publishing, 1993); C.S. KEENER, *Matthew* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997); T.G. LONG, *Matthew* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997); R.T. FRANCE, *Matthew: Evangelist & Teacher* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998); L.J. FRANCIS and P. ATKIN, *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A Guide to the Gospel Readings in The Revised Common Lectionary* (London: Mowbray, 2001); U. LUZ and H. KOESTER, *Matthew* (4 vols; trans. J.E. Crouch; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2001–2007); P. BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2002); D.C. ALLISON, *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004); F.D. BRUNER, *Matthew: A Commentary* (Rev. and expanded edn; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004); R. PREGENT, *Matthew* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004); U. LUZ, *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005); J. NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005); B.E. REID, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005); R.T. FRANCE, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Parker's ground-breaking review *Codex Bezae* on D.05 as a manuscript offers a detailed bibliography which the reader can be referred to. No further extensive work on Codex Bezae as a manuscript has been published in a monograph after this one.

<sup>3</sup> Although not directly linked with my subject, we refer the reader to key redaction critical works in Matthew (i.e. the contribution of the evangelist to the text) by Bornkamm (G. BORNKAMM, G. BARTH and H.J. HELD, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* [transl. Percy Scott; Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963], and literary critical aspects in Matthew by Stanton (G.N. STANTON, 'The Communities of Matthew,' *Interpretation*, 46 [1992], 379–91).

<sup>4</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity' which is summarised in *ibid.*, 'Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, E.J. Brill, 128–60.

<sup>5</sup> AMPHOUX, *Matthieu*, which is entirely dedicated to the Greek text of Matthew in D.05, and *ibid.*, 'La composition de Matthieu inscrite dans dix prophéties de la Bible grecque,' in G. DORIVAL and O. MUNNICH (eds), *Κατὰ τοὺς Ο΄ – Selon les Septante. Mélanges offerts à Marguerite Harl* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1995) 333–69, which detects a visible literary structure in the Bezan text of Matthew as opposed to the Alexandrian text.

Gospel in the early Church<sup>6</sup> and the singularity of Codex Bezae as the main representative of the so-called ‘Western’ text, the study of the Bezan text of Matthew has attracted by contrast meagre interest.<sup>7</sup> The book of interest in Bezan studies is predominantly the Acts of the Apostles because of the huge differences between its text and the one printed in the Nestle-Aland, or our vernacular translations.<sup>8</sup> In addition to the uniqueness of some variant readings in this MS, its bilingual status has lent itself to further considerations of the potential linguistic interdependence or independence between the Latin and the Greek columns as well as to individual studies on one or the other language.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, we shall first evaluate the scholarship on Codex Bezae, then the Gospel of Matthew in particular to identify some key developments in this context before moving to the core parts of this thesis.

## II. Key Works on Codex Bezae

Three ground-breaking works on Codex Bezae will be introduced before moving to the studies in the Bezan text of Matthew: F.H. Scrivener’s late 19<sup>th</sup> c. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, D.C. Parker’s *Codex Bezae*, and the 1994 colloquium on Codex Bezae in Lunel, France.

---

<sup>6</sup> Matthew was the most widely used Gospel by the early Church (see H. KÖSTER, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* [TUGAL 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957] and É. MASSAUX, *L’influence de Matthieu dans la Littérature chrétienne avant St. Irénée* [Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950]).

<sup>7</sup> Since Holmes’ 1984 dissertation, only one recent doctoral work bearing on Bezan Matthew, though included in a larger study of singular harmonisations on scribal habits in early majuscules (Æ.01, B.03, C.04, D.05, W.032), has been written (G.S. PAULSON, ‘Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus in the Gospel of Matthew’ [unpublished Ph.D. diss.; University of Edinburgh, 2013]). It examines the text as a manuscript from the angle of a scribe as opposed to the consideration of an inner textual and contextual cohesion.

<sup>8</sup> The text of Acts of the Apostles in Codex Bezae is overall 6.6% longer than the corresponding Alexandrian text of Codex Vaticanus but of equal significance to the length difference is the large amount of alternative material and the sustained criticism of the apostles. (J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* [JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002] 6). Read-Heimerdinger, alone or in collaboration (J. RIUS-CAMPS and J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* [LNTST; 4 vols; London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006–9]) has suggested the complex allusions to Jewish traditions together with the linguistic coherence as reasons for identifying the Bezan text as preceding that of Codex Vaticanus, while E.J. Epp had earlier identified it as a late, corrupted text, which incorporates anti-Judaic features (E.J. EPP, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* [SNTSMS3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966]). Epp’s contribution remains to date influential in the scholarship and his theories are still assumed among textual critics despite his own corrections in a later contribution stating enhancement rather than clear anti-Judaic bias (‘Anti-Judaic Tendencies in the D-Text of Acts: Forty Years of Conversation,’ in T. NICKLAS and M. TILLY [eds], *The Book of Acts as Church History: Text, Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations/Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte: Text, Texttraditionen und antike Auslegungen* [BZNW 120; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003] 111–46 [134]).

<sup>9</sup> See PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 50–63, 194–249; J. RIUS-CAMPS, ‘Le substrat grec de la version latine des Actes dans le Codex de Bèze,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 271–95.

## II. 1. Scrivener's Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis

After a series of various studies on Codex Bezae in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries,<sup>10</sup> Scrivener performed the first holistic study of Codex Bezae in a work eventually presented to the Reverend Edward Harold, Bishop of Ely, in 1864.<sup>11</sup> Presented as an exact copy in 'ordinary type' of the manuscript,<sup>12</sup> the edition is supplemented by an introduction to the history of the MS, its palaeography, the specific stichometry of the Greek text, a dedicated discussion to the Latin and Greek pages, and a detailed list of all corrections that were introduced by secondary hands.

On the Bezan text itself, a special focus of Scrivener's study is to point out the linguistic influences naturally inherent to the bilingual character of the Codex: in his view, the Latin text has *not* influenced the Greek which has a standalone origin claiming thereby that the bilingual tradition originated from separate and independent texts. By comparing the Latin and Greek columns, Scrivener estimated that, although bilingual, they were brought together, based on independent translations, which points to Gaul (mainly due to orthographic peculiarities specific to a Celtic *milieu*)<sup>13</sup> as the origin of Codex Bezae, a view that is no longer shared.<sup>14</sup> With regard to textual criticism, Scrivener briefly reviewed two groups of variant readings of interest, namely 'interpolations' and 'principal omissions and textual variations.'<sup>15</sup>

Although Scrivener's work specifically reviews the Greek and Latin columns in order to determine the genesis of the MS, there are some shortcomings in the conclusions with respect to date, place of origin and treatment of the variant readings, as well as some errors in the text itself. Also, while some notable variant readings of each book of the NT in its Bezan edition are commented upon, this contribution is very brief and relies exclusively on the external evidence. I will however use his Greek transcription,

---

<sup>10</sup> Ussher (1657); Leclerc (1686); Simon (1689); Mill (1707); Bentley (1707); Wettstein (1716); Dickinson (1732); Bengel (1763); Semler (1764); Michaelis (1767); Matthaei (1786); Griesbach (1787); Kipling (1793); Marsh (1795); Hug (1808); Middleton (1808); Scholz (1820); Schulz (1827); Scholz (1830); Credner (1832).

<sup>11</sup> SCRIVENER, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*. xxvii n.1 and xxxi.

<sup>12</sup> Only the supplementary leaves are relegated to the end of the document instead of their place in the manuscript. Parker will correct the few mistakes in his work on *Codex Bezae* (198–203 and 250–8). Scrivener's edition will be my source for the text of Matthew based on the uncorrected version (referred to as D\*).

<sup>13</sup> SCRIVENER, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, lxiv. Also see J.R. HARRIS, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1891) 17.

<sup>14</sup> On review on hypotheses on the origin of Codex Bezae, see K.E. PANTEN, 'A History of Research on Codex Bezae, with Special Reference to the Acts of the Apostles: Evaluation and Future Directions' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Murdoch University, 1995) 289–308, accessible from <http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/244> (accessed 28.02.2014), summarised in *ibid.*, 'A History of Research on Codex Bezae,' *TynB* 47 [1996] 185–7.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, xlix–l gives 4 'interpolations' in Matthew (Mt 1.16d, 20.28D, 24.41D, 25.1D), 4 in John, 17 in Luke, 5 in Mark for the Gospels; and lix–lx, 6 'principal omissions and textual variations' in Matthew (Mt 1.8, 5.4-5, 6.1, 10.2, 21.31, 26.39, 28.19), 3 in John, 6 in Luke, 4 in Mark. These pages actually discuss both Latin and Greek variant readings.

checking for errors against the digitalised copy of Codex Bezae<sup>16</sup> to explore and study the text.

## II. 2. Parker's *Codex Bezae*: A Modern Introduction to D.05

140 years later, Parker conducted the most systematic and complete study of Codex Bezae since Scrivener, expanding and correcting points on palaeography, codicology and textual criticism. He plainly advanced the study and classification of the many correctors and annotators of the codex.<sup>17</sup> With a wealth of detail, Parker suggests that Codex Bezae was copied in Beirut<sup>18</sup> around 400 CE by a single scribe conflating two bilingual copies, one of which was a single column of Acts, the other, the four Gospels in the so-called 'Western' sequence Mt-Mk-Jn-Lk.<sup>19</sup> Explaining its formation further, Parker proposed that each Gospel text was originally the result of the work of two scribes bringing together individual Greek texts and Latin translations whose final sequence was eventually altered – for unknown reasons.<sup>20</sup> The codex resulted in the collation of a Greek text and a Latin version which itself was a shorter version of the Greek eventually paired by adapting the Latin to the Greek. This demonstration is intended partly to explain the heterogeneity of the text mainly in terms of variant orthography of proper nouns throughout the manuscript e.g. Ἰωάννης *vs.* Ἰωάνης,<sup>21</sup> or of the irregular way of writing the *nomina sacra*, e.g. ΔΩΜ in Jn-Lk *vs.* ΔΜΝ in Mt-Mk-Ac.<sup>22</sup>

Beyond the discussion on the text and its nature, Parker suggests that the manuscript reflects the end of a textual process corresponding to a free 'genre,' rich in additions, harmonisations and conflicting interactions between the Latin and the Greek. While Parker offers a highly detailed presentation of the MS, some key elements on its genesis echoing earlier work performed by Birdsall and republished a few years ago,<sup>23</sup> nevertheless call for further text-critical considerations: indeed, while Parker's work offers a laudably objective presentation of a single manuscript, there is still a need for discussion of all the aspects that make Codex Bezae a distinctive witness in early Christianity. A similarly objective study of its variant readings would also be necessary across the books of the NT in Codex Bezae with regard to distribution rather than in the content of

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-NN-00002-00041/7> (accessed 04.01.14)

<sup>17</sup> Secondary hands (referred by Scrivener as correctors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K and L, not classified by chronological order) rank from 5<sup>th</sup> c. to 12<sup>th</sup> c. (*ibid.*, 35–49 and 123–65).

<sup>18</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 278. This hypothesis is no longer accepted. See PANTEN, 'History of Research on Codex Bezae,' 380.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 114–16. Amphoux finds Parker's work appealing but regrets the lack of discussion on and the unconvincing character of the question of the 'Western' order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae (C.-B. AMPHOUX, 'Review of Parker's *Codex Bezae*,' *NovT* 35 [1993] 411–13).

<sup>20</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 112; ALAND–ALAND, *Text*, 79.

<sup>21</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 109.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 97–106.

<sup>23</sup> J.N. BIRDSALL, 'The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the Status Quaestionis, Mainly from the Palaeographical Standpoint,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (TaS.ThS 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2006) 109–23.



the text itself. Such an analysis was made possible by a colloquium on the subject a few years later, to which we now turn.

### II. 3. A Modern Scholarly Discussion of Codex Bezae: The Lunel Symposium

In 1994, Parker and Amphoux organised a colloquium in Lunel, France, dedicated to Codex Bezae in order to review the current research and bring together the scholarly perspectives.<sup>24</sup> During this event, palaeographers, early Church historians and textual specialists reviewed and offered skilful scholarship on the manuscript.<sup>25</sup> While disagreements concerning the status of the manuscript, i.e. whether late and corrupted or bearing true original readings, are plain from this collection of papers, it has the merit of comparing views on a variety of disciplines pertaining to codicology, textual criticism, history of the text, exegesis and comparison with early Greek witnesses or versions.

The two editors demonstrated a similar interest in Codex Bezae, but while Parker is well-known as an international scholar, Amphoux is more familiar within France where he has been a successor of the French pro-‘Western’ textual critics, Vaganay and Duplacy. Opposite views are discussed in their distinct contributions to the collection of papers, and will now be presented in succession.

#### II. 3. 1. Amphoux’s Proposal of Bezan Priority

Building on previous publications on the structure of prophecies displayed in the Matthean text of Codex Bezae,<sup>26</sup> Amphoux demonstrates by means of literary analysis that there is an inner consistency to the manuscript. With regard to Matthew, he argues that a deliberate choice of specific words made by the editor/author of the manuscript corresponds to an inner textual structure that vanishes in the later alterations evidenced in other text-types. The literary structure that appears in Codex Bezae reveals numerous symmetries, while later text corruptions reduce the significance of vocabulary choices and blur the editorial intentions.

As an illustration of this literary analysis taken from his earlier publications, he shows that the finite verb *τίκτω*, ‘bear,’ appears five times (Mt 1.16,<sup>27</sup> 21, 23, 25; 2.2) in the infancy narrative in a symmetric arrangement, which places the prophecy of Mt 1.23a: Ἴδου ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται <αι> υἱόν (‘behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son’) in the central position. Indeed in all other manuscripts, there are only four occurrences of this verb (Mt 1.16 ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός).

Secondly, Amphoux explains the two variant readings in Mt 1.22D.05 (presence of *διὰ Ἡσαΐου*) and 2.17D.05 (presence of *ὑπὸ κυρίου*) as a visible reference to ten prophecies around the leitmotiv ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν (ὑπὸ κυρίου) διὰ (Ἡσαΐου) τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (‘to fulfil what had spoken [by the Lord] though the prophet [Isaiah] the

<sup>24</sup> PARKER, ‘Introduction,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, ix.

<sup>25</sup> AMPHOUX, ‘Le Texte,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 337–54.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 345

<sup>27</sup> Mt D.05 is lacunose in 1.16 but d5 has *peperit* instead of *genuit*. Since D.05 and d5 are generally in good agreement, Amphoux concludes that *τίκτω* may have been used on the Greek page. Mt 1.16B.03 has *ἐγεννήθη* (*ibid.*, 345).

prophet saying...;’ the brackets showing variant readings), which disappeared with later textual rearrangements. As a result, the Bezan numerical symmetry 1-2-3-4 making ten prophecies (one refers to Jesus, two to Jeremiah, three to the Lord, four to Isaiah)<sup>28</sup> in Matthew highlights a ‘peculiar geometry’ around Jesus as a focal point in Mt 2.23 (ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, ‘he will be called a Nazarene’).

Thirdly, although five closing *formulae* (Mt 7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1) – often understood in Matthew as mirroring the five books of the Torah<sup>29</sup> – repeat the pattern καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους (‘finished’ [‘saying’]) designating the fulfilment of Jesus’ sayings,<sup>30</sup> Amphoux claims that the unique ‘Western’ and apparently asymmetric reading of the fourth formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους (‘spoke’) in Mt 19.1 (attested by D it bo<sup>ms</sup>), once again refers to a central point between Jesus’ two ministries, first in Galilee, then in Judah. Amphoux argues that from an internal perspective, the substitution of ἐλάλησεν by ἐτέλεσεν is more convincingly explained by a desire to restore the plain symmetry than to break an existing one. With these four variants, he aims to demonstrate that text critical work cannot be discussed outside a contextual discussion and that the entire text of the Gospels has to be considered. According to him, the text of Codex Bezae reflects an *écriture savante* (i.e. ‘learned writing’),<sup>31</sup> full of numeric features that later corrections or different traditions attenuated or blurred in order to make the text correspond to a more liturgical or smoother reading.<sup>32</sup>

This feature of a coherent and at times numerical structure in Codex Bezae is a *leitmotiv* in Amphoux’s contributions and the author continues with two further main aspects in D.05: in Mark, he analyses the longer ending of the Gospel (Mk 16.9-20),<sup>33</sup> a portion of text which is absent in many early manuscripts (mainly  $\aleph$ B) but present in some, including Codex Bezae (A C D W  $\Theta$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 2427  $\aleph$ ), as an epilogue to the Four

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 345

<sup>29</sup> The attractive theory of five books of the Torah visible in the main Matthean discourses chap. 5–7, 10, 13, 18, 24–25 and alternating with narrative pieces was proposed by Bacon in B.W. BACON, *Studies in Matthew* (London: H. Holt & Co., 1930). For a summary on the critic and refinement of this theory, see Y.S. CHAE, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd. Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT.2 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) 373–7.

<sup>30</sup> Ἐτέλεσεν appears four times in the Alexandrian text, three times in Bezan Matthew: Mt 7.28B.03 (D.05 lac.), 11.1B.03/D.05, 13.53 B.03/D.05, 19.1B.03 (vl 19.1D.05 ἐλάλησεν).

<sup>31</sup> ‘Pour autant qu’on y ait accès, le texte courant primitif est d’une *écriture savante* (italics mine), adaptée à une lecture plus théologique que liturgique,’ (C.-B. AMPHOUX, *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* [2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1986] 145 and *idem*, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* [2<sup>nd</sup> edn; transl. J. Read-Heimerdinger; English ed. amplified and updated by Amphoux and Heimerdinger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991] 110). Interestingly, in her translation, Read-Heimerdinger translates *écriture savante* by ‘written language’ which may have less impact than Amphoux’s French formula, and could be more favourably translated by *learned* or *coded language* as in J. DELOBEL, ‘The Text of Luke-Acts, A Confrontation of Recent Theories,’ in J. VERHEYDEN (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven: University Press & Peeters, 1999) 93.

<sup>32</sup> AMPHOUX, ‘Le Texte,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 345.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 348.

Gospels.<sup>34</sup> Intimately linked with this observation, he notices that the Pericope of the Adulteress (Jn 7.53–8.11 in the canonical place but absent in many early witnesses<sup>35</sup> or relocated to a different place in some others<sup>36</sup>) stands in Codex Bezae<sup>37</sup> in the exact middle of the Four Gospels – note that the Gospel of John appears in the second position in the ‘Western’ order – and constitutes further evidence of a coherent Bezan structure.<sup>38</sup>

Amphoux’s conclusions are highly valuable because of their uniqueness and consistency in both their demonstrations and striking conclusions, but at the same time it is easy to identify reasons why the reception of his ideas in the scholarly world has not been more favourable. Firstly, Codex Bezae is mostly accepted as a paraphrasing text, rich in harmonisations and lengthy additions, mainly because it differs widely from the assumed purity of the readings attested in the Alexandrian tradition. In this respect, Amphoux tries to break this somewhat circular argument by looking afresh at the manuscript in its entirety rather than taking isolated verses or using, somewhat mechanically, the principles of textual criticism, and he thereby shows an inner consistency that could not have appeared haphazardly. A second, apparently minor consideration, is the absence of any of Amphoux’s publications in English<sup>39</sup> thereby limiting the propagation of his theories, even if they are understood at all.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, Amphoux finds in numerous other occasions<sup>41</sup> an explanation of Bezan variants reflecting the theory of the so-called ‘*proportion du simple au double*’ (symmetry between elements found in the

---

<sup>34</sup> This theory, originally published in C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘La finale longue de Marc: un épilogue des quatre Évangiles,’ in C. FOCANT (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Peeters, 1993) 548–55, is summarised in AMPHOUX, ‘Le Texte,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 348. This view is invalidated by most of the textual critics because there is one page in the early papyrus  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  which contains the end of the Gospel of Luke and the beginning of John, showing this order.

<sup>35</sup> Omitted in  $\mathfrak{P}^{66.75}$  & A<sup>vid</sup> B C<sup>vid</sup> L N II W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Psi$  0140 0211 33 565 1241 1333<sup>txt</sup> 1424\* 2768 *a/a fl q* sy sa ac<sup>2</sup> pbo bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Hier<sup>mss</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Jn 7.36 (minuscule 225), Jn 21.25 (family *f*<sup>1</sup>), Lk 21.38 (family *f*<sup>13</sup>), Lk 24.53 (1333<sup>s</sup>).

<sup>37</sup> The manuscripts having the Pericope of the Adulteress at the same place as Codex Bezae are  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat bo<sup>pt</sup>; Hier<sup>mss</sup> (*cum obel. S 1424<sup>mg</sup> al, cum obel ab 8.2 v/8.3 E  $\Lambda$  al*).

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 348. This work will – unless explicitly said differently – use the Eusebian order Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn for convenience.

<sup>39</sup> Amphoux only publishes in French – the only exception is his *Introduction to Textual Criticism*, translated by Read-Heimerdinger (*op. cit.*) – with more than 100 articles and reviews. It is interesting to listen to Jongkind’s comment reviewing the Lunel proceedings mentioned earlier mention not without irony: ‘Both approaches have a respectable pedigree, though in the Anglo-Saxon world the voice of the Western priority approach is not very often heard, perhaps because of the language barrier. In the book under review most, but not all, contributions assuming Western priority are in French. At times, one is led to wonder what the reason is why some people end up in one school of thought and some in the other. It cannot simply be because one happens to be taught by a professor who holds one or the other opinion, can it?’ (D. JONGKIND, ‘Review of *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity/Le texte du nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*,’ *TC* 12 [2007] 1–5).

<sup>40</sup> On the perception of the English scholarly community, Birdsall gives a harsh comment concluding his review on Amphoux’s work: ‘For my part, I do not find his exegesis either clear, nor, when I understand them, convincing’ (J.N. BIRDSALL, ‘After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, xxix).

<sup>41</sup> See e.g. C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘Le Canon du Nouveau Testament avant le IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle,’ *FilNeo* 21 (2008) 9–26 [17]; ‘Les lieux de rédaction des lettres de Paul d’après la tradition manuscrite,’ *BABELAO* 2 (2013) 87–104.

proportion of 1:2) which could appear as somewhat forced. Despite the documented origin of this literary process,<sup>42</sup> almost any occurrence above 2 may be understood as being in a single-to-double proportion: technically, the single to double proportion, numerically written as  $n+2n$  or  $n+1+2n$  where  $n$  is an integer gives the mathematical progression  $u_n = \{3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, \dots\}$  whereby almost<sup>43</sup> any literary symmetry can be explained by a 1:2 proportion.

Although Amphoux is a less familiar figure within the scholarly world of textual criticism than other researchers, the examination of his theories, especially with regard to the consistency and the somewhat objective structure of the text, nevertheless demands consideration.

Other publications in the Lunel volume, though not directly linked to Matthew, reflect similar conclusions regarding a coherent text, testifying thereby to an earlier, if not original, text, or at least one well attested in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE, which was gradually altered in later recensions.<sup>44</sup>

### II. 3. 2. The 'Mainstream View' on Codex Bezae

Other textual critics at Lunel view Codex Bezae as a secondary text. In so doing, some but not all follow the theory developed by Westcott and Hort at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. and which prioritised the Alexandrian text, a theory later taken over by E. Nestle, then B.M. Metzger and K. and B. Aland.<sup>45</sup>

While scribal corruption is an evident phenomenon in early manuscripts, and Codex Vaticanus<sup>46</sup> is no exception, it is regarded as more manifest in the case of Codex

---

<sup>42</sup> While the 1:2 proportion is Greek construction taken from Plato's *Timaeus* and assigning a fixed 1:2 ratio between the divine and earthly world, Amphoux suggests this proposition is still apparent in the composition of the NT. See C.-B. AMPHOUX and A. SIRANDOUR, 'La composition de Jérémie LXX d'après les divisions du Codex Vaticanus (B),' in M.K.H. PETERS (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubliana, 2007* (SBL.SCSt 55; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 3–21 [19 n. 7] and C.-B. AMPHOUX *et al.*, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014) 276–7.

<sup>43</sup> Few numbers are *de facto* excluded as not belonging to the series, i.e. 2 [*per se*], 5, 6 and 9 for integers under 10.

<sup>44</sup> Especially E. GÜTING, 'Weakly Attested Original Readings of the Manuscript D.05 in Mark,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 217–31; W. HENDRIKS, 'Leçons pré-alexandrines du Codex Bezae dans Marc,' in *ibid.*, 232–9; D. ROUGER, 'Celse et la tradition évangélique du Codex de Bèze,' in *ibid.*, 240–7; J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, 'The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae: A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12,' in *ibid.*, 303–10.

<sup>45</sup> See Westcott's and Hort's summary on  $\aleph$ B: '[...] it is our belief (1) that readings of  $\aleph$ B should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and (2) that no readings of  $\aleph$ B can be safely rejected absolutely, though it is sometimes right to place them only on an alternative footing, especially where they receive no support from the Versions or the Fathers.' (quoted in ALAND—ALAND, *Text*, 18).

<sup>46</sup> '... so called [by Westcott and Hort] because it manifests no particular tendency. [Westcott and Hort claim that] It is basically the primitive text, preserved by good fortune in at least a relatively pure state, if not in its original form. Unfortunately its representatives are rare: B.03 and S.01 [ $\aleph$ .01], but especially B.03' (C.-B. AMPHOUX, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* [2<sup>nd</sup> edn; transl. J. Read-Heimerdinger; English ed. amplified and updated by Amphoux and Heimerdinger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991] 150.

Bezae. Indeed, as Petzer summarizes,<sup>47</sup> most scholars see the ‘Western’ text as an early derivative of the Alexandrian text and therefore, Codex Bezae in its particularity is, specifically since Westcott and Hort, seen as the result of a corruption.<sup>48</sup> The largely accepted Munster theory of the origin of the Western text<sup>49</sup> is understood as a gradual process culminating in a major recension (‘Hauptrezension’) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> c. in Syria after a ‘pre-Western’ period (Barbara Aland’s language) witnessed to by 2<sup>nd</sup> c. Church Fathers, specifically Justin Martyr and Irenaeus.<sup>50</sup>

Recensions, i.e. the revision of a text on the basis of a critical examination of sources, are themselves reflecting corrections. While Codex Vaticanus has long been understood as one,<sup>51</sup> the discovery of papyri sharing a high level of similarity with B.03, like  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ , a papyrus which predates it by at least a century, confirms that such agreements point to a careful transmission since the early times of scribal activity. This B.03- $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  agreement does not only eliminate the idea of a recension that would have given birth to the Alexandrian text but also allows to see in Codex Vaticanus traces of the initial text. On the opposite hand, agreements between early papyri and Codex Bezae have not been able to yield any similar conclusion until recently.<sup>52</sup> In this environment, Bezan readings identified as harmonising, and often differing from B.03, are generally regarded as secondary by textual critics. As a result, the ‘Western’ reading is usually rejected when it departs from the Alexandrian reading.

As an illustration, Birdsall reviews the *status quaestionis* of Codex Bezae in the introduction to the Lunel colloquium, within the scholarly discussions around the priority of Codex Bezae and confesses that he is not convinced by the arguments whereby Codex Bezae would be closer to the initial text than Codex Vaticanus is.<sup>53</sup> Ehrman discusses Bezan readings and puts them in the perspective of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE social and theological context.<sup>54</sup> While he does not take a stand on the originality or secondary character of the manuscript’s variants, he confirms that the Bezan readings reflect 2<sup>nd</sup> c. questions. He analyses some variants as potentially original or at least not descending from an Alexan-

---

<sup>47</sup> J.H. PETZER, ‘The History of the New Testament Text, Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism,’ in ALAND–DELOBEL (eds), *New Testament Textual Criticism*, 22.

<sup>48</sup> See AMPHOUX, *Introduction*, 150.

<sup>49</sup> B. ALAND, ‘Entstehung, Charakter, und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes: Untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte,’ *ETL* 62 (1986) 5–65 [5,20]. Aland uses the term ‘D-text’ for the ‘Western’ text.

<sup>50</sup> PETZER, ‘History of the New Testament,’ 22.

<sup>51</sup> This view is currently hotly debated as the usually accepted Egyptian recension due to a high homogeneity across the Alexandrian text-types can be hampered by the newly found agreements between  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and Codex Vaticanus: such agreements can equally reflect a simple and careful textual transmission. See E.J. EPP, ‘A Continuing Interlude in the New Testament Textual Criticism?’, in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 105 and G.D. FEE,  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$  and Origen: the Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,’ in *ibid.*, 247–73.

<sup>52</sup> Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps have recently detailed the agreements between papyri and Codex Bezae (‘Tracing the Readings of Codex Bezae in the Papyri of Acts,’ in C. CLIVAZ and J. ZUMSTEIN (eds), *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context – Lire les papyrus du Nouveau Testament dans leur contexte* (BETL 242; Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011) 307–38.

<sup>53</sup> J.N. BIRDSALL, ‘After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, xix–xxx.

<sup>54</sup> B.D. EHRMAN, ‘The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century,’ in *ibid.*, 96–122.

drian archetype. For his part, Elliott studies the papyrus evidence available in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. but sees only scarce evidence for Bezan priority.<sup>55</sup> Holmes summarises his dissertation on Bezan Matthew as seeing all variants as scribal and therefore secondary emendations.<sup>56</sup> Finally, Parker sees in the results of the contributions of other participants of the colloquium reasons to believe *contra* Amphoux that Codex Bezae is a corrupted text despite being a true early witness in the development of the New Testament.<sup>57</sup>

### III. Individual Studies of the Greek Text of Matthew in Codex Bezae

Because of Holmes' extensive initial work on Bezan Matthew in his dissertation, a description of his doctoral work will be introduced in detail in section III. 1.<sup>58</sup> Amphoux's specific work on the same text<sup>59</sup> will be discussed in the next section (III. 2).

#### III. 1. A Text-Critical Approach: Holmes' Study on Bezan Matthew

This original work on the analysis of Bezan Matthew establishes an in-depth classification of the major variant readings, concluding that they represent an early editorial – i.e. secondary – activity on the part of the Bezan editor in the recension of the Gospel of Matthew. To reach this conclusion, Holmes classifies the variants, using Weiss's classical listing of 'errors,'<sup>60</sup> into six categories: 'alternative forms of texts,' 'additions,' 'omissions,' 'harmonisations,' 'various types of improvement and corrections,' and 'theologically motivated changes,'<sup>61</sup> suggesting as a result the secondary character of Bezan Matthew in comparison with the Alexandrian tradition. He then applies 'reasoned eclecticism' defined as the application of

all relevant criteria for a given case (external and internal) and attempts a resolution by weighing (over against one another) the various criteria, once again invoking the phrase, relying on "the balance of probabilities" when trying to decide on the most likely original reading.<sup>62</sup>

Before addressing these points, it is important to recall that the concept of 'additions,' 'omissions' and 'harmonisation' presupposes the somewhat subjective position of the textual critic: an 'addition' – except dittography – or an 'omission' – except homoioteleuton – already implies that the text in question is the result of a corruption of a

---

<sup>55</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, 'Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,' in *ibid.*, 162–82.

<sup>56</sup> M.W. HOLMES, 'Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,' in *ibid.*, 123–60.

<sup>57</sup> D.C. PARKER, 'The Paleographical Debate,' in *ibid.*, 335–6.

<sup>58</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity'

<sup>59</sup> AMPHOUX, *Matthieu*.

<sup>60</sup> 'The classes of errors which Weiss identified are: (a) harmonisation among the Gospels; (b) the interchange of words; (c) omissions and additions; (d) alterations of word order; (e) orthographical variation.' See B.D. EHRMAN and W.M. HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (NTTSD 42; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013) 138.

<sup>61</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity,' 70.

<sup>62</sup> E.J. EPP, 'Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament,' in EPP, *Perspectives*, 461–95 [493].

‘good’ text.<sup>63</sup> This implication is partly due to the fact that when a verse or portion of a verse is present in a few manuscripts only and absent in many, the said verse/portion of verse is generally viewed as an ‘addition’ on the grounds that the authentic reading would have been the more widely copied. A telling example that will illustrate the problem is Mt 20.28D.05, which reads an extra 61 words compared to almost the entire textual tradition,<sup>64</sup> leading Holmes to assign this verse to the group of *additional* variants, since the vast majority of texts do not have this reading. Commenting on the decision of the committee of the Greek New Testament to treat the words as secondary, Metzger clearly stated that this passage is ‘inserted’<sup>65</sup> and that ‘this interpolation is a piece of floating tradition, an expanded but inferior version of Lk 14.8-10.’<sup>66</sup> In actual facts, calling this verse an ‘addition,’ which makes little sense within the passage, is not a satisfactory hypothesis, and raises yet further questions (for example, if this is a case of harmonisation with Luke, why is the wording so different?).<sup>67</sup> Therefore, as previously explained, in this thesis the use of the words addition/omission will be carefully avoided in order to preserve neutrality during discussion.

Now that this is clarified, I will proceed to the examination of the variants of Mt D.05 discussed in Holmes’ dissertation.

### III. 1. 1. Alternative Forms of Texts<sup>68</sup>

Holmes describes eight examples<sup>69</sup> in the Bezan text of Matthew as *alternative forms*. The analysis performed shows a wealth of detail and references to previous works in the fields of external and internal criticism, with the aim of both evaluating the variant readings and determining their original or secondary status.

Holmes recognizes at the end of the evaluation that all variant readings point to a very early form of text but cannot be objectively regarded as either original or late. Moreover, since the Bezan readings outlined are *not* supported either by Alexandrian or by other non-‘Western’ witnesses, their originality is consistently disputed, which also

---

<sup>63</sup> As J. Keith Elliott correctly mentions ‘words like ‘add’ or ‘omit’ are loaded in favour of the view that we know precisely what the original text contained’; cf. J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of  $\mathfrak{B}^{45}$ ,’ in C. HORTON (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex  $\mathfrak{B}^{45}$*  (JSNTSup 258; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 122–31 [125].

<sup>64</sup> There is some support from the Latin tradition and one Greek witness ( $\Phi$ .043). See Chapter 5 III. 2.

<sup>65</sup> B.M. METZGER and B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 71.

<sup>66</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 43. Interestingly, Amphoux proposed a different approach leading him to see the ‘Western’ reading as the earlier, a conclusion that he develops by looking into the reasons *why* this longer text was deleted, that is to say by drawing on the evidence taken from internal criticism (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 254–5).

<sup>67</sup> Amphoux, despite lack of a definite conclusion, claims that the reading is a diatessaronic variant (from Tatian’s 2<sup>nd</sup> c. Gospel harmony). This point is surely of importance and diatessaronic variants may be found in Codex Bezae but we may argue with Harris, that while ‘we may be sure that Tatian’s text was Western [it is still unknown] whether it was Western in cause or effect, or both in cause and effect’ (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 255).

<sup>68</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 70–89.

<sup>69</sup> Mt 5.11, 10.11, 10.42, 16.16, 22.13, 23.27, 25.41.

shows the limitations of relying solely upon external considerations. Even so, it is recognised that ‘singularity is no proof of lateness,’<sup>70</sup> and the early character of the Bezan readings is further evidenced in the quotations of the Church Fathers, a fact that cannot be dismissed.

The eight variants studied by Holmes lead to a somewhat circular reasoning, that is, in the absence of conclusive internal evidence, the assumed superiority of  $\aleph$ B will decide in favour of the Alexandrian readings against Codex Bezae. In Holmes’ work the Bezan variants are always found to be the outcome of an editorial (hence secondary) effort taking place in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE or ‘very early in the textual transmission.’

### III. 1. 2. Additions<sup>71</sup>

It is largely recognized, although at times disputed, that Codex Bezae is characterised by ‘free additions (and occasional omissions) of words, sentences and even incidents.’<sup>72</sup> Holmes’ work clearly illustrates this point by evaluating eight ‘additions.’<sup>73</sup> Interestingly, out of these eight, two are claimed to be original<sup>74</sup> or ‘not a Bezan addition but rather an (essentially) “Egyptian” omission.’<sup>75</sup> Holmes reviews the entire scholarship on these ‘additions’ and recognizes that neither pure external nor internal criticism, nor the use of speculative arguments (e.g. ‘due to a now lost document,’ ‘some independent source’) can set aside the complexity in objectively judging the originality of the presence of a word/clause/phrase. He is often unable to propose a source for the variant but appears to invoke the Alexandrian reading by virtue of the *lectio brevior potior* (i.e. ‘the shorter reading is preferred’) text-critical principle, and systematically concluding that it has been deliberately inserted by the Bezan editor (understood as the author of Codex Bezae, not the later 400 c. CE scribe). However, his detailed proposals with regards to additions, lack a further development, on the reason why a substantial ‘extra’ piece of material could have been withdrawn to generate the shorter reading: as an illustration, the reason for the long ‘addition’ of Mt 20.28 (61 words) discussed in his dissertation<sup>76</sup> fails to seek a possible reason for which it was withdrawn.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 89–101.

<sup>72</sup> ‘Longer and shorter additions and [...] certain striking omissions’ (METZGER–EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament*, 309) and ‘[the ‘Western’ group] is related by hundreds of unusual readings, sometimes found in one or several, sometimes in others, but apparently reflecting an uncontrolled, sometimes ‘wild,’ tradition of copying and translating. This text-type is particularly marked but some long paraphrases and long additions, as well as by harmonistic tendencies and substitutions of synonyms’ (G.D. FEE, ‘Textual Criticism of the New Testament,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 7).

<sup>73</sup> Mt 10.23, 17.21, 19.25, 20.28, 25.1, 27.32; of particular interest and studied separately are 12.47 and 16.2b–3 (HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 89–103). The quotes used here reflect the earlier introduction on the concept of additions/omissions vs. presence/absence (Chapter 2 III. 1).

<sup>74</sup> Mt 12.47D.05 and 16.2b–3D.05 (*ibid.*, 107)

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 89–94.

<sup>77</sup> Amphoux alludes to this point but does not conclude on the reason for its absence (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 254). Similarly, Black identified a Semitic text behind Mt 20.28D.05 from the inconsistencies evidenced in the Greek but did not propose why other manuscripts would have deleted it; see M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998) 171.



III. 1. 3. Omissions<sup>78</sup>

Like additions, the term ‘omission’ is a slightly subjective way of reading an absence of words (here: in Codex Bezae) as opposed to their presence in other manuscripts. Holmes discusses nine omissions in Matthew by examining them in detail in terms of internal and external criticism with the aim of explaining the reason for their absence. In the evaluation of nine omissions, he concluded that the Bezan variant is always secondary and reflects a deliberate scribal activity but at the same time recognised that ‘the precise motivation for this activity remains obscure.’<sup>79</sup>

Within the class of omissions there are some instances traditionally known as ‘Western non-interpolations’ and defined by Westcott and Hort as ‘a number of passages which appear in nearly all manuscripts but are omitted by Codex Bezae, part of the Old Latin, usually part of the Old Syriac, usually some of the Church Fathers, and occasionally another Greek manuscript.’<sup>80</sup> Holmes rejects the originality of two ‘Western non-interpolations’ (Mt 9.34, 21.44),<sup>81</sup> before accepting four<sup>82</sup> others (Mt 6.15, 23.19, 26, 27.49). His argument, on Mt 21.44, the omission of ‘and whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder,’ in the Parable of the Wicked Tenants, is particularly interesting for this thesis. Holmes surprisingly contradicts Hort’s view of this verse as secondary. His rationale is based on firstly earlier scholarship<sup>83</sup> which had identified an allusion to the book of Daniel in Mt 21.44. Holmes suggested that the verse was deliberately omitted by Codex Bezae because of the ‘illogical sequence’<sup>84</sup> in the progression from Mt 21.43 to Mt 21.44 thereby echoing an inverted progression from Dan. 2.44 to its preceding verse Dan. 2.43. Similarly, and as a second argument, the corresponding parallel passage Lk 20.17–18 mirrors Mt 21.42,44 but the theme developed in Mt 21.42,44 is expected to appear before v. 43 to follow exactly the Lukan sequence: the Bezan editor would have avoided this apparent inconsistency deliberately and omitted the verse. The demonstration shows interesting features with regard to the omission.<sup>85</sup> These paradoxical conclusions highlight the interest in understanding the genesis and history of Codex Bezae vis-à-vis the Diatessaron.

The remaining omissions are claimed to be homoioteleutons, which, on the one hand, releases Codex Bezae from the charge of editorial change but, on the other, fa-

---

<sup>78</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 126–31.

<sup>79</sup> Mt 4.4; 5.30; 9.24; 13.33; 16.12; 21.44; 22.17; 23.34; 26.44; cf. *ibid.*, 115–31.

<sup>80</sup> The term was coined by Westcott and Hort in B.F. WESTCOTT–J.A.F. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan, 1907) 175–7 and METZGER, *Commentary*, 164–5.

<sup>81</sup> On the concept of ‘Western’ non-interpolations, see K.R. SNODGRASS, ‘Western Non-Interpolations,’ *JBL* 91 (1972) 369–79.

<sup>82</sup> Mt 6.25 is not discussed in Holmes’ dissertation.

<sup>83</sup> R. SWAELES, ‘L’arrière-fond scripturaire de Matt 21,43 et son lien avec Matt 21,44,’ *NTS* 6 (1960) 310–3.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

<sup>85</sup> Amphoux counter-proposes this view in suggesting that the verse was originally absent in the tradition of the separated gospels, but Mt 21.43–44 and Lk 20.17–18 were conflated in the Diatessaron (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 256).

vours the original existence of the readings as attested in the Alexandrian tradition, for example.

### III. 1. 4. Harmonisations<sup>86</sup>

Holmes noticed a relatively scanty number of such readings in Mt D.05 with a study of 25 examples of Bezan readings which he believed can be considered as reflecting assimilation to parallels.<sup>87</sup> He selected harmonisations according to their length of variant and their original degree of difference.<sup>88</sup> Despite the beauty of the detailed classification, backed up by a consideration of the conclusions of earlier scholarship, any possibly original reading in Codex Bezae is systematically rejected according to the text-critical principle which advocates the *most discordant readings*, i.e. ‘the reading which makes a passage less like its parallels’ as Parker’s concisely summarises.<sup>89</sup> Furthermore, since the text of Codex Vaticanus is predominately chosen as the point of reference, any variant reading differing from it and that is closer to a different Gospel will be identified as harmonistic and will confer an intrinsically higher probability in favour of B.03 being exempt from harmonisation. Both approaches, therefore, systematically or even mechanically favour the Alexandrian Tradition *contra* Codex Bezae and they exhibit some circular reasoning.

### III. 1. 5. Various Types of Improvement and Corrections<sup>90</sup>

Holmes divides these readings into (a) clarifications and corrections<sup>91</sup> (b) stylistic alterations<sup>92</sup> and concludes that a genuine correction of the scribe is aimed at improving the text by adding more precision. This is an interesting evaluation of the reasons why the Bezan scribe has used a synonym instead of the word attested by other manuscripts. While the question is a genuine one, Holmes’ concludes that Codex Bezae systematically ‘corrects’ the text but he does not address why these instances are sporadic or why they are only localised in certain parts of the Gospel. Moreover, the apparent inconsistencies of the text need prior evaluation to prove how a (the same?) scribe can insert grammatical mistakes and at the same time ‘improve’ the text of his exemplar. The synonyms are deemed by Holmes to reflect stylistic improvement, at least an intentional change aimed at adapting the text, thereby proving its later character. A rarely attested word which is not supported in the rest of the tradition may naturally point to a Bezan editorial

<sup>86</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 132–69.

<sup>87</sup> Mt 5.32; 9.15; 9.17; 9.29; 10.12f; 12.18?; 13.13; 13.14; 14.2,3,6; 16.21; 17.23; 18.10; 19.25. 19.9; 22.45; 24.31; 24.41; 25.3; 26.23; 26.42; 26.70; 26.73; 27.28; 28.7.

<sup>88</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 138. This method differs from Colwell’s segregation into harmonisations (a) to the context (b) to the general usage (c) to parallels, which should be preferred as offering a more objective description rather than a subjective degree of intentionality (E.C. COLWELL, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1969] 112–4).

<sup>89</sup> D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 111.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 168–99.

<sup>91</sup> Mt 17.12b–13; 21.7; 26.15; 1.22; 10.4; 26.14; 10.3; 11.2.

<sup>92</sup> Mt 2.6; 2.8–21; 5.36; 6.5; 9.9; 9.15; 12.44; 14.8; 14.19; 15.8; 15.14; 15.27; 16.5; 17.2; 17.14; 17.15; 21.18; 22.34; 24.33; 25.21,23; 25.24; 27.44; 27.49; 27.53; 27.65f. Cf. *ibid.*, 178–99.

change, rather than the other way round. However, that the changes have occurred in individual places without any consideration of a more global structure given by the editor demands a complementary evaluation. One word order change (Mt 9.9 ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς in D.05 *vs.* ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν in B.03) is examined and understood as smoothed Greek text, but a quick count of all word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03, reaching a relatively impressive number of 158 instances (See Appendix 2. VI. 3), challenges the more global approach to word order change as will be shown later in this work.<sup>93</sup> Finally, Holmes' explanations regarding substitutions like ὄχλοι/ὄχλοι πολλοί or ὄχλος/ὄχλος πολὺς<sup>94</sup> would deserve a more systematic approach than using only the external evidence.

### III. 1. 6. Theological Implications of Variant Readings in Bezan Matthew

Westcott and Hort were convinced that 'even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes.'<sup>95</sup> Other scholars have however identified several potentially theological reasons explaining variant readings, which will now be briefly reviewed.

Harris argued for the existence of underlying Montanistic traces in many Bezan variants.<sup>96</sup>

In the 1960s, Epp explains the variant readings in Codex Bezae as typically anti-Judaic which contrasts with earlier attempts to account for the characteristic Bezan readings.<sup>97</sup> In short, Epp suggests that the 'Western' text 'excuses' the Romans for Jesus's execution because they were 'ignorant' ('ἡγνοήσαμεν,' hence the formula *'ignorance motif'*) and the fault is consequently projected on the Jews.<sup>98</sup>

The author, however, updated his views almost forty years later<sup>99</sup> and tempers his conclusions by suggesting an enhancement of anti-Jewish thoughts rather than a malicious attack. Finally, he confesses that his conclusions were overestimated by scholars and that

'the point was not to prejudge the relationship of the two rival texts [i.e. Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae] but to point out, as objectively and conveniently as possible, their differences in conception and portrayal.'<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> See Chapter 3 IV.

<sup>94</sup> Holmes ('Early Editorial Activity,' 197) quotes Mt 14.19 but such case occur elsewhere (12.15, 15.31).

<sup>95</sup> WESTCOTT-HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 182.

<sup>96</sup> HARRIS, *Codex Bezae*, 148–53.

<sup>97</sup> EPP, *Theological Tendency* and *ibid.*, 'The "Ignorance Motif" in Acts and Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Codex Bezae,' *HTR* 55 (1962) 51–62.

<sup>98</sup> 'The D-text is hard on the Jews,' in EPP, 'Ignorance Motif,' 62.

<sup>99</sup> E.J. EPP, 'Anti-Judaic Tendencies in the D-Text of Acts: Forty Years of Conversation,' in NIKLAS-TILLY, *The Book of Acts as Church History*, 111–46.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

He also confirms that whilst ‘the tendency to anti-Judaism from a few passages’ is clearly apparent, ‘this [tendency in Codex Bezae] cannot be called as either special or a general tendency throughout the D-text.’<sup>101</sup>

Be that as it may, Epp’s views on the anti-Judaic views in Codex Bezae have been to date both influential in the scholarship and are often accepted. Only Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps have extensively challenged the idea, and suggested that, on the contrary, the Bezan text (of Acts) reflects a close familiarity with Jewish oral traditions and exegetical techniques, consistent with a situation where Jews and Christians were still a single – though schismatic – religious movement.<sup>102</sup>

Epp’s research on the Bezan text was taken further by his student Rice in the case of the book of Luke.<sup>103</sup> He too identified specific features in Lk D.05 that confirmed an anti-Judaic bias within a pro-Gentile pattern, exalting Jesus on the one hand and Peter among the other disciples on the other hand.<sup>104</sup>

In contrast to Epp, Holmes did not find any convincing traces of an ‘anti-Judaic bias’ in Bezan Matthew with only 13 – slightly far-fetched – examples arising mainly in Jesus’ trial,<sup>105</sup> and only 7-9 out of 13 could, in that author’s view, potentially qualify as anti-Judaic. On ‘Christological variants,’<sup>106</sup> i.e. alternative readings magnifying Jesus’ name, and ‘theological variants,’<sup>107</sup> he also acknowledged that no sure outcome can be proven from the detailed analysis in Matthew:

Clearly, [...], Bezae in Matthew has not been affected by this bias in the same way or to the same extent as have Luke and Acts: 7-9 anti-Judaic biases and five Christological appraisals.<sup>108</sup>

The study of anti-Judaic tendencies in the Bezan text of Matthew, therefore, is inconclusive, and recent work suggests that the question is somewhat inappropriate.

### III. 1. 7. Conclusions

Holmes concluded his dissertation by regarding the variant readings of Bezan Matthew as a ‘punctiliar event rather than a linear process’ driven by a 2<sup>nd</sup> c. editor ‘whose work has left its mark on the text-type found today in Codex Bezae and other manuscripts

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>102</sup> J. RIUS-CAMPS and J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition. Volume 4. Acts 18.24–28.31: Rome via Ephesus and Jerusalem* (LNTS 415; London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2009) 27.

<sup>103</sup> G. RICE, ‘The Alteration of Luke’s Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae,’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Case Western Reserve University, 1974); accessible at <http://documents.adventistarchives.org/Theses/Luke19740601.pdf> (accessed 03.05.14); *ibid.*, ‘Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias in the Western Text of the Gospel of Luke,’ *AUSS* 18 (1980) 149–56; *ibid.*, ‘The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke,’ *AUSS* 18 (1980) 50–7.

<sup>104</sup> RICE, ‘Alteration,’ 262.

<sup>105</sup> Mt 12.36; 21.32,42; 23.32f; 26.60-61,66; 27.22,26; HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 206–23.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 223–8.

<sup>107</sup> Mt 4.24, 15.30, 9.21, 15.34, 1.25, 24.30, *ibid.*, 228–36.

<sup>108</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 236.

standing within the “Western” textual tradition.<sup>109</sup> Holmes’s study is an impressive, well-structured work that discusses the ‘main’ variant readings in the Bezan text of Matthew supported by the available literature at that time. It shows the difficulty of finding a way between external support – in order to escape from circular reasoning when a Bezan variant is found to contradict the so-called superior Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus – and internal evidence, which focuses on the atomistic consideration of individual variant readings. This difficulty points to the need to revisit the text viewed as broader discourse units.

### III. 2. A Literary Analysis Approach: Amphoux’s *Évangile de Matthieu – Codex de Bèze*

In 1996 Amphoux edited a bilingual Greek-French version of the Bezan text of Matthew<sup>110</sup> which was intended to be the first book of a complete edition of the Four Gospels in Codex Bezae. Regarding the text itself, the organization in sense-lines (στίχοι) is carefully reproduced, the orthographic slips are corrected, the original readings are provided in the footnotes, and the text is supplemented with a critical study of selected variants. He concludes his work with an original and alternative proposal to the current document hypothesis<sup>111</sup> on the construction of Matthew, and the New Testament as a whole, a work which I will now summarize and review.

#### III. 2. 1. Reconstruction of the Text of the First Gospel

According to Amphoux, the careful study of Bezan variants lead him to conclude that the Gospel of Matthew finds its composition from *four* sources in different *states*: one source for Jesus’s sayings, two for narrative passages (one for the part common to Matthew, Mark and Luke, one for Lukan and Markan agreements), and one source for the birth narrative(s).<sup>112</sup> His hypothesis is based on a first source of Jesus’ *logia* exempt of narrative, organised in seven discourses, five of which are concluded by the same characteristic sentence:<sup>113</sup> a two-fold Galilean ministry (Mt 3-11 and 12,16-12), a central part of the ministry (16,13-20), a two-fold Judean ministry (21-23 and 24-28); and two units made up of the narratives common to Matthew, Mark and Luke.

Amphoux draws on both existing apocryphal documents and patristic quotations to identify those documents available to Matthew during the composition of his Gospel: Matthew would have organised his text into five phases delineated by seven discourses

---

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 249.

<sup>110</sup> See *supra*.

<sup>111</sup> The Two-Document theory postulates that Matthew and Luke wrote independently from each other but both depended upon Mark and a source of sayings referred to as Q. Streeter expanded this theory by adding two other sources, namely, ‘M’ and ‘L’ for purely Matthean and Lukan material respectively, referred to as the Four-Document hypothesis (B.H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and dates* [London: Macmillan, 1924] 223–70).

<sup>112</sup> AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 23–46.

<sup>113</sup> See introduction on Amphoux’s theories, section 0, page 19.

in Asia at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE by using various sources which he recomposed by carefully following them.<sup>114</sup> According to him, these sources are:

(a) the *logia* based on *instructions* and *writings of wisdom* (namely *Doctrinae Apostolorum*, the first Christian writing dated 50 CE and attested by Pseudo-Cyprian in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c., or called τῶν Ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί, i.e. the *Teachings of the Apostles*, by Eusebius of Caesarea in the 4<sup>th</sup> c.),<sup>115</sup> and also a second early writing dated 50 CE known as ‘Way of the Lord’ (‘Voie du Seigneur’), a halakhic text, which he claims to be the source of the Gospel of Thomas, and the unification of the two, close to what we now understand under the label ‘Q’;

(b) the first narrative tradition which came from the *Doctrina Petri* (according to Origen and mistakenly understood as Gospel to the Hebrews by Jerome)<sup>116</sup> transmitted by Luke and Mark, and from which Matthew would incorporate around ten prophecies (with the leitmotiv ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, i.e. ‘in order to fulfil what was spoken by the prophet’) by reducing them, as well as drawing on ‘lettres d’accompagnement,’ i.e. accompanying writings: 1 Peter for Mark, Hebrews for Luke;

(c) a book written by Ariston, modelled on John the Presbyter’s *Acts of Pilate*,<sup>117</sup>

(d) birth narratives, dated after 90 CE, which are themselves a collection of four traditions (Bethlehem cave, magi, John son of Zachariah, the Gospel according to the Hebrews), each being a specific theological response from several Asia Minor churches.

118

Based on this reconstruction, Amphoux explained Matthew’s text as a careful organisation of existing documents that he summarised as N + A + b + c + D, where N represents the Infancy Narratives, A, the common source to Matthew, Mark and Luke, b, the Lukan source, c, the Markan source<sup>119</sup> and D, the *logia* as found in the Didache and the Gospel of Thomas. This proposal is a unique theory that describes the editorial making of Matthew’s Gospel in the sense it uses all available and documented sources as opposed to theories involving hypothetical authorities or oral roots.

### III. 2. 2. Variant Readings Discussed

By discussing 36 Matthean variants, Amphoux reaches the exact opposite conclusion to what one usually finds from text-critical scholars, and argues that almost all Bezan read-

<sup>114</sup> AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 30–42.

<sup>115</sup> *H.E.* III,25.

<sup>116</sup> W.R. SCHOEMAKER, *The Gospel According to the Hebrews* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902) 199.

<sup>117</sup> The *Acts of Pilate* or Πράξεις Πιλάτου were not known to Eusebius, although he knew ‘Letters of Pilate’ through Justin and Tertullian (‘Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἄκτων,’ ‘and that these things did happen, you can ascertain from the Acts of Pontius Pilate’ [St. Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 39.5]).

<sup>118</sup> AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 30–46.

<sup>119</sup> The lowercase (b and c) corresponds to portions halved by Matthew before its integration into the Gospel, the uppercase to the unmodified texts, cf. *ibid.*, 25–9.

ings are the source variants that explain the readings of the other manuscripts,<sup>120</sup> thereby suggesting the priority of Codex Bezae. It is true that some ‘omissions’ are still explained as homoioteleutons (Mt 5.19b-20, 5.30, 10.19b, 10.37b, 10.41b, 18.18b), and, as presented in Holmes’s work, Mt 12.20 is thought to be a true omission, and Mt 17.12b is thought to have shifted place. The influence of the Diatessaron is a key feature in Amphoux’s rationale: because of the merger of all four Gospels into one in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. (Tatian’s Harmony), the process of returning to the status of separated Gospels can reveal mixes of pre-diatessaronic readings from the pre-170 period, and post-diatessaronic ones. Identifying readings as pre- or post-diatessaronic is virtually impossible without secure data on each reading: indeed, Amphoux’s theory is based on his earlier publications in which he shows that Codex Bezae is the pre-170 edition from Smyrna which influenced the Diatessaron (hence the ‘Western’ character of Tatian’s Harmony). For almost all other scholars, it is the opposite process that took place and Codex Bezae, as a post-Diatessaron work, was influenced by previously interwoven passages. Nevertheless, he admits that some verses attest diatessaronic readings, which is the case for the additional verses after 24.31 and 24.41, supposedly originating from Latin versions which expand and explain.<sup>121</sup> This book exhibits a proclivity to acknowledge readings in Bezan Matthew as more likely to be original. While sometimes lending support to that conclusion, alternative explanations for the authenticity of Bezan readings will be proposed in the following chapters of this thesis.

### III. 2. 3. Conclusions

Amphoux’s proposal is a unique reconstitution of the New Testament based on the analysis of Codex Bezae and on well-documented sources found in early Christian literature. His aim was to show that the careful literary analysis of Codex Bezae leads to the isolation of a peculiar structure which vanished during a later recensional process. Carefully detailing each of his assertions, Amphoux not only justified identifiable sources of Matthew (in contrast to ‘Q’ which has never been found as a document to date), he also suggests a possible construction of the books of the NT where Matthew is the first of a larger literary, theologically structured entity created in Asia in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE.

Amphoux’s views are neither used nor quoted in current scholarship, most probably because of the entrenched confidence in the Alexandrian texts<sup>122</sup> and the assumed

---

<sup>120</sup> ‘The reading is to be preferred that most fitly explains the existence of the others’ is one of the principles of textual criticism proposed by Westcott and Hort; for its list in the context of eclecticism, see E.J. EPP, ‘The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?’, in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 141–73 [158].

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 245–61.

<sup>122</sup> Amphoux acknowledged this in his re-edition of Vaganay’s original manual on textual criticism which he attributes to Hort’s understanding of the ‘Western’ text as a rough and late recension, in VAGANAY–AMPHOUX, *Introduction à la critique textuelle*, 145.

understanding of Codex Bezae as transmitting a later text<sup>123</sup> as well as the difficult-to-understand or highly technical character of his (untranslated) publications in French.<sup>124</sup>

### III. 3. Other Text-Critical Works on Matthew in Codex Bezae

These few works confirm that studies on Bezan Matthew are scarce apparently, because of (a) the preferred treatment of the text of the Gospels as an entity; (b) the attraction of scholarly interest to the Bezan text of Acts in terms of textual criticism given the major differences with the Alexandrian text; and (c) the apparently lower number of *v//* in Bezan Matthew (642 out of 1071 verses are free of any variant between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus).<sup>125</sup>

A few remarks on the nature of the variant readings found in Bezan Matthew can be read in various works dedicated to text critical observations but they are often relegated to conclusions reflecting a minor interest: Lagrange straightforwardly states in his major work on the first Gospel ‘*nous n’avons rien à dire de spécial sur la critique textuelle du premier Évangile*.<sup>126</sup> Martini, former holder of the Chair of Textual Criticism at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, a member of the UBS committee and known for his work on the textual comparison between  $\mathfrak{B}^{45}$  and Codex Vaticanus,<sup>127</sup> devoted a chapter to the textual criticism of Matthew.<sup>128</sup> He reports 196 variant readings worthy of interest<sup>129</sup> but once focused on Codex Bezae, he concentrates his comments on the five Bezan readings in Matthew within a footnote (!), which I reproduce here below:

‘A ce sujet, on peut poser la question de l’importance et de la signification des variantes “occidentales” en Mt. Elles ne représentent pas en Mt un cas particulièrement typique, et c’est pourquoi le premier évangile n’est pas le terrain d’analyse le plus propice pour en découvrir les caractéristiques. Parmi les ajouts typiques de D en Mt se distingue la longue considération parénétique de XX, 28 (qui a des affinités avec Lc., XIV, 8-10). Parmi les omissions, ont quelque importance IX, 34 (tout le verset est omis); XIII, 1 (omission de “de la maison” : peut-être pour harmoniser avec le parallèle lucanien ?); XIII, 33 (omission de “il leur dit”); XXI, 44 (omission de tout le verset : le texte court serait à préférer selon certains critiques). Parmi les transformations du texte nous rappelons III, 17, où le texte a été harmonisé avec Mt I, 11. On voit comment il est difficile de caractériser la tendance de ces variantes, dans la ligne par exemple de E.J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, Cambridge, 1966. Une éva-

<sup>123</sup> B. ALAND, ‘Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft,’ 5, 20.

<sup>124</sup> BIRDSALL, ‘After three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, xxix.

<sup>125</sup> Data retrieved from ALAND-ALAND, *Text*, 29–30.

<sup>126</sup> LAGRANGE, *L’Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, clxxix.

<sup>127</sup> C.M. MARTINI, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966).

<sup>128</sup> C.M. MARTINI, ‘La problématica générale du texte de Matthieu,’ in *ibid.* (ed.), *La Parola di Dio alle Origini della Chiesa* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 129–44 [131].

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.



luation de celle-ci pourrait seulement être faite en tenant compte du phénomène du texte “occidental” dans l’ensemble des Évangiles et des Actes.<sup>130</sup>

Metzger explains the variants discussed within the United Bible Societies (UBS) in his *Commentary*,<sup>131</sup> which was aimed at justifying the choice of text to be printed in the edition of the Greek text of UBS (4<sup>th</sup> edition) or NA<sup>27</sup>. Out of more than 3,000 *vll* analysed in the *Commentary* within the entire NT, 216 deal with Matthew out of which 188 deal with the extant parts of Codex Bezae (my own calculations). In this respect, none of the variants in Codex Bezae that do not agree with Codex Vaticanus are systematically rejected.

Finally, the doctoral work by Paulson on singular readings in early majuscules (Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, Bezae, Washingtonianus) was recently completed and represents a preparatory work for the study of scribal habits in all books of the New Testament.<sup>132</sup> The 259 singular readings in Mt D.05 are discussed in a few pages and encompass mostly orthography and lexical changes.<sup>133</sup> He concludes that they are ‘last minute changes’ as opposed to a ‘drastic re-presentation of Matthew.’<sup>134</sup>

#### IV. Studies of Matthew in Individual Manuscripts

Because my work will discuss the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae, it may prove helpful to consider previous scholarship that has examined the first Gospel in particular manuscripts including Greek papyri and majuscules as well as versions.

##### IV. 1. Matthew in Greek Papyri

The importance of papyri is the result of the earlier character of many of them compared to that of majuscules.<sup>135</sup> Their study is therefore understood to provide insights into the development of the text of the New Testament.<sup>136</sup> In the 1980s, Martini counts in accordance with Metzger<sup>137</sup> 15 papyri dated before 400 CE for the first Gospel, 12 of which are dated between 200 CE<sup>138</sup> – the earliest being  $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$ . In the mid-1990s, Metzger’s

<sup>130</sup> MARTINI, ‘La problématique générale du texte de Matthieu,’ 138, note 22.

<sup>131</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 1–72.

<sup>132</sup> PAULSON, ‘Scribal Habits.’

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 82–108.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 107–8.

<sup>135</sup> Elliott draws scholars against the undue emphasis given to papyri if they are of a late date. See J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Recently Discovered New Testament Papyri and Their Significance for Textual Criticism,’ in C. CLIVAZ and J. ZUMSTEIN (eds.), *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context – Lire les papyrus du Nouveau Testament dans leur contexte* (BETL 242; Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011) 89–108 [92].

<sup>136</sup> E.J. EPP, ‘The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament,’ in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 1–39.

<sup>137</sup> METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament*, 247–56.

<sup>138</sup> The 11 others that Holmes does not list are  $\mathfrak{P}^{1.25.35.37.45.53.62.64+67.70.71.77}$  (MARTINI, ‘La problématique générale du texte de Matthieu,’ 131) but are detailed in METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament*, 247–56).

*Kurzgefasste Liste*<sup>139</sup> listed 115 papyri and the Institute for New Testament Textual Research at the University of Münster, Germany, updated the list in 2010 by adding  $\mathfrak{P}^{116}$ – $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$  but none of these newly discovered papyri contain any portion of Matthew.

To date, there are 23 papyri containing portions of Matthew (list on next page). Access to the text of the papyri has been facilitated by the original work of Barret and Comfort,<sup>140</sup> Jaroš<sup>141</sup> and the Centre for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts.<sup>142</sup> The text of all papyri that include Matthew can also be accessed from B. Aland's doctoral student K.S. Min.<sup>143</sup>

In his study of Bezan Matthew in 1985, Holmes selects four papyri, namely  $\mathfrak{P}^{19}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ , because of a larger amount of available text in Matthew may contain and compares their variant readings with Mt D.05.<sup>144</sup> As an excursus to his doctoral dissertation, he extended his work to a study of the textual relationships between the Chester Beatty papyrus  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  in Matthew and other manuscripts including Codex Bezae due to the papyrus' prominent character for textual criticism<sup>145</sup> and the development of the New Testament.<sup>146</sup> Despite the fragmentary state of the first Gospel (Mt 20-21 and 25-26),<sup>147</sup> Holmes concludes, after carrying out a statistical study involving a wide selection of

---

<sup>139</sup> B. ALAND, K. ALAND, M. WELTE, B. KÖSTER and K. JUNACK, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1994).

<sup>140</sup> P.W. COMFORT and D.P. BARRETT, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts. A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of the Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001).

<sup>141</sup> Available on CD Rom (5,136 pages as a PDF format): K. JAROŠ, *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten griechischen Handschriften: Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments vor Codex Sinaiticus und Codex Vaticanus* (Ruhpolding/Mainz: F.P. Rutzen; Vienna/Würzburg: Echter, 2006).

<sup>142</sup> The CSNTM offers the on-line consultation of some individual manuscripts, covering papyri and majuscules: <http://www.csntm.org/manuscript> (accessed 01.04.2014).

<sup>143</sup> K.S. MIN, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.). Edition und Untersuchung* (ANTT 34; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2005).

<sup>144</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity,' 54–8.

<sup>145</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  (P. Chester Beatty I, c. 250, Egypt) has been studied since its discovery in 1933. See ELLIOTT, 'Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of Papyrus 45,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010) 53–64 [60]. Its editio princeps can be found in F.G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri II, Gospels and Acts* (London: E. Walker, 1933); H. GERSTINGER, 'Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien,' *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 67–72 (cited in METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament*, 253); T. C. SKEAT, 'A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of Gospels and Acts ( $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ),' *Hermathena* 155 (1993) 27–43; R.F. SCHEDINGER, 'The Textual Relationship between  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew,' *NTS* 43 (1997) 58–71; W.F. WARREN, 'The Textual Relationships of  $\mathfrak{P}^4$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ , and  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  in the Gospel of Luke' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans).

<sup>146</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  stands out because of its regular agreement with Codex Vaticanus. This observation led to the conclusion that B.03 was not the result of omission and that the readings witness a much earlier date than 4<sup>th</sup> c. CE (G.D. FEE, ' $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ , and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,' in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 247–73). In a way it can be said that the variant readings between  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and Codex Vaticanus have 'validated' the earlier character of Codex Vaticanus (as opposed to Codex Bezae). Therefore, and unsurprisingly, early papyri continue to attract much scholarly interest but have also led to contradictory conclusions. Moreover, their usually extremely fragmentary character is often omitted in the scholarship and observations on their readings and potential originality tend to outpace the ones of any majuscule.

<sup>147</sup> C. HORTON, 'The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance,' in HORTON, *The Earliest Gospels*, 149–60.

manuscripts on selected verses *viz.*, Mt 20.29,26.22,23,26, that there is *some* textual proximity between the readings of  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and those in Codex Bezae. The papyrus is placed in third position in terms of closeness with D.05 after  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  and the Old Latin Veronensis *b*.<sup>148</sup>

Elliott broadens this list with eleven papyri dated 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> c. CE.<sup>149</sup> In 14 verses, there is agreement between the Matthean reading and the papyrus,<sup>150</sup> while in ten verses Codex Bezae is not supported by papyri.<sup>151</sup> Again, the fragmentary character of the papyri may lead to skewed conclusions, as he shows from singular readings in  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  in Mt 20–21 and 25–26 only, passages in which Matthew is read in parts.<sup>152</sup> From this analysis, he further concludes that, except for  $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$  and 0171,<sup>153</sup> ‘no significant corpus of Greek material seems to have been a precursor of the D-text’ of Matthew.<sup>154</sup> He refines his judgement later<sup>155</sup> stating that the somewhat insignificant agreements between  $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and D.05, along with the absence of agreements between the other papyri and Bezan Matthew, lead to an uncertain consensus on early papyrus support of Mt D.05. In a more recent study, he completed the landscape of early papyri (2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE) with  $\mathfrak{P}^{101-104}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$ , as well as P. Oxy 4406 serving as amulet, where portions of Matthew are involved.<sup>156</sup>

Further focus was given in Min’s above-mentioned work, who classified early papyri concentrating on Matthew only according to criteria of ‘strict,’ ‘normal’ and ‘free’ textual character and transmission,<sup>157</sup> a refinement of Aland’s earlier criteria.<sup>158</sup> Wasserman complemented Min’s work on 13 early papyri ( $\mathfrak{P}^{1.35.37.45.53.64+67}$   $\mathfrak{P}^{70.77.101.102.103.104.110}$ ) and majuscule 0171 thereby confirming most of earlier statements on the free transmission of Matthew.<sup>159</sup>

I have added below some complementary data for the study of papyrus support in the Bezan text of Matthew by providing a list of Papyri–Codex Bezae agreements in Matthew based on NA<sup>28</sup> according to their age (century):

---

<sup>148</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 272.

<sup>149</sup> ELLIOTT, ‘Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 161–82 [164–5].

<sup>150</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{19}$  (Mt 10.33),  $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$  (Mt 12.25)  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  (Mt 19.10),  $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$  (Mt 25.13,21),  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  (Mt 26.34,44)  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  (Mt 20.29),  $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$  (Mt 26.39),  $\mathfrak{P}^{62}$  (Mt 11.25),  $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$  (Mt 11.27; 12.4),  $\mathfrak{P}^{71}$  (Mt 19.17),  $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$  (Mt 23.37).

<sup>151</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  (Mt 18.33; 19.3),  $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$  (Mt 25.22),  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  (Mt 20.30; 26.7),  $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$  (Mt 26.34,36),  $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$  (Mt 2.23),  $\mathfrak{P}^{71}$  (Mt 19.18),  $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$  (Mt 23.30).

<sup>152</sup> Elliott discusses singular readings in  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  including one page on Matthew in *ibid.*, ‘Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ,’ in HORTON, *The Earliest Gospels*, 122–31 [127].

<sup>153</sup> See section Chapter 2 IV. 2 of this chapter.

<sup>154</sup> ELLIOTT, ‘Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 182.

<sup>155</sup> ELLIOTT, *Thoroughgoing Principles*, 81–7.

<sup>156</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Six New Papyri of Matthew’s Gospel,’ *NovT* 41 (1999) 105–7.

<sup>157</sup> On this classification, see P.W. COMFORT, *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990).

<sup>158</sup> B. ALAND, ‘Kriterien zu Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments,’ in A. DENAUX, *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven, Leuven University Press, 2002) 1–13.

<sup>159</sup> T. WASSERMAN, ‘The Early Text of Matthew,’ in C.E. HILL and M.J. KRUGER (eds), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 83–107.

CHAPTER 2

c. 200	Ⲣ <sup>64+67</sup>	Mt 3.9,15; 5.20–22,25–28; 26.7–8,10,14–15,22–23,31–33
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>104</sup>	Mt 21.34–37,43–45(?)
2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>77</sup>	Mt 23.30–39
	Ⲣ <sup>103</sup>	Mt 13.55–56; 14.3–5
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>1</sup>	Mt 1.1–9,12,14–20
	Ⲣ <sup>45</sup>	Mt 20.24–32; 21.13–19; 25.41–26.39
	Ⲣ <sup>53</sup>	Mt 26.29–40
	Ⲣ <sup>70</sup>	Mt 2.13–16; 2.22–3.1; 11.26–27; 12.4–5; 24.3–6,12–15
	Ⲣ <sup>101</sup>	Mt 3.10–12; 3.16–4.3
	Ⲣ <sup>102</sup>	Mt 4.11–12,22–23
4 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>25</sup>	Mt 18.32–34; 19.1–3,5–7,9–10
	Ⲣ <sup>35</sup>	Mt 25.12–15,20–23
	Ⲣ <sup>62</sup>	Mt 11,25–30
	Ⲣ <sup>71</sup>	Mt 19.10–1,17–18
	Ⲣ <sup>86</sup>	Mt 5.13–16,22–25
	Ⲣ <sup>110</sup>	Mt 10.13–15,25–27
4 <sup>th</sup> /5 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>19</sup>	Mt 10.32–11.5
	Ⲣ <sup>21</sup>	Mt 12.24–26,32–33
5 <sup>th</sup> /6 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>105</sup>	Mt 27.62–64; 28.2–5
6 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>83</sup>	Mt 20.23–25,30–31; 23.39–24.1,6
	Ⲣ <sup>96</sup>	Mt 3.13–15
6 <sup>th</sup> /7 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>44</sup>	Mt 17.1–3,6–7; 18.15–17,19; 25.8–10
7 <sup>th</sup>	Ⲣ <sup>73</sup>	Mt 25.43; 26.2–3

Secondly, I have counted agreements between papyri and the early majuscules Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus from the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> in order to identify some tendency in the papyrus support.<sup>160</sup> The reader can refer to Appendix 1 to see the lists of all the variant readings with their support ordered by types of manuscripts. The table below numerically summarises the results:

Type of Agreement	Number of Instances
BDⲢ	21
DⲢ <i>contra</i> B	17
BⲢ <i>contra</i> D	18
BD <i>contra</i> Ⲣ	28
BⲢ <i>contra</i> DⲢ	4
Absence of agreement between B, D and Ⲣ	5
Total	93

Table 1: Textual Agreements between Mt D.05, Mt B.03 and Papyri

<sup>160</sup> I used the critical apparatus in NA<sup>28</sup>, although it apparently does not list all variants in all papyri. A more thorough evaluation using the text itself (as found in Min's book or from the pictures found in Jaroš's database) would be necessary.

From this grid it appears that there are 21 instances (i.e. 22% of the total instances where variant readings including papyri are mentioned in the critical apparatus) where papyri support both Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew. In 17 instances (18%) there is papyrus support with Codex Bezae against Codex Vaticanus, while in a roughly similar amount of instances (18, i.e. 19%) the papyri support the Mt B.03 readings against Bezae Matthew. In 28 instances, papyri are different from B.03/D.05 readings. In four, Codex Vaticanus agrees with some papyri when others agree with Codex Bezae. Finally there are five instances in which none of the witnesses agrees with another. In summary, one can conclude that from these data in Matthew papyri are equally good early support for both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae. Codex Bezae agrees with pre-5<sup>th</sup> century papyri in half of the cases (where support of papyri is indicated in the critical apparatus of Matthew), and the other half shows agreement between papyri and Codex Vaticanus. For some reason this agreement between the papyri and Codex Bezae is often overlooked, whereas the agreement between the papyri and Codex Vaticanus is well known and used as a further characteristic of the early character of B.03, despite the approximation of the dates of both manuscripts.

#### IV. 2. Matthew in Greek Majuscules<sup>161</sup>

Because specific works on Matthew in Greek minuscules are scarce, apart from work on Matthew in families 1 and 13,<sup>162</sup> I will briefly review the scholarship on Matthew in Greek majuscules only in this section.

Martini selected 400 CE as a cut-off date for the inclusion of early manuscripts,<sup>163</sup> which is why he only considered Matthew in the highly fragmentary majuscules 058, 0160 and 0212,<sup>164</sup> and the more extensive codices  $\aleph$ .01 and B.03 only. On the basis of this rationale, Martini rules out Codex Bezae from the manuscripts under consideration, as an edited text dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>165</sup> Martini rapidly brushes ‘Western’ variant readings into a footnote (*sic!*), summarizing the lack of interest in a specific study, at least with respect to Matthew alone:

‘On a plutôt l’impression que, jusqu’au IV<sup>ème</sup> siècle, l’usage existait en Egypte de transcrire l’Évangile de Matthieu séparément, et ce n’est pas sans influence sur l’histoire de son texte. Une confirmation de ceci pourrait être donnée par les autres fragments d’Évangile sur papyrus, qui sont presque

---

<sup>161</sup> Parker proposes to use the term ‘majuscules’ to contrast these manuscripts with the minuscules, arguing that the usual term of ‘uncials’ is of ‘uncertain origin’ and ‘more properly applied to various Latin scripts in use at the same period’ (PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, 9).

<sup>162</sup> A.S. ANDERSON, *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family 1 in Matthew* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004); J. GEERLINGS, *Family 13–The Ferrar Group: The Text According to Matthew* (SD 19; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press).

<sup>163</sup> MARTINI, ‘La problématique générale du texte de Matthieu,’ 131.

<sup>164</sup> Majuscule 058, dated 4<sup>th</sup> c., contains a part of the Gospel of Matthew (18.18-19,22-23,25-26,28-29), majuscule 0160, dated 4–5<sup>th</sup> c., contains Mt 26.25-26,34-36, lastly, majuscule 0212 (or Dura Parchment 24) has 2 verses in Matthew (Mt 27.56-57) revealing a ‘diatessaronic character’ (ALAND–ALAND, *Text*, 119, 123, 125).

<sup>165</sup> MARTINI, ‘La problématique générale du texte de Matthieu,’ 133.

## CHAPTER 2

toujours d'un seul Évangile. Mais ce problème n'a jamais été l'objet d'un travail précis.<sup>166</sup>

The fragmentary character of early majuscules could not help to fine-tune Martini's conclusions.

In order to plot the availability of the text of Matthew in the first majuscules, I have ordered majuscules witnesses of Matthew according to age, like I did in the section dedicated to papyri:<sup>167</sup>

Date	MS	Portion of Text in Matthew	
c. 300	0171	Mt 10.17-23,25-32	
4 <sup>th</sup>	℞.01	extant	
	B.03	extant	
	058	Mt 18.18-19,22-23,25-26,28-29	
	0231	Mt 26.75-27.1,3-4	
	0242	Mt 8.25-9.2; 13.32-38,40-46	
4 <sup>th</sup> /5 <sup>th</sup>	W.032	extant	
	0160	Mt 26.25-26,34-36	
5 <sup>th</sup>	A.02	Mt 25.7-28.20	
	C.04	Mt (lac. 1.1-2; 5.15-7.5; 17.26-18.28; 22.21-23.17; 24.10-45; 25.30-26.22; 27.11-46; 28.15-20)	
	D.05	Mt (lac. 1.1-20; 6.20-9.2; 27.2-12)	
5/6 <sup>th</sup>	071	Mt 1.21-24; 1.25-2.2	
	0170	Mt 6.5-6,8-10,13-15,17	
6 <sup>th</sup>	Σ.042	extant	
	Φ.043	extant	
	N.022	Mt (lac. 1.1-24; 2.7-20; 3.4-6,24; 7.15-8.1,24-31; 10.28-11.3; 12.40-13.4,33-41; 14.6-22; 15.14-31; 16.7-18.5; 18.26-19.6; 19.13-20.6; 21.19-26.57; 26.65-27.26,34-28.20)	
	P.024	Mt 1.11-21; 3.13-4.19; 10.7-19; 10.42-11.11; 13.40-50; 14.15-15.3,29-39;	
	Z.035	Mt 1.17-2.6,13-20; 4.4-13; 5.45-6.15; 7.16-8.6; 10.40-11.18; 12.43-13.11; 13.57-14.19; 15.13-23; 17.9-17; 17.26-18.6; 19.4-12,21-28; 20.7-21.8,23-30,37-45; 22.16-25; 22.37-23.3,13-23; 24.15-25; 25.1-11; 26.21-29,62-71	
	067	Mt 14.13-16,19-23; 24.37-25.1,32-45; 26.31-45	
	073	Mt 14.19-35; 15.2-8	
	078	Mt 17.22-18.3,11-19; 19.5-14	
	085	Mt 20.3-32; 22.3-16	
	087	Mt 1.23-2.2; 19.3-8; 21.19-24	
	094	Mt 24.9-21	
	0237	Mt 15.12-15; 17-19	
	0293	Mt 21.27-28,31-32; 26.2-12	
	7 <sup>th</sup>	0102	Mt 21.24-24.15
		0106	Mt 12.17-19,23-25; 13.32; 13.36-15.26
0107		Mt 22.15-23.14	
0204		Mt 24.39-42,44-48	
7/8 <sup>th</sup>	0275	Mt 5.25-26,29-30	
	0277	Mt 14.22,28-29	

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>167</sup> Data retrieved from NA<sup>28</sup> (792-819).

## CHAPTER 2

	0281		Mt 6.24-30; 7.4-24; 8.11-14; 9.1-15; 10.7-14; 11.3-11; 11.27-12.4,13-29; 13.19-23,25-31,52-58; 15.12-13,15-20,22-24,26-32; 16.12-19,25-28; 17.2,4-5,9,17-18.8,14-27; 19.21-20.4; 20.25-33; 21.8-13,27-32; 22.13-21,40-23.4; 23.17-18.22-30; 24.21-51; 25.39-44; 26.15-37,51-56; 26.64-71,73-27.4; 27.22-35
8 <sup>th</sup>	E.07		extant
	L.019		Mt (lac. 4.22-5.14; 28.17-20)
	0148		Mt 28.5-19
	0161		Mt 22.7-46
	0234		Mt 28.11-15
8/9 <sup>th</sup>	0298		Mt 26.24-29
9 <sup>th</sup>	H.013		Mt (lac. 1.1-15.30, 25.33-26.3)
	K.017		extant
	U.030		extant
	Δ. 037		extant
	Θ.038		Mt (lac. 1.1-19; 1.21-4.4; 4.17-5.4)
	0128		Mt 25.32-37,40-42,44-45
	0271		Mt 12.27-39
10 <sup>th</sup>	S.028		extant
	X.033		extant
	Γ.036		Mt (lac. 5.31-6.16 ; 6.30-7.26 ; 8.27-9.6 ; 21.19-22.25)
	0249		Mt 25.1-9

From this list, it appears that there are mainly lacunose or highly fragmentary witnesses of Matthew within majuscules. Theoretically, and apart from codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Bezae, only a few witnesses would be candidates for a text-critical evaluation or comparison with the Bezan text of Matthew: E.07, K.017, U.030, W.032, X.033, Σ.042, Γ.036, Δ.037, Θ.038 and Φ.043. Amongst these ones, Racine's dedicated a work on the quantitative evaluation of the text of Matthew in Codex Washingtonianus W.032.<sup>168</sup> He identifies Mt W.032 as Byzantine with a low if not any 'Western' influence. From a discourse analytical perspective, he compares Mt 8.1-34 in Codex Washingtonianus with Codex Vaticanus and concludes that there is a greater cohesion in the former than in the latter, inviting thereby for further analyses on the rest of Matthew. A further study in Mt W.032 was presented by Prior on a specific study on its *nomina sacra*.<sup>169</sup>

Further work on the text of Matthew in later (groups of) majuscules can be referred to in family E.07<sup>170</sup> and family II,<sup>171</sup> with mainly lists of variant readings. Lastly,

---

<sup>168</sup> J.J. RACINE, 'The Text of Matthew in the Freer Gospels, A Quantitative and Qualitative Appraisal,' in L.W. HURTADO (ed.), *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts. Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove* (SBLTCS 6; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 123-46.

<sup>169</sup> J.B. PRIOR, 'The Use and Non-Use of Nomina Sacra in the Freer Gospels of Matthew,' in L.W. HURTADO, *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts*, 147-646.

<sup>170</sup> R. CHAMPLIN, *Family E and Its Allies in Matthew* (SD 28; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1966). Geerlings will conduct a similar study on Mark and Luke: J. GEERLINGS, *Family E and Its Allies in Mark* (SD 31; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1968); *ibid.*, *Family E and Its Allies in Luke* (SD 35; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1968).

<sup>171</sup> R. CHAMPLIN, *Family II in Matthew* (SD 24; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1964).

the mention on a ‘Western’ variant of striking importance (Mt 20.28) in common with Codex Bezae is discussed in Batiffol’s presentation of codex Beratinus (Φ.043).<sup>172</sup>

An exception is the highly fragmentary majuscule containing a fragment of Matthew: the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. manuscript 0171 discovered in 1912 as a majuscule of specific interest for Matthew. The fragment, found in Egypt and containing (only) Mt 10 and Lk 22,<sup>173</sup> has distinctive ‘Western’ readings that prompted Hedley<sup>174</sup> to qualify 0171 as a ‘pure D-text.’ It was then commented by the Alands as ‘paraphrastic’<sup>175</sup> and confirmed by later studies including Parker<sup>176</sup> and, for the other fragment in Luke, Birdsall.<sup>177</sup> In view of the 11 agreements and nine disagreements with Codex Bezae, Elliott, however, concluded that 0171 was not specifically ‘Western’ in character<sup>178</sup> but that the agreements between 0171 and D.05 does not argue for its being ‘a precursor of the D-type.’<sup>179</sup> My own review of Matthew in 0171 suggests that the differences cannot all be systematically attributed to scribal emendation or errors but rather reflect a difficulty for the scribe of what will become 0171 to choose what to copy from two existing exemplars, one akin to Codex Bezae and one to Codex Vaticanus. Furthermore, its ‘paraphrastic’ character is most probably only due to the presence of Lk 22.42-43, verses that are highly disputed with regard to their originality.<sup>180</sup> In this respect, 0171 would rather appear as a key witness within the moveable transmission of Matthew in Egypt in the first centuries where at

---

<sup>172</sup> Batiffol discusses the textual variants of 6<sup>th</sup> c. Codex Beratinus Φ.043 and classifies them as ‘fondementalement occidental’ quoting the addition after Mt 20.28 as ‘une intrusion propre à D, à l’Itala et à la version Cureton, exclusivement’ (P. BATIFFOL, ‘Evangeliorum codex Graecus purpureus Beratinus Φ,’ *MAH* 5 (1885) 358–76 and *ibid.*, *Les manuscrits grecs de Berat d’Albanie et le Codex Purpureus Φ* [Paris: Editions Imprimerie nationale, 1886] 19). By deciding for a ‘Western’ character of Φ.043 in this passage as well as some distinctive others, Batiffol does not explain how Codex Φ can have been textually influenced to this extent by Codex Bezae. There is no newer extensive research on this codex after Battifol’s study.

<sup>173</sup> Apparently 0171 was overlooked in the first editions of the Nestle-Aland and the first study of the verses in Mt 10 was published in 1966. See K. ALAND, ‘Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament. Betrachtungen zu  $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$  und 0171,’ in B. KÖSTER, H.U. ROSENBAUM and M. WELTE (eds), *Supplementa zu den neutestamentlichen und den kirchengeschichtlichen Entwürfen. Kurt Aland: zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990) 72–96; D.C. PARKER, *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977-2007* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2010) 41.

<sup>174</sup> C. HEDLEY, ‘The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts,’ *CQR* 118 (1934) 223.

<sup>175</sup> K. ALAND, ‘Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament. Betrachtungen zu P69 und 0171,’ in B. KOSTER, H.U. ROSENBAUM and M. WELTE (eds), *Supplementa zu den neutestamentlichen und den kirchengeschichtlichen Entwürfen. Kurt Aland: zum 75. Geburtstag*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990) 72–96.

<sup>176</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 258.

<sup>177</sup> J.N. BIRDSALL, ‘A Fresh Examination of the Fragments of the Gospel of St. Luke in Ms. 0171 and an Attempted Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Recto,’ in R. GRYSON (ed.), *Philologia Sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem 70. Geburtstag* (VL 24; Freiburg: Herder, 1993) 212–7.

<sup>178</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 165 n. 12.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>180</sup> See e.g. B.D. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 187 suggesting an underlying anti-docetic theology. For a holistic study on the question, see C. CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43-44). Ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l’histoire* (BiTS 7; Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2010).



least two types of texts would be available and considered of equal importance, discussion which should be resumed afresh.

Little would appear to be gained from a sustained comparison of Codex Bezae with these manuscripts, apart from what has been already mentioned in the scholarship. In actual facts, the portion of the Matthean text in these manuscripts is most of the time as fragmentary as in the papyri if one departs from the early codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Washingtonianus and Koridethi. Other majuscules have not attracted the same attention in part at least because of their later date.

Beyond Greek witnesses in Matthew, and as a valuable testimony to the biblical tradition, versions will be now considered, taking the languages that may interact with the present work.

## V. Early Versions of Matthew and Their Influence on the Greek Text of Codex Bezae

Versions with extant parts of Matthew and a distinctive ‘Western’ character can be found in the Old Syriac,<sup>181</sup> the Egyptian dialects (Bohairic Coptic, Sahidic Coptic and Middle Egyptian mainly), and the Old Latin manuscripts<sup>182</sup>. Furthermore, these three languages are attested in the second century.<sup>183</sup> The textual proximity of Codex Bezae to Syriac, Coptic and Latin versions<sup>184</sup> has influenced research on its debateable origin as a manuscript,<sup>185</sup> and has therefore also attracted attention to the nature of its Greek text.<sup>186</sup> The relationships between Codex Bezae, Coptic and Syriac are however not well documented to the extent it should be and the ‘Western’ character of these Eastern witnesses is disregarded or lacking in conclusive research with regard to their kinship.

Intrigued by ‘unpure’ Greek or extra-Greek influences in Codex Bezae, certain scholars have proposed solutions to (apparently) irrational mistakes,<sup>187</sup> which the production of a bilingual, multi-layered manuscript inevitably renders likely. Multiple theories about these kinds of variants in Codex Bezae, though not necessarily in Matthew, have been explained as (a) Latinisms (Middleton and Harris<sup>188</sup> *contra* Scrivener, and

---

<sup>181</sup> B.M. METZGER, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977) 36–47.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, 99–152, 285–329.

<sup>183</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century,’ in *ibid.*, *Thoroughgoing Principles*, 29–39 [32].

<sup>184</sup> Kenyon established a list of agreements between the two versions, i.e. Old Latin and Old Syriac, and Codex Bezae (F.G. KENYON, *The Text of the Greek Bible* [London: Duckworth, 1949], 213–24).

<sup>185</sup> Metzger quotes South of France, southern Italy, Sicily, but confirms the hypothetical state of these affirmations (METZGER, *Introduction*, 88); Amphoux claims Smyrna (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 21); Parker, Beirut (PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 278).

<sup>186</sup> Harris calls these influences an ‘action and re-action between the Greek and Latin texts’ (HARRIS, *Codex Bezae*, 46).

<sup>187</sup> HARRIS, *Codex Bezae*, 50, n. 216.

<sup>188</sup> G. Middleton (1808) paved the way to this field and Harris further developed his thesis with an exhaustive list of 230 examples of such Latinised words or expressions, mainly in Matthew. See HARRIS, *Codex Bezae*, 41–6.

more recently Auwers, Haenschen, McKenzie and Stone<sup>189</sup>); (b) Aramaisms (Chase,<sup>190</sup> Harris,<sup>191</sup> Torrey,<sup>192</sup> Lagrange,<sup>193</sup> Wensinck,<sup>194</sup> Yoder,<sup>195</sup> Black,<sup>196</sup> Wilcox<sup>197</sup>); or (c) Atticistic influences (Kilpatrick<sup>198</sup>). No influence from the Coptic, as a language, has ever been proposed, although similarities between the Coptic versions and Codex Bezae are a known feature.<sup>199</sup>

### V. 1. Syriac

Aramaisms have led to some confusion with the existence of an underlying Hebrew substratum,<sup>200</sup> specifically in Matthew.<sup>201</sup> I will therefore briefly summarise the scholarship on the Syriac text of Matthew within the overall presentation of versional support to Mt D.05.

---

<sup>189</sup> J.M. AUWERS, 'Le texte latin des Évangiles,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 183–216; E. HAENCHEN, 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte,' *ZTK* 51 (1954) 153–67 and *ibid.*, *Die Apostelgeschichte, kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956) 49–51; R.S. MACKENZIE 'The Latin Column in Codex Bezae,' *JSNT* 6 (1980) 58–76; R.C. STONE, *The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1946).

<sup>190</sup> F.H. CHASE, *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1893) on the Book of Acts and *ibid.*, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London/ New York: Macmillan, 1895) on the Gospels pointing to a Syriac influence.

<sup>191</sup> J.R. HARRIS, 'Does Codex Bezae Syriacize?,' in *ibid.*, *Codex Bezae*, 178–90.

<sup>192</sup> Torrey alleged that the text of the Gospels in the 'Western' manuscripts was a translation from Aramaic (C.C. TORREY, 'The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels,' in D.G. LYONS-G.F. MOORE (eds), *Studies in the History of Religions Presented Howell Toy* (New York: Macmillan, 1912) 269–317).

<sup>193</sup> M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile selon Saint Marc* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1947) lix-lx.

<sup>194</sup> Wensinck suggested an influence on the 'Western' manuscripts by the Aramaic tradition during the transmission of the text of Luke (A.J. WENSINCK, 'The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and Their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of Saint Luke,' *BBC* 12 [1937] 11–48).

<sup>195</sup> J.D. YODER, 'The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis; Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1958). Accessible from UMI microfilms.

<sup>196</sup> M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998).

<sup>197</sup> M. WILCOX, 'Semitisms in the New Testament,' in W. HAASE (ed.), *Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament, Fortsetzung [Kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen]* (ANRW; Principat 25.2.; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1984) 978–1029; *ibid.*, 'The Aramaic Background of the New Testament,' in D.R.G. BEATTIE and M.J. MACNAMARA (eds), *The Aramaic Bible Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 362–78.

<sup>198</sup> G.D. KILPATRICK, 'Eclecticism and Atticism,' *ETL* 53 (1977) 107–12 (mainly on Acts) and *ibid.*, 'Eclecticism and Atticism,' in G.D. KILPATRICK and J.K. ELLIOTT (eds), *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays* (BETL 96; Louvain, Presses Universitaires, 1990) 73–9.

<sup>199</sup> See section Chapter 2 V. 3.

<sup>200</sup> On the consequences of the well-known statement by Papias (Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος) reported by Eusebius in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 3.39.13,16, see DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 16.

<sup>201</sup> See the comment in a manual of patristic studies: 'Les études actuelles sur L'Évangile de Saint Matthieu rejoignent ce que dit ici Papias : le premier Évangile a été écrit d'abord en araméen, puis diverses traductions grecques en ont été faites.' (D. BERTRAND, *Les Écrits des Pères apostoliques* [Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2001] 323, note 13).

It would not be too surprising to see local linguistic specificities reflected in the autograph text, without the text being necessarily a translation from Aramaic, although a would-be Semitic *Vorlage* would have certainly left a footprint in the text.<sup>202</sup>

Chase specifically analysed passages in the Book of Acts in Codex Bezae and concluded that ‘the Bezan text seemed to imply a Syriac text different from, and older than, that of the Syriac Vulgate’ and proposed that Acts D.05 is the result of assimilation of a Greek to a Syriac text that preceded the Peshitta version.<sup>203</sup> Subsequently, he pursued his study with the Gospels (Matthew, Luke and John)<sup>204</sup> along with a study of harmonistic influences and their source(s) (Tatianisms, retranslation, Syriac influence). The passages he studied in Matthew are Mt 1.16, 10.11-13, 42, 15.26, 16.16, 17.27, 18.2, 20, 20.28, 21.28ff, 22.34, 23.9, 25.41, 26.15,<sup>205</sup> and a specific study on the harmonistic passages are Mt 21.18, 24.31f, 26.59ff, 27.28.<sup>206</sup>

In the 1950s, Yoder devoted his doctoral dissertation on Syriacisms in Codex Bezae to a thorough analytical description of the Greek variants, in which he confirms a Greek origin<sup>207</sup> and refuses the influences of Semitisms and Latinisms reveals that the question is far from being easy to answer.<sup>208</sup>

By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> c., Black underlined the paratactic style in other non-Western witnesses or inconsistencies in the alleged influence of numerical correspondence of Latin and Greek words in either column.<sup>209</sup> Beyond linguistic considerations on Aramaic grammar and syntax reflected in the Greek text of Codex Bezae, he pointed out that the text is not ‘syriacised’ as such, but that the Aramaic breeding ground of the NT, especially as found in the Gospels, characteristically offers the testimony of a raw Greek and points to the early state of its redaction rather than to a later influence. On the contrary, early majuscules where Syriacisms are relatively absent and the Greek is improved would then in turn be later corrections:

[...] neither does evidence of a Syriac idiom or construction in D necessarily mean that its source was a Syriac version or Gospel, even where the same construction or idiom is found in the corresponding place in the version [...] the fact that it is not found in the non-Western manuscripts need not imply that the more respectable Syriacism is not present, or was the work of the Evangelist; on the contrary, the Evangelist may himself have been guilty

---

<sup>202</sup> On the ‘Aramaic Matthew,’ see the C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘Pour une approche documentaire des paroles de Jésus,’ *BABELAO* 1 (2012) 99–116 [102].

<sup>203</sup> CHASE, *The Old Syriac Element*, ix.

<sup>204</sup> Mark is eliminated because of ‘only a few verses’ in sy<sup>c</sup> (CHASE, *Syro-Latin Text*, 1).

<sup>205</sup> CHASE, *Syro-Latin Text*, 3–75.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, 76–100.

<sup>207</sup> ‘Codex Bezae is not “obviously un-Greek”’ (YODER, ‘Language,’ 17).

<sup>208</sup> YODER, ‘Language,’ 5.

<sup>209</sup> BLACK, *Aramaic Approach*, 67.

of the solecism, and the Syriac construction have been removed by later editors in the interests of a more polished Greek.<sup>210</sup>

Black however noted that these considerations of inter-linguistic contamination lack distinction between textual affinities: linguistic influence may lead to a risk of confusion between Aramaic influence and Syriacism, which is a ‘clear distinctive feature in D.’ Despite the ground breaking nature of this detailed work, the evidence of a Gospel deeply rooted in the early times of Christianity betrayed by its language is not so surprising and this does not help in understanding any possible underlying message in the Bezan text. Nevertheless, Black’s study will be decisive for this thesis in determining Semitisms behind syntactical or grammatical ‘mistakes’ in Codex Bezae. On Matthew specifically, Black identified such apparent ‘inconsistencies’ and could explain them by having recourse to Aramaic.<sup>211</sup>

Finally, Williams investigates agreements between Codex Bezae and the Old Latin and Syriac as a crucial task of textual criticism.<sup>212</sup> He discusses ‘Syro-Western’ agreements—between ‘Western’ (like Codex Bezae or the Old Latin) and ‘Eastern’ witnesses (like Syriac)—in Mark and Luke. He suggests that the agreements with Syriac are non-genetic because of the existence of (too) many non-agreements,<sup>213</sup> and that the agreements are the results of a Syriac translation technique.

## V. 2. Latin

Because of the bilingual character of Codex Bezae, the study of the Latin influences on the Greek column of Codex Bezae has generated a sizeable body of scholarly interest.

Harris was the first to conclude that the two texts D.05 and d5 have independent origins<sup>214</sup> but it appears that the structurally bilingual state of the codex underwent further retro-influences (‘action and re-action’ in Harris’ words), including scribal activity to obtain ‘verbal equality of Greek and Latin’ for the sake of correspondence, thereby explaining ‘additions’ of words in Codex Bezae.<sup>215</sup> Grammatical ‘mistakes’ in Greek (e.g. use of *genitives* with verbs requiring the *accusative* or the other way round), verbal tense differences (e.g. *aorist* where other manuscripts have *imperfect*), compound verbs instead of simple, or lexical variations are quoted and explained as Latinisms. Although it is relatively old research, Harris’ conclusions are still interesting in terms of linguistic influences and their consequences. ‘In any case, if one or two such [Latinizing] readings

---

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>211</sup> Black distinguishes Mt. 2.23, 7.6, 12.33 and Q passages Mt 6.11//Lk 11.3, Mt 8.22//Lk 9.60, or from the triple tradition (Mk 4.12//Mt 13.13//Lk 8.10, Mk 6.8,9//Mt 10.10//Lk 9.3) which he qualifies ‘misinterpretations of Aramaic’ and Mt 10.42, 12.19, 16.16, 11.20, 20.21, 23.16, Mt 24.51//Lk 12.46, Mt 23.13//Lk 11.52, Mk 2.21//Mt 9.16//Lk 5.36. He claims Aramaic to be the cause for textual variants (BLACK, *Aramaic Approach*, 186–270).

<sup>212</sup> P.J. WILLIAMS, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (TS3/3; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004).

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.*, 307–10.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>215</sup> His chapter VIII gives reasons of modification of the Latin or Greek columns by targeting word number correspondence in 8 instances in Mt D: 5.12; 11.28; 15.32; 17.2; 20.11; 25.25,34,41 (cf. *ibid.*, 53–61).

occur, that is no reason for despising the rest of the manuscript,' noting that 'Latinising' Greek words<sup>216</sup> are 'natural accidents of the case' [in a bilingual codex]. This point is quite important since the alleged 'bad Greek' of Codex Bezae may occasionally be due to later corruptions that should not hide the consistency of the manuscript itself. Nevertheless, although the study of influences and retro-influences between the Greek and the Latin pages has allowed verbal criticism of the Bezan text, Latinisation of the Codex is widely disputed with most scholars agreeing on Greek precedence.<sup>217</sup> In this respect, most of Harris' conclusions on the Gallican origins of Codex Bezae have been rejected for a long time now, but his 18<sup>th</sup> c. introduction on the Latin influences paved the way in attempting to explain the 'inconsistencies' of the MS.

Auwers analyses the Latin pages of Bezan Matthew and shows that while each Gospel reveals a different way of translating the Latin from the Greek, which points to their independence, there is however a 'mono-directional influence,' i.e. from one manuscript to the other but not the other way round. By confirming that Mt D.05 shows striking agreements with the European Old Latin pre-Vulgate codices Bobbiensis *k* and/or Palatinus *e* only, he suggests that the Latin page is an 'incomplete revision of Latin translations originating from multiple sources.'<sup>218</sup> Further research is needed on the provenance of the Latin pages and its agreement with the Greek.

Ammassari published a modern edition of the Latin pages of Codex Bezae in Matthew,<sup>219</sup> along with the companion volumes including the other Gospels. It presents the text and exegetical discussions of the Gospel, but the presence of many inconsistencies and errors prevents one from taking this book as a reference source.

Parker draws on the consideration of orthographical variants and distribution across the manuscript to conclude it was produced in a Latin Law school.<sup>220</sup>

By comparing both Greek and Latin pages of the Bezan text of Acts with the Alexandrian text, Rius-Camps suggests that it is the Latin page that harmonises with the Alexandrian text, rather than d5 being a direct translation from the Greek. He further argues that the Latin text was more subject to corrections because of its vivid use in the 4<sup>th</sup> c. as opposed to the Greek part which was no longer understood and as a result, kept in its more original form.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>216</sup> Harris quotes *λεπρώσος* for *leprosus* instead of *λεπρώς*, *φλαγγελλώσας* for *flaggelatum* instead of *φραγελλώσας* and *Σαμαριτανών* for *Samaritorum* instead of *Σαμαριτῶν* (*ibid.*, *Codex Bezae*, 46). Other cases have been identified even earlier with Mill's work: Latinised Greek forms of Ἡρώδους, Ἰωάννου, Mt 5.24, *offeres προσφερεῖς*, 3.16 *καταβαίνοντα* for *descendentem*, 11.22,24, *ἦν ὑμεῖν* for *quae vobis* instead of *ἦ ὑμεῖν*, 15.18,20 *ἐκεῖνα κοινώνει*). See J. MILL, *H Kainē Diathēkē, Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum lectionibus variantibus manuscriptis. Exemplarium, Versionem, Editionum, SS. Patrum et Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, et in easdem notis* (Studio et Labore Joannis Millii, S.T.P. Oxonii, e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1707) civ.

<sup>217</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 186.

<sup>218</sup> AUWERS, 'Le texte latin des Évangiles,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 183–216 [195,216].

<sup>219</sup> A. AMMASSARI, *Il Vangelo di Matteo nella colonna latina del Bezae codex Cantabrigiensis: note di commento sulla struttura letteraria, le punteggiature, le lezioni e le citazioni bibliche* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996).

<sup>220</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 272.

<sup>221</sup> J. RIUS-CAMPS, 'Le substrat de la version latine,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 271–295 [294].

Further to the consideration of the bilingual interactions in Codex Bezae, Jordaan specifically reviewed the word order differences between the two columns in Beza Luke and concluded that each page originates from a different archetype and that Latin word order was mostly assimilated to the one in Greek.<sup>222</sup> His preliminary work will be scrutinised further in chapter 2 of the present work.

Beyond Codex Bezae, Matthew was studied by McNamara in the 6<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> c. Latin Codex Ambrosianus I 61 from the point of view of non-vulgate readings.<sup>223</sup>

### V. 3. Coptic

Lastly, because of the often agreements between Codex Bezae and the early Coptic versions, a brief account on the status of scholarship of Matthew in this(es) language(s) can be proven interesting.

As one of the other early versional languages, Coptic<sup>224</sup> is of major interest for its use in our understanding of the liturgy in Egypt at the beginning of Christianity (4<sup>th</sup> c.).<sup>225</sup> The Coptic Codex Glazier G<sup>67</sup> text of Acts (1.1–15.3)<sup>226</sup> has been particularly scrutinised because of its frequent agreement with Codex Bezae.<sup>227</sup> Works on Coptic Matthew are mostly limited to the study of Codex Schøyen<sup>228</sup> (manuscript 2650; containing

---

<sup>222</sup> G.J.C. JORDAAN, 'The Word-Order Differences between the Greek and the Latin Text in Codex Bezae,' in J.H. PETZER and P.J. HARTIN (eds), *A South African Perspective on the New Testament. Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger During His Visit to South Africa in 1985* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986) 99–111.

<sup>223</sup> M. MCNAMARA, 'Non-Vulgate Readings of Codex Ambrosianus I 61 sup. The Gospel of Matthew,' in R. GRAYSON, *Philologia Sacra*, 177–92.

<sup>224</sup> This section will include the key main dialects of Coptic, i.e., Bohairic and Sahidic. Middle-Egyptian is usually understood as a Coptic dialect (NA<sup>28</sup>, *Introduction*, 73\*). Middle-Egyptian is in actual facts a precursor to Coptic but because of the widely spread inclusion as a Coptic language, this section will follow this habit. See J.P. ALLEN, *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 1.

<sup>225</sup> C. ASKELAND, 'The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,' in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 201–29.

<sup>226</sup> H.-M. SCHENKE, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)* (TUGAL 127; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981; reprinted MSC.CP 2; Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2001); *ibid.*, *Apostelgeschichte 1,1-15,3 im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen Codex Glazier* (TUGAL 137; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991); E.J. EPP, 'Coptic Manuscript G67 and the Role of Codex Bezae as a Western Witness in Acts,' in *ibid.*, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays, 1962-2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2005) 15–39; H.-M. SCHENKE, 'Codex Glazier – ein koptischer Zeuge des "westlichen" Actatextes,' in R. SCHENKE, G.SCHENKE and U.L. GESA-PLISCH, *Der Same Seths. Kleine Schriften zu Gnosis, Koptologie und Neuem Testament* (NHMS 78; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2012) 846–53.

<sup>227</sup> EPP, *Theological Tendency*, 11; RIUS-CAMPS–READ–HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae*, vol. 1, 7.

<sup>228</sup> A. SHISHA-HALEVY, 'Middle Egyptian Gleanings: Grammatical Notes on the "Middle Egyptian" Text of Matthew,' in *Chronique d'Égypte* 58 (1983) 311–29; U.-K. PLISCH, 'Die Perikopen über Johannes den Täufer in der neuentdeckten mittelägyptischen Version des Matthäus-Evangeliums (Codex Schøyen),' *NovT* 43 (2001) 368–92; M.E. BOISMARD, 'Étude sur le papyrus copte de l'Évangile de Matthieu provenant de la collection Schøyen,' *RB* 110 (2003) 387–98; *ibid.*, *L'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après le papyrus copte de la collection Shøyen: analyse littéraire* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2003); T. BAARDA, 'Mt 17:1-9 in Codex Schøyen,' *NovT* 46 (2004) 265–87; N. BOSSON, 'Le Codex Schøyen (Évangile de Matthieu). Études pour servir à l'identification d'un nouveau dialecte de Moyenne-Égypte,' in L.P. PAINCHAUD and P.-H. POIRIER (eds), *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica. Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk* (BCNH.E 7; Québec: Les Presses de

Mt 5.38–end) and Codex Bodmer XIX (Mt 14.28–end) due to substantial portions of the First Gospel.

The textual affinity between Coptic (specifically Sahidic and Bohairic) and Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus with some ‘Western’ readings is a well-known feature.<sup>229</sup> At the end of his dissertation, Holmes conducted a study on Coptic Codex Schøyen in Matthew but confessed that the lack of solid evidence prevents conclusions about its similarity with any of the ‘Western’ or Byzantine text-types and considers it a ‘mixed text.’<sup>230</sup> Lastly, other fragments containing Matthew in Coptic were identified but are not analysed against Codex Bezae.<sup>231</sup> The topic deserves further research because it still remains unexplained why readings in Coptic agree with Codex Bezae.

#### V. 4. Singular or Near-Singular Readings in Mt D.05 with Versional Support

To complete the picture of the closeness of Codex Bezae with early versions, the striking support of Syriac, Coptic and Latin with Codex Bezae can be summarised in chart-form. Matthew bears fewer singular or sub-singular readings<sup>232</sup> listed in the apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. From the critical apparatus, I have counted 32 such readings,<sup>233</sup> which can be broken down into singular Bezan *vll*, readings that agree with the *Vetus Latina*, readings that agree with Syriac manuscripts, or readings that agree with one or two other non-‘Western’ manuscripts, as we can see from the grid below.

Witnesses	D.05 alone	D.05 +1-2 MSS
Singular readings (D) <sup>234</sup>	75	47

l’Université Laval; Louvain/Paris: Editions Peeters, 2006) 19-79; T. BAARDA, ‘The Reading “Who Wished to Enter” in Coptic Tradition, Mt 23:13, Lk 11:52 and Thomas 39,’ *NTS* 52 (2006) 583–91; *Ibid.*, “...Thereafter He Shut the Door”: Matthew 25.10c in the “Schøyen Codex” – A Short Note,’ *NTS* 54 (2008) 275–81; H.-M. SCHENKE, ‘Ein anderes Matthäusevangelium im Dialekt M. Bemerkungen zum Codex Schøyen,’ in SCHENKE–SCHENKE–PLISCH (eds), *Der Same Seths*, 942-52. More recently, a Ph.D. dissertation by J.M. Leonard investigates further the text of Matthew in Coptic in a particular passage (J.M. LEONARD, ‘Codex Schøyen as an Alternative Gospel of Matthew: A Consideration of Schenke’s Retroversion of Mt 12:2–14’ [unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; University of Cambridge, 2007]).

<sup>229</sup> METZGER, *The Early Versions of The New Testament*, 99–152; *ibid.*, ‘An Early Coptic Manuscript of the Gospel according to Matthew,’ in J.K. ELLIOTT (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976) 93–104 [99,100]; AMPHOUX, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament*, 113-4.

<sup>230</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 284–310 [288].

<sup>231</sup> C.W. HEDRICK, ‘An Unpublished Coptic Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew,’ *JCS* 3 (2001) 149–51.

<sup>232</sup> By definition, singular and sub-singular Bezan readings are found in one or two other manuscripts. These two words are ‘dangerous’ as Elliott says since the ‘vast majority of their manuscripts, especially minuscules have not been read in their entirety’ (ELLIOTT, ‘Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of Papyrus 45,’ in *ibid.*, *Thoroughgoing Principles*, 53–64 [55]).

<sup>233</sup> My calculation is based on the critical apparatus of NA<sup>27</sup>. A study would be nonetheless needed for all *truly* D-singular or sub-singular readings including those that are not included in NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>234</sup> Mt 2.3; 4.7; 5.20,25,40; 6.4; 9.22,28; 10.6,8,11,13,14,16,18,25,41; 11.5; 12.11,18, 21,36,40,44,50; 13.13,17, 40,48,49; 14.6,8,11,14x2,16,19,28; 15.11x3,14,22,30,32; 16.3,13,22; 17.1, 7; 18.9,12,16,21; 19.10,16,17,20; 20.10; 1.22; 22.24; 23.10,27,32; 24.19,30; 25.17,28; 26.1,55,60 x3; 27.51; 28.18.

Witnesses	D.05 alone	D.05 +1-2 MSS
Singular readings (D*) <sup>235</sup>	9	1
D+Latin	51	29
D+Syriac	8	5
D+Coptic	4	10
D+Latin+Syriac	34	17
D+Latin+Coptic	15	13
D+Syriac+Coptic	3	4
D+Latin+Syriac+Coptic	14	23

Table 2: Near-Singular Agreements in Mt D.05 with Versional Support

The first column describes the singular agreements and agreements between Mt D.05 and versions (Latin, Syriac or Coptic) excluding any other support. The second counts near-singular readings (one to two manuscripts support) and ‘near versional support,’ i.e. where Mt D.05 agrees with one or more versions among the three versional languages along with 1-2 manuscripts. While 80 ‘pure agreements’ with the Latin are quite unsurprising, and even gave rise to the misnomer ‘Western’ text type, early versional support in Syriac and Coptic confirm the traces of a ‘Western’ archetype in Syria and Egypt before its migration to Gaul in the form of Codex Bezae. It should nevertheless be noted that the numbers mentioned in the table above do not count all the agreements where there is no variant readings. This means that agreements sound to be counted only when the Bezan reading differs from the text printed in the Nestle-Aland. In addition, there may well be further agreements between D.05 and early versions not recorded in NA<sup>28</sup>.

Now that this scholarly works have been presented, I will turn to the study of the Greek text of Matthew in Codex Bezae as delineated in chapter 1, beginning with a study of the nature of the variant readings found in Codex Bezae in comparison to Codex Vaticanus, which will help to give a solid ground on which to look at the issue of harmonisation.

---

<sup>235</sup> Mt 2.16; 5.36; 6.18; 11.3; 12.20,47; 15.32; 16.16; 18.14.



## Chapter 3

### LINGUISTIC CONSIDERATIONS ON THE VARIANT READINGS BETWEEN CODEX BEZAE AND CODEX VATICANUS IN THE GREEK TEXT OF MATTHEW

Because of the fluctuating state of Koine Greek, variant readings may appear in different states, one of which will be understood as ‘correct’ by classical standards, while others will be described as ‘bad’ Greek because of its rare use. In order to evaluate or at least segregate variant readings reflecting the evolving character of Koine Greek in the first centuries, I have chosen the chief representatives of the ‘Western’ and Alexandrian texts, namely Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus respectively, for this analysis because they differ by definition the most between all text-types.<sup>1</sup>

Because of the evolving character of Greek in the first centuries, the status of the language will be introduced first (section I). Variant readings between the two manuscripts in Matthew will be ordered according to orthographical (including nonsense readings), lexical and grammatical differences, corresponding to the usual term of ‘substitution,’ the latter implicitly leaving the impression that the Bezan form is naturally secondary (section II).<sup>2</sup> Section III will list the words that are present in Bezan Matthew as opposed to Codex Vaticanus and *vice versa*. The last category of variants, the one involving word order, will be far more detailed (section IV), because of its rare treatment in the field of textual criticism, drawing on recent research in discourse analysis as a tool for the field.

It will be seen that there is a number of variant readings between the two manuscripts that arise because of the changes in Greek that took place over time. These are rightly considered to be insignificant for the meaning or purpose of a text, and they can be discarded when discussing the contribution of variant readings to meaning. In the following sections, they will be principally found in Section I and II.1, although some possible exceptions will be pointed out. From section II.2 onwards, the potential contribution of the variant meaning is much greater, as will be seen.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 2 I.

<sup>2</sup> E.J. EPP, ‘Toward the Clarification of the Term “Textual Variant”,’ in J.K. ELLIOTT (ed.), *Studies in the New Testament Language and Text* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976) 153–73.

## I. The Flexibility of Koine Greek

### I. 1. Introduction to Koine Greek<sup>3</sup>

The language used in the New Testament is usually referred to as the Koine form of Greek or post-classical Greek,<sup>4</sup> and was widely spoken during the transitional period of 300 BCE to the 6<sup>th</sup> c. CE, more precisely, from Alexander the Great to Justinian (335 BCE-565 CE).<sup>5</sup> It follows the classical Attic and precedes the Modern Greek language. Hellenistic Greek is an (artificial) sub-division of post-classical Greek (300 BCE-300 CE) and Koine Greek can be considered as Late Hellenistic,<sup>6</sup> which overlaps with the Greek of the New Testament. The transitional nature of the development of Greek in the first centuries inevitably affected early Christian writers and may well have influenced scribes in the copying activity of the New Testament, whether in terms of pronunciation, grammar or vocabulary.

Textual critics usually discard them as theologically ‘insignificant’ because of their absence of impact on the understanding of the initial text of the New Testament, however there is no specific way of identifying them objectively, the reasons for which they will be studied in this section.

### I. 2. Atticistic Forms

Atticism as a literary movement within the Greek Empire started around the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC and was aimed at differentiating it from spoken Greek.<sup>7</sup> Caragounis sees for Atticism not an only cultural but a political origin.<sup>8</sup> The impact of textual criticism is that a variant reading involving a Koine word and an Atticistic one would be seen as a deliberate stylis-

---

<sup>3</sup> General reference books on Koine Greek can be referred to, esp. D.B. WALLACE, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996); H. KÖSTER, *Introduction to the New Testament. History and Literature of Early Christianity*, vol. 2 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000); C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006); A.F. CHRISTIDIS, *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> CARAGOUNIS, *ibid.*, 5; WALLACE, *Greek Grammar*, 15.

<sup>5</sup> CARAGOUNIS, *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 39-41.

<sup>7</sup> H. KÖSTER, *Introduction to the New Testament. History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*, Vol. 1 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995) 104-14; J. WISSE, ‘Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism,’ in G. NAGY (ed.), *Greek Literature in the Roman Period and in Late Antiquity Greek Literature* (London: Routledge, 2001) 65-82; S.A. ADAMS, ‘Atticism, Classicism, and Luke-Acts: Discussions with Albert Wifstrand and Loveday Alexander,’ in S.E. PORTER and A.W. PITTS (eds), *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History, and Development* (LingBS 6; ECIHC 3; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013) 91-111 [93].

<sup>8</sup> ‘Atticism [...] was a multifaceted movement with a cultural and linguistic agenda sometimes undergirded by politically inspired motivation directed at what was perceived to be the disastrous effects of Roman power. Recovering from the initial shock of the Roman occupation, and realizing the cultural and linguistic inferiority of the Romans, the upholders of the Atticist movement concentrated on the most representative and glorious period of Greek history – the Mycenaean age being too far away and too unreal. Since military action was out of question all other means available were used to assert Greek independence and superiority: culture, sciences, language, and art’ (CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 121)

tic alteration of an original form and would be classified as secondary. After Kilpatrick's ground work on Atticistic forms in textual criticism,<sup>9</sup> Elliott notes:

‘If we accept the rule of thumb enunciated by Kilpatrick which says that the scribes were more likely to alter Koine Greek to Attic Greek than the reverse, then, whenever we are confronted with variations in the MS. tradition between an Atticism and a non-Atticism, we will accept as original the non-Attic reading, other things being equal.’<sup>10</sup>

Fee puts any general comment into perspective:

‘All of this does not exclude Atticism as a possible cause of corruption. But it is only a possible cause, and in all of these cases not the most probable one.’<sup>11</sup>

This principle of selecting the less Atticistic form between two variant readings can mislead text critical conclusions. Indeed, I found that there is one example in Bezan Matthew where this principle is verified and one where it is invalidated: on the one hand, all manuscripts have, in Mt 15.14, the Koine Greek *βόθυνος*, *pit*, except Codex Bezae (and *f*<sup>1</sup>) which reads the Attic form *βόθρος* and is therefore understood as a choice made by the Bezan scribe *ergo* it should be considered as secondary.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, a few chapters earlier (Mt 12.11) Codex Bezae (as well as the entire textual tradition) reads the Atticistic form *βόθυνος*. Actually, both forms do coexist as their occurrence in the Jewish Scriptures shows, although *βόθρος* appears to be more widely used (22 times)<sup>13</sup> than its synonym *βόθυνος* (9 times).<sup>14</sup>

### I. 3. Unusual Forms

There are other variant readings between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae in Matthew that reflect the flexibility of Koine Greek. Bezan Matthew shows the confusion evidenced in the first centuries of weak aorist endings in thematic verbs where the ending *-o-* is gradually displaced:<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> G.D. KILPATRICK, ‘Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament,’ in J. BLINZER, O. KUSS and F. MUSSNER (eds.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1963) 125–37.

<sup>10</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Moeris and the Textual Tradition of the Greek New Testament,’ in *ibid.* (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976) 144–52 [145].

<sup>11</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?’, in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 136.

<sup>12</sup> See ‘*βόθρος ἀπτιχόν· βόθρος κοινόν*’ (Moeris in BDAG, s.v. *βόθρος*) and HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 183.

<sup>13</sup> Jos. 8.29, 1 Sam. 13.6, Ps. 7.16; 56.7; 93.13, Prov. 22.14; 26.27, Eccl. 10.8, Sir. 12.16; 21.10; 27.26; Amos 9.7; Zech. 3.9; Ezek. 26.20; 31.14; 32.18.21–22.24.29–30. Interestingly, the phrase *εἰς βόθρον* appears nine times in Ezek. 31–32LXX (equivalent of the Hebrew בור).

<sup>14</sup> 2 Sam. 18.17, 2 Ki. 3.16, Isa. 24.17–18; 47.11; 51.1, Jer. 31.28.43–44.

<sup>15</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, 214.

CHAPTER 3

D.05	B.03	Ref.
ἔβαλαν	ἔβαλον	13.48
εἶπαν	εἶπον	21.27; 27.21 <sup>16</sup>
ἔκραζαν	ἔκραζον	27.23
ἐξέβαλαν	ἐξέβαλον	21.39
εὔραν	εὔρον	22.10
ἦλθαμεν	ἦλθομεν	25.39
προσῆλθον	προσῆλθαν	5.1 ; 9.28 ; 13.36 ; 14.15

Similarly, strong aorist endings in ε from the 3<sup>rd</sup> p.sg. contaminated the ones in other persons where α is expected.<sup>17</sup> This feature is further evidenced in Mt D.05:

D.05	B.03	Ref.
ἀπεκάλυψες	ἀπεκάλυψας	11.26
ἀφήκατε	ἀφήκατε	23.23
ἐγείρατε	ἐγείρατε	10.8
ἐκέρδησες	ἐκέρδησας	18.5
ἐλθάτω	ἐλθέτω	6.10
ἐπληρώσατε	πληρώσατε	23.32
ἔσπειρες	ἔσπειρας	13.27
παρέδωκες	παρέδωκας	25.22

Finally, rare but possible alternative morphological forms can be found in Bezan Matthew:

D.05	B.03	Ref.
ἄλα	ἄλας	5.13
ἠδυνήθημεν	ἐδυνήθημεν	17.19 <sup>18</sup>
ἠύνουχίσθησαν	εύνουχίσθησαν	19.12
θαρρεῖτε	θαρσεῖτε	14.27 <sup>19</sup>
κλείς	κλειῖδας	16.19
ῥεριμμένοι	ἐριμμένοι	9.36 <sup>20</sup>
ἐστήκει	εἰστήκει	13.2 <sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, the form εἶπαν is overwhelmingly found in Bezan Matthew against εἶπον but the reverse happens as well: εἶπον D]εἶπαν B: Mt 2.5; 9.3; 12.2; 13.10; 16.14; 25.8; 27.49.

<sup>17</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 215.

<sup>18</sup> Mt 17.19D.05 is the form printed in the NA<sup>28</sup> contra B.03. Specifically, both forms of the aorist of δύναμαι can be found in NA<sup>28</sup>: ἠ- in Mt 17.16;19, Mk 4.33; 6.19;7.24; 9.28; 14.5; Lk 8.19; 9.40; 19.3, Jn 9.33, 12.39, Acts 13.38, 1 Co 3.1, Heb 3.19 for Mt 17.16, ἐ- in Mt 22.46; 26.9, Mk 5.3; 6.5; Lk 1.22, Jn 11.37, Acts 26.32, 1 Co 3.2, Heb 11.34, Rev 5.3; 7.9; 14.3; 15.8 for Mt 22.46 (MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 188).

<sup>19</sup> Both forms exists in early writings. It was speculated that ‘θάρσει, θαρσεῖτε, ‘cheer up,’ was a favourite phrase in Ionic: if that were so [...] we could understand how the rest of the verb came from θαρσεῖν, while the imperative phrase lived only in the ρσ form.’ (MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 104)

<sup>20</sup> For the analogical reduplication of the initial ρ for the particle perfect passive of ῥίπτω, see MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 192.

While Mt D.05 contains forms that are not impossible, this fact raises at least the question of the form found in the exemplar and, if different from the Bezan form, the reason why the scribe would have changed it into an alternative form which is neither a synonym nor a different word. The other form found in Codex Vaticanus attests a more common morphology that could well reflect a correction.

Now that alternative forms that developed historically have been presented, I will now turn in detail to the orthographical, lexical and grammatical differences in Matthew in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus.

## II. Orthographical, Lexical and Grammatical Differences

The present section will describe the differences in words between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 as long as they appear differently. This type of difference is typically classified as a ‘substitution’ but this term may imply that one manuscript is superior to the other and that Codex Bezae would have ‘changed’ the word in some way, either into another word, or with regard to its orthography, or its grammatical status (e.g. tense, case).

### II. 1. Orthographical Differences

When the early Greek manuscripts of the first few centuries CE were being written, the language was still evolving and the orthography was far from being standardised. To illustrate this fact, one may refer to the inscription concerning Jewish seats in the Theatre at Miletus stating ‘Τόπος Εἰουδέων τῶν καὶ Θεοσεβίων,’ i.e. ‘Place of the Jews, who also are called God-fearing,’ inscription that involve a relatively free spelling of relatively common Greek words (εἰουδέων vs ἰουδέων, θεοσεβίον vs θεοσεβίων).<sup>22</sup> Such differences would typically be called ‘spelling mistakes’ to judge by classical standards.

There are 668 variant readings (corresponding to 435 forms) in the Bezan text of Matthew involving orthography when compared to Codex Vaticanus, which will be listed in the following sections II. 1. 1 to II. 1. 3.

#### II. 1. 1. Itacisms or Iotacisms

With regard to orthographic variance, strictly speaking *iotacism* is a tendency to pronounce certain vowels or diphthongs (η, υ, ει, ηι, οι, υι) as a *iota* and as a consequence they tend to be spelt in manuscripts either ι or ει. *Itacism* is the similar process for the sound *eta* (η).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> On the pluperfect of ἴσθημι with different augments, see MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 188, 190.

<sup>22</sup> C.-B. AMPHOUX *et al.*, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014) 219-30.

<sup>23</sup> L. VAGANAY and C.-B. AMPHOUX, *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1986) 56. Scholars broaden the concept of itacism to all ‘inconsistencies of spelling involving vowels’ (J. GREENLEE, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* [2<sup>nd</sup> edn.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995] 57). Other confusions include αι/ε, ε/ει, ε/η, ε/ον, ω/ο, ι/α, η/ει, η/ει/ι/υ/ε etc.

Codex Bezae and other early NT majuscules are known for their number of itacistic forms.<sup>24</sup> In a major contribution to the understanding of the Greek language in Codex Bezae, Yoder<sup>25</sup> examined this tendency, assuming however that the ‘correct’ spelling is the one which is found in Codex Vaticanus. Prominent cases of orthographic differences are a phenomenon falling under this first category of itacisms.

Codex Vaticanus is understood by scholars to have fewer cases of itacisms, thereby showing that ‘the scribe was a very careful and capable scribe’<sup>26</sup> which has often led to the conclusion that the greater number of such inconsistencies in Codex Bezae points to a less capable scribe.<sup>27</sup> However, one could also argue that the lack of scribal activity in D.05 reveals the deliberate absence of ‘correction’ (also known as *diorthosis*<sup>28</sup>) and reflects the earlier form of the text. Itacisms and other orthographic differences have been studied in individual manuscripts and books of the NT,<sup>29</sup> and specifically in Matthew,<sup>30</sup> but they are not compared with the patterns displayed in other manuscripts and the result may lead to general conclusions on scribal habits in Codex Bezae, without comparison with other manuscripts of the same period.

To illustrate the topic, I have listed in Appendix 2 all itacistic differences between Mt B.03 and Mt D.05. Both texts exhibit tendencies towards the fuller form ‘ει,’ as opposed to the usual dictionary form in ‘ι’. In 45 occurrences (41 forms), Mt D.05 reads a ‘ι’-form as opposed to the usual dictionary form in ‘ει’ read in Mt B.03. Conversely, in 59 occurrences (19 forms), it is Mt B.03 which reads the fuller form as opposed to Codex Bezae, where Mt B.03 has the longer form rather than the dictionary form. Finally, the 109 occurrences of fuller forms (‘ει’) in both Mt D.05 and B.03, where the dictionary form is in ‘ι,’ show that itacism was a natural scribal habit, although it is more pronounced in Codex Bezae (in 302 occurrences, Mt D.05 would still read ει) in comparison with Codex Vaticanus.

The table below summarises these findings:

---

All cases are detailed at length in MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 65–89. The present work will use the word ‘itacism’ for all these cases.

<sup>24</sup> J.D. YODER, ‘The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis’ (Ph.D. dissertation; University of Princeton, NJ, 1958) 343.

<sup>25</sup> YODER, ‘Language,’ 27–43.

<sup>26</sup> HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 126 n.12.

<sup>27</sup> ‘Its spelling and accuracy [are] lamentable’ according to 17<sup>th</sup> c. scholar Bentley (collator of Codex Bezae), as quoted in PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 1.

<sup>28</sup> R.B. STEWART, *The Reliability of the New Testament. Bart D. Ehrman & Daniel B. Wallace in Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011) 198 n. 59. M.W. HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 123–60 [144].

<sup>29</sup> Á. URBÁN, ‘Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis [D]: intercambios vocálicos en el texto griego de Lucas y Hechos,’ *CCO* 3 (2006) 269–316; J. VOELZ, ‘The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek,’ *NovT* 47 (2005) 209–49. PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 107–11.

<sup>30</sup> URBAN, ‘Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis [D]: intercambios vocálicos en el texto griego de Mateo,’ *CCO* 5 (2008) 325–360.

	Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 have εἰ	Mt D.05 has εἰ <i>contra</i> Mt B.03	Mt D.05 has ι <i>contra</i> Mt B.03
Dictionary form in εἰ	n/a	6 occ. (5 forms)	45 occ. (41 forms)
Dictionary form in ι	103 occ. (66 forms)	298 occ. (155 forms)	59 occ. (19 forms)

Table 3: Distribution of Itacistic Forms in Mt D.05 and Mt B.03

Finally, it should be borne in mind that the presence of itacistic forms in Bezan Matthew is not necessarily due to the scribal habit of the copyist but may indicate that the exemplar itself had such forms and that the scribe carefully transmitted the text.<sup>31</sup>

Beyond εἰ/ι alternations, there are other itacistic forms that result in a difference in meaning: the first and second person plural pronouns (ἡμῶν/ὕμειν and derivatives) are a prime case; furthermore, the indicative future –σει sounds like the subjunctive present –ση. It is noteworthy that both phenomena occur in both Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus and that there is no particular bias in either of them, as the following list of occurrences in Matthew illustrates:

- Apparent difference in persons

D.05	B.03	References
ἡμῶν	ὕμῶν	6.25; 21.42
ὕμειν	ἡμῖν	25.8 <sup>32</sup>

- Apparent difference subjunctive present in D.05/indicative future in B.03

D.05	B.03	References
διαρπάση	διαρπάσει	12.29
ἀπαρνήση	ἀπαρνήσει	26.35

- Apparent difference indicative future in D.05/subjunctive present in B.03

D.05	B.03	References
λύσει	λύση	5.19
βληθήσει	βληθήση	5.25
ἀπολέσει	ἀπολέση	16.25
ἀρκέσει	ἀρκέση	25.9

There are further spelling differences between the two manuscripts in Matthew, which will now be examined.

<sup>31</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 107–11.

<sup>32</sup> While Mt 25.8D.05 seems clearly to be a mistake, Mt 21.42 is less obvious. It is possible that this latter verse uses the wording of Ps 117.23LXX (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν) and the Masoretic text (118.23 בעינינו) but adapted the Psalm to the audience and deliberately changed ‘our eyes’ into ‘your eyes.’

## II. 1. 2. Assimilation of Consonants

The phenomenon of conversion of the consonants  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\chi$  into the letter  $\nu$  before  $\lambda$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\chi$  as well as the substitution of /s/ with /z/ ( $\sigma\mu$ - and  $\sigma\beta$ - by  $\zeta\mu$ - and  $\zeta\beta$ -). Assimilation was common in Koine Greek.<sup>33</sup> I have catalogued the 12 different types of assimilation in Mt D.05 where the manuscript shows affinity with *non-assimilation* compared to the impeccable regularity of Codex Vaticanus. In this section the Bezan form will be mentioned first, along with the corresponding one in Codex Vaticanus and its reference in Matthew. If both forms are the same but not having the more regular form, the word will be specified once only.

- $\nu\pi$ - $\mu\pi$

The combination  $\mu\pi$  is spelt  $\nu\pi$  with a high consistency in Mt D.05 except the solitary instance of Mt 22.5D.05 where  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  is spelt with  $\mu\pi$ , perhaps a less common word that required a higher level of attention from the copyist or else was generally known in his culture with the older spelling. Conversely, the common word  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\omicron\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$  is systematically spelt  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\omicron\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$  in Mt D.05, i.e. in its non-assimilated form. The cases where Mt D.05 differs from Codex Vaticanus are as follows:

D.05	B.03	References
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\omicron\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\omicron\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$	5.16, 5.24, 6.1, 6.2, 10.32, 10.33 x2, 11.10, 11.26, 17.2, 18.14, 23.13, 25.32, 26.70, 27.29
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$	12.11
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$	13.45
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\iota$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\iota$	20.19
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\tau\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\tau\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$	27.30
$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$	$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$	27.41

- $\nu\mu$ - $\mu\mu$

The only non-assimilated form  $\nu\mu$ - $\mu\mu$  appears in the name Emmanuel ( $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\mu\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$ ]  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$ , Mt 1.23D.05) which will be discussed in the section dedicated to proper nouns, II. 1. 4).

- $\nu\chi$ - $\gamma\chi$

The combination  $\gamma\chi$  is spelt  $\nu\chi$  in Bezan Matthew except in Mt 14.14 where  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$  has the assimilated spelling:

D.05	B.03	References
$\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$	$\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$	9.36
$\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta$	-	14.14
$\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$	$\sigma\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$	15.32

<sup>33</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 104-6



σπλαγχμισθείς σπλαγγισθείς 18.27, 20.34

- νβ–μβ

The combination μβ is regularly spelt νβ in Bezan Matthew except in the case of the verb λαμβάνω (and derivatives), a verb which systematically exhibits the assimilated spelling (Mt 4.5,8; 12.45; 17.1; παραλαμβάνει, 10.38 λαμβάνει, 13.20 λαμβάνων, 17.24 λαμβάνοντες, 17.25 λαμβάνουσιν, 24.40,41 x2 παραλαμβάνεται) and the rare verb in 22.24, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ('to marry as next of kin'). Other non-assimilations occur as follows in the two manuscripts in question:

D.05	B.03	References
ἐνβάντα	ἐμβάντα	13.2
ἐνβαίνει	ἐνέβη	15.39
ἐνβαπτόμενος	ἐμβάψας	26.23
ἐνβῆναι	ἐμβῆναι	14.22
ἐνβλέψας	ἐμβλέψας	19.26
συνβούλιον	συμβούλιον	12.14, 22.15, 27.1, 28.12

- νφ–μφ

Similarly, the combination μφ may appear erratically as μφ or νφ in Mt D.05 while Mt B.03 has systematically the dissimilated form:

D.05	B.03	References
νυμφίου	νυμφῶνος	9.15
νυμφίος	-	9.15; 25.10
νύμφην	-	10.35
νυμφίου	-	25.1,5
συνφέρει	συμφέρει	18.6, 19.10
συνφωνήσουσιν	συμφωνήσουσιν	18.19

- νξ–γξ

The unique form γξ has the assimilation in Bezan Matthew:

D.05	B.03	References
ἔλενξον	ἔλεγξον	18.15

- νγ–γγ

There are eight places in D.05 where γγ is spelt νγ, which is surprising as one may assume that such common words would be known to be spelt with assimilation by a scribe:

D.05	B.03	References
ἄγγελον	ἄγγελον	11.10
ἄγγελοι	ἄγγελοι	13.39

### CHAPTER 3

ἐγόνγυσαν	ἐγόγγυζον	20.11
ἐνγύς	ἐγγύς	24.32, 24.33, 26.18
ἠνγάρευσαν	ἠγγάρευσαν	27.32
ἦνγικεν	ἦγγικεν	3.2, 4.17
παρανγείλας	παραγγείλας	15.35
σπόνγον	σπόγγον	27.48

It is all the more surprising to find such occurrences when in most of the instances (38), Mt D.05 does assimilate νγ into γγ as in Codex Vaticanus. The list below will firstly show ἄγγελος and its derivatives, then other words.

ἄγγελος	-	1.24; 2.13,19; 28.2,5 (declined versions: 4.11; 18.10; 22.30; 24.36; 25.31 -οι; 4.6 -οις; 13.41; 24.31 -ους 16.27; 26.53 -ων)
ἀνήγγειλαν		28.11
ἐπαγγείλαται		2.8
ἀπαγγείλατε		11.4
ἀπαγγεῖλαι		28.8
ἀπαγγελλεῖ		12.18
ἀπήγγειλαν		14.12
εὐαγγέλιον		4.23 ; 9.35 ; 26.13
εὐαγγελίζονται		11.5
παραγγείλας		10.5
ἄγγια	-	13.48
ἀγγαρεύει	-	5.41
ἀγγείοις	-	25.3-4
ἐγγείζει	-	24.31
ἦγγικεν	-	10.7; 26.45,46
ἦγγισαν	-	21.1
ἦγγισεν	-	21.34
σάλπιγγος	-	24.31
φέγγος	-	24.29

The spelling νγ for γγ is usually considered the consequence of a Latin pronunciation,<sup>34</sup> but it could simply be the usual 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE spelling<sup>35</sup> including *in lento* articulation.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 108.

<sup>35</sup> Caragounis illustrated a possible carelessness with a letter dated 2<sup>nd</sup> century written on a papyrus evidencing that non-assimilation was possible (the author of the papyrus quoted his own name with a non-assimilated -γγ-: Ἀπτῶνις Λόνγος) even if it may well be considered as a pure mistake of a ἄνορθογράφος (CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 43, quoting A. DEISSMANN, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* [New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1922] 187-9).

<sup>36</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 105.

## CHAPTER 3

- νλ – λλ

The assimilation of νλ into λλ never happens in Mt D.05 in verbs prefixed by συν-:

D.05	B.03	References
συνλαβεῖν	συλλαβεῖν	26.55
συνλέξωμεν	συλλέξωμεν	13.28
συνλέγοντες	συλλέγοντες	13.29
συνλέξατε	συλλέξατε	13.30
συνλέγονται	συλλέγεται	13.40
συνλέξουσιν	συλλέξουσιν	13.41

- νκ–γκ

The digraphs νκ/γκ, Bezan Matthew has the nine times the assimilated spelling as opposed to twice the dissimilated one:

D.05	B.03	References
ἀνάγκη	-	18.7
ἄνκιστρον	ἄγκιστρον	17.27
ἐγκατέλιπες	ἐγκατέλιπες	27.46
ἠνάγκασεν	-	14.22
ἦνεγκεν	-	14.11
προσήνεγκα	-	17.16
προσήνεγκαν	-	2.11, 4.24, 14.35, 22.19
προσήνεγκεν	-	25.20

- κν–κμ

The rare form in κμ is spelt κν in the only occurrence (ἀκνήν, ‘even yet’) in Bezan Matthew (Mt 21.44 has λικμήσει, ‘will crush,’ but that verse is absent in Codex Bezae):

D.05	B.03	References
ἀκνήν	ἀκμήν	15.16

- χχ–κχ

There are two examples of possible assimilation of χχ into κχ. Once, Bezan Matthew assimilates (26.28) as does Codex Vaticanus and once, Mt D.05 does not assimilate contra Codex Vaticanus. Interestingly, the phenomenon appears with the same word (ἐκχέω):

D.05	B.03	References
ἐκχυννόμενον	-	26.28
ἐχχυννόμενον	ἐκχυννόμενον	23.35

- σβ-ζβ

Initial σβ- (or σμ-) is usually spelt with a *zeta* in Bezan Matthew (wherever σβ appears within a word, as in *πρεσβύτεροι*, the spelling is consistently σβ):

D.05	B.03	References
ζμύρναν	σμύρναν	2.11
ζβέσει	σβέσει	12.20
ζβέννυνται	σβέννυνται	25.8

Concerning assimilation, it thus emerges that the trend is the absence of consistency, which cannot be accounted for with certainty since it can be explained as reflecting either a careless writer or the absence of a recension.

### II. 1. 3. Other Orthographic Variants

Other orthographic differences,<sup>37</sup> i.e., metathesis of aspiration (spelling of θ as τ, φ as π, κ as χ), non-elision (i.e. plain form *ἀλλά* before a vowel instead of *ἀλλ'*), avoidance of hiatus through prodelision (i.e. elision of the initial vowel) and crasis (i.e. contraction in which two vowels or diphthongs merge into one new vowel or diphthong), will be described below. The case of proper nouns bearing such alternative spelling will be illustrated in section II. 1. 4).

#### II. 1. 3. 1. Metathesis of aspiration

Moulton details this class of alternative forms as an Ionic phenomenon that crept into Koine Greek.<sup>38</sup> There are a few examples in Mt with some variants found in Codex Bezae:

- θ – τ

D.05	B.03	References
καθ' ἰδίαν	κατ' ἰδίαν	14.23
κατ' ἰδίαν	καθ' ἰδίαν	24.3
μεθ' ὄρκου	μετὰ ὄρκου	26.72

- φ – π

D.05	B.03	References
σφυρίδα	σπυρίδας	16.10

<sup>37</sup> For a broader discussion on spelling in the first centuries see MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 61–3 and for Codex Bezae specifically, YODER, 'Language,' 27–99.

<sup>38</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 100.

•  $\kappa - \chi$ 

D.05	B.03	References
ῥαχά	ῥακά	5.22
ἐκθροί	ἐχθροί	10.36 <sup>39</sup>
ἐκθρός	ἐχθρός	13.25
ἐκθρούς	ἐχθρούς	22.44
οὐκ εὗρον	οὐχ εὗρον	26.60

•  $\gamma - \chi$ 

D.05	B.03	References
δίδραγμα	δίδράχμα	17.24

•  $\kappa\kappa - \kappa$ 

D.05	B.03	References
ῥάκκους	ῥάκους	9.16

As in the preceding section, no specific bias can be determined: metathesis of aspiration can go both ways. Finally, these few examples hide the fact that in all other instances Mt D.05 and B.03 have the same spelling.

## II. 1. 3. 2. Elision and Non-Elision

Elision may or may not appear specifically in the form ἀλλά – ἀλλ', whether in Mt B.03 or D.05:

D.05	B.03	References
ἀλλά ἐπί	ἀλλ' ἐπί	5.15
ἀλλά ἐποίησαν	ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν	17.12
ἀλλά ὡς	ἀλλ' ὡς	22.30
ἀλλ' οἱ	ἀλλά οἱ	9.12
ἀλλ' οἷς	-	20.23
ἀλλ' ὅς	-	20.26
ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων	ἀπ' ἀλλήλων	25.32
μεθ' ὄρκου	μετὰ ὄρκου	26.72
δὲ αὐτοί	δ' αὐτό	27.44

Everywhere else in Mt D.05 elision takes place in common with B.03. The phenomenon is therefore not systematic and no particular linguistic bias can be demonstrated.

---

<sup>39</sup> From these examples there seems to be some tendency for Codex Bezae to write ἐχθρός with a  $\kappa$ , except at 13.28, 39 where Mt D.05 has the more regular  $\chi$ .

## II. 1. 3. 3. Crasis

Crasis happens in both Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus but not consistently.

D.05	B.03	References
ἀπότε	ἀπὸ τότε	26.16
κἀγώ	καὶ ἐγώ	2.8;10.33;11.28;16.18;18.33;21.24
καὶ ἐγώ	κἀγώ	26.15
καὶ ἐκεῖ	κἀκεῖ	5.23
κἀκεῖνα	-	23.23
κἄν	-	26.35
κἀκεῖ	καὶ ἐκεῖ	10.11
κἀκεῖνοις	καὶ ἐκεῖνοις	20.4

From the above list, it appears that in four cases, crasis happens in Mt D.05, twice it does not where it does in B.03, and lastly, rarer crastic forms (e.g. ἀπότε) are read in Mt D.05.

In other instances, the absence of crasis is simply due to the absence of the linking preposition or the distant position of the words:

D.05	B.03	References
ἐκεῖνα (no καὶ)	κἀκεῖνα	15.18
καὶ...ἐάν	κἄν	21.21

In two places, an apparent confusion between κ and ξ is evidenced in ἐκ – ἐξ, which leads to a different meaning:

D.05	B.03	References
ἐκ οὔ	ἐξ σου	2.6
ἐξ οὔ	ἐκ σοῦ	21.19

In the latter example, ἐξ οὔ ('from which') as opposed to ἐκ σοῦ ('from you') may reflect either scribal distraction or simply the consequence of external dictation or 'dictée intérieure'<sup>40</sup> despite the resultant change in meaning. Interestingly, 2.6d5 and 21.19d5 both read *ex te* like the Alexandrian reading.

## II. 1. 4. The Case of Proper Nouns

The orthography of proper names in Bezan Matthew may at times vary in contrast to more consistent forms in Codex Vaticanus. The present section will list all the proper nouns that differ in their spelling at least once in Bezan Matthew. The first block ('Inconsistent Agreements') presents the Bezan form and that found in Codex Vaticanus. It will be noticed that the readings sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. The second group ('Purely Orthographical Differences') lists differences that are purely orthographic. The third block ('Other Differences') summarizes morphological changes (with the

<sup>40</sup> A. DAIN, *Les Manuscrits* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975) 22,44–6.

exception of references to different entities).<sup>41</sup> The names are in alphabetic order of the proper nouns in Greek, the first word being the Bezan reading, the second one, that of Codex Vaticanus. The reference of the Matthean verse in question appears in the third column.

If the spelling is identical in both manuscripts, the second column will be replaced by a dash indicating the same spelling.

- Inconsistent Agreements

D.05	B.03	References
Beelzebul		
Βελζεβουλ	Βεεζεβούλ <sup>42</sup>	10.25
Βεελζεβουλ	Βεεζεβούλ	12.24,27
Bethlehem		
Βεθλέεμ	Βηθλέεμ	2.8
Βηθλέαιμ	Βηθλέεμ	2.16
Βηθλέεμ	-	2.1,5,6
Bethany		
Βηθανείαν	Βηθανία	21.17
Βηθανία	-	26.6
(Mount of) Olives		
Ἐλεῶν	Ἐλαιῶν	24.3
Ἐλαιῶν	-	21.1; 26.30
Egypt		
Ἐγύπτου	Αἰγύπτου	2.15
Αἴγυπτον	-	2.13,14
Αἰγύπτῳ	-	2.19
Galilee		
Ἀγιλαιίας	Γαλιλαίας	27.55
Γαλιλαίας	Γαλιλαίας	2.22; 4.18; 15.29; 21.11
Γαλιλαίαν	Γαλιλαίαν	4.12; 26.32; 28.7,10,16
Γαλιλαίαν	Γαλιλαία	4.23 <sup>43</sup>
Γαλιλαίας	Γαλιλαία	4.15 <sup>44</sup>
Γαλιλαίας	-	4.25; 19.1
Γαλιλαία	-	17.22

<sup>41</sup> See section II. 2. 1.

<sup>42</sup> 'No explanation of this reading is suggested which would justify its originality: we must perhaps assume a kind of assimilation based on the abnormality of the combination λζ in Greek' (MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 105).

<sup>43</sup> Considered as identically declined in two different ways.

<sup>44</sup> The case in the phrase is different in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus.

### CHAPTER 3

Γαλιλαιίου	-	26.69
Israel		
Εἰσραήλ	Ἴσραήλ	10.6; 15.24
Ἴσραήλ	-	2.6,20,21; 9.33; 10.23; 15.31; 19.28; 27.42
Zebedee		
Ζεβεδέου	Ζεβεδαίου	10.2; 20.20; 27.56
Ζεβεδαίου	-	4.21; 26.37
Jeremaiah		
Ἡρεμίου	Ἱερεμίου	2.17
Ἱηρημείαν	Ἱερεμείαν	16.14
John <sup>45</sup>		
Ἰωάννης	Ἰωάνης	3.1,4; 4.12; 10.2; 11.2,18; 14.4; 21.32
Ἰωάννην	Ἰωάνην	4.21; 14.10; 16.14; 17.1; 21.26
Ἰωάννου	Ἰωάνου	11.7,11,13; 14.8; 17.13; 21.25
Ἰωάννουσ	Ἰωάνου	11.12
Ἰωάννει	Ἰωάνει	11.4
Ἰωάνου	-	9.14
Ἰωάνης	-	14.2
Ἰωάνην	-	14.3
Elijah		
Ἡλειέας	Ἡλείας	27.49
Ἡλείας	-	11.14; 17.3,11,12
Ἡλείαν	-	16.14; 17.10; 27.47
Ἡλεία	-	17.4
Herod		
Ἡρώδους	Ἡρώδου	2.1
Ἡρώδης	-	2.3,7,13,16
Ἡρώδην	-	2.12
Ἡρώδου	-	2.15,19,22
Mary		
Μαριάμ	Μαρίαν	1.20
Μαρία	Μαριάμ	27.61
Μαριάμ	-	13.55
Μαριά	-	27.56; 28.1
Μαρίας	-	2.11

---

<sup>45</sup> The frequent doubling of -ν- is a distinctive feature of Codex Bezae. Statistics can be reviewed in PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 109–10.



## CHAPTER 3

Nazareth		
Ναζαρέθ	Ναζαρά	4.13
Ναζαρέθ	-	21.11
Ναζαρέτ	-	2.23
Nazarean		
Ναζωρέος	Ναζωραῖος	2.23
Ναζωραίου	-	26.71
Nephtalim		
Νεφθαλείν	Νεφθαλείμ	4.15
Νεφθαλείμ	-	4.13
Pilate		
Πιλάτω	Πειλάτω	27.2
Πιλᾶτος	Πειλᾶτος	27.13,24
Πειλᾶτος	-	27.17,22,58,65
Πειλᾶτον	-	27.62
Sidon		
Σιδῶνι	Σειδῶνι	11.21
Σειδῶνι	-	11.22
Σειδῶνος	-	15.21
Pharisees		
Φαρισαῖοι	Φαρεισαῖοι	9.11; 12.2; 15.1,12; 16.1; 19.3; 21.45; 22.15; 23.2,13,15,23,25,27,29; 27.62
Φαρισαίων	Φαρεισαίων	3.7; 16.6,11,12; 22.41
Φαρισαῖε	Φαρεισαῖε	23.26
Φαρεισαῖοι	-	12.14; 22.34
Φαρισαῖοι	-	9.14
Canaanite		
Χαναναῖος	Καναναῖος	10.4
Χαναναία	-	15.22

- Purely Orthographic Differences

D.05	B.03	References	Type of Change
Ἄρχιλαος	Ἄρχέλαος	2.22	ε-ι
Ἄρειμαθείας	Ἄριμαθαίας	27.57	ει-ι, ει-αι
Βαραχείου	Βαραχίου	23.35	ει-ι
Βεθσαιιδά	Βηθσαιῖδάν	11.21 <sup>46</sup>	

---

<sup>46</sup> Βεθσαιῖδάν sounds like a mistake in Codex Vaticanus as no accusative form is relevant in the verse in question and quite likely to be an assimilation to the previous form Χοραζίν ending in ν.

### CHAPTER 3

Γεθσαμανεί	Γεθσημανεί	26.36	α-η
Ἐμμανουήλ	Ἐμμανουήλ	1.23	νμ-μμ
Ἰσάκ	Ἰσαάκ	22.32	α-αα
Καΐφα	Καϊάφα	26.3	αι-αια
Καεῖφαν	Καϊάφαν	26.57	ει-ι + α
Καισαρίας	Καισαρείας	16.13	ι-ει
Σιών	Σειών	21.5	ι-ει
Χοραζαίν	Χοραζείν	11.21	αι-ει

- Other Differences

D.05	B.03	References
Γεννησάρ	Γεννησαρέτ	14.34
Δανιήλου	Δανιήλ	24.15
Ηλει	Ελωει	27.46
Σαμαριτανῶν	Σαμαρειτῶν	10.5
Σκαριώτης	Ἰσκαριώτης	10.4; 26.14

Thus, in the case of proper nouns, it is seen that Codex Vaticanus rarely varies in its orthography for proper nouns and a special care seems to have been taken by the scribe to avoid any variation in the spelling. Exceptions are Nazareth; and Eli, Mary, Daniel, which are found with a Hebraic, un-declined as well as Greek, declined form in both codices.

Conversely, Bezan Matthew has differing orthographies (*Bethlehem* is spelt differently twice out of 5 in Mt, *Olives*, once out of three, *Israel* twice out of ten, *Egypt*, once out of four, *John* spelt with two ‘ν’s three out of 21 out of 23, *Elijah* once out of nine, *Pilate* three times out of eight, *Pharisees* 22 times out of 25). Inclusion of Aramaic or Hebrew terms has resulted in differences between the two manuscripts that are apparently not meaningful for the reconstruction of the probable initial text. However, it would be wrong to generalise for while the above mentioned differences are semantically insignificant they have a potential theological impact as pointed out by a few scholars.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> As an illustration, variant readings involving a different orthography of proper nouns between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae have retained scholarly attention: Nazareth/Nazara in Matthew was challenged in H.P. RÜGER, ‘Nazareth, Nazara, Nazarēnos, Nazōraios,’ *ZNW* 72 (1981) 257–63 and J. RIUS-CAMPS, “‘Nazareno’ y ‘Nazoreo’, con especial atención al Códice Bezae,” in R. PIERRI (ed.), *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi fi lologici di Greco biblico in onore di padre Lino Cignelli, OFM* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta 68; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006) 183–204. Similarly, the impact of orthography on theological bias was carefully studied in the Bezan text of Acts with regard to the spelling of Jerusalem in Greek (Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλήμ) in J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 317 and J. ROSS, ‘The Spelling of Jerusalem in Acts,’ *NTS* 38 (1992) 474–6.

## II. 1. 5. Nonsense Readings

Finally, there are a few words that apparently make no sense and can be confidently corrected without suspecting an intention behind such a slip. There are 62 such nonsense readings in Mt D.05 that can be grouped as follows:<sup>48</sup>

- Slip of Syllables

2.9 ἀκούσαν<τες>; 10.34 εἰρή<νη>ν; 12.41 <γε>νεῖς; κα<τα>κρинуῖσιν; 13.30 ἀποθή<κη>ν; 16.26 κέρδη<σῃ>; 18.25 ἀπο<δο>θῆναι; 23.6 πρω<το>κλεισίαν; 27.54 <λέ>γοντες

- Slip of Initial, Middle or Final Letter(s)

2.22 ἐφ<οβ>ήθη; 9.15 νηστεύ<σ>ουσιν; 9.20 τοῦ <ί>ματίου; 11.1 ἐτέλεσ<ε>ν; 11.20 α<ί>; 12.24 δαι<μ>όνια; 12.25 στ<αθ>ήσεται; 12.45 χείρον<α>; 13.38 υἷο<ι>; 14.24 ἦ<ν>; 15.1 προ<σ>έρχονται; 15.29 <ῶ>ρος; 16.16 το<ῦ> (σώζοντος); 17.8 ἐπέρ<α>ντες; 17.9 ὄρ<ου>ς; 21.21 ἀποκρ<ιθ>εῖς; 21.46 προφ<ήτ>ην; 23.23 Φαρισαῖο<ι>; 23.38 < ὕ>μῶν; 25.15,24 ἔν<<α>>; 26.23 ἀποκρ<ιθ>εῖς; 26.34 νυκτ<ί>; 26.45 τού<ς>; 27.48 ὄξου<ς>; 27.66 τ<ῶ>ν φυλακ<ῶ>ν; 28.6 τόπο<ν>; 28.13 <α>ύτόν

- Haplography

26.1 ὅτ<ε> ἐτ<ε>λεσεν

- Dittography<sup>49</sup>

6.20 θησαυρούς<<ους>>; 10.15 ἔν<<η>>ἡμέρα; 13.38 <<τῆς βασ>> τῆς βασιλείας 21.29 μετα<<μετα>>μεληθεῖς; 23.3 πάντα οὖν << πάντα οὖν >>; 23.6 τὴν <<τὴν>>; 25.21,23 ἐπὶ <<ἐπ'>> ὀλίγα; 26.12 σώ<<ματос>>ματός 27.60 προσκυλίσα<<λιστα>>

- Confusion of Letters (the Bezan writing precedes the one in Mt B.03 in this section)

γ/τ:<sup>50</sup> 2.21 τὴν/γῆν; 10.25 τένηται/γένηται

ε/α: 17.18 ἐθαραπεύθη/ἐθεραπεύθη; 11.8 ἡμφιασμένον/ἡμφισμένον; 2.6 ποιμενεῖ/ποιμανεῖ; 4.2 τεσσαράκοντα/τεσεράκοντα; 14.2 ἐναργοῦσιν/ἐνεργοῦσιν

α/ω: 2.7,16 ἡκρεῖβασεν/ἡκρεῖβωσε

- Other Slips

4.18 ἀμφίβληστρο<<ς>><ν>; 13.1 Ἐ<<ς>><ν>; 12.22 πλούτου<<ς>>; 17.24 δίδραγμα<<τα>><sup>51</sup>; 23.4<<ᾶ>>δυσβάστακτα; 26.6 λεπρωσοῦ; 26.53 λεγειῶνης

<sup>48</sup> The reconstructed, expected word is mentioned as found in Codex Bezae. The letters between the signs <> are not read in Mt D.05 but should be read, the ones between <<>> appear in Mt D.05 but should not be read. The combination of the two signs albeit difficult to read allows to see the original and rectified orthography (cf. ἐ<<ς>> <ν>).

<sup>49</sup> The case of Mt 23.7 where Codex Bezae reads twice Ἐβαβεί Ἐβαβεί as opposed to one in Codex Vaticanus is not listed here as a dittography because it could be an authentic and deliberate repetition.

<sup>50</sup> Confusion of majuscules Γ, Ι and Τ is considered as usual misreadings in majuscules.

<sup>51</sup> The impossible plural δίδραγματα (like a -μα, -ματος, τό stem) may have been influenced by the disputed presence of the article τά (B *rell*, τό W *sa*, *om.* Ἄ\* D *mae bo*) before δίδραγμα.

Conversely, Codex Vaticanus only occasionally displays an erroneous form according to usual standards against a correct form in Codex Bezae (26.59 ψευδομαρτυρ<ι>άν; 15.30 αὐτοῦ<ς>, 26.53 δύνομαι for δύναμαι). The case of Mt 26.52, where Codex Vaticanus reads ἐν μαχαίρῃ as opposed to the Bezan form ἐν μαχαίρᾱ will not be considered as a slip as it is documented as a fluctuating form during the Koine period.<sup>52</sup>

Although it may be concluded that the omission of a syllable or a letter at the beginning, middle or end position is an accidental scribal inconsistency, called syncopation, some instances may actually reflect a phenomenon resulting from the accentuation of the word in the evolving Koine language, known as ‘gradation’ or alternatively as ‘Kretschmer’s law,’ by which an ‘unstressed vowel after a liquid or nasal dropped out when the same vowel stood in the previous syllable.’<sup>53</sup> This phenomenon reflects what Harris calls ‘a state of decay’ of the preposition, which is evidenced through a further examination of prefixes: με for μετά, ἀ for ἀνα, πε for περί.<sup>54</sup> Moulton summarizes Harris’s discoveries of syncopation in D.05 as follows:

Harris lists κα(τα)φάγοντι in Lk 15.30, πε(ρι) τοῦ Ἰ. in Mk 5.27, ἀ(να)στάς in Mk 10.1, ἀ(να)πτύξας in Lk 4.17, κα(τα)λῦσαι in Ac 5.39 and perhaps ἐ(πι)πλή(σ)οντι in Lk 23.43. He observes that 8.01 in Hermias is not free from such forms.<sup>55</sup>

Therefore κα<τα>κρινοῦσιν (Mt 12.41D.05) may well be similar to the case found in Lk 15.3D.05 where καφάγοντι is written for καταφάγουντι and could be explained as a transformation of κατά- into κα-. If accentuation is involved, it may indicate that the scribe was still pronouncing the words correctly before writing them.

In addition to these occurrences of apparent orthographical nonsense readings, there are also ‘grammatical’ nonsense readings, where the Bezan form may be possible but is impossible in the context. The attraction from a word in the immediate context can sometimes be argued as a potential reason for the reading.

- Nonsense Readings Due to Attraction

D.05	B.03	References	Immediate Context
ἀμφίβληστρος	ἀμφίβληστρον	4.18	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
ἦν ὑμεῖν	ἦ ὑμῖν	11.22	ὕμῖν
ἦν ὑμεῖν	ἦ σοί	11.24	ὕμῖν
θῆλυν	θῆλυ	19.4	ἄρσεν
τόν	τό	12.33	δένδρον καλόν

<sup>52</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 1, 48.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 56.

<sup>54</sup> J.R. HARRIS, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1891) 147.

<sup>55</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol.2, 92.

## CHAPTER 3

χλαμύδα	χλαμύδαν	27.28	κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν
μέγαν	μέγαν	4.16	εἶδον

- Grammatical Nonsense Reading

D.05	B.03	References	Immediate Context
έμοϊ	έμοϋ	16.23	εἶ ... ὅτι <sup>56</sup>
δ δέ	δν δέ	21.35	ἀπέκτειναν
λέγοντες	λέγοντας	22.16	τούς μαθητάς
τὸ δὲ αὐτο<<ι>>	τὸ δ' αὐτὸ	27.44	καὶ οἱ λησταί

As a summary on orthographical differences, it appears that the inconsistency in spelling in Bezan Matthew is only relative. Slips echo the transitional period of Koine Greek and, as a result, the stricter orthography in Mt B.03 is more likely to reflect an increased care towards a more systematic orthography. Even if the exact differences listed above would require more investigation from the development of Greek in the first centuries, I will concentrate, in the rest of this chapter, on the variant readings in Mt D.05 compared to Codex Vaticanus that do affect potentially the meaning.

The following section will now consider word differences between Mt D.05 and B.03 whether they are lexical (II. 2) or grammatical (II. 3). Because of the high number of differences, all variant readings are appended at the end of this work for further reference (Appendix 3) and only representative examples and general conclusions will be set out in the following sections.

### II. 2. Lexical Differences

A variant reading between Mt D.05 and B.03 can involve different parts of speech: nouns, verb, adverbs, pronouns, particles and prepositions. Traditional textual criticism would characterise such isolated differences in words between two manuscripts as a ‘substitution,’ a conclusion which may convey the idea that one manuscript is ‘right’ and the other manuscript has corrupted the text by substituting a word by another.

This section will comment on the lists displayed in Appendix 2 according to the part of speech (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, particles, prepositions).

#### II. 2. 1. Nouns

A comparison between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 reveals that alternative nouns are either similar (e.g. 19.10 ἀνδρος D.05/ἀνθρώπου B.03; 24.5 θεραπείας D.05/οἰκετείας B.03; 9.29 ὀμμάτων D.05/ὀφθαλμῶν B.03) or refer to apparently different entities (e.g. Mt 14.6 Ἡρωδιάς D.05/Ἡρωδιάδος B.03<sup>57</sup>; Ἰωσήφ/Ἰωσή;<sup>58</sup> Λεββέος/Θαδδαῖος.<sup>59</sup>), nevertheless with some contextual similarity (e.g. 17.2 χειῶν D.05/φῶς B.03; 22.46 ὥρας D.05/ἡμέρας B.03).

---

<sup>56</sup> οι, ι and ει are spelt [i] in Koine Greek.

<sup>57</sup> Codex Bezae seems to refer to Herodias as Herod’s daughter (as in Mk 6.22), Codex Vaticanus as Herodias’ daughter. The problem is much wider than just a simple harmonisation with Mark as pointed out

Some nouns can be read as a different part of speech in Mt B.03 (e.g. Mt 5.11 δικαιοσύνης D.05/ἔμοῦ B.03, 5 occurrences in total).<sup>60</sup>

There are in total 45 such alternative forms occurring 50 times.

## II. 2. 2. Adjectives

Similarly to the list of alternative nouns that appear in both codices studied for Matthew, there are 13 instances where synonymous adjectives are used (e.g. Mt 21.30 ἑτέρω D.05/δευτέρω B.03; 24.39 πάντα D.05/ἅπαντας B.03; 26.7 πολυτείου D.05/ βαρυτείου B.03) or five instances involving different entities (e.g. 11.3 ἐργαζόμενος D.05/ἐρχόμενος B.03; 25.28 πέντε D.05/δέκα B.03) and three changes in parts of speech.

## II. 2. 3. Verbs

The differences in verbal forms are the largest in number (85 forms occurring 92 times). Interestingly, although the rest of the sentence is equivalent, it appears that a verb can be read differently in each manuscript, a phenomenon which is difficult to explain, especially if the meaning remains somewhat equivalent (e.g. Mt 10.18 σταθήσεσθαι D.05/ἀχθήσεσθε B.03 ‘you will stand’ as opposed to ‘you will be brought to’) or, if despite a change in tenses the verb has a different radical (e.g. Mt 14.8 εἶπεν D.05 ‘he said’/φησὶν B.03 ‘he says’). A detailed exegetical study of the passage in context would be necessary to seek to identify what lies behind the variant.

As a particularity of the Greek language, verbs can convey a slightly different meaning based on the presence or absence of prefixes (compound or simple verb). There are 19 instances where a simple verb is read in Mt D.05 as opposed to a compound verb in Mt B.03, 13 instances corresponding to the other way round and six have variant readings in compound verbs formed with different prefixes in both manuscripts (see Appendix 3, II. b). Such raw data help to avoid general statements that Codex Bezae uses simplified verbal forms or ‘adds’ to simple verbs.

Since a prefix confers a further level of precision to the verb, it is theoretically more likely that the variant reading originated from an editorial work rather than from a mistranslation for this reason, as ‘adding’ a prefix reflects more a deliberate scribal act. However, since there is no systematic move towards the prefixation of a verb or the contrary, any conclusion in this respect would not be holistic and therefore partial.

in Elliott’s discussion on choices in modern synopses: J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘Resolving the Synoptic Problem Using the Text of Printed Greek Synopses,’ in *ibid.* (ed.) *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010) 459–67.

<sup>58</sup> See Metzger’s proposal on Ἰωσῆ as probably the Galilean pronunciation (יִשְׁשִׁי) of the ‘correct Hebrew (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ)’ (*Commentary*, 34).

<sup>59</sup> The two Alexandrian and ‘Western’ forms existed early in the textual transmission, as it can be seen from the (later) hesitant conflated readings Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος, C<sup>2</sup> K L N W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup>22 565 579 700 1424 M f sy<sup>p,h</sup> | Θαδδαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Λεββαῖος 13 | Λεββαῖος D k μ; Or<sup>lat</sup> | txt X B f<sup>13</sup> 892 l2211 lat co (and other minor variants).

<sup>60</sup> This variant reading is discussed at length in HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 71–80.

In the case of a reading involving a different verb, it is noteworthy that the meaning is often still contextually similar (e.g. Mt 24.38 *γαμίζοντες* D.05/*γαμίσκοντες* B.03; Mt 16.4 *ζήτει* D.05; *αίτει* B.03; Mt 9.15 *νηστεύειν* D.05/*πενθεῖν* B.03); in some few cases only, is it unrelated (e.g. Mt 19.1 *ἐλάλησεν* D.05; *ἐτέλεσεν* B.03; Mt 16.16 *σῶζοντος* D.05/*ζῶντος* B.03)<sup>61</sup>. From these data, it appears that all the verbs are substantially either highly similar in both manuscripts or different but most of the time conveying a similar intent.

The reason for the difference can hardly be explained straightforwardly in any case, but a ‘substitution’ by the Bezan scribe of the Mt B.03 reading cannot be defended from a study of these differences and should therefore not be categorised in this way.

#### II. 2. 4. Adverbs, Pronouns, Particles, Prepositions

With respect to **adverbs**, most of the differences (12/14) between Mt D.05 to B.03 reveal an alternative wording with a similar meaning (e.g. Mt 2.16 *κάτω* D.05/*κατωτέρω* B.03, 14.21 *ὡς* D.05/*ὡσεὶ* B.03; 2/14 are changes in grammatical nature) which cannot be confined to a fanciful rewording as such, but would need further investigation.<sup>62</sup>

Similarly, a few (15) **pronouns** are read differently in both manuscripts, while a change in parts of speech may occur as it the case in five instances. Interestingly, the rest of the phrase is similar if not identical.<sup>63</sup>

In 44 instances, grammatical **particles** (*δέ, καί, μητέ, γάρ, ἤ, ἀλλά* etc.) are read differently between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03, giving the impression of insignificant differences but, at the same time, reinforcing the question about the reason for the change.<sup>64</sup> Truly, alternative readings implied by different conjunctions functioning as connectives are commonly disregarded by most textual critics, as the meaning is apparently not affected. As an example, the particle *ἄν* is preferred ten times to *νί ἐάν* in Mt D.05, an apparent substitution that is a recurrent phenomenon in early manuscripts.<sup>65</sup> Similarly, the

<sup>61</sup> For the first variant reading, see Amphoux’s proposal in Chapter 2 II. 3. 2For the second variant reading, Black (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998] 245) indicates the confusion between the two verbs to a possible parablesis on original Aramaic words *ܝܚܡܕ* and *ܝܝܚܕ*.

<sup>62</sup> As an illustration, Read-Heimerdinger suggests that when the apparently synonymous forms *ὡς/ὡσεὶ* (‘as’) are variant in the textual tradition, the editor (in her example, of Bezan Luke) signals a comparison of symbolic nature by using *ὡς* as opposed to a more factual one. The alternative variant readings corresponds to a lack of understanding of the symbol to a narrative flow (cf. J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, ‘Luke’s Use of *ὡς* and *ὡσεὶ*: Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message,’ in PIERRI, *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae*, 251–74 [273]). Applied to Bezan Matthew, the three variant readings in Matthew are 9.16 (*ὡς περιστερὰν* D.05/ *ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν* B.03), 9.36 (*καὶ ῥεριμμένοι ὡς πρόβατα* D.05/*ῥεριμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα*, 14.21 (*ἄνδρες ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι* D.05/*ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι* B.03) and could well point to a theological meaning.

<sup>63</sup> Differences due to itacism and apparently resulting in a change in pronouns (e.g. *ὕμειν* D.05] *ἡμεῖν* B.03) are not included here. See Chapter 3 II. 1. 1

<sup>64</sup> The choice in particles can be analysed from a linguistic perspective in order to evidence an authorial purpose behind the specificity of the particles used in the discourse or narrative. See J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 202–53.

<sup>65</sup> ‘The particle *ἄν* indicating a prospective meaning after relative pronouns and relative adverbs, is replaced by *ἐάν* in later Greek with the same function and position – a phenomenon caused by the fact that in classical Greek instead of *ἐάν* (‘if’) people also wrote *ἄν*.’ (G. MINK, ‘Problems of a highly contaminated tradition: the New Testament,’ in P.T. VAN REENEN, A.A. DEN HOLLANDER and M. VAN MULKE [eds], *Studies in*

case of *καί/δέ* interchange is usually either unnoticed or grouped *en masse* by textual critics. However, linguists using discourse analysis as S.E. Runge, S.H. Levinson and J. Read-Heimerdinger have challenged this view by demonstrating how the choice of conjunction, including *καί* and *δέ*, can affect the focus of the sentence or passage and therefore the underlying message. Beyond the example of *καί/δέ*, Read-Heimerdinger discusses the subject of connectives –which includes conjunctions – in her analysis of the differences between the Bezan text of Acts and Codex Vaticanus in a dedicated study.<sup>66</sup> Runge adds:

Greek connectives play a functional role in discourse by indicating how the writer intended one clause to relate to another, based on the connective used. Although the diversity of connectives provides valuable exegetical information about the writer's intentions, it often has caused a good deal of confusion regarding exactly how each one differs from the other.<sup>67</sup>

Identifying such apparently meaningless differences as insignificant scribal customs ignores the implication in terms of text coherence with a distinctive presentation of the events. The reason for the presence of a conjunction instead of another in Matthew certainly deserves an entire study which cannot be produced here. Meanwhile, the above mentioned variants should not be simply identified as fanciful changes driven by scribal habit since the reasons behind the choice could in fact be determined.

In 12 occurrences (9 forms), **subordinating conjunctions** such as *ὅπως, ἵνα, ὡς* differ between Mt D.05 and B.03 and once there is a change in parts of speech.

There are 27 occurrences in Mt D.05 where the **preposition** differs from Codex Vaticanus. From the detailed list in Appendix 2, one can infer that the variance is far from being systematic since it represents less than 4% of the total number of prepositions in Matthew.<sup>68</sup> It is also evident that Bezan Matthew tends to use a narrow choice of prepositions where Codex Vaticanus would have a wider range at its disposal (to *ἐν, ἐπί, ὑπό, ὑπέρ* in Codex Bezae correspond 11 prepositions in Codex Vaticanus) and one could think of a poorer vocabulary reflecting originality before a recension, but the opposite can equally be observed: to *ἐν, ἐκ, εἰς, ἀπό* in Mt B.03 correspond to 14 prepositions in Codex Bezae. In 7 instances, Mt D.05 prefers a preposition in contrast to Mt B.03 and in 5 instances it is the other way round (e.g. Mt 22.16 *πρὸς αὐτόν* D.05/*αὐτῷ* B.03; Mt 4.23 *ὄλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν* D.05/*ἐν ὄλη τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ* B.03). It can be suggested that fortuitous

---

*Stemmatology II* [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996] 13–86 [28]). Also see Robertson's comment: '[...] ἄν [...] is undoubtedly [an] intensive [particle] whatever its actual meaning, whether it is blended with εἰ into ἐάν or used with ὅς, ὅστις, ἵνα, ὅπως, ὡς etc. or used with the verb itself in the apodosis of a condition.' (A.T. ROBERTSON, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* [3<sup>rd</sup> edn; New York: George H. Doran, 1919] 1142).

<sup>66</sup> READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 202–53.

<sup>67</sup> S.E. RUNGE, *A Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems Inc., 2010) 18.

<sup>68</sup> A total of 724, based on my own count from NA<sup>28</sup>.



slips or scribal changes are therefore relatively unlikely but that they seem to be driven by editorial thoughts to convey a discourse.

The above variations are linguistic differences, the individual discussion of which goes beyond the scope of this work, but the fact that they are not more widespread than one isolated case here or there suggests that they cannot be considered as insignificant differences. At the same time, and for the reasons presented above, an accidental scribal mistake in the midst of a relatively stable sentence is quite unlikely because of the closeness of the alternative wording involved, neither is a translation from a different language as Greek the case.

## II. 3. Grammatical Differences

Some variant readings between Mt D.05 and B.03 can be described as representing a grammatical difference. This is true for verbs and nouns, which will be discussed now.

### II. 3. 1. Verbal Grammatical Differences

There are 148 instances where verbs are found in a different form in Matthew in Codex Bezae and in Codex Vaticanus. They can be classified thus (the number of individual instances is indicated in in brackets):

- i. Differences in person where the verb in Mt D.05 refers to a different person in Mt B.03 (21) with the notable example of a verb in the plural with a subject in the singular.<sup>69</sup>
- ii. Differences in tense (Mt D.05 vs Mt B.03, 63 instances): within indicative (47), or imperative (6), or subjunctive (1), or participle (9)
- iii. Differences in mood (Mt D.05 vs Mt B.03, 51 instances):
  - a. indicative vs participle (16), or imperative (3) or subjunctive (15) or infinitive (1)
  - b. imperative vs indicative (1)
  - c. participle vs indicative (2) or imperative (1) or infinitive (1)
  - d. subjunctive vs indicative (5) or participle (2) or infinitive (1) or imperative (1)
  - e. optative vs subjunctive (1) or infinitive (1)
- iv. Differences in voice (Mt D.05 vs Mt B.03, 13 instances):
  - a. active vs passive (3) or middle (3)
  - b. middle vs active (2) or passive (2)
  - c. passive vs active (3)

---

<sup>69</sup> Porter summarises ‘Grammarians are not decided why but it is frequently the case that neuter plural subjects take singular verb forms. Some suggest that neuter items are by nature collective, while others suggest that (in earlier times) the neuter plural ending was identical with a similar collective ending.’ (S.E. PORTER, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* [BLGS 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994] 73).

It should be emphasised that despite the numerous variations in the grammatical form of the verbs between the two codices, the verb remains the same and only tense, mood or voice change. Whatever meaning ensues, the change from Mt B.03 to Mt D.05 or *vice versa* does not sound to be the result of a substitution due to a synonym or a preferred use of the language because of the absence of pattern and importance of the verbal aspect in Greek.<sup>70</sup>

### II. 3. 2. Grammatical Differences Affecting Nouns

Nouns can also be subject to variant readings in the codices, either in number (15 instances for singular in Mt D.05 against Mt B.03 and eight instances for the opposite case) or morphology (five instances) when compared to Codex Vaticanus. A difference in the dative form happens in the expression ‘on the day of Sabbath’ twice (12.1,12 *σάββασον* D.05/*σαββάτοις* B.03).

More specifically, nominal phrases can be subject to variation (35 instances): for example, nouns are inflected differently according to the choice of preposition (e.g. Mt 10.18 *ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων* D.05/*ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας* B.03; Mt 14.19 *ἐπὶ τὸν χόρτον* D.05/*ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου* B.03) or when the verb can govern several cases (e.g. Mt 9.25 *ἐκράτησεν τὴν χειρὰ* D.05/*ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρός* B.03). Finally, when the referent within a nominal phrase is not unequivocal, variant readings arise (e.g. Mt 6.5 *τὸν μισθὸν αὐτόν* D.05/*τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν* B.03; Mt 9.26 *ἡ φήμη αὐτοῦ* D.05/*ἡ φήμη αὕτη* B.03).

### II. 3. 3. Other Grammatical Differences

Apart from verbal and nominal differences in Bezan Matthew compared with Codex Vaticanus as delineated in the two previous sections, some differences may be the result of a fully different phrasing. Such instances deserve a separate section as they are a mix of grammatical, semantic or syntactical variations and will influence the further course of this work.

There are 33 instances of syntactical differences in nominal phrases. Such a rewording keeps a similar meaning most of the time (e.g. Mt 6.8 *πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς ἀνοίξει τὸ στόμα* D.05/*πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν* B.03) or substantially equivalent (e.g. Mt 23.9 *ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς* D.05/*ὁ οὐράνιος* B.03) between the two texts, but may also induce a slight change (e.g. Mt 16.22 *ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμᾶν καὶ λέγειν* D.05/*ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμῶν* B.03; Mt 13.17 *οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰδεῖν* D.05/*οὐκ εἶδαν* B.03).

Where Mt D.05 and B.03 have such variant readings, the meaning remains decidedly close and the reason for a change in phrasing merits a linguistic investigation that goes beyond the scope of this work.

## II. 4. Conclusions

Spelling, lexical and grammatical differences were reviewed in this section by comparing the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus.

---

<sup>70</sup> ‘Aspect refers to the author’s or speaker’s subjective portrayal of an action’ (A.D. NASELLI, ‘A Brief Introduction to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek,’ *DBSJ* 12 [2007] 17-28).

While spelling differences are a good indicator of the variability of Greek in the early centuries, they are usually discarded in text-critical works because of their limited relevance for evaluating the initial text, although it is generally acknowledged that moving orthography can be indicative of the dates and *milieu* of production of the documents.<sup>71</sup>

Furthermore, out of 541 *vll* discussed (corresponding to 485 forms) no systematic pattern explaining a systematic change from Mt B.03 to D.05 or vice versa, suggesting that hasty judgements may lead to unjustified downgrading of the Greek used in Codex Bezae, a conclusion that should rather force scholars to find explanations on the reason for changing apparently insignificant differences in parts of speech between both codices: such differences need to be further studied from a linguistic perspective aiming at understanding the coherence of the text, specifically in most instances of unaltered meanings. In any case, it seems unlikely from the study presented in this work that they are due to any systematic scribal emendation.

### III. Presence or Absence of Words

This section will list the differences in presence/absence of words in Mt D.05 against B.03 in order of increasing length.

#### III. 1. Presence of Words in Mt D.05 against Absence in Mt B.03

On 327 occasions, the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae reads words where Codex Vaticanus does not. Traditionally, this number would be expressed as ‘additions’ in Codex Bezae, with the usual understanding that Codex Bezae is eager to paraphrase or explain,<sup>72</sup> thereby highlighting its secondary character. There are 259 cases for the presence of one ‘extra’ word in Mt D.05 compared to Mt B.03. Figures go down to 39 cases for the presence of two words in Mt D.05 *contra* Mt B.03, 11 cases of three words and four cases of four words. Other ‘chunks’ of more than five words can be divided into: 10 cases of 5-12 words and four cases of more than 15 words (Appendix 2 lists all the occurrences in detail).

The occurrences where one<sup>73</sup> or two<sup>74</sup> words only are present in Mt D.05 as opposed to Mt B.03 therefore constitute the major portion of the variant readings while more lengthier ‘additions’ are relatively scarce.

Despite the distinctive presence of the instances where Mt D.05 reads more than 3 words than Mt B.03, the majority of extra material remains confined to 1-2 words,

---

<sup>71</sup> MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol.1, 22-56.

<sup>72</sup> ‘Harmonisation thus seems to account for a high proportion of the distinctive readings of Codex Bezae.’ (D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* [Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997] 42).

<sup>73</sup> The long list can be summarised and ordered into: particles 60, articles 55, pronouns 51, verbs 21, adjectives 18, prepositions 14, nouns 17, subordinating conjunctions 11, adverbs 9 and interjection 1.

<sup>74</sup> Article+noun or pronoun 14, prepositional phrases 12, particle+verb 5, particle+noun or pronoun 4, negative verbal phrase 3, particle+adverb 1, verb+pronoun 1.

which suggests a strict transmission of the text of the Gospels. The examination of such raw data prevents the erroneous conclusion that Bezan Matthew reflects ‘fanciful additions’ since such variants are delimited to 1-2 words. Additionally, the presence of larger portions of textual material when compared to Codex Vaticanus is relatively meagre in number.

The same exercise needs to be run for the corresponding case where Codex Vaticanus could be considered to ‘add’ more words than Codex Bezae in Matthew. This will be examined now. The overall distribution of presence/absence is given in the last section (III. 3).

### III. 2. Absence of Words in Mt D.05 against Presence in Mt B.03

There are 243 cases where Mt B.05 reads words that are absent in the Bezan text of Matthew. As noted in the previous section, these absences would be traditionally considered as ‘omissions,’ an often mentioned ‘characteristic’ of Codex Bezae, which however runs counter to the earlier mention that the manuscript is prone to paraphrase. Similarly to the case above, the overwhelming majority of differences between Mt D.05 and B.03 are in one<sup>75</sup> or two<sup>76</sup> words (see Appendix 2) while the instances of three (12) or four words (1) occur more rarely, as do larger portions of five words up to the presence of 37 words for Mt 5.19b-20 (8).

### III. 3. Conclusions

The table below summarises the previous two sections:

	Number of Occurrences of Presence in D.05/Absence in B.03	Number of Occurrences of Absence in D.05/Presence in B.03
One word	259	196
Two words	39	26
Three words	11	12
Four words	4	1
5-15 words	10	5
>15 words	4	3
<b>Total occurrences</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>243</b>
<b>Total words</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>396</b>

Table 4: Distribution of Word Presence or Absence in Mt D.05 vs Mt B.03

From these statistics and despite the obvious great number of word differences between the two manuscripts in Matthew, it appears that the *tendency* (that I base on the number of occurrences) of Bezan Matthew to ‘add’ is quantitatively comparable to its

<sup>75</sup> Articles 57, particles 45, pronouns 34, adverbs 13, nouns 10, subordinating conjunctions 10, adjectives 11, prepositions 8, verbs 7, interjection 1.

<sup>76</sup> Particle+noun or pronoun 8, article+noun or pronoun 8, prepositional phrases 6, noun+adjective 1, particle+verb 1, verb+pronoun 2, subject+object 1.

tendency to ‘omit.’ Indeed the larger difference of words involved spelt out in the table (584/396 words) are influenced by the larger amount of words (124) in Mt 20.28 (61 words), 16.2-3 (31 words), 12.47 (17 words), 24.31 (15 words) as opposed to the number of ‘omissions’ that involve roughly half that number (65). Therefore, while the text of Matthew cannot be seen as fully ‘fixed’ because of the number of variants, there is no clear proclivity as such towards addition or omission. Rather there is a difference in word choices, as it was shown in the two last sections (III. 1,2), although the extreme closeness of the vocabulary suggests a relative firmness of the text that could be regarded as the archetype of both manuscripts.

Revisiting Holmes’ doctoral work, it was seen that in analysing variant readings in terms of presence, absence, substitution of words or improvement of ‘the’ text, he implicitly confers a secondary character on the variant readings of D.05 and inevitably leads to a circular reasoning. The presentation carried out in this work has the merit of not using such an implicit vocabulary, seeking as it does to present objectively differences between the two manuscripts. Conversely, it does not provide possible explanations to the source of all variant readings, though it does at least suggest that all the Bezan variants in Matthew cannot be explained as easily as part of a corrupted text deriving from an Alexandrian archetype.

#### IV. The Specific Case of Word Order Differences

In this last section of the chapter dedicated to the analysis of linguistic differences of the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus, the often neglected area of word order will be examined. One can usually read that, just like ‘additions’ and ‘substitutions,’ word order is understood as a scribal *change* when it differs from the text of reference. This section will not only seek to present different order in Bezan Matthew objectively (as opposed to a *change* in word order as if the Bezan order was implicitly a secondary feature) but it will provide, based on current scholarly studies on the subject, a revision of this rarely noticed feature. The reason for this is that a different word order is either discarded or judged as insignificant since the meaning is apparently exactly the same. Indeed, out of 157 differences in word order between Mt D.05 and B.03 that can be counted from the manuscripts, only 45 are mentioned in the critical apparatus of the NA<sup>28</sup>.

##### IV. 1. The Study of Word Order

The study of word order in a language refers to the evaluation of the relative position of syntactic constituents within a clause. Although it is common to analyse languages by designating their syntactical order in a clause (‘subject’ [S], [finite] ‘verb’ [‘V’] and ‘object’ [‘O’]) by ‘fixed’ or ‘restrictive’ (SVO as in English, German; SOV as in Japanese, VSO as in Biblical Hebrew)<sup>77</sup> or ‘relatively free’ (French, German)<sup>78</sup> or ‘free’ (Greek, Lat-

---

<sup>77</sup> This supposes that we are talking about languages that have such categories.

in), a more detailed examination of languages individually shows that this is not so straightforward. It is frequently assumed that languages such as Greek or Latin have a ‘free’ word order meaning that a change in the syntactical order does not appear to affect the meaning.<sup>79</sup>

Word order in Greek is generally designated as ‘free’ because order variation is technically possible. This equivalency is due to the phenomenon of inflection (declensions/cases, i.e. nominative, genitive, accusative, dative in Greek) where the inflected word indicates its grammatical function and hence its role in the sentence. Nonetheless, as a consequence of the ‘free’ word order, traditional grammars of NT Greek<sup>80</sup> and previous studies of Greek word order in the NT<sup>81</sup> have failed to agree on the question of basic constituent order, although some consensus is found around the verb-initial clauses, at least in narratives, which will be taken as a principle in this chapter.<sup>82</sup>

#### IV. 2. Word Order in NT Greek

Word order has been studied in Ancient Greek (Dunn,<sup>83</sup> Cervin,<sup>84</sup> Dover<sup>85</sup>), NT Greek (Wieland, Friberg, Levinsohn, Pitts)<sup>86</sup> or both (Caragounis<sup>87</sup>) and recently, within individual books of the NT from the edited text of Nestle-Aland (Kwong for the Gospel of Luke<sup>88</sup>) and in particular manuscripts (Yoder in Codex Bezae,<sup>89</sup> Jordaan in a comparison

<sup>78</sup> Order changes may change in each language: French has a SVO order in an independent clause unless a pronoun is involved (‘je vois *le chat*’ but ‘je *le* vois’); German has SVO in main clauses, but verb-final order in subordinate clauses (‘*ich vertraue keinem Menschen auf der Erde*’ vs. ‘*die Ansage, daß ich keinem Menschen auf der Erde vertraue, ist relativ pessimistisch.*’).

<sup>79</sup> On NT Greek word order, Porter comments: ‘The flexibility of Greek syntax because of its inflected endings and its various ways of forming clauses does not mean that the order of various elements makes no difference. [...] Greek has several well-established patterns’ (PORTER, *Idioms*, 289).

<sup>80</sup> G.B. WINER, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* (trans. and rev. W.F. Moulton, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959) 684–702.

<sup>81</sup> See e.g. *ibid.*, 684–702 and T. ROBERTSON, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; New York: George H. Doran, 1919) 417–25.

<sup>82</sup> Porter recalls that ‘Many of the reference grammars of the Greek of the NT are convinced that standard NT Greek ‘word order’ is verb-subject-object. One of the major problems with such analyses is caused by the failure to recognise that the majority of Greek clauses do not express all of the elements used in the formulation.’ (PORTER, *Idioms*, 293).

<sup>83</sup> G. DUNN, ‘Syntactic Word Order in Herodotean Greek,’ *Glotta* 66 (1988) 63–79.

<sup>84</sup> R.S. CERVIN, ‘Word Order in Ancient Greek: VSO, SVO, SOV, or All of the Above?’ (Ph.D. thesis; University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1990). Available from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/21810> (accessed 02.05.14).

<sup>85</sup> K.J. DOVER, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960; repr. 2010).

<sup>86</sup> D.J. WIELAND, ‘Subject Verb Object Relationship in Independent Clauses in the Gospels and Acts’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1946); T. FRIEBERG, ‘New Testament Greek Word Order in Light of Discourse Considerations’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1982); S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Dallas: SIL International, 2000); A.W. PITTS, ‘Greek Word Order and Clause Structure: A Comparative Study of Some New Testament Corpora,’ in PORTER–PITTS, *The Language of the New Testament*, 311–46.

<sup>87</sup> C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

<sup>88</sup> I.S.C. KWONG, *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages* (LNTS 298; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005).

<sup>89</sup> YODER, ‘Language,’ 481–506.

of the Latin and Greek columns of Codex Bezae,<sup>90</sup> Read-Heimerdinger in Codex Bezae, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus for the text of Acts<sup>91</sup>). With the support of these studies, the idea of ‘free word order’ in Koine Greek is being revisited and now considered as bearing more significance than was previously recognised.

#### IV. 3. The Concept of Constituent Order and Markedness

It is worth noting that a completely ‘free’ word order is not possible in Greek: εἰς ὑμᾶς can be placed in various positions within the sentence but the order \*ὑμᾶς εἰς is not possible: linguistically, the term of *constituent order* rather than *word order* should be used. Although it may be disputed, NT Greek is generally understood as VSO and classical Greek as SVO.<sup>92</sup> What will be exposed here is that Greek may not have a basic word order that is syntactic in nature (i.e. order of subject, verb, object) but rather pragmatic.

Discourse analysis, a discipline of linguistics examining the articulation of a text at the extra-sentential level, helps the understanding of these two concepts.<sup>93</sup> In a handbook on discourse analysis<sup>94</sup>, Levinsohn illustrated the principles that describe the relative order of constituents within a clause.<sup>95</sup> The present summary will first introduce the default order of constituents following the verb in a verbal clause:<sup>96</sup> pronouns, subjects and objects, adverbial or prepositional phrases – analysed pragmatically as *core* and *periphery*, *topic* and *comment* (principles 1-4). By ‘natural word order,’ I will refer here to the arrangement of the constituents in a clause as following the commonly acknowledged natural flow of information in a sentence, that is from ‘old/known information’ to ‘new information.’ Principles 5 and 6 will illustrate how the change in or violation of this default order results in prominence given to one or more constituents. The examples will be taken exclusively from the Gospel of Matthew in the texts of Codex Vaticanus or Codex Bezae when they differ. Finally, differences leading to exegetical considerations that

---

<sup>90</sup> G.J.C. JORDAAN, ‘The Word-Order Differences between the Greek and the Latin Text in Codex Bezae,’ in J.H. PETZER and P.J. HARTIN (eds), *A South African Perspective on the New Testament. Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger During His Visit to South Africa in 1985* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986) 99–111

<sup>91</sup> J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, ‘Word Order in Koine Greek. Using a Text-Critical Approach to Study Word Order Patterns in the Greek Text of Acts,’ *FilNeο* 9 (1996) 139–80; *ibid.*, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 62–115.

<sup>92</sup> See S.E. PORTER, ‘Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek,’ *FT* 12 (1993) 184–5 for bibliographical data summarised in this conclusion. Noteworthy, Porter indicates that the examination of the Greek of individual NT books or texts from other authors using Koine Greek shows preferences in the syntactic order: VSO in Paul, SVO in Luke and SOV in Epictetus (*idem*, 185).

<sup>93</sup> Porter gives a brief overview of this discipline in PORTER, *Idioms*, 298–307.

<sup>94</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 29–47.

<sup>95</sup> Levinsohn cogently mentions that these *principles* are not *rules* and may vary from one author to another but that they are generally applicable. Understanding these principles of default order will help the marked constituent to be recognised and therefore the intention of the author of a text. Beyond this distinction, a variation in word order between two manuscripts may be explained by a different emphasis and thereby by a different importance e.g. in the message conveyed if a pattern is found in the text.

<sup>96</sup> Although other principles would guide word order within nominal phrase, we will stick to verbal clauses in this present work.

may occur due to a different order of the constituents between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae will be considered.

An immediate consequence of the existence of a default order is the introduction of the concept of *markedness*: disrupting the usual position of the words tells the hearer or reader which ones are highlighted (or significant in the discourse).<sup>97</sup> In this respect, the *unmarked order* will be referred to here as ‘*neutral order*’ or ‘*default order*’ which signals no specific feature in the sentence. This is the case when the sentence is descriptive and none of the constituents is highlighted. To take an example: while ‘Herod beheaded John’ is descriptive, there is a pragmatic way, by changing the word order, to convey the message that ‘It is *Herod* who beheaded John (and not Pilate)’ (ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀπεκεφάλισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην) or ‘It is *John* whom Herod beheaded (and not someone else)’ (τὸν Ἰωάννην ἀπεκεφάλισεν ὁ Ἡρώδης). These two latter examples illustrate the concept of *marked order* (the two examples just cited) and *unmarked order* (ἀπεκεφάλισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὁ Ἡρώδης). The default position of the verb will be considered in the following sections as clause-initial in narratives.<sup>98</sup>

The following sections will summarise the findings of Levinsohn, as a discourse analyst who has written most systematically on the subjects, with regard to the default (IV. 4) and marked order (IV. 5) in narratives, which will support my analysis of the word order differences between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew.

#### IV. 4. Default Order Principles 1-4

Levinsohn establishes that there are four default order principles in word order.

##### IV. 4. 1. Principle #1: Pronominal Constituents–Nominal Constituents

Levinsohn refers to an unmarked or default order for *pronominal constituents* (henceforth ‘PC’) to follow the main verb immediately and to precede the *nominal constituents* (henceforth ‘NC’).<sup>99</sup> The default word order is therefore V–PC–NC which indicates that there is no special feature in the clause. The PC may be either an independent pronoun or a pronominal constituent in a prepositional or nominal phrase. This can be illustrated in Matthew as follows:<sup>100</sup>

- Examples where PC is a pronoun:

Ref	Verb	PC	NC
16.19B.03	δώσω	σοι	τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν

<sup>97</sup> Markedness is a linguistic term developed in the 1930s by the so-called Prague School or Prague linguistic circle to, amongst other things, characterise binary oppositions and create hierarchy in words. Historical background and individual theories are summarised in H. ANDERSEN, ‘Markedness Theory – The First 150 Years’ in O. MISESKA-TOMIC (ed.), *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony* (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989) 11–46.

<sup>98</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 38.

<sup>99</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 29.

<sup>100</sup> The text of NA<sup>28</sup> will be cited in the absence of variant word order. Since all examples will be taken from the Gospel of Matthew, ‘Mt’ will be omitted in the references.



4.8	δείκνυσιν	αὐτῶ	πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν
9.28	καὶ λέγει	αὐτοῖς	ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πιστεύετε

- Examples where PC is a prepositional phrase:

Ref	Verb	PC	NC
5.11D.05	εἶπωσιν	καθ' ὑμῶν	πᾶν πονηρὸν ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης
12.45	παραλαμβάνει	μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ	ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα
21.33	καὶ ὠρυξεν	ἐν αὐτῶ	ληνὸν
26.36B.03	Τότε ἔρχεται	μετ' αὐτῶν	

In these examples, the order of the constituents reflects the absence of any highlighted features. The presence of a variant reading with a different order will be discussed in the following sections.

#### IV. 4. 2. Principle #2: Core Constituents –Peripheral Constituents

A sentence can be divided into two parts: a ‘core’ (i.e. a *subject* or an *object* or any *other nominal constituent* which is not preceded by a preposition or an *adjectival complement*) and a ‘periphery’ (i.e. most generally *prepositional phrases*, *adverbial phrases of time and location*). The second principle formulated by Levinsohn is that *core constituents* are typically ordered *before peripheral ones*.<sup>101</sup> Some examples from Matthew can be given:

Ref	Verb	Core	Peripheral
8.13	καὶ ἰάθη	ὁ παῖς [αὐτοῦ]	ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκεῖνη
6.13	μὴ εἰσενέγκης	ἡμᾶς	εἰς πειρασμόν
9.16	αἶρει γὰρ	τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ	ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου
9.17	βάλλουσιν	οἶνον νέον	εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς

These examples show clauses starting with a verb and a subject, which both correspond to the core; the peripheral phrase (introduced by prepositions) naturally follows it.

#### IV. 4. 3. Principle #3: Propositional Topic –Nonverbal Constituents of the Comment

Because of the natural flow of information from old to new, linguists also identify two parts within a sentence as a *topic* and a *comment*. The common order in NT Greek is to have the *theme* or ‘propositional topic’ (‘PT’) come first, followed by the *non-verbal constituents of the comment* (‘NVCC’).<sup>102</sup>

An immediate consequence is that the *subject* (usually a propositional topic) precedes the (usually nonverbal) *object*.

<sup>101</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 30.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

Ref	Verb	Propositional Topic	NVCC
12.45	καὶ γίνεται	τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου	χείρονα τῶν πρώτων
13.41	ἀποστελεῖ	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου	τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ

Propositional topic and nonverbal constituent of the comment broaden the more familiar concept of ‘subject’ and ‘object’ as grammatical entities.

#### IV. 4. 4. Principle #4: Verb–Supportive Constituent–Focal Constituent

It may well be that the three first principles do not help in giving enough information on the relative word order, specifically when some constituents are grammatically equivalent. In such a case, the *most important constituent of a comment* is generally to be found as far as possible *towards the end of the sentence*.<sup>103</sup> This is the case of a clause with two peripheral constituents, where the more important (‘more focal’) of the two will be placed after the first one (‘less focal’). A couple of examples are indicated here below:

Ref	Verb	Supportive	Focal
3.13	τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην	πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην <sup>104</sup>
5.33	ἀποδώσεις δὲ	τῷ κυρίῳ	τοὺς ὄρκους σου <sup>105</sup>
12.11D.05	καὶ ἐνπέση	τοῖς σάββασιν	εἰς βόθυνον
12.36	ἀποδώσουσιν	περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως

In all these examples, the first peripheral constituent supports the second one, the latter receiving greater salience.

Because the above-mentioned ordering principles 1-4 correspond to a ‘neutral,’ ‘default’ or ‘unmarked’ order of constituents, any order violating them may be understood as a deliberate attempt by the author to highlight the ‘displaced’ constituent or to place it in marked focus. There are two principles that guide the altering of the constituent order. These will be examined now.

#### IV. 5. Marked Order Principles 5-6

Levinsohn proposes two principles identifying a marked word order.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>104</sup> In Mt 3.13, there are three PPs (ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην and πρὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην) where the focal constituent is John as a character, placed after the less focal ones, ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας and ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην. The focus here is the move towards John in order to be baptized and not to originate from Galilee or to go to the Jordan.

<sup>105</sup> The two core constituents τῷ κυρίῳ and τοὺς ὄρκους σου may be of grammatically equal importance; nevertheless, it is understood that τοὺς ὄρκους σου (‘your oaths’) is of greater importance (receives more focus) by being placed at the end of the clause.

## IV. 5. 1. Principle #5: Marked Instances of End of Sentence Focus

After describing the position of constituents in default order, Levinsohn discusses the marked order in narratives. In Principle 5, Levinsohn stipulates that a constituent is marked if it is placed at the end of the phrase where it is not anticipated to be (thereby violating one of the aforementioned principles).<sup>106</sup> The displaced constituents are typically (a) a pronominal phrase, (b) a subject or presentational articulation (c) a core constituent of the comment after a peripheral constituent the verb which can be placed at the end of the clause. All cases are examples reflecting markedness. The below examples are presenting the case of prepositional phrases that are in the unexpected, hence marked, order. In the first example though, the conflict between the prepositional phrases allows to see the prepositional pronoun ὑπ' αὐτοῦ as marked.

Case	Ref	Core	Periphery	Focused Constituent
(a)	3.6	καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο	ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ	ὑπ' αὐτοῦ <sup>107</sup>
(b)	13.2	συνήχθησαν	πρὸς αὐτὸν	ὄχλοι πολλοί <sup>108</sup>
(c)	7.5	ἐκβαλε πρῶτον	ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σοῦ	τὴν δοκόν <sup>109</sup>

## IV. 5. 2. Principle #6: (Point of Departure) - Focal Constituent - Verb

The second way of highlighting a constituent corresponds to their fronting, i.e. moving them nearer the front of the sentence and placing them before the main verb.<sup>110</sup> Since potentially all constituents can be fronted, as a result, all constituents in a preverbal position are not necessarily in marked focus. To help the distinction, linguist Simon Dik identified two distinct pre-verbal positions as P1 and P2.<sup>111</sup> P1 is classified as a *point of departure*<sup>112</sup> or a *frame of reference*<sup>113</sup> for the narrative that follows. A *point of departure* is a linguistic term that 'signals discontinuities of situation, of reference, and sometimes of action, viz., the placement at the beginning of a clause or sentence of an adverbial or nominal constituent.'<sup>114</sup> The P2 position, however, refers to a highlighted constituent, i.e. marked position, where 'newly asserted information is placed. We can cite a few examples:

<sup>106</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 34-5.

<sup>107</sup> This example and the last one violate principle 1 which stipulates that the prepositional pronoun should be placed right after the verb in the default order.

<sup>108</sup> The presentational See in contrast Mt 27.62 *συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς Πιλάτον* where the constituents are in default order.

<sup>109</sup> The core follows a prepositional phrase against principle 2. Such a violation highlights 'your eye.'

<sup>110</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 38.

<sup>111</sup> S. DIK, *The Theory of Functional Grammar: Part I: The Structure of the Clause* (FGS9: Dordrecht/Providence, RI: Foris Publications 1989) 363 quoted in RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar*, 190 n.27. On clarifications of P1 and P2 position see RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar*, 192-5.

<sup>112</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 8.

<sup>113</sup> RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar*, 190.

<sup>114</sup> LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 7.

Ref	Verse	Principle Violated	Marked Constituent
16.19D.05	σοι δώσω τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν	#1	σοι <sup>115</sup>
15.14B.03	ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται	#2	εἰς βόθυνον
6.11	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον	#3	τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶ

Any work on word order must be aimed at carefully identifying if a preverbal constituent is in P1 or P2 position and therefore if it is in marked focus or simply acts as a point of departure.

#### IV. 6. Summary

Although word order is an often neglected area in exegesis and textual criticism, the absence of its consideration may hide the force and aim of a discourse or a narrative and relegate the associated study of variant readings to an unnoticed or barely studied feature.<sup>116</sup> Furthermore, variant readings consisting of different word order may be omitted thereby reducing the number of variants, but likewise their inclusion is not regarded as either significant or explainable. The six principles proposed above help to refine the postverbal word order more systematically, and to distinguish a default from a marked order in a clause.

The last section will apply the principles described to text-critical investigations within the Bezan text of Matthew compared with Codex Vaticanus.

#### IV. 7. Application to Variant Word Order in Mt D.05/B.03

Now that the preceding principles have been set out, this section will consist of two parts: I have counted 158 instances of word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03. 155 can be broken down into verbal clauses (IV. 7. 1) and nominal phrases (IV. 7. 2). A third category, accounting for three instances (IV. 7. 34.), includes a different kind of word order variation that goes beyond the level of the sentence and involves the transposition and/or reorganisation of entire clauses. This latter class is not a word order variation within a clause as defined in the earlier sections and will be only briefly described at this end of this section.

It is important to keep in mind that not all word order differences are listed in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. Out a total of 155 genuine word order differences between Mt D.05 and B.03, 68 (i.e. 41%) are not included in NA<sup>28</sup>. Such absence of references will be asterisked in the following sections as well as in Appendix 2 VI. 3. When they are mentioned in the apparatus, the words are indicated in the text either by S-shaped symbols (˘ ˘) around the words appearing in different order in other manuscripts, and/or by

<sup>115</sup> In this example, Codex Bezae places the pronoun σοι before the verb, highlighting thereby the act of giving the keys of the Kingdom of Heavens to *Peter* and to *nobody else*. Codex Vaticanus does not give such a specific emphasis by having the default order δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν.

<sup>116</sup> LEVINSOHN, 'The Relevance of Greek Discourse Studies to Exegesis,' *Journal of Translation* 2 (2006) 11–21.

the use of numbers in the apparatus corresponding to their position in the clause within a particular manuscript or sets of manuscripts.

#### IV. 7. 1. Word Order Differences in Verbal Clauses

The differences in word order within a verbal clause will be classified in this section according to whether they are dependent or independent clauses. In such cases and as described in the previous section, the highlighted constituent in the clause is ‘fronted,’ i.e. in preverbal position when the word order deviates from the default pattern. As it is typical with any writing in Greek, the editors of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae use these devices so that the highlighted constituents attract the audience’s attention as we shall see below. However, since this work will present only the instances where they differ, conclusions about broader authorial intentions will require a discourse analysis of the entire passage, which is beyond the scope of this initial study.

This section will discuss word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 with respect to their positions *vis-à-vis* the verb: such differences will be divided between the cases of fronted words, i.e. transposed words from the default post verbal order to P2-position (IV. 7. 1. 1) and post-verbal rearrangements within verbal clauses (IV. 7. 1. 2).<sup>117</sup>

##### IV. 7. 1. 1. Fronted Words in Verbal Clauses

Predominantly, it is independent (a.) and dependent clauses (b.) that offer a wide range of word order variation with respect to the verb. Although there are instances where variations in the verbal form occur as well (*viz.* a different tense is used), these will be set aside in order to consider how the word order depicts emphasis: any variation in the words inverted will be disregarded as not directly relevant for this particular study. The highlighted constituent will be mentioned in boldface. For the sake of simplicity, independent interrogative clauses will not be examined as the same principles apply.<sup>118</sup>

##### (a) Independent Clauses

In independent clauses, the principles discussed in the earlier sections of this chapter will apply and the following lists show a different way of ordering the words with respect to the verb (fronted or default) in both manuscripts (i. and ii.). There are instances where it is not immediately obvious, which one of the constituents that appear in a different order is fronted (iii.). In this latter case, Levinsohn suggests that the marked status of one order *vs* the other cannot be determined with certainty and that this should be discussed individually within the context of the passage. In any case it is worth mentioning such instances because of the fact that the question remains why the order is different if all other things are equal, hence the classification as ‘variation in the choice of or-

---

<sup>117</sup> Words in P1 position will not be discussed because of their status of points of departure/frame of reference.

<sup>118</sup> Levinsohn presents constituent order in information interrogatives as focus-preposition articulation where the question word is naturally the focal position. Therefore, preverbal constituents are understood as marked focus. The interrogative pronoun is naturally in the first place (*ibid.*, 53).

### CHAPTER 3

der.’ As mentioned earlier, an asterisk next to a reference means that the word order difference is not indicated in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>.

#### i. Default Order in Mt D.05, Marked Order in Mt B.03

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
2.13	φαίνεται κατ’ ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ	κατ’ ὄναρ ἐφάνη τῷ Ἰωσήφ
4.4*	ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
4.16*	εἶδον φῶς μέγα<<ν>>	φῶς εἶδεν μέγα
5.36	οὐ δύνασαι ποιεῖν τρίχα μείαν λευκὴν	οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι
11.26*	ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου	εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου
12.46	ζητοῦντες λαλῆσαι αὐτῷ	ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι
13.13	λαλεῖ αὐτοῖς	αὐτοῖς λαλῶ
13.28	λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ δοῦλοι	οἱ δὲ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν
14.25*	ἀπῆλθεν περιπατῶν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης	ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
15.14	ἀμφότεροι ἐνπεσοῦνται εἰς βόθρον	ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται
15.15*	εἶπεν αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ εἶπεν
16.4	(γενεὰ πονηρὰ) ζῆτει σημῖον	(γεν. πον. καὶ μοιχαλεις) σημεῖον αἰτεῖ
17.16*	οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν θεραπεῦσαι αὐτόν	οὐκ ἠδυνήσθησαν αὐτόν θεραπεῦσαι
19.13*	ἐπιθῆ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς	τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῆ αὐτοῖς
19.16	λέγει αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ εἶπεν
20.26	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθ<αι>	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθαι
20.27	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν πρῶτος
21.26	ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην	ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην
22.13	εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς διακόνους	ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τοῖς διακόνους
25.38*	εἶδομεν σε ξένον	σε εἶδομεν ξένον
25.40*	ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς	ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς
26.50*	εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
27.23	λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ ἡγεμῶν	ὁ δὲ ἔφη
28.20	εἶμι μεθ’ ὑμῶν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας	μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἶμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας

#### ii. Marked Order in Mt D.05, Default Order in Mt B.03

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
4.24*	πάντας ἐθεράπευσεν	ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς
12.1*	ἤρξαντο τοὺς στάχους τίλλειν καὶ αἰσθίειν	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχους καὶ ἐσθίειν
13.30*	ἄφετε ἀμφότερα συναυξάνεσθαι	ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα
14.28	αὐτῷ Πέτρος εἶπεν	ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ
16.1*	αὐτόν ἐπηρώτησαν	ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν
16.5b	ἐπελάθοντο οἱ μαθηταὶ ἄρτους λαβεῖν	ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους
16.13	τίνα με οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι	τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι
16.19	σοι δώσω τὰς κλεῖς	δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας
17.3	ᾠφθη αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλείας	ᾠφθη αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλείας

### CHAPTER 3

	[μετ' αὐτοῦ συναλαλοῦντες	[συναλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ
20.22*	δύνασθε τὸ ποτήριον πιεῖν	δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον
24.40	τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ	τότε ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ
27.17*	ὕμειν ἀπολύσω	ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν
26.26	ὁ Ἰησοῦς λαβὼν ἄρτον	λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον
26.55*	ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς ὄχλοις	εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις

#### iii. Variation in the Choice of Order of the Fronted Constituents

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
4.9*	πάντα σοι δώσω	σοι πάντα δώσω
9.6*	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔξουσίαν ἔχει	ἔξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
9.11	ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἐσθίει	μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν
18.35*	ὕμειν ποιήσει ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος	ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ποιήσει ὑμῖν
19.8*	πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν [ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν Μωϋσῆς	Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκλ. ὑμῶν [ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν
21.31*	τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο [τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐποίησεν	τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησεν τὸ θ. τοῦ πατρὸς
24.51*	μέρος αὐτοῦ θήσει μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν	μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει
26.55	καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκαθήμην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμην

#### iv. Discussion of a Few Examples

In order to provide a discussion of effective differences due to word order alteration, the case of δύο in Mt 24.40D.05 from group ii can be taken as an example. As the subject, it is in preverbal – P<sub>2</sub> – position (τότε is the ‘frame of reference’ or ‘point of departure,’ i.e. in P<sub>1</sub> position) in Codex Bezae unlike Codex Vaticanus. In this position, the repeated comparison two/one (in preverbal order all the time in Codex Bezae) is clearly highlighted as a discourse device in the entire passage of Mt 24.40-42.

24.40D.05 [a] τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ·	[b] εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφείεται
24.41D.05 [a] δύο ἀλήθουςαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ	[b] μεία παραλαμβάνεται· καὶ μεία ἀφείεται
24.42D.05 [a] δύο ἐπὶ κλείνης μειᾶς·	[b] εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφείεται

Moreover, the parallel which displays an easily visible structure could indicate an original reading in the presence of the three verses against the absence of Mt 24.42 in Codex Vaticanus.<sup>119</sup>

Mt 9.11, from group iii, offers a second example where both sentences in which-ever order make sense in both manuscripts. However, in terms of the force of the discourse, Codex Vaticanus highlights only the eating with the tax collectors and sinners, a

<sup>119</sup> This variant is discussed in Chapter 5 III. 2.

good ‘forward-pointing’ reference<sup>120</sup> towards the answer ‘those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick.’ (9.12). Codex Bezae also highlights the subject matter, i.e. ‘your teacher,’ but anticipates the question starting with *διὰ τί* + subject + verb from John’s disciples in 9.14 (‘Why do we and the Pharisees fast...’). In Codex Bezae, the passage is more concerned with who Jesus is rather than what he does.

Likewise, the fronting in 19.8D.05 in group iii of the prepositional phrase *πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν* (‘for your hardness of heart’) only, as opposed the double fronting (with *Μωϋσῆς*) in Codex Vaticanus, may well reveal a purely Jewish *milieu* where the mention of Moses did not need to be marked, while the reference to the hardness of the hearts is fronted, because of the common prophetic addresses to the Jewish people (*viz.*, ‘stubbornness,’ ‘hardness of the heart,’ ‘stiff-necked people’). It could be concluded that it is unlikely that a later scribe ‘back-engineered,’ to borrow a scientific term, the text in adding a Jewish flavour.

For the same reason, the natural order of *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* in 26.55D.05 (group ii) as opposed to its marked position in Codex Vaticanus can be explained as a reference in Codex Bezae to a customary religious activity which had no need of a specific emphasis in Jesus’ time.<sup>121</sup>

#### (b) Dependent Clauses

As opposed to independent clauses, there are few (14) instances of dependent clauses where the word order is variant between Mt D.05 and B.03. Similarly to independent clauses the positions of constituents will be understood to follow the same principles as described in the previous sections.

##### i. Default Order in Mt D.05, Marked Order in Mt B.03

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
5.18*	ἕως ἂν γένηται πάντα	ἕως πάντα γένηται
6.4	ὅπως ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου ἦ	ὅπως ἦ σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη
9.21	ἐὰν ἄψωμαι μόνον	ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι
9.28	ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι	ὅτι τοῦτο δύναμαι ποιῆσαι
15.31*	ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι βλέποντας [κωφούς λαλοῦντας]	ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους βλέποντας [θαυμάσαι κωφούς ἀκούοντας]
27.13*	τόσα καταμαρτυροῦσιν σου	ὅσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν

##### ii. Marked Order in Mt D.05, Default Order in Mt B.03

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
2.13*	ἕως ἂν σοι εἶπω	ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοι

<sup>120</sup> See Runge’s definition of ‘forward-pointing’ references as grammatical or discourse features ‘attracting extra attention to the thing to which it refers’ (RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar*, 61).

<sup>121</sup> This specific word order is discussed later in the work (see section Chapter 6 II. 1).



6.18 ἵνα μὴ φανῆς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύων ὅπως μὴ φανῆς νηστεύων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις

### iii. The Special Case of Genitive Absolutes

The specific case of genitive absolutes can be isolated: while the natural order in the genitive absolute is for the participle to precede the subject,<sup>122</sup> Mt D.05 has the marked order three times, thereby highlighting the subject, while Mt B.03 highlights the subject in one further occurrence.

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
2.13*	αὐτῶν δὲ ἀναχωρησάντων	ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν
17.22*	αὐτῶν δὲ ἀναστρεφόμενων	συστρεφόμενων δὲ αὐτῶν
26.26	αὐτῶν δὲ ἐσθιόντων	ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
12.46	λαλοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ	ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος

### iv. Discussion of a Few Examples

Without giving over-signification to any type of word order, but still keeping in mind that it is actually unlikely that a scribe ‘inverted’ words for no reason, two points can be discussed:

In Mt 6.18B.03, the default order is probably in line with the passage on fasting (Mt 6.16-18) and gives more importance to fasting as a rite. The Bezan marked order rather reflects the importance of distinguishing activities for the Father from those for men (praying, fasting). This statement is well in line with the flow of discourse starting from the Lord’s Prayer, where behaviour towards men as opposed to the Father is highlighted.

In a second example, the use of the default order in the genitive absolute found in Mt 12.46D.05 (λαλοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ‘while he was still speaking’) as opposed to the subject-focused αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος in Codex Vaticanus could well appear as an insignificant feature. Actually, the fact that Mt 12.47 is absent in few manuscripts including Codex Vaticanus (Ⲭ\* B L Γ ff<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa) may be due to a scribe wanting to reduce the apparent repetition (12.47D.05: ‘Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee’<sup>123</sup>). The texts are as follows:

12.46D.05 Λαλοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες λαλῆσαι αὐτῷ

<sup>122</sup> Matthew has more often the verb first (Mt 1.20, 2.13, 8.1,5, 17.22, 24, 18.24,25, 24.3, 25.10, 26.26, 27.19, 35, 28.11; the references to the variant readings where Codex Bezae has the different order are underlined) than the subject first, once: Mt 9.32 and 12.46).

<sup>123</sup> This translation of Mt 12.47 is from the King James Version since the RSV is not translated at this verse.

12.47D.05 Εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ · ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντές λαλήσαι σοι

12.46B.03 Ἐπι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἰστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι.

12.47B.03 *om.*

As a result, the marked order (αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος) signalling a highlighted genitive absolute in Codex Vaticanus may indicate a scribal activity aimed at avoiding the repetition of v.47 and merging vv. 46-47. This would suggest that 12.46D.05 and 12.47D.05 correspond to the reading closer to the original.

As in the previous section we have seen that it is the prepositional clause involving a pronoun that changes place, as well as the position of the object right after the main verb.

#### IV. 7. 1. 2. Post-Verbal Rearrangements of Nominal Constituents in Verbal Clauses

It happens that the constituents placed *after* the main verb in Mt D.05 when compared to B.03 exhibit different orders. The principles presented earlier can suggest which order is more marked than the other (i. and ii.). The principles governing default word-order in verbal clauses help to identify marked elements within a clause by the relative position of nominal constituents. Like in the preceding subsection, there are instances where the nature of the order cannot be straightforwardly identified. Indeed, while the pronoun is expected to directly follow the verb, a prepositional phrase and an object are both expected to be peripheral: as a result, their relative position is unsure to suggest whether they are in default or marked order. The authorial perspective is therefore key in the understanding of which order is more likely to be original or displaced and further work on the context would be needed.

##### i. Default Order in Bezan Matthew as Opposed to Codex Vaticanus

Almost all instances involve a pronoun, whether as a prepositional phrase or a simple pronoun.

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
5.11	εἰπωσιν καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν	εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρόν καθ' ὑμῶν
14.4	ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης	ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης αὐτῷ
14.16	δότε ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν αὐτοῖς	δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν
26.36	ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετ' αὐτῶν	ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
27.59*	παραλαβὼν Ἰωσήφ τὸ σῶμα	λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ

In the last example the order difference could have arisen from the possible wrong understanding of 'taking Joseph's body' (\*παραλαβὼν τὸ σῶμα Ἰωσήφ). While it is not certain which constituent in the above list is highlighted, the question still remains as to why the order was changed and/or the article added in the two manuscripts.

## CHAPTER 3

### ii. Marked Order in Bezan Matthew as Opposed to Codex Vaticanus

There are two examples where the prepositional phrase stands immediately after the verb, highlighting thereby the pronoun:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
18.21	ἀμαρτήσῃ καθ' ὑμῶν ὁ ἀδελφός μου	ἀμαρτήσῃ ὁ ἀδελφός μου εἰς ἐμέ
21.32	ἦλθεν γὰρ πρὸς ὑμᾶς Ἰωάννης	ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς

### iii. Conflicting Principles/Variation in the Choice of Order of the Fronted Constituents

Where pronouns or pronominal phrases appear in a different place within a clause, it is not straightforward to identify which position is marked or unmarked if at all, as there seems to be an editorial, deliberate choice of order. This is the case in six instances:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
13.29*	ἐκριζώσῃτε ἅμα καὶ τὸν σείτον σὺν αὐτοῖς	ἐκριζώσῃτε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον
18.16	παράλαβε μετὰ σοῦ ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο	παράλαβε ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο μετὰ σοῦ
20.10	ἔλαβον δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνὰ δηνάριον	καὶ ἔλαβον ἀνὰ δηνάριον καὶ αὐτοὶ
26.22	ἤρξαντο λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶ<<ν>>	ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῶ εἰς ἕκαστος
26.23	ὁ ἐνβαπτόμενος τὴν χεῖρα μετ' ἐμοῦ	ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα
27.51	ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο μέρη ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω	ἐσχίσθη ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω εἰς δύο

### iv. Discontinuous Constituents

When words that are expected to be contiguous are split by another constituent, Levinsohn speaks of discontinuous constituents.<sup>124</sup> The main linguistic device involved here is the prominence of the split constituents. This appears for verbal clauses (including interrogatives) and non-verbal (nominal, adjectival, pronominal) phrases:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
• Verbal		
1.20*	τὸ ...γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἁγίου ἐστίν	τὸ ...γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστίν ἁγίου
13.39*	ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτὰ ἐστίν ὁ διάβολος	ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ἐστίν ὁ σπείρας αὐτὰ ὁ διάβολος
22.28	τίνος ἔστε τῶν ἑπτὰ γυνή	τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή
25.23	ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός	ἐπὶ ὀλίγα πιστός ἦς
27.40	εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ	εἰ υἱὸς θεοῦ εἶ
• Non-Verbal		
12.4*	ὁ οὐκ ἦν ἐξὸν αὐτῶ	ὁ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῶ
18.24	προσῆχθη αὐτῶ εἰς ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων	προσ. εἰς αὐτῶ ὀφειλ. μυρίων ταλάντων
22.36*	ποία ἐντολὴ ἐν τῶ νόμῳ μεγάλη;	ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῶ νόμῳ;
26.22	ἤρξαντο λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶ<<ν>>	ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῶ εἰς ἕκαστος

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

27.15\* ἀπολύειν ἓνα δέσμιον τῷ ὄχλῳ

ἀπολύειν ἓνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον

## v. Discussion of a Few Examples

It is difficult to ascertain which of the two prepositional phrases is in marked focus in Mt 27.51 because either can be identified as supportive/less focal or highlighted. Furthermore, one can wonder why there is such a difference in word order in one of the texts. How important is it that the temple's curtain was divided into two parts from top to bottom or from top to bottom into two parts? A harmonisation with Mk 14.38 (B.03: ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο [+μέρη, D.05] ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω) could be the reason (although such a reference to a harmonisation is surprisingly not indicated in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>).

In such a case, the difference in order in Matthew raises the reason for an inversion. If Levisohn's principles can help, it could be argued that Codex Bezae is highlighting the two parts as Jewish features common in many episodes of the Jewish history (crossing of the Red Sea etc....) where Codex Vaticanus highlights the cutting from the top as God's sign. In summary, rather than being the result of an accidental inversion, the word order may well bear some underlying message. Further investigation into the first century cultural context would be needed to determine if this is the case.

Finally, the proximity of Mt 26.23 with the Markan parallel Mk 14.20 (ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον) could explain the use of the present middle participle as opposed to the active aorist participle in Codex Vaticanus. However, the word order in Bezan Matthew shows that the prepositional phrase was emphasised by having the subject immediately follow the verb, indicating a gesture with the person, rather than the default ordering, signalling a gesture to the dish. It could therefore well be possible that the Jewish reader/audience would be familiar with the 'table etiquette' described in Sirach 31.14 (οὐ εἰς ἐπιβλέψῃ μὴ ἐκτείνῃς χεῖρα καὶ μὴ συνθλίβου αὐτῷ ἐν τρυβλίῳ, 'Do not reach out your hand for everything you see, and do not crowd your neighbour at the dish'), where the order in Mt 26.23D.05 would be an indication of. The other order in Codex Vaticanus would then be a focus on the scene of Judas dipping his hands in the dish at the same time as Jesus.

Now that these differences in word order involving the verb (whether main or subordinate) have been set out, I will turn to the consideration of word order in nominal phrases.

## IV. 7. 2. Word Order Differences in Nominal Phrases

Within nominal phrases (66) words also appear in a default or marked order. The word order differences within a nominal phrase will be discussed according to the part of speech involved: adjectives (IV. 7. 2. 1), adnominal genitives (IV. 7. 2. 2), other instances of nominal phrases (IV. 7. 2. 3) will be followed by a discussion of a few examples in text-critical terms (IV. 7. 2. 4).

## IV. 7. 2. 1. Adjectives

Adjectives are in their default order when they follow the noun.<sup>125</sup> As a result, adjectives in prenominal position are highlighted.

## i. Numeral Adjectives

Numerals can be in postnominal (default) order or in prenominal order (marked) and Mt D.05 and B.03 display both positions. In the case of numeral adjectives, because the ordinal adjective naturally carries emphasis within its meaning, it is naturally expected to be in prenominal position but can be postnominal when no specific attention from the reader/audience is expected.<sup>126</sup> The cardinal adjectives are usually in prenominal position when describing an intrinsic quality or of particular importance.<sup>127</sup>

## • cardinals

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
4.2	τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας	νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα
17.4	τρεις σκηνας	σκηνας τρεις
19.6	μεία σάρξ	σάρξ μία
21.24	ένα λόγον	λόγον ένα

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
5.36	τρίχα μείαν	μίαν τρίχα
18.28*	δηνάρια ρ̄ (έκατόν)	έκατόν δηνάρια

## • ordinals

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
27.45*	ένάτης ώρας	ώρας ένατης

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
20.3*	ώραν τρίτην	τρίτην ώραν
20.5	ώραν έκτην και έννάτην	έκτην και ένατην ώραν
27.64* (έως τής)	ήμέρας τρείτης	(έως τής) τρίτης ήμέρας

## ii. Demonstratives

Variance in the position of the demonstrative occurs several times between the two manuscripts in some common expressions such as ‘all these’ (πάντα ταῦτα/ταῦτα πάντα)<sup>128</sup> or many crowds (πολὺν ὄχλον/ὄχλον πολὺν):

<sup>125</sup> READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 90.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

<sup>128</sup> On the differences and variant readings involving πάντα ταῦτα/ταῦτα πάντα, see J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 98.

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
18.10*	τούτων τῶν μεικρῶν	τῶν μεικρῶν τούτων
23.36	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα
24.33	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα
24.34	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
13.56*	πάντα ταῦτα	ταῦτα πάντα
20.14*	τῷ αἰσχάτῳ τούτῳ	τούτῳ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ
24.2*	πάντα ταῦτα	ταῦτα πάντα
24.14*	τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο	τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
14.14*	ὄχλον πολύν	πολὺν ὄχλον

Individual studies on the most frequent positions of the pronoun would be needed here but is beyond the scope of this initial work. The aim here is to highlight word order differences as a significant feature of variation that is worthy of consideration in evaluating variant readings.

#### IV. 7. 2. 2. Adnominal Genitives and Pronouns

Some forms involving nouns in the genitives in relationship with other nouns are particularly variant in Mt D.05/B.03. When the genitive involves a pronoun, the latter can be in pre- or postnominal position.

- Genitives of Relationship

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
2.22	Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ	τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρώδου
14.33*	υἱὸς θεοῦ	θεοῦ υἱός
23.9	ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν ὁ πατήρ

- Partitive Genitives

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
5.29*	ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σου [σκανδαλίζει σε	ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιός [σκανδαλίζει σε
9.30*	οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί
10.30	καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς
12.13*	τὴν χεῖρα σου	σου τὴν χεῖρα
20.13	ἐνὶ αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν ἐνί
20.34	τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν τῶν ὀμμάτων
28.9*	τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας

- Subjective Genitives

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
4.24*	αὐτοῦ ἢ ἀκοή	ἢ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ
19.29	τοῦ ὀνόματός μου	τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος
23.2	τῆς καθέδρας Μωϋσέως	τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας

- Possessive Genitives

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
6.4	ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου	σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη
16.18*	τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μου	μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
18.31*	οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ οἱ σύνδουλοι

The above lists indicate that there is variability of order, seemingly with no impact on the meaning, but certainly suggests an editorial act. Interestingly, Mt D.05 has more often the default order than Mt B.03.

#### IV. 7. 2. 3. Other Nominal Phrases

This last subclass of nominal phrases includes mostly independent words that are linked or not linked to a coordinating particle (καί, ἤ), where no markedness seems to be involved. Runge reminds us that ‘the narrative events that are added one to another are judged by the writer to be of equal status.’<sup>129</sup> Thus, there is apparently no reason for having *A and B* or *B and A*, although one must nevertheless ask why the word order would have been changed. The occurrences are listed below:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
14.21	παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν	γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων
15.38	παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν	γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων
15.30	τυφλοῦς, κυλλοῦς	κυλλοῦς, τυφλοῦς
16.12	Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων	Σαδδουκαίων καὶ Φαρισαίων
18.8	χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν	κυλλὸν ἢ χωλόν

A specific consideration of word order in coordinated nouns and on their importance in the message conveyed has been already discussed.<sup>130</sup>

#### IV. 7. 2. 4. Interpretation of Word Order Differences in Nominal Phrases

As an illustration of the possible meaning of markedness due to word order, Mt 4.2D.05 shows Jesus brought to the desert and tempted by the devil where he fasted for forty days and forty nights, νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας. Codex Vaticanus has the natural order καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα. While the reference to forty nights is exclusively Matthean (Mark and

<sup>129</sup> RUNGE, *Discourse Grammar*, 26.

<sup>130</sup> READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 76–7, 82–5.

Luke have ‘forty days’ only), the additional reference to forty nights is most probably a Jewish feature because of its reference to the Jewish Scriptures.<sup>131</sup> However, the order found in the LXX consistently has the prenominal order, i.e. *τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας και τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας*, a direct import from the same word order in Hebrew (ארבעים יום ווארבעים לילה). Therefore this unique order in Bezan Matthew could be construed as an original wording aiming at drawing the attention of the reader/audience to certain biblical figures (Moses in Exodus, Elijah in Deuteronomy) or divine events (creation in Genesis). For this reason, the Bezan formulation is more likely to be earlier than the Alexandrian one, while the default order reflects a straight forward narrative account of the event.

Reasons might be found in the local context of 1<sup>st</sup> c. Judaism but it might be no longer possible to access this with sufficient precision to arrive at an answer.

#### IV. 7. 3. Other Types of Word Order Differences

This final section will focus on examples that I deliberately discarded as they cannot be technically classified as grammatical differences of word order, but instead, reflect a different syntax due to a different formulation. There are two such groups, one where the wording is different lexically or syntactically or both or where the wording implies a change in nature of the words, and one where the words are similar but the place of the verb is different. A third group corresponding to the inversion due to grammatical constraints will not be listed because it is irrelevant: *καί* as a connective will always be in the first position while *δέ* will systematically be in the second position. This section is slightly at the crossroads of constituent order and different rephrasing and will not be examined.

##### IV. 7. 3. 1. Change of Position of Conjunctions/Adverbs

In the following 29 instances, the conjunction or adverb is at a different place whether in Mt D.05 or Mt B.03. Nuances are brought in the intensity of the discourse but would require further linguistic exploration:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
9.9	<i>και παράγων ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν</i>	<i>και παράγων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν</i>
9.33*	<i>οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐφάνη</i>	<i>οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως</i>
18.19	<i>δύο ἐὰν συμφωνήσουσιν</i>	<i>ἐὰν δύο συμφωνήσουσιν</i>
21.21*	<i>και τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ ἐὰν εἶπητε</i>	<i>κᾶν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἶπητε</i>
18.20	<i>οὐκ εἰσιν γάρ δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι</i>	<i>οὗ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι</i>
24.30	<i>και κόψονται τότε πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί</i>	<i>και τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί</i>
26.53	<i>ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι</i> <i>[τὸν πατέρα μου και παραστήσει μοι πλείω</i>	<i>ὅτι οὐ δύνομαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν</i> <i>[πατέρα μου και παραστήσει μοι ἄρτι πλείω</i>
25.27	<i>ἔδει οὖν σε βαλεῖν</i>	<i>ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν</i>

<sup>131</sup> Gen. 7.4,12,17, Exod. 24.18, 34.28, Deut. 9.9,11,18,25, 10.10, 1 Ki. 19.8, 2 Ma. 12.9.



Each occurrence would need a specific study to determine whether Codex Bezae is more inclined to poetic or sophisticated or emphatic phrasing or if the alternative wording reflects a poor knowledge of Greek, for example.

#### IV. 7. 3. 2. Syntactical Rearrangements

In this section, the syntax in both manuscripts is close but somewhat different. The question of the reason for a change again is raised though it will probably remain unanswered without further development in linguistic and/or cultural studies.

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
5.11	διώξουσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσουσιν	ὀνειδίσουσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξουσιν
9.17	καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι	καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐρχέται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπόλλυνται
10.11	ἢ πόλις εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσέλθητε εἰς αὐτήν	εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε
11.9	εἰδεῖν; προφήτην;	προφήτην ἰδεῖν;
13.23*	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν	ἐπὶ τὴν καλήν γῆν
13.24*	τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀγρῷ	τῷ ἀγρῷ ἑαυτοῦ
14.8	εἶπεν, δός μοι	δός μοι, φησὶν
16.22	ἤρξατο αὐτῷ ἐπιτετιμᾶν καὶ λέγειν	λέγει αὐτῷ ἐπιτετιμῶν
17.24*	(...λαμβάνοντες) καὶ εἶπαν τῷ Πέτρῳ	(...λαμβάνοντες) τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ εἶπαν
17.4	καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μείαν καὶ Ἡλεία μείαν	καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ μίαν Ἡλεία
17.8*	εἶδον εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸν Ἰησοῦν	εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
22.7	ἐκεῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας ὠργίσθη	ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὠργίσθη
23.10	ὅτι καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός	ὅτι καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν εἷς ὁ Χριστός
24.3*	τῆς παρουσίας σου	τῆς σῆς παρουσίας
24.30*	(μετὰ δυνάμεως) πολλῆς καὶ δόξης	(μετὰ δυνάμεως) καὶ δόξης πολλῆς
25.15*	τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ	τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν
26.50	ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, ἕτεραι	ἐταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει

The concept of markedness is less visible here and may involve stylistic preferences (e.g. probable chiasm in the case of 17.4B.03 καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ μίαν Ἡλεία); no systematic pattern stands out.

#### IV. 7. 3. 3. Differences Resulting in a Different Meaning

In the following cases, the word order difference implies a different emphasis or meaning. For this reason, these word order differences are classified separately from the other sections:

Ref.	Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
6.14*	ἀφήσει ὑμῖν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος	ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος
13.48	ὅτε δὲ ἐπληρώθη ἀνεβίβασαν αὐτήν	ἦν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη ἀναβίβασαντες
16.5a*	καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο [οἱ μαθηταὶ ἄρτους λαβεῖν	καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ [πέραν ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους
18.9	τὸ αὐτὸ εἰ καὶ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδαλίζει σε	καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδα-λίζει σε
20.17	παρέλαβεν τοὺς ἰβ̄ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ εἶπεν	παρέλαβεν...καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπεν

20.12	ἴσους αὐτοὺς ἡμεῖν ἐποίησας	ἴσους ἡμῖν αὐτοὺς ἐποίησας
21.39	ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλαν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος	ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπ. καὶ ἀπέκτειναν

To take an example, the adverbial καὶ before ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν means ‘even your Father [will forgive you]’ in Mt 6.14D.05, while when it is placed before ὑμῖν it means ‘[your heavenly Father] to you also [or even you will forgive].’ As a result, it is neither a question of markedness nor default order which has guided the scribe but a difference in meaning.

#### IV. 7. 3. 4. Reordering of Verses

A final matter must be considered before drawing the study of word order to a close. There are three cases where entire verses of Bezan Matthew appear in a different position to Mt B.03. Although these differences are discussed among scholars, there is no consensus about the original order.

The first two verses are Mt 5.4,5 for which Metzger proposed quite surely ({B}-grade) that an inversion had taken place due to a deliberate symmetric re-organisation of the text:

If verses 3 and 5 had originally stood together, with their rhetorical antithesis of heaven and earth, it is unlikely that any scribe would have thrust ver. 4 between them. On the other hand, as early as the second century copyists reversed the order of the two beatitudes so as to produce such an antithesis and to bring πτωχοί and πραεῖς into closer connection.<sup>132</sup>

The next case of verse inversion is Mt 17.12b-13 traditionally ignored in commentaries (e.g. Metzger and Davies-Allison). Holmes describes this inversion as an editorial improvement of the text aimed at avoiding an ‘awkward switch of subjects.’<sup>133</sup> Interestingly, there are no variant readings (except a minor one: νῦν is added in a few manuscripts) apart from the different place of the verses.

The last case can be found in Mt 21.29-31 (Parable of the Two Sons) where there is more than a change in position of the words or a verse, and the passage may reflect a completely different purpose. Indeed, the analysis and possible reasons for so many variant readings can be reduced to three standalone forms of texts, discussion of which goes beyond the scope of this work although views can be found in the scholarship.<sup>134</sup>

<sup>132</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 10.

<sup>133</sup> HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 128–9.

<sup>134</sup> In summary, Metzger describes three main states of the text whether the first and second son agree or not (a) ‘yes’ – ‘no’ – ‘the first’ as in ⱼ C\* K W Δ Π c q vg sy<sup>c,p,h</sup> al (b) ‘no’ – ‘yes’ – ‘the last one as in D a b d e ff<sup>2</sup> h l sy<sup>s</sup> al (c) ‘yes’ – ‘no’ – ‘the last’ (with four variants whether ‘the first’ or ‘the second’ or ‘the last’ [the latter has itself two variants] as in B Θ f<sup>13</sup> 700 sy<sup>pal</sup> arm geo al (*Commentary*, 44-6) and concludes with a meaningless articulation in Codex Bezae, the Old Latin and the Syriac. Amphoux, based on an earlier work published by Michaels (J.R. MICHAELS, ‘The Parable of the Regretful Son,’ *HTR* 62 [1968] 15–26) revises this conclusion and proposes the Bezan text to reflect a typically Stoic-Cynic rhetoric which explains the other two traditions (‘Les contextes de la parabole des deux fils [Mt 21,28-32],’ *LOAPL* 3 [1991] 215–248). Elliott summarizes all views in J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘The Parable of the Two Sons. Text and Exegesis,’ in A. DENAUX (ed.), Page | 96

## IV. 8. Conclusions

The question of word order differences in manuscripts is largely overlooked among textual critics, despite the acknowledgement of it as a category of its own when talking about variant readings. The temptation to mention only word order differences (and not word order ‘changes’ as often read in text-critical studies) between the text of reference, i.e. Nestle-Aland, and a given manuscript fails to identify reasons for such a difference and to conclude systematically that the reading of the manuscript under study is variant hence secondary. Furthermore, the temptation is to appeal to the ‘free word order’ status of Koine Greek and thereby disregard a genuine reason for the construction of a discourse, where word order is used to highlight some elements in contrast to others.

Therefore, an exhaustive list of all word order differences between the two texts of Matthew in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus was first drawn up from NA<sup>28</sup> but complemented by the consultation of Scrivener’s edition, bringing to light a much higher number of instances than originally identified from NA<sup>28</sup> alone.

While proposing which of the above 156 variant readings are more likely to be original is a task which goes beyond this work – although a couple of examples were identified with immediate text-critical conclusions – further study is needed. The prime purpose of this section was to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that, while there is often no obvious reason for modifying word order given the flexibility of the Greek language, word order differences are likely to be more significant than is usually realised, not to identify a difference in meaning but a difference in focus or emphasis.

When talking about word order in Codex Bezae, even Harris’ work on Codex Bezae overlooked the significance of such changes. Yoder checked variant readings involving word order changes with a focus on the Greek and Latin columns and concluded that ‘the multiplicity and variety of transpositions of words in a sentence testifies to an atmosphere of freedom: whether *licet* or *illicet*, one is unable to determine.’<sup>135</sup> Only more recently, works have received increased interest in word order in the texts of New Testament but the essence of the variation is hardly commented on or in text-critical discussions. And yet, the overall interest in studying word order outside of unapplied linguistics resides, as Levinsohn mentions, in its interest for exegesis<sup>136</sup> for which the choice of text is critical.

It has been shown that from what we can see in Mt D.05 and B.03 scribes followed principles of marked and default order in a natural manner, and that the same message could have been conveyed by ordering the sentence differently but the focus would have been different. Interestingly, when the word order is different in Mt D.05/B.03, Codex Bezae tends to have the default order. Though speculative, this

---

*New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven/Paris/Sterling/Virginia: Peeters Publishers and Leuven University Press, 2002) 67-78 (reprinted in ELLIOTT, *Thoroughgoing Principles*, 359-71).

<sup>135</sup> YODER, ‘Language,’ 351.

<sup>136</sup> S.H. LEVINSOHN, ‘The Relevance of Greek Discourse Studies to Exegesis,’ *Journal of Translation* 2 (2006) 20.

### CHAPTER 3

study has also suggested a few readings that appear to be closer to the context of an audience rooted in 1<sup>st</sup> c. Judaism. This initial exploration presented here may help further work on the subject to be able to identify a reason for word order change rather than simply indicating (or not) a different word order from the ‘text of reference.’

Now that the presence or absence of words, alternative wording and word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 have been presented (totalising 1,266 differences if one excludes the 668 instances of orthographical difference), a last case of variant readings that combines all these types, harmonisations, will now be presented in the next three chapters.

## Chapter 4

### METHODOLOGY IN THE CONSIDERATION OF HARMONISTIC READINGS IN THE BEZAN TEXT OF MATTHEW

#### I. Review of the Preceding Chapters, Limitations

As we have seen above from the history of research (Chapter 2), the Bezan text of the Gospels, especially Matthew, has been relatively underappreciated. Concerning a text-critical analysis of the variant readings in Mt D.05 specifically, the most thorough study to date remains that of Michael Holmes.<sup>1</sup> Holmes summarised all the Bezan variants in Matthew by classifying them into omissions, additions, substitutions, harmonisations and general improvement and concluded that they were secondary in character, resulting from the many corrections that took place during the early stages of the transmission process. His conclusions support the general understanding of the ‘Western’ text as a whole as a paraphrasing text,<sup>2</sup> which is fond of textual expansions and striking omissions,<sup>3</sup> and, with particular reference to Codex Bezae, a ‘harmonising’ tendency,<sup>4</sup> i.e. as the most distinctive manuscript in this group, ‘it exhibits a tendency to reduce discordant parallels across the Gospels by amending the text and making them agree.’<sup>5</sup> Indeed, one of the standard principles of textual criticism stipulates that one should adopt the reading which makes a passage less like its parallel,<sup>6</sup> the most discordant reading is more likely to be original, because scribes have a tendency to reduce discordance between the Gospels rather than the other way round.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, the ‘harmonising’ reading is customarily regarded as a correction of the ‘non-harmonising’ one.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity.’

<sup>2</sup> B.W.F. WESTCOTT and F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1907) 122.

<sup>3</sup> N.R. LIGHTFOOT, *How We Got the Bible?* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003) 58.

<sup>4</sup> [The harmonising tendency of Codex Bezae is] ‘a well-known phenomenon, especially in Luke (J. DELOBEL, ‘The Lord’s Prayer in the Textual Tradition. A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion’s Role,’ in J.-M. SEVRIN (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif* [BETL 86; Leuven: Peeters/Louvain: University Press, 1989] 293-30 [303 n. 38]); a ‘distinctive characteristic of the whole manuscript’ (HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 124); ‘a high proportion of distinctive readings of Codex Bezae’ (D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997] 42; E. J. EPP, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966) 74; ‘a hallmark of the Western and Byzantine traditions’ (G.D. FEE, ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels’ in EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 175).

<sup>5</sup> According to Tischendorf’s fourth principle of textual criticism, ‘in parallel passages the tendency of copyists would be to make the readings agree, and therefore, in such passages, testimonies are to be preferred which are not in precise accordance’ (summarised in J. FINEGAN, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974] 63).

<sup>6</sup> PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, 111.

<sup>7</sup> On the shift from the search of the ‘original’ text to the ‘best available’ text, see E.J. EPP, ‘The Multivalence of the Term “Original Text” in New Testament Textual Criticism,’ *HTR* 92 (1999) 245–81 (246).

My classification of variants in Bezan Matthew in Chapter 3 as a mixture of presence or absence of words, lexical/grammatical differences, can sometimes be awkward and difficult simply because the readings in question reflect harmonisation, i.e. where the scribe or editor of a manuscript seems to have (inadvertently?) borrowed the language from a parallel passage and inserted it into the text. Let us take Mt 9.17D.05/B.03 as an illustration as it bears all the above mentioned features:

Codex Bezae	Codex Vaticanus
Οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μήγε ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ↑ ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι· βάλλουσιν δὲ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς καὶ ἀμφότεροι τηροῦνται	οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἄσκοί καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται

If one follows the comparison of the two texts according to the classification done in the preceding chapter, words appear in different order when comparing Codex Bezae to Codex Vaticanus (ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι/καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπόλλυνται) and are either omitted (*om./ἐκχεῖται*), added (ὁ νέος/*om.*; τοὺς ἀσκούς/*om.*) or substituted (ῥήσσει/ῥήγνυνται; δέ/ἀλλά; τηροῦνται/ συντηροῦνται) however the lexical proximity of Mt 9.17D.05 with Mk 2.22 (καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοί· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς) can be *prima facie* regarded as a harmonisation with Mark. Actually, Mt 9.17D.05 ‘resembles’ to the NA<sup>28</sup> form of Mk 2.22, the verse in Mark is highly variant. Therefore, concluding into a harmonisation ignores the question of the original form of Mk 2.22.<sup>9</sup> This is the reason why concluding into a harmonisation may be a partial statement and needs exploring further.

Specifically, the phenomenon of harmonisation raises the question of how or why a scribe, having in front of him a specific reading, would not copy but amend the text, thereby substituting the reading in front of him for an ‘equivalent’ reading found in one of the other Synoptic Gospels. In his short essay on how scribes worked, Dain talks about a *dictée intérieure* which consists in memorising the verse or portion of verse and writing it down the best he could.<sup>10</sup> This copying exercise therefore is likely to generate inadvertent changes as well as reflecting systematic scribal errors as Baarda mentions:

---

Throughout his article Epp uses the term ‘original text’ in inverted commas to highlight the difficulty in identifying what is really behind the quest of textual criticism. Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel follow Petzer’s proposal that ‘the twenty first century research will have to solve the two remaining riddles: the problem of the second century text, and even to the first century text including the nature of the ‘original’ text and its relation to the ‘autographs’ (B. ALAND–J. DELOBEL [eds], *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods* [CBET 7; Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994] 8).

<sup>8</sup> K. ALAND and B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 262.

<sup>9</sup> The variant reading of Mt 9.17D.05 (par. Mk 2.22) is discussed in Chapter 6 II. 2.

<sup>10</sup> A. DAIN, *Les Manuscrits* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975) 22, 44–6.

Textual harmonisation was most probably one of the attempts to remove or neutralise the disagreements among the Gospels. Apart from an amount of unconscious assimilation by the scribes who inadvertently reproduced the text of the Gospel with which they were most familiar, and not the text of the exemplar being copied, they are certainly deliberate alterations, omissions or additions. Scribes consciously altered their manuscripts and made it conform it to that of the other Gospels, especially when these latter texts stood in high esteem in their community because of their archaic character or supposed apostolic origin. This process of harmonization was not necessarily limited to the canonical Gospels, but extended also to documents that were later labelled as apocryphal Gospels.<sup>11</sup>

As a result, the scribes' knowledge of the Scriptures comes into play at the moment where a verse or portion of verses 'resembles' more a different Gospels than the assumed text to be copied. Conversely, there is general consensus that it is *a priori* relatively unlikely that a scribe would 'de-harmonise' the wording common to two (or more) Gospels.

Scholars have addressed since long this question of *diorthosis*,<sup>12</sup> a phenomenon whereby a scribe amends the biblical text in formation, either by accident or deliberately, resulting in an 'orthodox corruption,' as Ehrman strikingly describes it.<sup>13</sup> The question still remains as to why a scribe would naturally add to or 'correct' the text that he may have anticipated to be missing or 'wrong,' or why a word or clause or phrase with apparently no difference in meaning would be deliberately substituted by taking from the parallel passage.

Regarding the harmonisations in Codex Bezae, earlier scholarship on harmonisation as a scribal activity in early manuscripts (section II.1) and in Mt D.05 (section II. 2) will be briefly reviewed. I will then describe a methodology on how such harmonisations can be identified from the Nestle-Aland apparatus in order to comment on the Bezan text of Matthew (section III).

## II. History of Research on Harmonistic Variants

While harmonisation is introduced in any major work of textual criticism,<sup>14</sup> the study of specific instances of harmonistic readings in the Gospels are rare.<sup>15</sup> Beyond individual

---

<sup>11</sup> T. BAARDA, 'Διαφωνία-Συμφωνία: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *Essays on the Diatessaron* (CBET 11; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994) 29–47.

<sup>12</sup> On the phenomenon of diorthosis, see e.g. R.B. STEWART, *The Reliability of the New Testament*, Bart D. Ehrman and Daniel B. Wallace in *Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011) 76. On its application to the Bezan text of Matthew, see M.W. HOLMES, 'Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 150–2.

<sup>13</sup> B.D. EHRLMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. J.K. ELLIOTT, 'Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden/Boston: Brill) 2010, 417–30; D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the*

studies, the importance of textual criticism in the broader scholarly context of synoptic studies is nonetheless consistently advocated as unavoidable although rarely discussed in detail.<sup>16</sup> To help supplement this area of research, the phenomenon of harmonisation as a scribal habit will be first introduced (II.1) before a specific development on alleged harmonistic variants in Bezan Matthew will be presented (II.2).

## II. 1. Harmonisation as a Scribal Habit

Without mentioning directly scribal activity, the 19<sup>th</sup> c. scholar Burgon, who maintained an ideological preference for the Byzantine text, differentiates between harmonisation and the related phenomenon of assimilation.<sup>17</sup> Harmonisation is an intentional circumstance reflecting

a tendency to bring the Four Records (the Gospels) into one harmonious narrative, or at least to delete or to vary statements in one Gospel which ‘appeared’ to conflict with parallel statement in another.<sup>18</sup>

Furthermore he concludes that the possibility of an ‘Evangelical Diatessaron,’ or Harmony, or combined narrative now forgotten,’ appears to have influenced the Gospels.<sup>19</sup> In contrast, he defines assimilation as the case where ‘sometimes the expression of one Evangelist gets improperly transferred to another.’<sup>20</sup>

This latter understanding continues to be the definition of harmonisation in current scholarship. In his manual on the textual criticism of the New Testament, Metzger gives several examples of harmonistic corruptions and summarizes the assumption as follows:

Since monks usually knew by heart extensive portions of the Scriptures, the temptation to harmonise discordant parallels or questions would be strong

---

*New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 338-41. For a wider consideration of biblical manuscripts, see E. TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, MI: Fortress Press, 2001); *ibid.*, ‘The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,’ *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3-29.

<sup>15</sup> A few articles are of interest in suggesting of a probable original reading after internal and external consideration: J.W. WENHAM, ‘How Many Cock-Crowings: The Problem of Harmonistic Text-Variants,’ *NovT* 25 (1979) 523-5; *ibid.*, ‘Why Do You Ask Me about the Good: A Study of the Relation between Text and Source Criticism,’ in *NTS* 28 (1982) 116-25; H.-W. BARTSCH, ‘Über den Umgang der frühen Christenheit mit dem Text der Evangelien. Das Beispiel des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis,’ *NTS* 29 (1983) 167-82; M.W. HOLMES, ‘The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,’ *JBL* 109 (1990) 651-64; J.R. SHAFFER, ‘A Harmonization of Matt 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10,’ *TMSJ* 17 (2006) 35-50; E.F. HILLS, ‘Harmonizations in the Caesarean Text of Mark,’ *JBL* 66 (1947) 135-52; R.L. OMANSON, ‘A Question of Harmonization – Matthew 9:18-25,’ *Bible Translator* 42 (1991) 241.

<sup>16</sup> J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘L’importance de la critique textuelle pour le problème synoptique,’ *RB* 96 (1989) 56-70; G.D. FEE, ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonisation in the Gospels,’ in EPP-FEE, *Studies*, 174-8.

<sup>17</sup> J.W. BURGON, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, being the Sequel to ‘The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels’* (Reprint 1998; London: G. Bell, 1896) 44-58.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.



in proportion to the degree of the copyist's familiarity with other parts of the Bible.<sup>21</sup>

Beyond the scribe's knowledge of the Scriptures potentially creating harmonistic readings accidentally, the dislike of disagreeing sacred texts made the process at times intentional.<sup>22</sup> As a result, textual critics suggest that the most discordant reading between two variant readings should be taken as the one which is more likely to be original. However, as Delobel admits, 'the harmonistic corruption lies on the border between accident and purpose,' and he confesses 'it turns out to be very difficult to decide [between the two].'<sup>23</sup> This remark should not be forgotten in assessing a (potentially) harmonising variant so that the text critical principle does not turn out to be applied mechanically.

In his study on scribal habits in early papyri (Ⲣ<sup>45.66.75</sup>),<sup>24</sup> Colwell formalised his conclusions on the causes of harmonisations. He classified the latter into harmonisations to the immediate/intermediate context (the latter being defined as four or five verses immediately before or after the reading),<sup>25</sup> to usage (i.e. adaptation to common words or phrases or to well-known passages) and to a parallel passage from another Gospel.<sup>26</sup> Colwell showed that the scribes were more inclined to harmonise to the immediate context rather than to parallels or to general usage.<sup>27</sup>

Further, James Royse pursued Colwell's work with a comprehensive study on the scribal habits in six early and extensive Greek NT papyri Ⲣ<sup>45.46.47.66.72.74</sup>, concluding that the most common form of corruption is harmonisation, normally to the immediate context.<sup>28</sup> He concludes that the tendency of scribes was to omit rather than to add text, which undermines the text-critical principle that the shorter reading should be preferred.

---

<sup>21</sup> B.M. METZGER and B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 262.

<sup>22</sup> 'But again it could also be intentional, because it was impossible that sacred texts should not be in agreement' in ALAND-ALAND, *Text*, 290.

<sup>23</sup> DELOBEL, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Textual Tradition. Variant Readings in the Greek Manuscripts of the Gospels,' in *ibid.*, *Logia*, 431-57 [441].

<sup>24</sup> E.C. COLWELL, 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,' in J.P. HYATT (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Papers Read at the 100<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964* (Nashville: Abington Press, 1965) 370-89.

<sup>25</sup> The immediate context is defined as the four or five verses immediately before or after the reading, the intermediate context as anything up to one or two chapters before or after the reading, and harmonisation to general usage as adoption common words or phrases, or to well-known passages' summarised in D. JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (TaS.ThS 5; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007) 140.

<sup>26</sup> As introduced by Hernandez, this position is a methodological one. See J. HERNÁNDEZ, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi* (WUNT2 218; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) 52; JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 143.

<sup>27</sup> B.D. EHRMAN and M.W. HOLMES (eds), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Questionis. A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger* (SD 46; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 246.

<sup>28</sup> J.R. ROYSE, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008) 360; more generally on scribal habits see *ibid.*, 'Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament,' in EHRMAN-HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 239-52.

Textual critics identify harmonistic readings where variants seem to be textually closer to other passages. This method of identification is deeply rooted mainly due to the fact that it apparently makes good sense (it is more likely that two parallel readings are brought closer than de-harmonised) and is usually based on a relatively subjective and approximate analysis of the variant reading, which is seen as ‘quite similar’ to a parallel passage or ‘with no doubt’ pointing to a harmonistic reading. In order to test this usual procedure, the aim in this work will be to compare the exactness of the variant reading with the parallel reading and specifically within the two selected manuscripts. In contrast to Holmes who restricted his study to the harmonistic variants only,<sup>29</sup> the present work will list all readings claimed as harmonistic.

Finally, harmonisations are considered in the scholarship as the result of professional scribal activity conducted in scriptoria but it has been far from firmly established how the early texts of the New Testament were copied in the two first centuries. This is particularly highlighted in the form of canons in Parker’s presentation of the difficulties to approach harmonisations, without being though able to identify their genesis.<sup>30</sup>

## II. 2. Vogels’ Approach on Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew

As mentioned earlier (Chapter 1, V.3.), Vogels’ 1910 monograph examines the alternative, and allegedly harmonistic, wording of Codex Bezae (1,278 references from the Gospels, of which 229 in Matthew) in relation to Nestle’s text,<sup>31</sup> the so-called ‘right text’ (‘der richtige Text’),<sup>32</sup> and concludes that a Gospel Harmony stands behind the Bezan text. While such an idea is not new,<sup>33</sup> his work systematically lists all variant readings in Codex Bezae along with the wording from parallel sections within the Gospels that appear to display similarities. He then classifies such readings under four categories in sections §§1-4 of his monograph.

Section §1 is dedicated to what Vogels calls ‘harmonisation in objective differences’ (‘Harmonistik in sachlichen Differenzen’).<sup>34</sup> In this section, he lists 15 harmonising variants in Codex Bezae (among which three are in Matthew), where ‘D’<sup>35</sup> would have deliberately smoothed (‘gemildert’) a reading in order to match the parallel wording. Section §2 deals with ‘harmonisation in transition passages’ (‘Harmonistik in

---

<sup>29</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 131.

<sup>30</sup> D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 339-40.

<sup>31</sup> At the time when Vogels published his monograph, his ‘Nestle text’ corresponded to the first edition (1898) which Eberhard Nestle generated from the compilation of the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort and Weymouth (after 1901 he replaced the latter with Bernhard Weiß’s 1894/1900 edition). See A.J. FORTE, ‘Observations on the 28<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition of Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*,’ *Biblica* 94 (2013) 268-92 [269].

<sup>32</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 12.

<sup>33</sup> F. H. CHASE, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1895) 76-100.

<sup>34</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 8-11.

<sup>35</sup> It is unclear in his use of ‘D’ whether Vogels refers to the scribe who copied Codex Bezae and generated the alternative readings, or to the editor of Codex Bezae who a Gospel Harmony. In the absence of evidence, I will assume that he means ‘D’ to refer to the scribe copying Codex Bezae.

Übergängen'),<sup>36</sup> that is, text lying at the very junction of two pericopes, an apparently ideal position for harmonisation according to Vogels. In this section, he lists 50 such instances in Mt-Mk-Lk (of which 15 instances are in Matthew alone).<sup>37</sup> Section §3 examines 'parallel variant readings' ('Parallel Varianten'),<sup>38</sup> a lengthier part of the study compared to §§1-2. In this section, he identifies the passages that are present in Codex Bezae against the Nestle text in a context where they 'seem' to be 'out of place' ('nicht offenbar in den Text hineingehören, [...], wo sie ebenso wenig Existenzberechtigung haben'). Within the list of all Gospel texts of this last section, Vogels notes 97 examples in Matthew where the reading of Mt D.05 agrees with the one in the Bezan form of the parallel passage, a feature that he relates to the influence of a harmonising text. In the final and longest section, §4, Vogels lists by chapter and verse all the readings that he considers as being harmonising in Codex Bezae but not belong to any of the categories described in the previous sections ('Liste der harmonistischen Lesarten').<sup>39</sup> In this latter section, Vogels neglects to comment on any of these readings, however, and simply indicates the parallel verse that exhibits a similar or identical wording.

Despite the effort made in exhaustively documenting harmonistic variants to support the thesis that a harmonising text lies behind the Bezan text, the listings remain unconvincing and appear to be somewhat tainted with an enthusiastic subjectivity.<sup>40</sup> More specifically, on the content of Vogels' analysis, the variant readings consist of an heterogeneous mix of orthographical resemblances in parallel gospels in Codex Bezae (e.g. *ράκκους* vs. *ράκους* in Mt 9.16B.03//Mk 2.21D.05), factual but minor differences that cannot be taken as decisive (e.g. *τὸ ἀργυριὸν μου* in Mt 25.27D.05//Lk 19.23D.05; *εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* in Mt 13.2D.05//Mk 4.1D.05), or longer assimilations (cf. Mt 18.11D.05//Lk 19.10 *ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*). These shortcomings severely limit the validity of Vogels' study which ultimately fails to substantiate the central thesis. As a result, his monograph merely demonstrates a resemblance between the Synoptic Gospels, an unremarkable feature that is entirely typical of parallel episodes. Further, for each Bezan reading that differs from the Nestle text, it appears that a parallel text can always be identified, by the very nature of synoptic texts, as a potential 'import' of wording from the parallel text. On this last point, it can be noticed that many *vll* are explained as an 'import', which Vogels justifies by relating them to Luke, Mark or John, or a combination thereof.

Finally, even though the evidence of interwoven wording involving different Gospels is interpreted by Vogels as diatessaric readings, Vogels actually never quotes the

---

<sup>36</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 12-22.

<sup>37</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 13.

<sup>38</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 22-62.

<sup>39</sup> VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 62-107.

<sup>40</sup> Most of the arguments that Vogels brings to the reader's attention are, in his own words, 'evident' ('augenscheinlich'), or else he claims that 'nobody will doubt ('wird niemand bestreiten wollen') that [such changes] are obviously ('offenbar') and only ('nur') due to harmonistic tendencies'. He also notes that the variations at passage junctions are of striking importance ('vondurchschlagender Bedeutung') (VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 17), but without further comment.

Diatessaron and therefore fails to compare Codex Bezae with the Diatessaron text, insofar as it may be reconstructed with some confidence in any of the instances.

The main issue with Vogels' approach is that the distinction between seeing the text of Codex Bezae as resulting from a harmonising archetype, on the one hand, and from a scribe smoothening the differences, on the other, gets gradually blurred in the monograph. Indeed, the explanation that it is a derivation from a harmonising text ultimately conflicts with the idea that it arises from deliberate scribal activity aimed at 'matching' the parallel text, namely by harmonisation. This point is particularly reflected in the unclear identification of 'D,' whether this reflects the activity of a scribe or the trace of a diatessaric text.

In view of the above comments, I decided against using Vogels' data for the purposes of this present study, and that on three grounds: the lists of Bezan readings with their source in other texts, despite their exhaustive character; the use of the eclectic Nestle text as an exclusive point of reference ('the right text'); and the diverse references to variant Gospel passages with no consistent pattern to explain the Bezan readings. I judged these flaws to be sufficiently significant to make his thesis, though interesting, unsuitable for the kind of textual criticism envisaged here where external and internal evidence must be weighed.

It is worth noting that even though Vogels' pioneering work has not been taken further in a formal publication, his results have combined with the predominant role of the Nestle (then Nestle-Aland) text in textual criticism to contribute to the understanding of Codex Bezae as a harmonising text (even if at times that understanding is either unspoken or unconscious).

### II. 3. Holmes' Approach to Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew

As presented in Chapter 1, the only study dedicated to harmonisation in the Bezan text of the Gospel of Matthew is a chapter in Holmes' dissertation. He lists 14 instances of harmonisation in Bezan Matthew based on a series of criteria.<sup>41</sup> These instances involve other passages in Matthew, the immediate context or more distant passages. While he restricts harmonisations to passages of 'decent length'—his point here is that there should be 'enough material' for the claimed harmonistic reading to be regarded as a harmonisation to a different Gospel—I will study all the variant readings indicated in the NA<sup>28</sup> as detailed in the next section.

In order to attempt to include all variant readings allegedly harmonistic, the natural reference of the critical edition of NA<sup>28</sup> will be appealed to.

### III. Methodology for the Identification of Harmonistic Variants in NA<sup>28</sup>

The introduction of the various sigla used in the critical edition of NA<sup>28</sup> are explained in the *Introduction*.<sup>42</sup> Two different ways seem to refer to the principle of harmonisations:

---

<sup>41</sup> HOLMES, 'Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 140.

<sup>42</sup> NA<sup>28</sup>, *Introduction*, 60\*-61\*.

first, a ‘*p*’-sign, standing for *Parallelstellen* (Germ. *parallel reading*), is assigned next to a variant in the case of a harmonisation with a ‘parallel passages in the Gospels [...] listed in the margins at the beginning of the pericopes’.<sup>43</sup> Second, a biblical cross-reference in brackets identifies an intra- or inter-Gospel parallel reading. Because it seems that the *p*-sign apparently refers explicitly to a parallel passage (‘P’ for ‘Parallel’), hence a harmonistic reading, I will call it an *explicit indication* of harmonisations, instance which will be discussed (section III. 1) and the biblical cross-reference will be referred to as an *implicit indication* of harmonistic readings (section III. 2).

### III. 1. Explicit Indications of Harmonistic Readings in NA<sup>28</sup>

Coming back to the use of variant readings referred to as harmonisations in NA<sup>28</sup>, my own count of references in NA<sup>28</sup> where a *p*) is attached to a variant reading in the Bezan text of Matthew leads to a result of 52.<sup>44</sup>

When taking representative text-types of the other early Greek witnesses, *viz.*, W.032 for the pre-5<sup>th</sup> c. state of the Byzantine text (in Matthew),<sup>45</sup> ℳ (Majority Text) for its post-5<sup>th</sup> c. state,<sup>46</sup> Θ.038 for the Caesarean text, Ⲙ.01 and B.03 for the Alexandrian text, my own count from the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> gives that Matthew exhibits 17 harmonistic readings in Ⲙ.01/B.03, 48 in W.032, 53 in ℳ and 51 in Θ.038. The following table displays a comparison across the Synoptic Gospels.

Gospel	B	Ⲙ	D	W	ℳ	Θ
Matthew	17	17	52	48	53	51
Mark	10	38	70	59	49	66
Luke	10	45	171	64	73	76
Total	37	100	293	171	175	193

Table 5: Harmonistic Readings in Early Manuscripts Indicated with a *p*-Sign

According to the above statistics, it is clear that D.05 is supposed to be far more harmonistic (293 instances in total) in the Synoptics than any of the manuscripts chosen. Also, Bezan Luke seems to have a greater proclivity towards harmonisations than the other Gospels in other manuscripts. Finally, Codex Sinaiticus offers a good deal of harmonistic tendency and, as expected, Codex Vaticanus shows very little since any similarities between Gospels in this manuscript are assumed to reflect the author’s intention.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 61\*.

<sup>44</sup> For sake of comparing, Bezan Mark has 70 potentially harmonistic variants and Bezan Luke, 171.

<sup>45</sup> Codex Washingtonianus shows affinity to different text-types according to the Gospels: W.032 is ‘Western’ in Mark 1-5, Caesarean in Mark 5-16, but Byzantine in Matthew and in Luke 8-24, and Alexandria in Luke 1-8, mixed in John. Epp classifies it as C-text, formerly Caesarean, because it stands between B (Codex Vaticanus) and D (Codex Bezae). See EPP, ‘Textual Criticism in Exegesis of the New Testament,’ in S.E. PORTER (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1997) 70-1.

<sup>46</sup> EPP, ‘Textual Criticism in Exegesis,’ 66.

## CHAPTER 4

However, these conclusions are based on the count of explicit references to *p*) contained in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> hence the question comes back to ascertaining if assigning a harmonistic reading to a certain variant reading is justified. I will be seeking to test this question by examining the occurrences of *p*) assigned to the readings of D.05 in Matthew.

As a summary, the 52 references in question are as follows:

- Presence in Mt D.05 *contra txt*
  1. Mt 4.19 <sup>†</sup>*p*) γένεσθαι
  2. Mt 5.25 <sup>†</sup>*p*) σε παραδώσει
  3. Mt 5.44 <sup>†</sup>*p*) εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς
  4. Mt 9.15b <sup>†</sup>*p*) ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμεραῖς
  5. Mt 12.1 <sup>†</sup>*p*) τοὺς
  6. Mt 13.9 <sup>†</sup>*p*) ἀκούειν
  7. Mt 14.15 <sup>†</sup>*p*) αὐτοῦ
  8. Mt 16.13 <sup>†</sup>*p*) με
  9. Mt 17.21 <sup>†</sup>*p*) τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ
  10. Mt 19.20 <sup>†</sup>*p*) ἐκ νεότητός
  11. Mt 22.27 <sup>†</sup>*p*) καί
  12. Mt 24.31 <sup>†1</sup>*p*) ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀναβλέψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν
  13. Mt 24.41 <sup>†</sup>*p*) δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται
  14. Mt 26.28 <sup>†</sup>*p*) καινῆς
  15. Mt 26.55 <sup>†</sup>*p*) πρὸς ὑμᾶς
  16. Mt 26.70 <sup>†</sup>*p*) οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι
  17. Mt 26.9 <sup>†</sup>*p*) τοῖς
  18. Mt 27.28 <sup>†</sup>*p*) ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν καί
- Absence in Mt D.05 *contra txt*
  19. Mt 16.4 <sup>□</sup>*p*) om. καὶ μοιχαλῖς
  20. Mt 26.73 <sup>°</sup>*p*) om. καί
- Alternative Wording in Mt D.05 *contra txt*
  21. Mt 3.17 <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) συ εἶ
  22. Mt 4.18 <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) παράγων
  23. Mt 5.29 <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) ἀπέλθῃ
  24. Mt 5.32 <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ
  25. Mt 5.39 <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) ἐπί
  26. Mt 9.15a <sup>ϛ</sup>*p*) νηστεύειν

## CHAPTER 4

27. Mt 9.17 ῥῃσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς
28. Mt 9.17 ῥῃ ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί
29. Mt 9.27 ῥῃ υἱέ
30. Mt 9.6 ῥῃ ἔγειρε καί
31. Mt 11.19 ῥῃ τῶν τέκνων
32. Mt 13.13 ῥῃ ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούσωσιν καὶ μὴ συνῶσιν μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν
33. Mt 13.34 ῥῃ οὐκ
34. Mt 15.36 ῥῃ τῷ ὄχλῳ
35. Mt 16.4 ῥῃ ζήτηῖ σημεῖον καί
36. Mt 16.20 ῥῃ ἐπετίμησεν
37. Mt 16.21 ῥῃ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι
38. Mt 16.23 ῥῃ ἐπιστραφεῖς
39. Mt 17.23 ῥῃ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας
40. Mt 19.9 ῥῃ ὅς ἂν
41. Mt 20.19 ῥῃ ἀναστήσεται
42. Mt 20.26 ῥῃ ἐστίν
43. Mt 20.30 ῥῃ υἱέ
44. Mt 20.31 ῥῃ υἱέ
45. Mt 21.1 ῥῃ πρὸς
46. Mt 21.13 ῥῃ ἐποιήσατε
47. Mt 24.17 ῥῃ τι
48. Mt 24.29 ῥῃ ἐκ
49. Mt 24.45 ῥῃ θεραπείας
50. Mt 25.27 ῥῃ τὸ ἀργυρίον
51. Mt 26.7 ῥῃ πολυτίμου
52. Mt 28.8 ῥῃ ἐξελθοῦσαι

### III. 2. Implicit Indications of Harmonistic Readings in NA<sup>28</sup>

Interestingly, yet confusingly, some further references in Mt D.05 may qualify as harmonisations although they are not referred to with the sign *p*) in the critical apparatus of Nestle-Aland. In a significant number of cases, the critical apparatus mentions the reference of the verse in question without any *p*) sign, where the *vl* matches linguistically the verse or portion of verse from another Gospel. The present section deals with this other way of noting harmonisation which is defined as ‘implicit’ as opposed to ‘explicit,’ as was the case of the preceding section. Apparently, the symbol <sup>τ</sup> (and the equivalent symbols <sup>τ</sup> <sup>τ</sup><sup>1</sup> <sup>τ</sup><sup>2</sup>)<sup>47</sup> along with the reference in question is used in the critical apparatus where additional material is close to the wording of a different Gospel or is highly similar to the immediate or intermediate context. Likewise, some *vll*, typically accompanied by a reference to the Scriptures, reflect words or a group of words that appear to be *substitut-*

<sup>47</sup> NA<sup>28</sup>, *Introduction*, 57\*

*ed* for the ones in the printed text. In this case, the critical apparatus indicates these ones by using the symbols ς and ς̄.<sup>48</sup> The reason for which the apparent harmonisation is not indicated by the *p*-sign is not explained. Such cases occur for apparent harmonisation (a) with the Septuagint, (b) within Matthew and (c) with Lukan parallels as will now be shown.

There are 18 implicit harmonisations indicated in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> in Matthew:

- Presence in Mt D.05 *contra txt*

1. Mt 2.18 ς(Jr 38.15) θρῆνος καί
2. Mt 4.10 ς(16.23 p) ὀπίσω μου
3. Mt 13.14 ς(Isa. 6.9) πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπὲ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ
4. Mt 18.10 ς(18.6) τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ
5. Mt 18.10 ς(Lk 19.10) [11] ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλὸς
6. Mt 20.16 ς(22.14) πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ
7. Mt 20.28 ς(cf. Lk 14.8–10) ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε· ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνήσαι μὴ ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθῶν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπη σοι; ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσης εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· συνάγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον
8. Mt 22.45 ς(43) ἐν πνεύματι
9. Mt 24.37 ς(39) καί

- Absence in Mt D.05 *contra txt*

10. Mt 24.39 ° (37) καί

- Alternate Wording in Mt D.05 *contra txt*

11. Mt 1.23 ς(cf. Isa. 7.14) καλέσουσιν
12. Mt 1.25 ς(Lk 2.7) τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον
13. Mt 9.29 ς(20.34) ὀμμάτων
14. Mt 10.35 ς(Mi 7.6) υἱός
15. Mt 17.2 ς(28.3) χιών
16. Mt 20.3 ς(6) εὗρεν
17. Mt 20.31 ς(34) υἱέ
18. Mt 25.3 (4) ἐν τοῖς ἀγγελίοις αὐτῶν

---

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*



From this list, one element immediately demands attention: ‘*cf.*,’ the Latin abbreviation for *confere*, ‘compare,’ is not explained in NA<sup>28</sup> as bearing a specific meaning in cross-references.<sup>49</sup> It appears, however, 17 times in the critical apparatus of the four Gospels<sup>50</sup> without any distinctiveness in the references alluded to being pointed out. Specifically, since all cross-references imply by essence a parallel verse which should be referred to, the mention of ‘*cf.*’ is of little value.<sup>51</sup> I will, however, mention it whenever it occurs, to match the NA<sup>28</sup> apparatus.

Secondly, Mt 13.13 has variant readings involving Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae where it is not obvious if the *p*)-sign applies to both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae. This will be discussed in an excursus to Chapter 6.

Thirdly, Mt 4.10 appears with both a *p*)-sign and a cross reference, as will be discussed in the section below (III.3). The reason for this unusual dual reference to a harmonisation is unclear but will be classified in the explicit harmonisations in order not to count it twice.

These implicit harmonistic readings need to be added to the previous grid to fill out the picture of the entire harmonistic tendencies of the six selected manuscripts which is reflected as follows:

Gospel	B	Ⲙ	D	W	Ⲛ	Θ
Matthew	24	24	70	60	67	63
Mark	10	40	78	67	58	73
Luke	12	49	187	70	81	84
Total	46	113	335	197	206	220

Table 6: Combined Implicit and Explicit Harmonistic Readings in Early Manuscripts

The tendencies are similar to those observations in Table 5 but display the entire potential harmonistic tendencies of the six manuscripts, since they include all the variants classified as such in the critical apparatus. The present work will aim at listing and discussing the 70 Bezan variant readings in Codex Bezae by classifying them in an ordered manner.

I will now turn to the successive forms of harmonisations and conclude by the identification of criteria to use to analyse all such forms in Bezan Matthew thoroughly.

### III. 3. Special Cases: Harmonisation with the Septuagint and John

There are two cases within these 70 instances which will not be discussed in this work because of their unique status with non-Synoptic Gospels: harmonisations with the Septuagint (III. 3. 1) and with the Gospel of John (III. 3. 2).

<sup>49</sup> NA<sup>28</sup>, 61\* simply clarifies the abbreviation *cf.* as standing for *confere*.

<sup>50</sup> Three times in Matthew, four times in Mark and Luke, six times in John: Mt 1.23; 20.28; 27.16; Mk 7.31 ; 10.25 (x2); 13.9; Lk 7.28 (x2); 10.17; 14.19; Jn 4.35,36; 8.6,59; 19.4,19,20.

<sup>51</sup> Forte, commenting on the 28<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle-Aland, refers to *cf.* as ‘possible relations between variants’ (FORTE, ‘Observations,’ *Biblica* 94 [2013] 268-92 [269]).

### III. 3. 1. Cases of Implicit Harmonisations with the Septuagint in Bezan Matthew

According to the indications of the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> among the 70 occurrences of harmonisations in Bezan Matthew there are four that are understood as harmonising with the Septuagint. Two consist in a longer reading in Mt D.05 as opposed to a shorter reading in Codex Vaticanus: Mt 2.15 – par. Jer. 38.15LXX and Mt 13.14 par. Isa. 6.9LXX. Two consist of alternative wording to Codex Vaticanus: Mt 1.23 – par. Isa. 7.14LXX as well as Mt 10.35-36 – par. Mic. 7.6LXX.

The issue of the use of the Septuagint in the New Testament is a topic of its own and because the other 66 *vll* out of 70 are presented as harmonistic variants with a Gospel parallel, these four readings will not be analysed in this work.<sup>52</sup>

### III. 3. 2. A Case of Harmonisation with John

From the list of alleged harmonisations in Bezan Matthew delineated above, there is one variant reading indicated in the critical apparatus as a harmonisation with John and potentially Mark (Mt 26.7//Jn 12.3 [par. Mk 14.3]). Since the relationship of John with the Gospels is hotly debated<sup>53</sup> the variant stands beyond the scope of this work. The study of this variant reading will be published separately.

Therefore, this work will concentrate on the remaining 65 *vll*, i.e. once the four harmonisations with the Septuagint and the one with John have been set aside. Further, despite the fact there are parallels with the Synoptic Gospels that also have verbal or contextual proximity with John, the verse from the fourth Gospel will not be quoted in the present analysis but only indicated in a footnote if relevant, since all the remaining variant readings are with Synoptic Gospels.

### III. 4. Cases of Mixed Implicit and Explicit Harmonisations in NA<sup>28</sup>

There are finally two examples of alleged harmonisation in the apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> that may invalidate the idea that a harmonising reading is either cross-referenced or assigned with a *p*)-sign.

The first one is at Mt 4.10, where the Bezan reading (“Υπαγε ὀπίσω μου Σατανᾶ”) is referred to as *p*) combined with a cross-reference with Mt 16.23. This variant reading, discussed in Chapter 5 I. 2, appears to be an isolated case in the critical apparatus and confirms that the difference between the *p*)-sign and a cross-reference is somewhat unclear.

---

<sup>52</sup> I have submitted a publication elsewhere where they are discussed. See L. PINCHARD, ‘Four Variant Readings in Bezan Matthew Claimed as Harmonising with the Septuagint,’ *BABELAO* [pending]. On an introductory presentation of the challenges of LXX quotations in the New Testament, see G. Dorival’s chapter in C.-B. AMPHOUX *et al.*, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014) 195-210 [195].

<sup>53</sup> A good entry point to the question of the relation between John and the Synoptics is the articles and book of the specialists of the Synoptic Problem, F. Neiryneck and D. Moody Smith: F. NEIRYNCK, ‘John and the Synoptics: 1975-1990,’ in A. DENAUX (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 3-62; *ibid.*, ‘The Question of John and the Synoptics. D. Moody Smith 1992-1999,’ in F. NEIRYNCK (ed.), *Evangelica III. 1992-2000. Collected Essays* (BETL 150; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001) 616-28 and *ibid.*, ‘John and the Synoptics in Recent Commentaries,’ in *ibid.*, 601-15.

The second example is Mt 13.57 ('a prophet is not without honour except in his own country and in his own house'). Indeed, within the same variation-unit, two different variant readings are referred to separately as one being implicit (with Jn 4.44) and one being explicit (assumed Mt 6.4, Lk 4.23-24). Because Mt D.05 is not harmonising here, it will not be discussed in this work.

There are no further cases of this kind in the rest of the Gospel of Matthew.

#### IV. The Evolution Towards the Explanation of Variant Readings as Harmonisations in NA<sup>28</sup>

The identification of two signs (*p*) and cross references) in NA<sup>28</sup> to refer to harmonistic readings needs some further explanation, which will be first discussed.

##### IV. 1. The Nestle-Aland Editions and Harmonistic Readings

In order to achieve a more objective examination of potential harmonistic variants in Bezan Matthew, it is more appropriate to work from the available identification of harmonistic variant readings in the edition of NA<sup>28</sup>. Clearly, it makes no claim to be exhaustive, but because of its convenient size and the ready-made selection in the critical apparatus, it is the successive editions of the Nestle-Aland text that the majority of New Testament exegetes have been using as their reference text for at least the last 50 years. The evolution of the description of the apparatus symbols across the past editions of Nestle-Aland is of particular interest, especially the successive explanations of the *p*) symbol (what I have called 'explicit harmonisations') as well as the bracketed cross-references (designated in this study as 'implicit harmonisations'). It appears that the introduction to the abbreviations used in the last three editions of Nestle-Aland presents a gradually less explicit and more cautious description as to what the symbol *p*) and the cross references were intended to mean. The following transcripts of the introductions of the corresponding editions illustrate the development:

The 25<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle-Aland (1963) states:

'In the Gospels it is often intimated through a prefixed *p*) that the reading in question has probably crept in from one of the other Gospels (Mt 5.39,44), it may be either under the influence of the early Harmony of Gospels of Tatian, or through later harmonising; also in other passages the presumed origin of a variant has been occasionally indicated by a Bible reference, as in Mt 6.13; 8.11.'<sup>54</sup>

In its 26<sup>th</sup> edition, the editors of NA<sup>26</sup> (1979) modified the explanation to say:

'If a reading is derived from a parallel passage (especially in the Gospels), the sign *p*) is added (cf. Mt 3.10), or the particular source is given in parentheses (e.g. Mt 1.25, the reference to Lk 2.7 for the variants of *υἱόν*; Mt 1.23,

---

<sup>54</sup> NA<sup>25</sup>, 80\*.

## CHAPTER 4

to Is 7.14 for *καλέσουσιν*). Parallels within the same book and their variants are also noted, e.g., Mt 2.13 the insertion of *εἰς τὴν χώραν* in Codex Vaticanus (B) is derived from v.12; the transposition *κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται* in C K 33 700 892 *pc* parallels the variant reading (v.l.) in C L W 0233 *℣* at v.19. At times the reference is even more precise, e.g., at Mt 2.18 it is noted that the insertion of *θρῆνος καί* in C D L W 0233 *f*<sup>13</sup> *℣* sy<sup>s.ch</sup> may be traced to the Septuagint text of Jr 38.15.<sup>55</sup>

In its 27<sup>th</sup> (1994) and 28<sup>th</sup> (2012) editions, the introduction makes first a general comment:

The following signs and annotations are placed immediately after the sign of the critical apparatus as an explanation of the corresponding variant or variants.

Then, providing further detail on the various signs, it states:

'*p*) refers to parallel passages in the Gospels, which are listed in the margin at the beginning of the pericopes.<sup>56</sup>

'A parenthetical reference to a passage standing before a variant reading refers to a parallel passage in another New Testament book (*cf.* the reference to Lk 2.7 at Mt 1.25<sup>r</sup>). If the parenthetical reference does not name a book, e.g. (22.3), the parallel is found within the same book (*cf.* the reference to Ac 22.3 at Ac 21.39 <sup>r</sup>), or the same chapter (*cf.* the reference to verse 12 at Mt 2.13<sup>r</sup>). A parenthetical reference to a verse with *v.l.* standing before a reading suggests that the reading derives from a variant reading in the verse indicated (*cf.* Mt 2.13<sup>r</sup>, which refers to the same transposition at 2.19). A reference to a passage in the Septuagint standing before a variant suggests a parallel expression in the Septuagint text (*cf.* the reference to Jr 38.15 *⊆* at Mt 2.18<sup>r</sup>).<sup>57</sup>

In view of this evidence, it may be deduced that anyone using the Nestle-Aland since its 25<sup>th</sup> edition is entitled, and liable, to understand that the signs of the critical apparatus continue to indicate a reference to harmonistic readings (as a consequence of a harmonising text,<sup>58</sup> or from later harmonising [NA<sup>25</sup> introduction]).<sup>59</sup> Despite the more cautious approach in the last two editions where these two references to harmonisation vanished, the dominant position over the past decades of the Nestle-Aland as the

---

<sup>55</sup> NA<sup>26</sup>, 46\*.

<sup>56</sup> NA<sup>27</sup>, 15\*; NA<sup>28</sup>, 57\*.

<sup>57</sup> NA<sup>27</sup>, 15\*; NA<sup>28</sup>, 61\*.

<sup>58</sup> See II. 2.

<sup>59</sup> The importance of the Introduction to the N-A apparatus is pointed out in this review of the latest edition: 'The reader of the apparatus must be sufficiently acquainted with the pertinent sections of the introduction to be able to find an explanation or a discussion of an editor's critical choices and *modus interpretandi*' (A.J. FORTE, 'Observations on the 28<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition of Nestle-Aland's Novum Testamentum Graece,' *Biblica* 94 [2013] 268-92 [271]).

reference Greek text of the Gospels, as well as the force of their introductory explanation of the text critical symbols have naturally remained. Indeed, the original German wording of the introductory comments of the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> editions is even more direct about the role of the symbols to ‘explain the variants’, in saying they ‘geben Erläuterungen zur der Variante zu der sie gehören’<sup>60</sup>.

Therefore, although mention of ‘harmonisation’ or ‘diatessaronic’ readings is no longer explicitly made in these comments, scholars will nevertheless be inclined to understand the readings in the apparatus prefaced with *p*) or a cross-reference as harmonisations. In light of the successive introductions to NA<sup>25-28</sup>, and even though it may be pointed out that Nestle-Aland no longer uses the term of harmonisations, it is not without justification to understand that any reading that is indicated in one of these two ways in the critical apparatus is intended to be interpreted as a harmonistic reading.

In this work, and specifically in Chapters 4–6, I will often use language indicating that the critical apparatus identifies a variant as harmonising when either *p*) or a cross reference is added before the reading and its support. Because of its pocket format, the NA<sup>28</sup> has necessarily performed a selection of variant readings; more specifically, if there are 70 instances (out of probably many more) where the editors of the Nestle-Aland text have thought it worth providing information by way of explanation of certain variant readings with two different symbols, it is fair to deduce that these 70 *vll* are singled out because they are viewed by the editors as likely reflecting assimilation with their respective parallel passages.

#### IV. 2. Interaction between Vogels’ *Harmonistik* and Nestle-Aland’s Suggestions of Harmonistic Variants

As an additional note, of the 70 *vll* extracted in this work from the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, 46 are discussed in Vogels’ *Harmonistik* and clearly tagged as harmonising. Out of the 24 remaining readings not identified by Vogels, there are nine cases of intra-Mt readings<sup>61</sup> and four cases of harmonisation with the LXX (Mt 2.18//Jer. 38.15, Mt 13.14//Isa. 6.9, Mt 10.35//Mic. 7.6 and Mt 1.23//Isa. 7.14), both types omitted from Vogels’ analysis because they not result from inter-Gospel interaction. There thus remain 11 readings that could have been counted as intra-Gospel harmonisations, but which go unnoticed by Vogels either for a reason unknown (1–6), or perhaps because they are said by him to involve a harmonisation due to usage (7–11):

#	Reference	Variant reading in D.05	Parallel
1	Mt 5.39	<sup>⚭</sup> <i>p</i> ) ἐπί	Lk

<sup>60</sup> NA<sup>28</sup>, 15\*.

<sup>61</sup> There are actually 11 instances of intra-Mt readings thought to be harmonistic in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>; however, for two of them NA<sup>28</sup> identifies the harmonisation as coming from the immediate or more distant context (Mt 18.10 <sup>⚭</sup>[18.6] τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ and Mt 17.2 <sup>⚭</sup>[28.3] χιῶν) while Vogels claims they are inter-Gospel related (Mk 9.3 [VOGELS, *Harmonistik*, 27] and Mk 9.42 [*ibid.*, 68] respectively).

#	Reference	Variant reading in D.05	Parallel
2	Mt 9.17 [1]	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς	Mk–Lk
3	Mt 9.17 [2]	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	Mk–Lk
4	Mt 16.20	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ἐπετίμησεν	Mk–Lk
5	Mt 21.1	⸮ <i>p</i> ) πρὸς	Mk–Lk
6	Mt 24.29	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ἐκ	Mk
7	Mt 5.29	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ἀπέλθῃ	Mt–Mk–Lk
8	Mt 20.19	⸮ <i>p</i> ) ἀναστήσεται	Mt–Mk–Lk
9	Mt 20.31	⸮ <i>p</i> ) υἱέ	Mt–Mk–Lk
10	Mt 20.30	⸮ <i>p</i> ) υἱέ	Mt–Mk–Lk
11	Mt 9.27	⸮ <i>p</i> ) υἱέ	Mt–Mk–Lk

Table 7: Unspecified References in Bezan Matthew in Vogels' Work

Suggested as Harmonistic in NA<sup>28</sup>

From these facts, it may be concluded that it was Vogels' thesis of a harmonising text behind Codex Bezae that possibly prompted NA<sup>25</sup> to adopt this explanation in its introduction for the signs for indicating textual parallels.

A glance at the *Commentary* by B.M. Metzger shows how the editorial committee of NA<sup>28</sup> viewed at least some of the variant readings that are accompanied by *p*) or cross-references. In fact, only 16 out of the possible 70 are discussed in the *Commentary*, suggesting that the significance of the others was plain enough not to need further explanation. For those 16, Metzger presents the committee's reasoning about the variant readings in question, and demonstrates that the editors themselves did indeed think harmonisation was responsible for each of them.<sup>62</sup> In the absence of any alternative explanation to account for the other readings of parallel passages, it is legitimate and natural to conclude that when a parallel is listed in the apparatus its purpose is to indicate that the variant is believed to have arisen through scribal assimilation or borrowing.

## V. Conclusions on the Criteria for Harmonisation in Bezan Matthew

Now that the criteria for harmonistic readings in Mt D.05 are identified (i.e. variant readings marked with the *p*)-sign in the critical apparatus or a scriptural cross-reference), I will seek to answer the following questions aimed at delineating the exact nature of the variant reading classified as a harmonisation in the critical apparatus: (1) Which other Gospel(s) is (are) used for the assumed harmonisation,<sup>63</sup> i.e. what is the further breakdown of the 70 harmonistic readings in Mt D.05 (2) Is the Bezan reading

<sup>62</sup> Wording varies with expressions like 'recollection from a parallel passage', 'reference from Luke, Mark', 'manifestly borrowed from e.g. Luke', 'apparently comes from the parallel passage.' This is the case of Mt 1.25, 2.18, 5.44, 11.19, 13.13, 17.21, 18.11, 19.9 (x2), 19.20, 20.16, 20.28, 20.30, 20.31, 26.28, 27.28, 28.8.

<sup>63</sup> The parallel passage is usually indicated in the margins of the NA<sup>27</sup> text. The sign *p*) however does not mention which Gospel Mt D.05 would be assimilating with, neither does it which manuscript it is harmonising with.

assimilating to the other Synoptic Gospel in its Bezan version or to a reading in a different MS in case it (the Bezan reading) is the result of a scribal activity and not the original reading (3) Is the parallel passage also subject to textual variation (4) Is the *v*l attested in Mt D.05 a characteristic ‘Western’ reading or is it more widely attested across the textual tradition?

Since the purpose of this work is to formally address and discuss the variant readings in Bezan Matthew that are attached to either a *p*)-symbol or a cross reference in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, a list based on the classical classification of chapters would make little sense. There are several other classifications that may be considered here, namely (1) harmonisations within (a) Mt-Mk (b) Mt-Lk (c) Mt-Mk-Lk passages (2) the length of the harmonisations, i.e. from ‘omission’ to the presence of 61 words in the case of Mt 20.28D.05 (3) text-types of witnesses supporting either D.05 or B.03, which accounts for 97% of the cases against 3% where a group of manuscripts support readings against both D and B. There are objections to pursue the second and third possible classifications. Indeed, out of the 70 alleged harmonistic readings in Mt D.05, half involve two or less than two words. Furthermore, pooling together variants according to text-types would not offer significant novelty: Holmes already proposed to categorise the Bezan variants according to their agreements with other text-types, grouping them into readings found

‘only in D and the Latin tradition; [...] in D and a small cluster of other Greek witnesses; [...] in D and the Byzantine tradition; [...] in D and the Alexandrian tradition, among the possible combinations.’<sup>64</sup>

In order to further analyse the nature of harmonisations by taking into account the possibility of multiple classifications, I will divide the passages found in Mt D.05 according to their relationship with the other Gospels. to achieve this I will analyse according to the cases where the *v*l in question (i) refers to Matthew only (‘vertical harmonisation’) (ii) is claimed in the critical apparatus to be harmonising with Mark (only) in the cases where Mark is itself variant or secure (iii) is claimed in the critical apparatus to be harmonising with Luke (only) in the cases where Luke is itself variant or secure (iv) is claimed in the critical apparatus to be harmonising with both Mark and Luke passages. The methodology immediately suggests potential conflicts or overlaps in two situations: (1) the *v*l refers to a passage found in the three Synoptics but where Mark does not share the same reading in Luke; such instances will be classified within the section dedicated to harmonisations with Mark (Chapter 5 II.) (2) the *v*l refers to a passage found in the three Synoptics but where Luke does not share the same reading in Mark; such instances will be classified within the section dedicated to harmonisations with Luke (Chapter 5 III.).

---

<sup>64</sup> HOLMES, ‘Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 126–7, 139.





## Chapter 5

### THE STUDY OF HARMONISTIC READINGS IN THE BEZAN TEXT OF MATTHEW WITH PARALLELS IN ONE GOSPEL

This chapter will concentrate on variant readings in Bezan Matthew that are apparently harmonising with only one Gospel passage, whether Matthew ('vertical harmonisation') or Mark/Luke ('horizontal harmonisation'). The initial section will address harmonisations apparently reflecting the influence of the immediate context, i.e. within Matthew itself (I.). Then, the alleged harmonisations in Mt D.05 with Mark will be divided into three parts: first the situation of the Gospel of Mark in relation to Matthew will be introduced (II. 1), secondly, variant readings that are similar to Mark in the instances where Mark is itself firm (II. 2) or variant (II. 3) will be presented. In a further section (III.), harmonisations with Luke will be examined following a similar pattern.

I have counted that four allegedly harmonistic readings are linked to the immediate context, while the remaining three are passages referred to by Colwell as 'intermediate context' but which I would rather qualify as 'distant passages.' The corresponding verses will be reviewed now. From now on, the verse studied in all following sections will appear in bold font, the claimed harmonistic variants will then be isolated and printed beneath the verse in the format found in NA<sup>28</sup>, if there are other *vll* in the said verse, they will be indicated after the phrase 'further *vll*' unless they can be considered insignificant for the study. Then, the parallel verses involved in the potential harmonisation (in Matthew and/or Luke and/or Mark and/or John) will be printed in normal font along with the corresponding critical apparatus from NA<sup>28</sup>.

#### I. Harmonisations within Matthew

There are seven variants found in Codex Bezae indicated in the critical apparatus as harmonising with another Matthean reference only in either the immediate or intermediate context (see Chapter 4 II. 1).

##### I. 1. Reading Present in the Immediate Context

The following verses in Codex Bezae all involve potential harmonisation with the immediate context. In some instances, it will be shown that such alleged harmonisations within the immediate context can also involve parallel passages in the other Synoptics (e.g. Mt 18.10) but the proximity of the verses in Matthew is probably far more in favour of intra rather than inter harmonisation than assimilation hence their classification in this section.

##### Mt 9.29 – par. Mt 20.34

Mt 9.29 τότε ἤψατο τῶν ῥοφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν λέγων· κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν.

ῥ(20.34) ὀμμάτων D Θ | ὀφθαλμῶν B *rell*

Mt 20.34 σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤψατο ῥατῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν, καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέβλεψαν ὧ καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

ῥατῶν (-Θ) τῶν ὀμμάτων B Θ | p) τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν  $\aleph^1$  (\*αὐτοῦ) C K N W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424  $\aleph$  | txt (τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν) D L Z f<sup>13</sup> 892; Or | ὧ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ C K N W Γ Δ 565 579 1241 1424  $\aleph$  q sy<sup>p,h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> | txt (om.) B D rell

While the two readings are found in two distant passages in the final organisation of the Gospel, the context is highly similar, it is thus appropriate to discuss it in this section rather than the following one.

In Mt 9.27-31, Jesus heals two blind men, which is paralleled in a slightly different way in Mark (Mk 10.46-52, Bartimaeus) and Luke (Lk 18.35-43, one blind man only).<sup>1</sup> Also, in Mark and Luke, the healing itself is not described but only the recovery of sight is mentioned. These synoptic parallels are closer to the other healing in Mt 20.29-34 (also two blind men); in both Matthean passages the healing by touching the eyes is mentioned before the recovery of sight and for this reason we will include this *v*l among the harmonisations within D.05 only. The similarity in the description of the healings has inevitably led to a possible interchange in the nouns designating the eyes (ὀμμάτοι, ‘eye’ or ‘eyelid’ vs. ὀφθαλμοί, ‘eye’).<sup>2</sup>

In terms of external evidence, only Codex Bezae and Koridethi attest the reading ὀμμάτων while the rest of the tradition supports the reading ὀφθαλμῶν. Interestingly, a similar but more complex textual conflict is evidenced in Mt 20.34, where, as seen in the critical apparatus of this verse, ὀφθαλμοὶ and its variant reading ὀμμάτα are read with the pronoun in either the default or the marked order:

#### Use of ὀμμάτα in Mt 20.34a

αὐτῶν τῶν ὀμμάτων	B
τῶν ὀμμάτων	Θ
τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν	D L Z f <sup>13</sup> 892; Or

#### Use of ὀφθαλμοὶ in Mt 20.34a

τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν	$\aleph^1$ (*αὐτοῦ) C K N W Γ Δ f <sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 $\aleph$
--------------------	--

#### Mt 20.34b

αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ	C K N W Γ Δ 565 579 1241 1424 $\aleph$ q sy <sup>p,h</sup> sa <sup>ms</sup>
-------------------	---

<sup>1</sup> ‘The colorless story of Jesus healing two blind men has no true parallel in Mark and Luke and is almost certainly a redactional creation’ (DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 133).

<sup>2</sup> Ὀμμα, ατος, τό 1. lit. eye, 2. fig. eye of the soul (τῆς ψυχῆς); ὀφθαλμός, οῦ, ὁ 1. lit. as an organ of sense perception, 2. transferred from sense perception to mental and spiritual understanding (BDAG, s.v. ὄμμα, ὀφθαλμός).

It can be concluded that the external evidence is sharply divided as to which noun to use but also as to whether the possessive adjectives should be mentioned and with what force (default or marked order) for Mt 20.34. However, the apparently lower numerical weight of two manuscripts in Mt 9.29 leaves the reading τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν more likely to be original. The confusion in the use of ὀφθαλμοί or ὀμμάτα in Mt 20.34 as well as the geographical distance between Codex Bezae and Codex Koridethi without further contamination leaves the external evidence inconclusive.<sup>3</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, it is to be noticed that nouns designating concrete parts of the body (in the dative) usually follow the verb ἄπτω (bone, flesh, ...) as a ‘means of conveying a blessing (divine working by a touch of the hand)’<sup>4</sup> hence ὀμμάτων may well be correct, and *de facto* may well be a correction to replace ὀφθαλμῶν. Conversely, the conflict between the act of touching (the eyelid) and the consecutive fact of (eyes) seeing may well have been understood as pure synonyms and called for a replacement of the expression ἤψατο τῶν ὀμμάτων with a more casual ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. Also, the rarity of the word ὀμματα (found in Mk 8.23 and Mt 20.34D only, but 10 times in the Sapiential scriptures<sup>5</sup>) may be an argument for a later, harmonised use of the more common ὀφθαλμός.

The disputed variant in both Matthean passages shows a conflict in the choice of the Greek word for ‘eye,’ favouring the physical touching on the eyelid versus the eyes. The weight of the external evidence attesting ὀφθαλμῶν in Mt 9.29 favours this reading as more likely to be original. Also, ὀφθαλμῶν could be corrected to ὀμματῶν in order to specify the physical organ of sight. However, the equally divided support in Mt 20.34 cannot reduce the problem to harmonisation in three manuscripts since ὀμμάτα may have been truly original: the reason for changing ὀφθαλμῶν to ὀμματῶν may have been caused by a harmonisation to usage since ὀφθαλμοί is a more common way of designating the eyes.

### Mt 18.10 – par. Mt 18.6

Mt 18.10 Ὅρατε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων·<sup>†</sup> λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἔν οὐρανοῖς ἰδιὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>(18.6) τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ D it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>c</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* (om.) B *rell*

<sup>3</sup> Holmes analyses this variant reading as a harmonisation (‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 167).

<sup>4</sup> BDAG, s.v. ἄπτω.

<sup>55</sup> The noun ὀμμάτων is scarcely found in the NT (9.29D.05; 20.34 in D L Z f<sup>13</sup> 892; Or) and in the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mk 8.23, εἰς τὰ ὀμματα αὐτοῦ) but is mentioned in the Jewish Sapiential literature (Prov. 6.4; 7.2; 9.18; 10.26; 23.5; Wis. 11.18; 15.15) and 4 Maccabees (4 Ma. 5.30; 6.26; 18.21). As a point of comparison, ὀφθαλμός is mentioned more than 500 times in the Jewish Scriptures.

## CHAPTER 5

Further vll: [10] ἔν τῷ (-33) οὐρανῷ B 33892 | -N<sup>c</sup> f<sup>1</sup> aur e ff<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>; Or Eus | <sup>τ</sup>(Lk 19.10) [11] ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ (- Δ) υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (+ ζητῆσαι καὶ 579 892<sup>c</sup> c sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>, + ζητῆσαι L<sup>mg</sup>) σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλὸς D K L<sup>mg</sup> N W Γ Δ Θ<sup>c</sup> 078<sup>vid</sup> 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>c,p,h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | *txt (om.)* & B L<sup>txt</sup> Θ\* f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 892\* e ff<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Eus

Mt 18.6 Ὅς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίση ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, συμφέρεει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῆ μύλος ὀνικὸς ἑπερὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῆ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης.

ἑπί D 565 1424 | εἰς K W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 1241 ℳ | ἐν (τῷ τραχήλῳ) 700 | *txt*  
(περὶ) & B L N Z 0281 579 892; Did

Mt 18.10 comes at the end of the saying on True Greatness and Temptations to Sin and before the Parable of the Lost Sheep, although these two verses may be included in the latter passage because of the absence of v.11 in many manuscripts among which Codex Bezae. Therefore, the two verses can be understood as either concluding or introductory or transitional in Jesus' discourse. There are two implicit harmonistic variants involved: first, the longer reading ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ in D.05 against the shorter reading ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων in B.03 can be explained as an assimilation to the immediate context in Mt 18.6.<sup>6</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the longer reading is supported by all Latin versions, the Curetonian Syriac as well as some Sahidic manuscripts against the rest of the tradition. This support could mean that the Bezan reading was copied before the readings were dispersed into separate geographical areas. It is nevertheless interesting that there is significant geographical support for the attestation of the Bezan reading (Egypt, Syria, Latin world), even though the external evidence numerically supports the shorter reading.

The reference to the 'little ones' completed or not by 'who believe in me' is a rather Matthean feature (Mt: 4, Mk: 1, Lk: 1) but the phrase τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ also occurs once in each of the parallel passages Mk 9.42 and Lk 17.2, again with some textual variation. The readings below from the external evidence will help to show at a glance the variability of the phrase in the manuscripts, which points to a textual difficulty and goes much beyond the potential harmonisation with Mt 18.6:

### Matthew

10.42	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	B <i>rell</i>
10.42	ἓνα τῶν ἐλαχιστων τούτων	D <i>latt</i>
18.6	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ	<i>firm</i>

---

<sup>6</sup> This is the view of M.W. HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984) 159.

CHAPTER 5

18.10	ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	B <i>rell</i>
18.10	ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ	D it vg <sup>mss</sup> sy <sup>c</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup>
18.14	ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	Ⲡ B D L N 0281 33 565 (579) 892 e (εἶς K W Γ Δ Θ 078 <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 700 1241 1424 Ⲙ lat)

Mark

Mk 9.42	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων	Ⲡ C <sup>*vid</sup> Δ it
Mk 9.42	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ	A B C <sup>2</sup> K L N W Γ Θ Ψ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 28 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 (2542) Ⲙ lat sy sa bo <sup>pt</sup>
Mk 9.42	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πίστιν ἐχόντων	D a

Luke<sup>7</sup>

Lk 17.2	τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα	Ⲡ* B L Ψ 579 892
Lk 17.2	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	Ⲡ <sup>2</sup> A D K N W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1241 1424 2542 Ⲙ

When isolated, Mt 18.10D.05 looks like an internal harmonisation with 18.6; if put in perspective, both readings are paralleled in the Synoptics in different contexts. Shorter, longer or even alternative readings can therefore be found. Therefore, concluding in a harmonisation with the immediate context ignores a part of the problem, which is demonstrated by the multiplicity of textual variants across the Gospels.

In terms of internal evidence, the references to the ‘little ones’ four times in Matthew reveal a well-balanced rhythm a-b-b-a (‘a’ being the shorter reading, ‘b’ being the longer one) which is more likely to be editorial rather than a re-arranged structure by a scribe:

10.42	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων
18.6	ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ
18.10D	ἐνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ
18.14	ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων

Mt 10.42 might be considered to be a distant passage; however, the context of general ethical statements on ‘whoever does’ (ὅς [δ'] ἄν), attributed to Jesus could well have been rearranged by Matthew into a structured way centred on faith, hence the two central presences of τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ. Conversely, a truncation leading to the shorter reading could be the result of either a perceived syntactical redundancy or the designation of a different group of ‘little ones.’

<sup>7</sup> Lk 17.2 reads ‘It would be better for him if a millstone were hung round his neck and he were cast into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to sin.’ Here again, we have a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus supporting Codex Bezae while the original hand supported Codex Vaticanus.

Thus to conclude that the Bezan scribe would have deliberately added τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ from an earlier occurrence reflects a too mechanical application of text critical principles rather than a consideration of a potential Matthean original structure or, the other way round, a simplification of a *lectio difficilior*.

Mt 20.3 – par. Mt 20.6

Mt 20.3 καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τρίτην ὥραν Ἦ εἶδεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀργούς

Ἦ(6) εὔρεν D 1424 it | εἶδεν B *rell*

Mt 20.6 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην Ἦ ἐξελθὼν εὔρεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας Ἦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ὧδε ἐστήκατε ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργοί;

Ἦ ὥραν C K W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 1844 *M* it sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* (*om.*)  
 ⋈ B D L Θ 085 700 892\* lat; Cyr | Ἦ ἀργούς C<sup>\*.3</sup> K W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 579 1241 1424  
 1844 *M* f h q sy<sup>p,h</sup> | *txt* (*om.*) ⋈ B C<sup>2</sup> D L Θ 085 33 565 700 892 lat sy<sup>s,c</sup> co;  
 Or

This verse stands at the beginning of the passage of the Labourers in the Vineyard and describes the encounter between the householder and the first group of idle men about the third hour. In Codex Vaticanus and most manuscripts, the householder ‘saw others standing idle’ (20.3) then ‘found others standing idle’ (20.6) while Codex Bezae ‘found others standing idle’ in both places.

In terms of external evidence, the *vl* εὔρεν (‘he found’) is read only in Codex Bezae and in the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> c. minuscule 1424 (mostly Byzantine with Caesarean readings)<sup>8</sup> while the rest of the textual tradition has εἶδεν (‘he saw’). The overwhelming support for the reading εἶδεν tends to favour the Alexandrian reading as the original one, although the single agreement between two independent manuscripts, D.05 and 1424, is interesting.

In terms of internal evidence, εὔρεν is found as a secure reading three verses later, in 20.6, when the householder finds the group at the eleventh hour. The structure of the parable may well have favoured a similar structure in the presentation of the situation and called for the repetition of εὔρεν as found in Codex Bezae: the householder goes out, finds/sees others standing idle and speaks to them, as can be seen from the synoptically arranged texts below.

Mt 20.3-4NA <sup>28</sup>	Mt 20.6NA <sup>28</sup>
καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τρίτην ὥραν	περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ἐξελθὼν
εἶδεν (εὔρεν D.05) ἄλλους	εὔρεν ἄλλους
ἐστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀργούς	ἐστῶτας

<sup>8</sup> Codex 1424 is the oldest minuscule of a family of manuscripts grouped as family 1424 (7, 27, 71, 115, 160, 179, 185, 267, 349, 517, 659, 827, 945, 954, 990, 1010, 1082, 1188, 1194, 1207, 1223, 1293, 1391, 1402, 1606, 1675, 2191). Cf. METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament*, 65.

Mt 20.3-4NA <sup>28</sup>	Mt 20.6NA <sup>28</sup>
καὶ ἐκεῖνοις εἶπεν,	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς,
Ἐπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα κτλ.	Τί ᾧδε ἐστήκατε ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργοί;

Nevertheless, the presence of εὔρεν as a harmonistic variant would be more likely to have occurred *after* a first occurrence, while εὔρεν in Mt 20.6 appears *de facto* later: the second εὔρεν (firm, 20.6) can technically not have attracted the former. While there is no apparent reason why an original εὔρεν in 20.3 would have been changed into εἶδεν, Amphoux proposes an explanation. He analyses two specific groups of people where classical exegesis<sup>9</sup> usually mentions four groups (found at the third, sixth, ninth and eleventh hour). He highlights that only these two are described in full with respect to the householder going out, finding/seeing them and asking why they are idle.<sup>10</sup> During the evolution of the text, the liturgical use of this parable drew attention to the (assumed) refusal of the four groups to go into the vineyards,<sup>11</sup> while the original text may have pointed to the two groups of the third and eleventh hour only with a deliberate chiasmic symmetry καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τρίτην ὥραν/περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην ἐξελθὼν with the adversative δέ against the first consecutive καὶ enhancing the opposition, while the clause εὔρεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας remains stable. The passage in question could well have used εὔρεν twice in the tightly structured composition, as the lay-out of the text above indicates, and the repetition could therefore well be original. The reason for replacing εἶδεν with εὔρεν would then have arisen once the narrative was thought of as involving different groups of people where parallelism is not needed. The parable changed its significance and the syntax was then adapted to a more narrative mode.

#### Mt 22.45 (Mt 22.43)

Mt 22.45 εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ ὁ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν;

†(43) ἐν πνεύματι D K Δ Θ 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 565 1424 pm it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> mae bo<sup>pt</sup> | txt  
(om.) B rell

Mt 22.43 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι ὁ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον ἠ λέγων·

†ὁ Ἰησοῦς L Z 0281 f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1424 f ff<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup> vg<sup>mss</sup> mae bo | txt (om.) B rell |  
ὁ καλεῖ κύριον αὐτόν ℣ L Z 892 | κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ K W Γ Δ 0102 f<sup>1.13</sup> 565  
579 700 1241 ℞ e q sy<sup>h</sup> | αὐτόν (-1424) κύριον καλεῖ 0161 1424 | txt (καλεῖ  
αὐτόν κύριον) B<sup>(\*)</sup>.2 D (Θ) 0107<sup>vid</sup> 0281 33 l2211 lat sy<sup>s.c.p</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 72 and subsequent references.

<sup>10</sup> AMPHOUX, *L'Évangile selon Matthieu*, 253–4.

<sup>11</sup> Amphoux points out that only the first and last groups are present in the vineyards. This statement is consistent with the absence of any specific description of the two other groups: Mt 20.5 οἱ δὲ ἀπῆλθον. πάλιν [δὲ] (absent in B K W Γ Δ Θ 085 f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1241 1424 ℞ it mae bo, but present in ℣ C D L 33 579 892 l844 lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa) ἐξελθὼν περὶ ἑκτὴν καὶ ἐνάτην ὥραν ἐποίησεν ὡσαύτως (ἑκτὴν καὶ ἐνάτην D fl ('Going out again about the sixth hour and the ninth hour, he did the same.')). See AMPHOUX, *Matthieu*, 253–4.

Matthew 22 ends with a passage where Jesus and the Pharisees discuss the relationship between the Messiah and David (Mt 22.41-46). Jesus dominates the conversation with a series of questions. Two of them concerning the quotation of Ps 109.1LXX are expressed in a similar way. In v. 43, all manuscripts read David ‘in [the] Spirit,’ *ἐν πνεύματι*, while in v. 45, some manuscripts, including Codex Vaticanus, do not.<sup>12</sup>

As in the previous example, one may ask whether the variant reading is a possible vertical or horizontal harmonisation. Indeed, Luke has a similar passage (Lk 20.41-45) but does not mention ‘David in the Spirit’ and Mark has the fuller form of ‘David in the Holy Spirit’ (*Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ* [Mk 12.36]). If harmonisation has taken place, it is therefore most likely due to the immediate context because of the great degree of similarity between vv. 43 and 45, which is why it is included in the section dedicated to Mt-Mt parallels only.

In terms of external evidence, the textual tradition is quite divided, although a wide range of Greek witnesses representing diverse text-types (Western, e.g. D.05, Caesarean, e.g. Θ.038, 565, *f*<sup>13</sup>, Alexandrian, e.g. 0281) and early versions support Codex Bezae with the presence of the phrase against its absence in Codex Vaticanus and the rest of the tradition. Mt 22.43 is more stable with the same words being present in all manuscripts, though expressing *καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον* with three different word orders. Unless the weight of both Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus is taken as conclusive, the external evidence does not explain the two strands of tradition.

In terms of internal evidence, the similarity in construction (interrogative pronoun + οὖν Δαυὶδ + ἐν πνεύματι + καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, the three last words being subject to word order variation) and the closeness of the two verses could be responsible for scribal alteration. The geographical variety of witnesses supporting the Bezan reading cannot explain that the repetition occurred by chance but may well point to a common archetype. Equally, the evidence supporting the absence of the phrase as in B.03 and its support could also be the result of a simplification aimed at reducing the repetition. Indeed, the withdrawal of *ἐν πνεύματι* could have led to the multiple word order changes around the clause *καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον* to underline one aspect or the other within the reasoning between Jesus and the Pharisees and Sadducees.

As a result, the shorter reading could be due to stylistic improvement and the longer one might equally be a literary device reflecting orality, using the deliberate repetition of the clause *οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον*.<sup>13</sup> To conclude that Mt 22.45D.05 is harmonising is again seen to be no more than one explanation and by no means necessarily the most satisfactory.

<sup>12</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 159.

<sup>13</sup> This agrees with Davies and Allison: ‘given the redactional parallels between vv. 43 and 45, we deem the phrase original’ and see the omission as a ‘scribal harmonisation (cf. Mark and Luke)’ (DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 252).



Mt 24.37 – par. Mt 24.39

Mt 24.37 Ὡσπερ ἡ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Ɀ(39) καὶ D K W Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 l2211 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt*  
(*om.*) Ɀ B L Γ 33 700 892 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup> co

Further *vll*: ἡ δὲ Ɀ K L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 l2211 ℣ lat  
sy<sup>p.h</sup> | -565 bo<sup>ms</sup> | *txt* (γὰρ) B D 067 aur e r<sup>1</sup> vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.hmg</sup> co

Mt 24.39 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἕως ἤλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμός καὶ ἤρην ἅπαντας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ [καὶ] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Ɀ(37) B D 892 l2211 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup> co | *txt* (καὶ) Ɀ K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33  
565 579 700 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup>

Mt 24.37 occurs at the beginning of a large passage on eschatological vigilance (Mt 24.36-25.30) dealing with the coming of the Son of Man within the wider context of ignorance.<sup>14</sup> The two verses of Mt 24.37-38 are a clarifying explanation of v.36. An explicit parallelism is shown by the words used<sup>15</sup> which inevitably to harmonisation. This instance is of a particular nature, however, as the presence of καὶ in 24.37D.05 seems to be claimed by the critical apparatus to be reflecting its presence in 24.39. The critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> does not use the sign *p*) but inserts square brackets around the connective καὶ indicating thereby a high level of uncertainty regards its presence or absence in the initial text. Interestingly, the verse is similar to a parallel found in Lk 17.26 which is secure across the textual tradition;<sup>16</sup> nevertheless, the moderate verbal agreement between Mt 24.27 and Lk 17.26 will allow the reading of Mt 24.37 to be considered as a purely internal parallel in the present work.<sup>17</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the absence of the adverbial καὶ in v.37 is widely attested in early majuscules, minuscules as well as in versions (Old Latin and some manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Syriac and Coptic) as is its presence in Codex Bezae and other majuscules, minuscules mixed Latin versions and the Harklean Syriac. The critical apparatus suggests that the absence is a harmonisation with the verbally similar v.39 where καὶ is also absent in some manuscripts and where NA<sup>28</sup> has retained the Ɀ.01 reading.

The presence or absence of καὶ at the two places may be summarised as follows:

1. καὶ καὶ K W Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup>

<sup>14</sup> DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 374.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 380.

<sup>16</sup> Lk 17.26: καὶ καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>17</sup> While the beginning of the sentence displays only partial verbal agreement (Lk: καὶ καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε, Mt: Ὡσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε), the presence of ἔσται καὶ and τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου are common to Mt and Lk while the Matthean ἡ παρουσία (παρουσία appears four times in the Gospels but all are concentrated in Mt 24) is read as ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις in Luke (Mt: 4, Mk: 4, Lk-Ac: 26). The hypothesis that Luke has drawn from Bezan Matthew would be interesting to examine further.

CHAPTER 5

2. <i>καί</i>	<i>om. καί</i>	D l2211
3. <i>om. καί</i>	<i>καί</i>	⋈ L Γ 33 700
4. <i>om. καί</i>	<i>om. καί</i>	B 892 it vg <sup>mss</sup> sy <sup>s,p</sup> co

This comparison shows that *καί* may be present *or* absent in v.37/39 at the same time or present in v.37 *and* absent in v.39 or *vice versa* leading to four different cases according to manuscripts. Technically, and on the basis of the text-critical principle of the less discordant reading being more likely to be original, the double absence of *καί* in Mt 24.37,39B.03 could equally be analysed as a harmonisation *within* Codex Vaticanus. Equally, the absence of *καί* in Codex Washingtonianus and allies could be seen as a harmonisation. The readings printed in the NA<sup>28</sup> tend to simplify the hypothesis as if there were only two possibilities: absence of *καί* in the first verse, presence in the second verse. The quality of the manuscripts reflecting each of the potential readings shows that the change occurred at an early stage of the textual transmission and that the *vl* in question is not insignificant to the extent it generated such a large spectrum of variation. The original reading is difficult to determine but to apply text-critical principle of choosing the less discordant reading is here inappropriate.

In terms of internal evidence, the structure of Mt 24.37-39 is organised with an obvious parallelism where the double presence or double absence highlights the symmetry:

[37] ὡσπερ γὰρ	αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε,
	οὕτως ἔσται (vl καὶ) ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
[38] ὡς γὰρ	ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις [vl ἐκεῖναις] ταῖς ...
[39]	οὕτως ἔσται [vl καὶ] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

The Bezan reading displays a break in the symmetry with the presence of the first *καί* and its absence in v.39 (a *lectio difficilior* if one expects either a double presence or double absence) highlighting thereby the Coming of the Son of Man in Noah's days at the expense to the expected Coming of the Son of Man.<sup>18</sup> This emphasis on the days of Noah could point to an eschatological/apocalyptic *milieu*, which was expecting the Coming of the Son of Man any time soon.

Reporting an implicit harmonisation in Codex Bezae in the two verses hides the reason for the irregular presence of *καί* across the textual tradition. Furthermore, NA<sup>28</sup> reflects the text chosen from the most discordant readings.<sup>19</sup> Finally, as suggested above, only taking account of the context of 1<sup>st</sup> c. Judaism succeeds in providing exegetical support for identifying the reading from which all the other variants have arisen.

<sup>18</sup> RSV translates the two clauses the same way 'so will be the coming of the Son of man' because of the difficulty of rendering this in English. It is noteworthy that the French translation (Bible de Jérusalem) translates the adverb: 'Tel sera aussi l'avènement du Fils de l'homme.'

<sup>19</sup> Actually both cases 2 or 3 in my development above address the question but case 3 has certainly been chosen by the Committee because of the more important weight given to ⋈ L Γ 33 700 as opposed to D l2211.

Mt 25.3 – par. Mt 25.4

Mt 25.3 αἱ γὰρ μωραὶ λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας ἰ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔλαβον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἔλαιον<sup>τ</sup>.

<sup>τ</sup>(4) ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν D (ff<sup>1</sup>) | *txt (om.)* B *rell*

Further vll: ἰ ἑαυτῶν Z f<sup>1</sup> | –& L Θ 700 lat | *txt (αὐτῶν)* B C D K W Γ Δ 0249  
f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 892 1241 1424 1844 12211 ℹ it vg<sup>mss</sup>

Mt 25.4 αἱ δὲ φρόνιμοι ἔλαβον ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις <sup>τ</sup> μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων ἰ ἑαυτῶν.

<sup>τ</sup> αὐτῶν C K W (Γ) Δ 0249 f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 ℹ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt (om.)* & B  
D L Z Θ f<sup>1</sup> 700 892<sup>vid</sup> 1844 12211 aur h q r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s,p</sup> | ἰ αὐτῶν D K L W Γ (*cf.* <sup>τ</sup>)  
Δ Θ 0249\* f<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1844 12211 ℹ | –C Z<sup>vid</sup> 1424 lat |  
*txt (ἑαυτῶν)* & B 0249<sup>c</sup>

Mt 25.3 stands at the beginning of the Parable of the Ten Bridesmaids (Mt 25.1-13) and describes the foolish virgins taking their lamps with them but they ‘did not take with them oil.’ Codex Bezae reads ‘in their flasks’ after ‘oil.’

In terms of external evidence, a minority of manuscripts only (the visible part of 1424 and, to some extent,<sup>20</sup> the Latin Codex Corbiensis I) as well as a few minuscules read ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν after ἔλαιον. Because of the paucity of Bezan support, it can be assumed that the longer reading was either shortened at a very early stage or was created as an expansion in isolated cases.

In terms of internal evidence, the presence of extra words, specifically at the end of a sentence<sup>21</sup> and moreover in a minority of manuscripts, is usually construed as evidence of an addition. As in a previous example in this section (Mt 20.3), the harmonisation is nevertheless more likely to have happened after the first mention rather than the other way round. The critical apparatus to Mt 25.3 refers to the presence of ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν in the immediately following verse which describes the wise virgins or maidens with an evident parallelism: certainly, the presence of the words in Codex Bezae may well be an addition, although a deliberate omission may equally have occurred to avoid repetition in 25.4:

Mt 25.3NA <sup>28</sup>	Mt 25.4NA <sup>28</sup>
αἱ γὰρ μωραὶ	αἱ δὲ φρόνιμοι
λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας ἰ αὐτῶν	ἔλαβον
οὐκ ἔλαβον	ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις (αὐτῶν)

<sup>20</sup> Codex ff<sup>1</sup> does not have the pronoun after *in vasis* (‘stultae autem, acceptis lampidibus suis non sustulerunt oleum secum in vasis’). See E.S. BUCHANAN, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: the Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis: (ff [or ff<sup>1</sup>]), Being the First Complete Edition of the MS. Now Numbered Lat. 17225 in National Library at Library at Paris* (vol. 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), *ad. loc.*

<sup>21</sup> The presence of the prepositional phrase also happens at the end of a verse which could be seen as the ideal place for an addition (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 258).

μεθ' ἑαυτῶν

μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων ἑαυτῶν.

ἔλαιον (ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν)

The two verses chiasmically arrange τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν and μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων ἑαυτῶν around the main verb ἔλαβον ('took flasks of oil with their lamps,' hence the cross-harmonisations between ἑαυτῶν/αὐτῶν leading to four different combinations), in which case the phrase ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις may well have been transposed in preverbal position in v.4 as well, with the removal of αὐτῶν because of μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων (αὐτῶν). Further, v.4 has two prepositional phrases introduced by ἐν and μετὰ which have the same grammatical role and could theoretically be positioned in either order. According to principles elucidated by discourse analysis, the first prepositional phrase is supportive while the second, introduced by μετὰ, is focal, which is relevant for understanding the *vll*.<sup>22</sup> If we look at the story as a whole, three elements are described: the oil, the lamps and the flasks. The rest of the pericope focuses on the oil and the lamps alone while the flasks are mentioned only in 25.3D and 25.4, most probably because the oil is already in the lamps and the flask does not require further mention. This is also consistent with the focal position of μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων (ἑαυτῶν) and the corresponding supportive position of ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις. The parable may also be understood here as an interpretation of the oil-in-the-flask so to speak (ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις) to show unity at the Coming of the Son of Man<sup>23</sup> which has gradually slipped into becoming a story about the maidens and the lamps with less emphasis on the flasks, thereby making their double mention obsolete.

Although ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν in v.3 may be a (secondary) addition, the repetition can also be seen to constitute a coherently structured doublet and the prepositional phrase would have simply been removed due to the lack of importance of the flask and the emphasis on the oil.

## I. 2. Reading Present in More Distant Contexts

The next three examples are a sub-class of apparent vertical harmonisation, where the passages in question appear in an entirely different context, thus going beyond the Colwell-Tune classification of intermediate context. The possibility that a scribe has been influenced by a totally different parallel needs to be examined in detail.

### Mt 4.10 – par. Mt 16.23

Mt 4.10 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὑπαγε<sup>†</sup>, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ, Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

<sup>22</sup> S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Dallas: SIL International, 2000) 32.

<sup>23</sup> See N.J. DUFF, 'Wise and Foolish Maidens, Matthew 25:1-13,' *USQR* 40 (1985) 55-8 (57).

CHAPTER 5

ⲧ(16.23)<sup>24</sup> ρ) ὀπίσω μου C<sup>2</sup> D L Z Γ 33 579<sup>c</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 ℳ b h l\*sy<sup>(s)c.h</sup>  
 sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | retro it; Ir<sup>arm</sup> vid | txt (om.) & B C\*<sup>vid</sup> K P W Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579\*  
 700 892\*<sup>vid</sup> f k vg sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> vid Or

Mt 16.23 ὁ δὲ Ⲯ στραφεῖς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω ϱ μου, Σατανᾶ· σκάνδαλον ϱ εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ϱ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Ⲯ ρ) ἐπιστραφεῖς D K L Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 1424 | ϱ εἶ ἐμοῖ D ( ϱ 565) | μου εἶ K L W Γ Δ  
 f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1241 1424 ( ϱ C Θ) ℳ sy<sup>h</sup> | txt (εἶ ἐμου) & B f<sup>13</sup> 700 | ϱ ἀλλα τοῦ  
 ἀνθρώπου D (ff<sup>1</sup>) q | -e ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup>

Mt 4.10 occurs in the Temptation pericope which is thematically shared by the other two Synoptics, although the three successive temptations are described in Luke and Matthew alone. However, the injunction to Satan as worded in Mt 4.10 and embedded within the Temptation pericope is found in this passage in Matthew alone.<sup>25</sup> The Bezan reading is Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου σατανᾶ (‘Begone behind me Satan!’) instead of Ὑπαγε σατανᾶ (‘Begone, Satan!’) in NA<sup>28</sup>. This longer expression is found verbatim in the different context of Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16.23, par. Mk 8.33), where both Markan and Matthean readings are firm in the pericope in question.<sup>26</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the absence of the prepositional phrase ὀπίσω μου after the imperative Ὑπαγε is well supported with 18 Greek manuscripts, among which Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, and early versions (Old Latin, Syriac and Coptic). Despite the external weight in favour of the &NB reading and the reasons for an addition by harmonisation with Mt 16.23, the longer reading is nevertheless supported by a good number of witnesses (secondary Alexandrian, Western and early versions as the Old Syriac and some Coptic dialects) and cannot be simply dismissed. Besides, an ‘addition’ would be intentional, which would be expected in a fewer number of witnesses or at least a narrower spectrum.

In terms of internal evidence, the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> and most commentators<sup>27</sup> point to a vertical harmonisation with the passage of Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi? Technically, this interpolation would be a harmonisation neither with usage, nor with immediate/intermediate context, nor with another Gospel according to Colwell’s principles. Metzger argues that the reason for which the two words would have

<sup>24</sup> This is the only occurrence where the critical apparatus refers to both a reference and a ρ) sign for the same variant reading. A second abnormality appears in Mt 13.57 for which two different readings are considered in the critical apparatus as harmonisations, one with a biblical cross-reference, one with the ρ)-sign (see Chapter 4 III. 3. 2). All other apparent harmonisations in Nestle-Aland have either one or the other indication.

<sup>25</sup> ‘As Luke moved the last temptation to second place, he could not have retained the repudiation’ (DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 372).

<sup>26</sup> Significantly there is no exact syntactically close parallel in Luke in the sense that the three Synoptics have Peter’s confession at Caesarea-Philippi but Luke concludes at 9.21 by requesting silence.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 372, n.40

been supplied to the verse can only be traced back to copyists ‘recall[ing] the words of Jesus to Peter.’<sup>28</sup> An alternative explanation could be that the longer reading in Mt 4.10D.05 would have been seen by copyists as offensive to the supremacy of Peter, resulting thereby into its deletion. Its removal would then be best explained by the ecclesiastical discomfort of comparing the leading disciple in early Christianity with Satan.<sup>29</sup>

Mt 17.2 – par. Mt 28.3

Mt 17.2 καὶ Ἦμετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, ὁκαὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς Ἦτὸ φῶς᾽.

Ἦ(28.3) χιών D lat sy<sup>c</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | τὸ φῶς B *rell*

Mt 28.3 ἦν δὲ ἦ Ἦεἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπῆ καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν Ἦῶς χιών.

Ἦιδέα K L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1-13</sup> 33 565 1241 1844 *pm* | *txt* (εἰδέα) Ἰ<sup>(\*)</sup>.1 A B C D 700 892 1424 12211 *pm* | Ἦῶσεἰ A C L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 1844 12211 *M* | *txt* (ὡς) *ϕ*<sup>105vid</sup> *Ϟ* B D K *f*<sup>1</sup> 892

This passage is the second verse of the Transfiguration pericope (Mt 17.1-13) where the *vl* refers to Jesus’ garments becoming as ‘white as snow’ (D.05) or ‘white as light’ (B.03). ‘White as snow’ is again found as a firm reading of a much later passage of the Gospel of Matthew regarding the resurrection of Jesus (Mt 28.3 ‘His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment *white as snow*’).

In terms of external evidence, Codex Bezae and the Old Latin as well as some early versions in Syriac and Coptic attest the reading ‘like snow’ against the rest of the textual tradition which is overwhelmingly verified. It cannot, however, be overlooked that the location of the manuscripts supporting Codex Bezae are geographically widely spread (Syria, Rome), which points to the early character of the variant as well as its early propagation. Interestingly, the beginning of Mt 17.2D.05 is also at odds with the bulk of the textual tradition which reads a succession of first, an indicative aorist passive (μετεμορφώθη), then an active one (ἔλαμψεν) bound by a consecutive καὶ before introduc-

<sup>28</sup> Metzger grants a A-rating to the Alexandrian reading and details: ‘If the words ὀπίσω μου were originally in the text, no satisfactory reason can be found to account for their omission. On the other hand, if they were originally absent, copyists who recalled the words of Jesus to Peter, ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ (Mt 16.23, where there is no variation of reading), would have been likely to supply them here.’ (METZGER, *Commentary*, 10)

<sup>29</sup> J. Read-Heimerdinger has documented the Alexandrian tendency to reduce the Apostles’ foibles where *ϞB* see them rather as ‘inspired heroes enacting the will of God.’ (*The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* [JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002] 354).

ing the clause on the garments becoming white, while Codex Bezae has a participial (aorist passive) clause before the main one.<sup>30</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, the parallel in Mark, alluded to in Davies and Allison's analysis,<sup>31</sup> is verbally too distant (Mk 9.3 *καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν*) to explain any harmonisation with a parallel gospel. Also, both readings have their internal logic: Davies and Allison see that Matthew assimilated his text to the previous clause (*ὡς ὁ ἥλιος*<sup>32</sup>), which is supported by the two comparatives found in the same verse (*ὡς ὁ ἥλιος* and *ὡς τὸ φῶς*) and could account for a harmonisation on the basis of the sense of the immediate context. The comparison between *light* and *white* is absent from the rest of the Scriptures. Conversely, the comparison between white and snow is not uncommon in the Jewish Scriptures<sup>33</sup> and could be understood as a harmonisation with usage. The critical apparatus in NA<sup>28</sup> therefore calls for another locus, Mt 28.3 on Jesus' resurrection, where *λευκὸν ὡς χιών* is read.<sup>34</sup> Although the passage is quite distant, the expression may be seen as a deliberate (original?) catchword used in relation to the Transfiguration seen as foreshadowing the resurrection.<sup>35</sup>

While the argument of an internal harmonisation is possible, the presence of *φῶς* could just as well be a correction to reflect liturgical use in the early Church, where pericopes were taken independently from the Gospels and where the disconnection from the resurrection would have favoured the writing of *φῶς* to parallel *ἥλιος* in the same verse. Also, there might be the underlying idea that a face 'like the sun' would naturally mean that a cloth as 'white as snow' would have melted, thus producing in the change to 'white as light.'

#### Mt 20.16 – par. Mt 22.14

Mt 20.16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι.†

<sup>30</sup> Any conclusion referring to the Bezan preference with regard to parataxis needs to be evaluated case by case: Yoder claimed that parataxis is favoured in the Bezan text of Acts but the opposite in Luke and Mark (J.D. YODER, 'Semitisms in Codex Bezae,' *JBL* 78 [1959] 318–9).

<sup>31</sup> DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 696.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 696.

<sup>33</sup> Psalm 104.2 (103.2LXX) compares light and garments (*ἀναβαλλόμενος φῶς ὡς ἱμάτιον*, Heb. *וְהוּ עָרַב כְּשֵׁמֶת*, 'who coverest thyself with light as with a garment'). 'White like snow' is found in Psalm 51.7 'I shall be whiter than snow' (50.9LXX *ὑπὲρ χιόνα λευκανθήσομαι*) as well as Exod. 4.6, Num. 12.10 and 2 Ki. 5.27. Isaiah (1.18) has 'shall be as white as snow' (RSV, literally will be made white as snow': *ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ*) and Daniel (7.9) has 'his raiment was white as snow' ([*ἔχων περιβολήν*] *ὡσεὶ χιόνα*), and the hair of his head like pure [lit. white] wool (*ὡσεὶ ἔριον λευκόν*). Sirach (43.17b-18) shows a parallelism between white and snow through indirectly 'He scatters the *snow* (*χιόνα*) like birds flying down, and its descent is like locusts alighting. The eye marvels at the beauty of its *whiteness* (*λευκότητος*), and the mind is amazed at its falling.'

<sup>34</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 34.

<sup>35</sup> See S.S. LEE, *Jesus' Transfiguration and the Believers' Transformation. A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (WUNT 2, 265; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 118.

CHAPTER 5

ⲧ(22.14) πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ C D K N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup>  
 33 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 ℣ latt sy mae bo<sup>pt</sup> | *txt (om.)* & B L Z 085 892\*  
 1424 /844 sa bo<sup>pt</sup>

Mt 22.14 πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν ⲧ κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ⲧ ἐκλεκτοὶ.

ⲧ *bis* οἱ L *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 892 sa

Mt 20.16 is the concluding verse to the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard as outlined earlier,<sup>36</sup> which starts at Mt 20.1, according to the usual division of pericopes. The variant reading in question corresponds to the presence of seven words (πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ) in Codex Bezae and a number of other manuscripts after 20.16, ‘so the last will be first, and the first last’ and correspond almost verbatim to the last verse of Matthew’s Parable of the Wedding Banquet (Mt 22.1-14, ‘For many are called, but few are chosen.’) creating thus a two-fold conclusion to the Vineyard parable.

In terms of external evidence, the presence of these seven words is evenly divided, with early majuscules and minuscules, all Latin witnesses as well as other early versions (Syriac, Middle Egyptian and some Bohairic manuscripts) supporting the Bezan variant, against mainly Alexandrian witnesses as well as early Coptic versions. The variant must therefore have occurred at a very early stage, most probably before the 2<sup>nd</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> c. CE because of the Old Latin and Coptic. Metzger recognizes that the words might have fallen out of the text through homoioteleuton (ἔσχατοι...ὀλίγοι), but goes on to state ‘it is much more likely that [the words] were added here by copyist who recollected the close of another parable (22.14 where there is no significant variation of reading<sup>37</sup> with a {A}-rating. The large number of manuscripts attesting the one and the other cannot help to decide the originality. Although traditional textual critical tools will clearly favour the weight of &B and the shorter reading, it is, however, difficult to explain that a great number of independent manuscripts have deliberately added this verse. Its withdrawal, on the other hand, can well be explained on the basis of the apparent strangeness of a dual conclusion.

In terms of internal evidence, the presence of two concluding expressions, which in substance are closely related to the Semitic phenomenon of *nimshalim* (parables, comparison),<sup>38</sup> does not occur elsewhere in the NT. That said, these two expressions display a grammatically coherent structure introduced by οὕτως and concluded by a reason articulated by γάρ, a construction that may constitute a single conclusion: ‘for many are called, but few are chosen, *because* many that are first shall be last and the last shall be first.’ Because of its length, these words cannot have crept into the text accidentally, therefore must therefore be deliberate.

<sup>36</sup> See Mt 20.3 in this section.

<sup>37</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 41.

<sup>38</sup> D. STERN, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991) 16.



By looking at the entire passage, the verse before 20.1 (i.e. 19.30 Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι ('But many that are first will be last, and the last first,' firm across all manuscripts) is strikingly similar to 20.16bD.05, albeit in the reverse order (πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι *vs.* ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι), and could equally represent as the start of the parable, which would then be embedded within this chiastically arranged saying. Indeed, the use of δέ in Mt 19.30 could be explained as the conclusion of the preceding pericope, but the connective γάρ introducing Mt 20.1 signifies a link between the two passages and suggests that a new pericope begins with 19.30. In the structure of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, the adjective ἔσχατοι is omnipresent (Mt 19.30, 20.12,16 x 2) and can be understood as a catchword, while the second conclusion closes the parable as it started, the theme of on being chosen (ἐκλεκτοί): the parable may then have emphasised not only the fact of being first or last, but also that the group of people found (20.6D.05 εὔρεν, B.03 εἶδεν) was actually chosen.<sup>39</sup>

It is, in consequence, entirely plausible that the shorter reading is the result of a later withdrawal due an apparent repetition, unconnected with the evolution of the story of the labourers.

### I. 3. Conclusions

At first sight, contamination from the immediate context is a plausible explanation for wording that is highly similar to that which appears within a short distance in the same document. Indeed, the reverse process whereby a scribe would have deliberately changed a word into a synonym is less likely. On the other hand, from the examples studied in this section, it appears that harmonisations in Bezan Matthew in different contexts are relatively unlikely. On the contrary, readings that may look like a 'de-harmonisation' in other manuscripts may simply reflect a state where the Christian Scriptures were known in the form of individual pericopes rather than as narrative or theological continuum united within a single gospel, and the coherence would not have been apparent.

In the examples cited in this section, the shorter reading is thus more likely to be the result of a syntactical simplification and the apparent repetitions in the longer readings may well translate a deliberate force in the discourse, as well as serve as markers for the construction of the text. The Bezan text notably displays structural patterns that are not so readily discernible, if at all, in Codex Vaticanus.

## II. Harmonisations in Bezan Matthew with Mark Only

### II. 1. Validity of the Concept

The concept of Matthean harmonistic readings with Mark in Codex Bezae must first be discussed in relation to the circulation of the Gospel of Mark in the first two centuries. While such a harmonisation is technically possible (e.g. if the variant verse in Bezan

---

<sup>39</sup> This point was examined in Mt 20.30 in the earlier section.

Matthew is virtually identical to a parallel passage in Mark), it depends on the underlying assumption that the scribe of Matthew responsible for a harmonising reading was familiar enough with the Markan text at the time he edited his copy to be able to make the assimilation. Therefore, before concluding on any harmonisation of the Bezan text of Matthew with Mark, the question of to which extent the Gospel of Mark was circulating and was relatively well-known at the time of the edition of the Matthean text that generated Codex Bezae needs to be addressed.

In his influential work on the Christian literature before Irenaeus, Massaux concluded that, in contrast to Matthew, Mark was not used in the earliest Fathers.<sup>40</sup> He sees no literary influence of Mark in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch (c. 35-110), although he used Matthew abundantly.<sup>41</sup> Later, in Justin Martyr's time (100-165), the Gospels were used, mainly Matthew, but rarely Mark if at all.<sup>42</sup> Agreements between the texts of Justin Martyr and Codex Bezae are known to be significant,<sup>43</sup> and demonstrate that traces of the Bezan text or of its ancestor can be identified in pre-200 writings. The problem is complex and subject to on-going debate<sup>44</sup> but it is vital to remember that similar wording between Matthew and Mark cannot simply be taken as evidence for the 'harmonisation of Matthew to Mark.' In the case of a syntactic or lexical proximity between Bezan Matthew and Mark the reason for the closeness requires a more rigorous analysis to explain the phenomenon. Moreover, while the copying of Codex Bezae is dated to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> c., the support of witnesses for Bezan readings as early as 2<sup>nd</sup> c. suggests that the exemplar may have arisen at a time when Mark was not widely available. As a result, the concept of 'harmonisation with Mark' is in strong conflict with the low use of

---

<sup>40</sup> 'At least until the end of the second century [the Gospel of Mark] remained in the shadow of the Gospel of Matthew' (É. MASSAUX, *L'influence de L'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irénée* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950) 647-54 (Engl. Translation: A.J. BELLINZONI [ed.], *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus* [3 vols.; New Gospel Studies 5.1-3; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990-3]). As for Justin, Massaux mentions that 'force est de constater l'absence de Marc et de Jean que Justin paraît ignorer' (108). In an article on Origen's comments on the 2<sup>nd</sup> c Greek philosopher Celse who used the Scriptures against the Christians, Rouger notes that 'bien que Justin semble connaître Marc, on a noté combien cet évangile est absent de ses écrits, au contraire de Matthieu et Luc' (D. ROUGER, 'Celse et la tradition évangélique du Codex de Bèze,' in PARKER-AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 246).

<sup>41</sup> 'Saint Ignace d'Antioche connaît indubitablement l'évangile de *Mt.*; en plus d'un endroit, ses lettres trahissent l'utilisation de cet évangile. [...] Tout en ne recourant pas explicitement à *Mt.*, et en ne citant pas ses textes littéralement, plus d'une fois l'évêque d'Antioche s'y réfère et en dépend littérairement, manifestant par là une très grande familiarité avec lui' (MASSAUX, *Influence de L'Évangile de Saint Matthieu*, 106). This is a different view to Helmut Koester's *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TUGAL 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), who explains the similarity of Patristic quotations with the 'text' of the Gospels as reflecting oral tradition - 'text' in quotation marks because of the Church Fathers before Irenaeus, i.e. before the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. rather reflect the *sources* to the Gospels rather than the Gospels themselves).

<sup>42</sup> É. MASSAUX, *L'influence de L'Évangile de Saint Matthieu*, 569.

<sup>43</sup> See Klijn: 'We only have to point to the agreements between Justin and the Old Latin, Marcion and D, to readings found in the Diatessaron, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac' (A.F.J. KLIJN, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*, II: 1949-1969 [NTS 21; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969] 67).

<sup>44</sup> See J.-L. VIX, 'L'école de rhétorique de Smyrne' in 'Irénée entre Bible et Hellénisme,' colloquium held in Lyons (France), 30<sup>th</sup> June-2<sup>nd</sup> July 2014.

the Markan text from which the scribes would have imported discordant wording. As a matter of fact, to think of the Gospel texts as equally available and defined in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. is an undocumented assumption.<sup>45</sup>

With this *provisio* in mind, I will firstly deal with readings in Bezan Matthew that allegedly harmonise with firm readings in Mark (II. 2). Then I will go on to look at possible harmonisation with Mark where the Markan reading is variant (II. 3).

## II. 2. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Firm Markan Reading

In the following five examples, the cases where the reading in Mt D.05 is identified in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> as a potential harmonisation with Mark,<sup>46</sup> but where the corresponding Markan reading is *firm* across the textual tradition, will be studied. As such, a variant reading closer to the parallel wording could technically be a harmonisation; nevertheless, the following examples will show that this is by no means straightforward. To ease the identification of the Markan parallels for the reader, the Matthean verse will be presented the same way as the Mt–Mt variants.

### Mt 4.18 – par. Mk 1.16

Mt 4.18 Ἐπιπεπατων δε παρα την θαλασσαν της Γαλιλαιας ειδεν δυο αδελφους, Σιμωνα τον λεγομενον Πετρον και Ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου, βαλλοντας αμφιβληστρον εις την θαλασσαν· ησαν γαρ αλιεις.

† *p*) παραγων D it sy<sup>s</sup>; Eus | *txt* περιπατων B *rell*

Mk 1.16 Και παραγων παρα την θαλασσαν της Γαλιλαιας ειδεν Σιμωνα και Ανδρεαν τον αδελφον † Σιμωνος † αμφιβαλλοντας εν τη θαλασση· ησαν γαρ αλιεις.

† του Σιμωνος A Δ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 1241 *pm* | αυτου D W Γ Θ 28 33 579 1424 2542 *pm*  
lat sy<sup>s,p</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | αυτου του (-l2211) Σιμωνος K l2211 *pm* sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* (Σιμωνος) & B  
L 565 700 892 | † αμφιβαλλοντας (αμφιβαλοντες Θ) τα δικτυα D Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 28  
565\* (latt) sy<sup>p</sup> | *p*) βαλλοντας αμφιβληστρον Γ 579 892 1241 1424 |  
αμφιβληστρον (αμφιβληστρα *f*<sup>1</sup>) βαλλοντας *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 2542 | αμφιβαλλοντας  
(αμφιβαλοντας K) αμφιβληστρον A K W Δ 565<sup>c</sup> l2211 & | *txt*  
(αμφιβαλλοντας) & B L 33

Mt 4.18 and its parallel verse Mk 1.16 open the Galilean ministry of Jesus with a high degree of verbal similarity in the two Gospels. Such a similarity may well explain the

<sup>45</sup> Ehrman confirms that harmonisation with Mark is a ‘rare’ phenomenon and that therefore a harmonisation towards Mark is hardly possible. See B.D. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: the Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 92.

<sup>46</sup> There is no implicit reference to harmonisation with Mark, i.e. all alleged harmonisations with Mark are indicated with the *p*) sign. Strictly speaking NA<sup>28</sup> does not mention that the parallel passage in question is Mark but I have identified it as being with Mark.

switch from περιπατῶν to παράγων to reduce the discordance, thereby pointing to the secondary character of παράγων. Codex Bezae reads the apparently firm Markan feature.

In terms of external evidence, the variant reading περιπατῶν in Mt 4.18 attested in almost all the textual tradition outweighs the other verbal form παράγων supported by Codex Bezae and the Old Latin. Interestingly, the testimony of an early version of the Syriac and of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. Church Father Eusebius shows that the reading was also present in the East in the first centuries. The critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> attests no variant reading in Mark with regard to the form παράγων hence the inclusion on this section.<sup>47</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, both phrases represent good Greek since περιπατῶν+παρά and παράγων+παρά are both possible, despite a different meaning (περιπατέω: *walk, go*, παράγω: *pass by*, both introducing παρά τὴν θάλασσαν)<sup>48</sup> and neither can be preferred to the other *per se*. If the *vl* παράγων were the result of a harmonisation, the switch καί/δέ would still need to be explained as an editorial act.<sup>49</sup> It is difficult to identify with certainty which reading gave rise to the other: on the one hand, the verbal proximity may suggest that Matthew simply took from Mark; on the other hand, scribes could well have changed παράγων into περιπατῶν because Jesus was already in Galilee (and not *departing from*)<sup>50</sup> as Lagrange suggests.<sup>51</sup> The load of allusions behind the verb περιπατέω signalling a divine activity and alert the audience to Jesus' divinity,<sup>52</sup> could explain the switch from παράγων into περιπατῶν. Conversely, it is quite unlikely that such an amount of loaded allusions would have been missed by a scribe, at such an

---

<sup>47</sup> The consultation of Codex Alexandrinus at Mk 1.16 reveals that the reading attested in this manuscript is περιπατῶν and not παράγων. The omission of this variant reading does not preclude the mention of a harmonistic slip in NA<sup>28</sup>: indeed, περιπατῶν could well be a Markan harmonisation with Matthew. This error is the only one that I found in the critical apparatus of Matthew and its parallels where harmonisation is suggested.

<sup>48</sup> BDAG quotes examples with both verbs with the preposition παρά.

<sup>49</sup> Winer proposes that δέ indicates movement 'to something new, different and distinct from what precedes' (G.B. WINER, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* [trans. and rev. W.F. Moulton, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959] 552). Porter and Reed add further: 'The adversative and connective senses attributed to δέ then become specific instances of 'something new, different and distinct' (LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 225) which is not the case with καί (S.E. PORTER and J.T. REED, *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament. Approaches and Results* [JSNT.S 170; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999] 229).

<sup>50</sup> Davies and Allison, who tend to explain Matthean developments from Mark, note: 'Mark begins with καί παράγων, otherwise there is agreement. Περιπατέω is also redactional in Mt 14.29 and 15.31. Matthew has retained παράγω in 9.9=Mk 2.14 but dropped it here and in 27.32=Mk 15.21. It is redactional in 9.27 and 20.30 it seems to mean 'depart' in 9.9, 27; and 20.30. This helps account for its absence at this point, as does the awkward iteration in παράγων παρά' (DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 395).

<sup>51</sup> '[...] dans Marc, parce que Jésus est en route, tandis que dans Matthieu, Jésus déjà établi au bord du lac, se promène, mais dans le dessein d'exercer sa mission.' (M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* [Paris: J. Gabalda, 1923] 70).

<sup>52</sup> See God as 'walking in the garden' [of Eden] in Gen. 3.8LXX (καί ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ); Ps 103.3LXX talks about God 'riding on the wings of the wind' (ὁ περιπατῶν ἐπὶ πτερύγων ἀνέμων). Likewise Job 9.8 (LXX: περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης, 'trampled the waves of the sea').

early stage, to the extent he would have corrected *περιπατῶν* into *παράγων* by ‘harmonisation’ with Mark.<sup>53</sup>

Leaving aside the absence of any indication of a variant reading in Mk 1.16 in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, it cannot be determined with certainty which reading is more likely to be original, but it appears that the conclusion towards a harmonisation relies on external evidence only.

#### Mt 4.19 - par. Mk 1.17

Mt 4.19 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων

Ɀp) γενέσθαι Ɀ<sup>1</sup> D 33 l844 l2211 lat sy<sup>p.hmg</sup> | txt (om.) B rell

Mk 1.17 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων

No vll

In the first call of Jesus to the disciples (Mt 4.19), Jesus says ‘Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men,’ which appears as *ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*. Mk has *ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων* with the aorist middle infinitive. The presence of *γενέσθαι* in Mt D.05 naturally causes a harmonisation to Mk to be suspected: this high level of verbal agreement in the saying of Jesus may explain the addition of *γενέσθαι* as a deliberate attempt to reduce the discordance.

In terms of external evidence, the immense majority attests the shorter reading, which is a first indication in its favour. The presence of the longer reading is found in Codex Bezae, as well as in some lectionaries, minuscules, early versions and a corrected version of Codex Sinaiticus. The weight of external evidence naturally favours the reading of Codex Vaticanus against the allies of Codex Bezae in accordance with the usual principles of external textual criticism. Interestingly, we have an example of a correction by a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus which agrees with Codex Bezae.<sup>54</sup> Such a correction may well indicate that there is a true difference between the two sentences with or without *γενέσθαι* and at least for one major witness, the addition of *γενέσθαι* was needed.

In terms of internal evidence, both readings are good Greek although the verb *ποιήσω*, not followed by a verb and meaning ‘I will make you (be),’ is closer to the He-

<sup>53</sup> Interestingly, the Latin page of both verses are different in Codex Bezae: Mt 4.18d5: *transiens* [autem secus mare galilaeae]; Mk 1.16d5: *praeteriens* [secus mare galilaeae].

<sup>54</sup> My own count is that later hands of Codex Sinaiticus in Matthew correct the original text of Mt Ɀ.01 resulting into an agreement with Codex Bezae, against 14 times where the corrections depart from Codex Bezae.

brew.<sup>55</sup> However, the high verbal similarity between Mt and Mk in a sentence which might well have quickly become revered in the post-Easter communities, is more likely to have attracted a single sentence using γενέσθαι. If we assume Markan priority, Matthew may have taken verbatim from Mark hence the agreement. The shorter reading could reflect a deliberate intention whereby Jesus makes the disciples (immediately) fishers of men (and they immediately are) against ‘he makes them *become* fishers of men’ which implies a period of transition. As we have already seen,<sup>56</sup> the depiction of the disciples as accomplished men who understand the teachings of Jesus straightaway could translate a later exaggeration of their heroic status, hence the removal of γενέσθαι.

As a result, it is difficult to conclude about harmonisation one way or the other: usual text critical criteria favour the shorter reading, whereas redactional considerations potentially favour the longer one.

#### Mt 13.34 – par. Mk 4.33-34

Mt 13.34 Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς Ἦ οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.

ⲓⲫ) οὐκ ⲛ<sup>2</sup> D K L Γ Θ ⲑ ⲑ<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 Ⲙⲗ lat bo | txt  
(οὐδέν) ⲛ\* B C W Δ ⲑ<sup>13</sup> ⲑ sy<sup>h</sup> sa; Cl

Mk 4.33 Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν·  
[34] χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ’ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν Ἦ πάντα.

[34] Ἦ αὐτᾶς D W it | txt B rell

Mt 13.34 comes after a succession of three parables<sup>57</sup> (echoed by the initial demonstrative ταῦτα πάντα) bringing the teaching to a conclusion with a chiasmically arranged sentence. Once again, the absence of a variant reading in the prepositional clause introduced by χωρὶς of Mk 4.34 gives the impression at first sight that Mt D.05 has been harmonised with Mark.

In terms of external evidence, the textual tradition is well divided with an equal split of varied text-types. The variety of witnesses supporting one or the other reading is too broad to draw conclusions, unless the weight of ⲛ.01 and B.03 is considered decisive, as is usual among textual critics who assume the superiority of those manuscripts. It will be noticed that, as in the preceding example, a later hand of ⲛ (ⲛ<sup>2</sup>) agrees with Codex Bezae, which may hint at the secondary character of the Bezan text or alternative-

<sup>55</sup> For example, Gen 12.2 (‘and I will make of you a great nation,’ לְגוֹי גָדוֹל אֶעֱשֶׂה לְךָ using the construction ל + הַשֵּׁע) is translated verbatim (LXX ποιήσω σε εἰς ἔθνος μέγα) i.e. without the *gal* infinitive construct תַּיִתְּלָה.

<sup>56</sup> See the discussion of Mt 4.10 in I. 2.

<sup>57</sup> Parables of the Weeds among the Wheat, of the Mustard Seed, of the Yeast. These three follow the longer and more detailed Parable of the Sower.

ly could reflect a correction in favour of an older manuscripts. The external evidence does not help in providing a conclusive proposal with regard to reading is more likely to be original. Both expressions are acceptable although rarely found in the Scriptures.<sup>58</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, the level of agreement between Matthew and Mark is lower than the former examples, apart from the similar prepositional clause *καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς* which differs only by the use of *καί/δέ* and *οὐδὲν/οὐκ* as one can see from the following synoptic arrangement:

Mt 13.34	Mk 4.33-34
Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς	Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν·  χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἴδιαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν Ἦ πάντα (Ἦ αὐτᾶς D W it)

A harmonisation could have happened in Mt D.05 to match the (almost perfectly secure) prepositional phrase found in Mark.<sup>59</sup> Nevertheless, the rest of the verse is lexically too different to justify a simple harmonistic slip. Actually, Matthew links the two clauses *ταῦτα πάντα...τοῖς ὄχλοις* and *χωρὶς...αὐτοῖς* by the connective *καί* thereby bringing the two clauses to the same level of importance, while Mark has introduced a slight opposition between them with the adversative connective *δέ*. The first clause in Matthew uses parables in the plural in the form of *ταῦτα πάντα* where *οὐδὲν* (B.03 reading) is rather expected ('all these/'nothing') as opposed to *οὐκ*, in which case, *οὐδὲν* would then be a correction from the *lectio difficilior* *οὐκ*. In other words, *οὐκ* can be considered a harmonistic variant, while *οὐδὲν* can also be seen as a correction adapting to *ταῦτα πάντα*. Interestingly, the final clause *κατ' ἴδιαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν αὐτᾶς* (D.05 reading) in Mark bearing the *ἢ αὐτᾶς/πάντα* also reflects the conflict between the particularity and generality of that which the disciples understood and could have been rewritten in Matthew to adapt it to the new syntax.

This example suggests that not only do the words need to be taken into consideration but also the entire flow of the discourse, which may have been constructed in a different way, resulting in an initial change in the parts of speech. The redactional act of Matthew in writing his gospel is also at stake here, as harmonisation assumes that his text would have been different from Mark's in this instance.

<sup>58</sup> Such constructions as *χωρὶς...οὐκ* translating the Hebrew *כִּלְ...קַר* are rare in Hebrew (Gen. 47.22,26 – translated as such in Greek) as in original Greek (Bel. 1.9 only, and NT Books: Mk. 4.34, Rom. 10.14, 2 Co. 12.3). *Χωρὶς...οὐδὲν* is even rarer with no occurrence in the Jewish Scriptures that would translate *כִּלְ...קַר* and only three in the NT (Jn 15.5, Phm 1.14; Mt 13.34 in the aforementioned witnesses).

<sup>59</sup> This is stated as a firm fact in DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 425, note 84.

Mt 15.35-36 – par. Mk 8.6

Mt 15.35 καὶ Ἦ παραγγείλας Ἦ τῷ ὄχλῳ Ἦ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν [36] Ἦ ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας ὡκαὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ Ἦ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ Ἦ τοῖς ὄχλοις Ἦ

[36] Ἦ ρ) τῷ ὄχλῳ C D N P W Γ Δ Θ 565 1424 l2211 M̄ lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae | txt (τοῖς ὄχλοις) N̄ B K L f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 e f ff<sup>1</sup> sy sa<sup>ms</sup> bo

Further significant vll: Ἦ τοὺς ὄχλους C 892<sup>c</sup> 1424 | τοῖς ὄχλοις K L N P W Γ Δ 565 700 l221 M̄ | txt (τῷ ὄχλῳ) N̄ B D Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 892\* 1241 lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo<sup>mss</sup>

Mk 8.6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Ἦνα παρατιθῶσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ.

No vll

Mt 15.35-36 corresponds to the Feeding of the Four Thousand, where Jesus commands the *crowd(s)* to sit down, after which he breaks the seven loaves and fish and gives to the *crowd(s)*. Both words in italics are variant in terms of number: the variant in the second occurrence concerns Codex Bezae where it is singular as in Mk 8.6 (secure) against Codex Vaticanus (plural).<sup>60</sup>

In terms of external evidence, there are two stands of tradition where the verb in the second occurrence is in the plural (Codex Bezae and mostly Byzantine and Caesarean support) against the singular in Codex Vaticanus with mostly Alexandrian and some Byzantine and Caesarean support. Interestingly, the versions are quite divided: within Sahidic, Coptic and early Latin witnesses, some support the singular, others, the plural.

In terms of internal evidence, the occurrence of ‘crowd(s)’ in Mt 15.36 could indeed be the consequence of an attraction from the previous verse 35 where Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae unanimously read the singular against the rest of the tradition. Because of the verbal proximity with Mark and the second Evangelist’s fondness for the singular ‘crowd,’<sup>61</sup> the singular in Bezan Matthew could constitute a

<sup>60</sup> The reason for which the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> does not mention any reference to v. 35 may be the absence of variant in the parallel passage of Mk 8.6. The proximity with τῷ ὄχλῳ in v.35 may have prompted a harmonisation with the immediate context, however, to respect the indication provided by NA<sup>28</sup>, this variant will be considered in the harmonisation of Matthew with Mark.

<sup>61</sup> There are 34 occurrences of the word ὄχλος in Mark (Mk. 2.4,13, 3.9,20,32, 4.1,36, 5.21,24,27,30f, 6.34,45, 7.14,17,33, 8.1f,6,34, 9.14f,17,25, 10.1,46, 11.18,32, 12.12,37,41, 14.43, 15.8,11,15). Only Mk 10.1 reads ὄχλοι (once the word appears [in D.05] as λαόν instead of ὄχλον [in N̄B] in 11.32).



harmonisation with Mk 8.6. Conversely, Matthew seems to favour the plural ‘crowds.’<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless, first, these observations ignore the existence of the reverse problem in the first Feeding (Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mt 14.19-21),<sup>63</sup> which has an even higher degree of verbal proximity than with Mk 15.35-36 with the sequence *καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους* (D.05 τὸν ὄχλον) *ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου*, [...] *οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις* (‘and commanding the crowd[s] to sit down on the grass, [...] and the disciples [gave the loaves] to the crowds’). Secondly, the first occurrence of ‘crowd’ (Mt 14.19) is in the singular with variant readings (D 892 *lat mae bo*<sup>mss</sup>) while the second (same verse) is plural as a secure form. As a result, the plural in some manuscripts of Mt 15.35 is more likely to reflect harmonisation with the earlier passage, an option which is not indicated in NA<sup>28</sup>.

Mt 14.19 <i>καὶ κελεύσας τὸν ὄχλον</i> [...] <i>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις</i> .	D
Mt 14.19 <i>καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους</i> [...] <i>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις</i> .	B
Mt 15.35f <i>καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ</i> [...] <i>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τῷ ὄχλῳ</i> .	D
Mt 15.35f <i>καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ</i> [...] <i>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις</i> .	B

Thirdly, there might be a deliberate use of the singular or plural form of ‘crowd:’ in Bezan Matthew, the first feeding reads the singular first then the plural, and in the second feeding the singular is read twice—an un-noted feature in the scholarship. Beyond accidental slips, it may well be that there is an deliberate mention of two different groups (one reflected in the use of the singular, the other one in the use of the plural).<sup>64</sup>

Finally, a third occurrence of the plural ‘crowds’ in v. 39, along with two Feedings in Mark (6.30-45 and 8.1-10), constitute too complex a picture to conclude that there is simply a harmonisation with Mark.

In conclusion, the temptation to suppose harmonisation with Mark is strong, specifically because of the secure readings across the tradition in Mark, and the Markan fondness for the singular *ὄχλος*. The high verbal agreement between each verse in their Matthean and

<sup>62</sup> Mark always uses the singular form *ὄχλος* except once (Mk 10.1) where the form is even disputed. Matthew is known to prefer the plural form (31/50 as quoted in J.R.C. COUSLAND, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* [NTS 102; Leiden: Brill, 2002] 37).

<sup>63</sup> The similarity of the two feedings has attracted a fair body of literature as to the crowds’ identity. See J.R.C. COUSLAND, ‘The Feeding of the Four Thousand Gentiles in Matthew? Matthew 1:29-39 as a Test Case,’ *NovT* 41 (1999) 1–23.

<sup>64</sup> The differences between ‘crowd’ and ‘crowds’ and its occurrences as variant readings are a rarely noticed textual problem; the distinction could be explained as the singular reflecting a delimited crowd as opposed to a more undefined one. On this variant reading, Rius-Camps notes that ‘de la pinya formada per “la multitud” (τὸν ὄχλον, en singular) fanàtica hem passat a “les multituds” (οἱ ὄχλοι, en plural) diversificades i personalitzades gràcies a l’impacte de l’ensenyança de Jesús’ (*ibid.*, ‘Simó Pere, ¿fou des dels inicis deixeble de Jesús?’ in A. PUIG I TÀRRECH [ed], *La veritat i la mentida* [SB 10; Barcelona: ABCat-PAM, 2010] 139–53 [146]). Also see *ibid.*, ‘The Spelling of Jerusalem in the Gospel of John: The Significance of Two Forms in Codex Bezae,’ *NTS* 48 (2002) 84–94 [89].

Markan readings is surely a potential source of scribal harmonisation; however, a consideration of a harmonisation with the similar, preceding context would lead to the opposite conclusion with regard to which form of ‘crowd’ in Mt 15.36. Some more detailed analysis is needed to explain a possible reason for the alternation in the two miracles in Bezan Matthew.

Mt 16.23 – par. Mk 8.33

Mt 16.23 ὁ δὲ Ἰσραφελῆς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

†p) ἐπιστραφελῆς D K L Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 1424

Mk 8.33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφελῆς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω Ἰμου, σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

†τῷ A C K W Γ Δ Θ 0214 f<sup>1.13</sup> 28 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 ℳ |  
txt (om. τῷ) ⋈ B D L

Mt 16.23 describes Jesus’ reaction to Peter’s reaction to Jesus’ announcement of his suffering and resurrection, which is immediately followed by his confession at Caesarea Philippi, where Jesus ‘turns’ to Peter. The verb *to turn* in Mt 16.23 is variant and its form in Bezan Matthew is identical to the one in Mk 8.33, a closeness that may be understood as a harmonisation with Mark.

In terms of external evidence, the impressive (principal manuscripts, among which Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus) and wide diversity of witnesses (Alexandrian, Caesarean and Byzantine) supporting *στραφελῆς* leaves little doubt about its originality according to usual principles of textual criticism. The tradition is well divided, however, with some important and diverse text-types, including majuscules and minuscules supporting the Bezan reading. The *v*l is therefore unlikely to be accidental and, furthermore, was present at an early stage of transmission.

In terms of internal evidence, the absence of variant readings in the intransitive participial clause introduced by *ἐπιστραφελῆς* in Mk 8.33 has apparently led to the conclusion that Mt D.05 harmonises with Mark. While the aorist passive participle of compound verb is hardly found in the NT,<sup>65</sup> its simple form *στραφελῆς* is found in a few other places, i.e. once more in Matthew,<sup>66</sup> eight times in Luke, none in Mark (once in John), in

<sup>65</sup> Only in Mark 8.33 and as a *v*l in Mt 9.22 in a few manuscripts ⋈ B (D) N f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1844 12211 against C K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 1424 ℳ.

<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, there is a further (singular) reading beyond *ἐπιστραφελῆς/στραφελῆς* at Mt 9.22D.05: ἔστη στραφελῆς. Strikingly, the compound form in C K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 1424 ℳ is *not* suggested as a harmonistic reading (i.e. no *p*-sign) within the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. Since the external evidence calls for the simple form, the compound form is only reported in the critical apparatus as a variant reading.

the general pattern ‘and he turned around + verb [saw, looked, Ø] + [he] said,’ which is firm most of the time:

### Matthew

9.22	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς <sup>67</sup> ἑστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἶπεν	ἑπί- C K L W Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 1424 ℳ   ἔστη στραφεὶς D   στραφεὶς ⋈ B N f <sup>13</sup> 33 892 l844 l2211
------	--	--

### Luke

7.9	καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπεν	firm
7.44	καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη	firm
9.55	στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς	firm
10.23	καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ’ ἰδίαν εἶπεν	firm
14.25	καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·	firm
22.61	καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ,	firm <sup>68</sup>
23.28	στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·	στραφεὶς is firm, rest is variant

The rareness of the aorist participle of ἐπιστρέφω renders a harmonisation with usage unlikely. On the other hand, the reading *στραφεὶς* could well be regarded as such. Considering a discordant form in Mt and Mk, Davies and Allison mention that Matthew ‘abbreviates’ Mark<sup>69</sup> justifying the use of *στραφεὶς* by the systematic use of the compound verb in Matthew.<sup>70</sup> However, since a harmonisation of Matthew with Mark is technically unlikely in a 2<sup>nd</sup> c. environment as mentioned in the introduction to this section (II. 1), it may mean that the compound form is in fact a genuine redactional Matthean form taken from Mark. Also, the verb ἐπιστρέφω, beyond its relation to a physical movement (‘to turn around’) or a change of mind or of a course of action, also bears a religious and moral sense (‘turn to God,’ ‘regret’),<sup>71</sup> which may have appeared inappropriate to the Matthean scribe, Jesus being the subject, and he would have changed it into the more usual *στραφεὶς* form. At the only other place where a similar *v/l* occurs between ἐπιστραφεὶς and *στραφεὶς*, Codex Bezae has the simple verb, showing thereby that it does not *systematically* use the compound verb.

This variant is therefore not a case of obvious harmonisation with Mark in Mt 16.23D.05.

<sup>67</sup> ⋈\* D it sy<sup>s</sup> do not read Ἰησοῦς.

<sup>68</sup> The verb is firm though there are other variants: ὁ κύριος *v/l* Ἰησοῦς D f<sup>1</sup> 1241 l844 vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>s.p.h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>

<sup>69</sup> The passage displays a high degree of agreement except the Markan repetition of ἐπιτιμᾶν (καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. [33] ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὕπαγε κτλ.), which may well have been reduced by Matthew and substituted with ἰλεώς σοι, κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο if we assume Markan priority.

<sup>70</sup> See DAVIES—ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 633.

<sup>71</sup> BDAG, s.v. ἐπιστρέφω; also see the discussion with its proximity with μετανοέω in J.W. HEIKKINEN, ‘Notes on “epistrepho” and “metanoeo”’, *ER* 19 (1967) 313-6.

Mt 26.9 – par. Mk 14.5

Mt 26.9 ἐδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο ὧ παραθῆναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι ὧ πτωχοῖς

ὧ *p*) τοῖς A D K W Γ Δ 700 1241 1424 *pm* | *txt (om.)* ⋈ B L Θ 0293 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33  
565 579 892 1844 *pm*

Further vll: ὧ *p*) τὸ μύρον K Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 579 700 1241 1424 1844 *pm* c q

Mk 14.5 ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον παραθῆναι ἐπάνω ὧ δηνარიῶν τριακοσίων<sup>2</sup> καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς· καὶ ὧ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ

<sup>5</sup>A B K Γ Δ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 28 700 892 1241 1424 2542 ⋈ *lat* | *txt* ⋈ C D L W Θ Ψ 565  
579 *it* | ὧ ἐνεβριμοῦντο ⋈ C\* W 1424 | ἐνεβριμήσατο (!) 2542

Mt 26.9 appears during the pericope of the Anointing at Bethany (Mt 26.1-13) where the disciples complain about the waste of the perfume poured on Jesus' feet claiming that 'this ointment might have been sold for a large sum, and given to *the* poor.' Whether πτωχοῖς ('poor') should be read anarthrously or arthrously is the question raised by the variant reading.<sup>72</sup> There is no parallel in Luke involving the proposal to give to the poor (Lk 7.39-50).<sup>73</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence or absence of τοῖς is fairly divided between Western, Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses on the one hand side, and Alexandrian and other Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses on the other side. Both readings have significant early support. If this were a harmonisation, it must be concluded that all the manuscripts supporting the Bezan reading made the same addition, which would either be an unlikely coincidence or the consequence of two separate archetypes contaminating all the other manuscripts.

In terms of internal evidence, the repetitive sequence of the majuscules –OIC – OIC could suggest that the omission of τοῖς was caused by a scribal slip on the basis of homoioteleuton. However, this error is unlikely to have crept into so many manuscripts. Beyond these considerations of potential scribal slips, the resemblance with the Markan verse indeed favours the explanation of harmonisation but the level of verbal agreement is only partial with, apart from the variant in question, two further differences: (1) τοῦτο in Mt in most manuscripts against the secure form τοῦτο τὸ μύρον in Mark; and (2)

<sup>72</sup> Strangely, Davies and Allison explain the presence of the article as Mark putting the definite article as part of a global rewording of the Matthean text, which is against their usual acceptance of Markan priority (*Matthew*, III, 445). Nevertheless, they explain the differences between Mark and Matthew in this verse as reflecting 'Matthew's characteristic desire to compress the narrative and eliminate unnecessary features.' This however does not explain the 'expected' presence of the article before πτωχοῖς.

<sup>73</sup> Jn 12.5 involves the arthrous noun but, as mentioned earlier, the Johannean passages will not be discussed here.

πολλοῦ which is firm in Mt, against ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων, an expression which is present in Mark across the textual tradition despite a word order difference in two streams of manuscripts.<sup>74</sup>

To summarize, the Bezan variant occurs in a sentence where other more important features could have been harmonised with Mark (the myrrh and the sum of money), but which are not assimilated; furthermore, the absence of article in the expression ‘giving to the poor’ is subject to variation in the NT and could equally reflect deliberate stylistic rearrangement. Therefore, a harmonisation with Mark is unlikely, even though the original text cannot be reconstructed with certainty as the problem is wider than it appears.

### II. 3. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Variant Markan Reading

In the following five examples, the reading in Mt D.05 is suggested in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> as an apparent harmonisation but where the assumed corresponding Markan parallel is itself variant will be studied. These cases are hardly conclusive, however, because it is difficult to know which reading from which Gospel is more likely to be original. Since the previous section indicated the reasons why the Gospel of Mark was not circulating in the first part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. within the early communities unlike Matthew, at least as far as Patristic and extra-canonical evidence is concerned,<sup>75</sup> any harmonisation is most likely to have occurred in Mark with Matthew. Although the exact written status of the Gospels before the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. is still hotly debated and because of the tentatively speculative aspect of any conclusion on this topic, all potentially harmonistic readings of this section will be discussed in such a way as to leave the debate open, and yet without concluding straightforwardly that the discussed harmonisation is ‘obviously from Mark.’

#### Mt 17.21 – par. Mk 9.29

Mt 17.20 ὁ δὲ <sup>τ</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς, Διὰ τὴν <sup>φ</sup> ὀλιγοπιστίαν ὑμῶν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, Ἔμετάβα ἔνθεν ἔκει, καὶ μεταβήσεται· καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσῃ ὑμῖν.[21]<sup>φ</sup>

<sup>τ</sup>ρ) [21] τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται (ἐκβαλλ-<sup>κ</sup>2; ἐξερχ- 118 209 l2211) εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία <sup>κ</sup>2 C D K L W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 l2211 <sup>Ϟ</sup> lat sy<sup>(p).h</sup> (mae) bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or | txt (om. v.21) <sup>κ</sup>\* B Θ 0281 33 579 892\* e ff<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup>

Mk 9.29 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελεθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ<sup>τ</sup>

<sup>74</sup> As a supplementary note, John has a fuller reading, with the presence of the three constituents τὸ μύρον, τριακοσίων δηναρίων and the article τοῖς.

<sup>75</sup> See par. Chapter 5 II. 1.

†καὶ (+τῆ Δ) νηστεία  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$   $\aleph^2$  A C D K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 28 33 565 579  
 700 892 1241 1424 2542 *l*2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> co (<sup>r</sup>sy<sup>s-p</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>) | *txt* (*om.* καὶ  
 νηστεία)  $\aleph^*$  B 0274 *k*

A portion of a Markan verse appears to have been inserted by some manuscripts into Matthean material, about a specific type of exorcism that could not be achieved by the disciples. Strictly speaking, the verse designated by ‘Mt 17.21’ as such does not exist in NA<sup>28</sup> but since it is present in some manuscripts among which Codex Bezae, I will refer to it as ‘Mt 17.21.’

In terms of external evidence, the full verse is either present or absent in an equally divided number of witnesses. Indeed, the absence of the verse is supported by mostly Alexandrian majuscules and two Old Latin witnesses as well as some early Syriac and Coptic while it is present in Western, Byzantine and Caesarean manuscripts and other early versions. Further, the testimony of Origen’s *Commentary of Matthew* suggests that the verse may have been included in the Father’s copy of Matthew.<sup>76</sup> The text-critical principle preferring the shorter text, coupled with the absence of the verse in  $\aleph^*$  and B, and the existence of similar wording in Mark, tend to suggest a verse that was subject to scribal emendation. Metzger concludes *de facto* that there is no reason for a deliberate omission of such a verse.<sup>77</sup> Holmes thinks similarly<sup>78</sup> but confesses that the ‘addition’ must have happened at an early stage of the copying process eventually infected a great number of manuscripts.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, if the presence of the verse reflects a harmonistic addition, this is not a unique variant peculiar to Codex Bezae, the withdrawal of which would need an explanation. Last but not least, while Bezan Matthew explains that the exorcism in question can be achieved only by both prayer and fasting (no manuscript mentions only one reason – prayer and fasting – in Mt 17.21), the textual tradition in Mark is divided as to only prayer or both prayer and fasting: indeed, only by prayer (εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ) is supported by a few, but noticeable Greek witnesses and the early African Latin codex Bobbiensis *k*, while the double mention of ‘prayer and fasting’ (καὶ νηστεία) is supported by the early witnesses among which  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$  and other geographically diverse majuscules and minuscules, and early versions.<sup>80</sup> Interestingly, some

<sup>76</sup> Origen quotes this verse as πρόσχωμεν δὲ καὶ τῷ τούτῳ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία, ἵν’ εἴ ποτε δέοι περὶ θεραπείαν ἀσχολεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς τοιοῦτόν τι πεπονθότος τινός, μὴ ὀρκίζωμεν μηδὲ ἐπερωτῶμεν μηδὲ λαλῶμεν ὡς ἀκούοντι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ πνεύματι, ἀλλὰ «σκολάζοντες προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία» ἐπιτύχωμεν προσευχόμενοι περὶ τοῦ πεπονθότος <σωτηρίας τῆς ἀπὸ θεοῦ> καὶ τῇ ἑαυτῶν νηστεία ἀπώσωμεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα (ORIGEN, *Commentaria in Evangelium secundum Matthaem*, 7 in MIGNE, PG, 13).

<sup>77</sup> Metzger, rates the omission with a {A}-rating, noting that ‘Since there is no satisfactory reason why the passage, if originally present in Matthew, should have been omitted in a wide variety of witnesses, and since copyists frequently inserted material derived from another Gospel, it appears that most manuscripts have been assimilated to the parallel in Mk 9.29’ (*Commentary*, 35).

<sup>78</sup> ‘Another example of the deliberate insertion of additional material’ (HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 94).

<sup>79</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 76.

<sup>80</sup> Metzger suggests an {A}-rating (i.e. certain) for the absence of ‘fasting’: ‘In light of the increasing emphasis in the early church on the necessity of fasting, it is understandable that καὶ νηστεία is a gloss which

Syriac and Bohairic versions read *fasting* before *prayer* (sy<sup>s.p</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>) signalling a prominence of one over the other. Significantly, Codex Bezae has the two mentions of prayer and fasting in both Mark and Matthew. The importance of Codex Vaticanus and the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus are both significant to justify the absence of Mt 17.21, but the amount of widely diverse manuscripts attesting the presence prevents such a simple conclusion.

In terms of internal evidence, the verbal agreement between the two verses of Mark and Matthew is high but not comprehensive, maybe indicating a non-Markan source for Matthew as the synoptic alignment below reveals:<sup>81</sup>

Matthew	Mark
τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος	τοῦτο τὸ γένος
οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται (vll)	ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελεθεῖν
εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία	εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ (vl +καὶ [+τῆ] νηστεία) <sup>82</sup>

Since the external evidence is not conclusive, the composition of the passage may well be at stake. The whole pericope of Jesus Healing a Boy appears in the three Synoptics and can be formally divided into six parts ([1] request for healing; [2] it is said that the disciples could not heal the boy; [3] Jesus is angry but heals the boy; [4] the disciples wonder why they could not heal the boy; [5] Jesus tells the disciples they can ‘remove mountains’ if they have faith in God; [6] Jesus answers by quoting [a] prayer, [b] and fasting), in a highly interwoven textual structure involving other parts of the Gospels as well. The formal division is provided below:

Mk 9.14-29B.03:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]		[6a]
Mk 9.14-29D.05:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]		[6ab]
Mt 17.14-21B.03:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
Mt 17.14-21D.05:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6ab]
Lk 9.37-42:	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]		

There are however other contexts which are similar to the textual composition of Mt 17.14-20[+21.D.05] that describe the fifth part:

Mk 11.23 (Withered Fig Tree)	[5]
Mt 21.21 (Withered Fig Tree)	[5]
Lk 17.5-6 (Mustard Seed)	[5]

---

found its way into most witnesses. Among the witnesses that resisted such an accretion are important representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text’ (*Commentary*, 85).

<sup>81</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 97.

<sup>82</sup> The variation in Mk 9.29 (i.e. whether καὶ [+τῆ Δ] νηστεία is original or not) suggests that there might even have been competing notions of faith (saving faith and faith required to perform great miracles), which may have led to its emendation in Matthew. Also see DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 727.

Further, if one analyses the passage of Mt 17.20-21D.05 in terms of discourse analysis, a structure in the Bezan text can be presented with a logical δέ-γάρ-καί-δέ structural arrangement:

17.20           ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ...  
                  ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ...  
                  καὶ οὐδὲν ...

[17.21D.05] τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία

In his study of connectives in discourses, Levinsohn reviewed the function of δέ as a signal for introducing distinctive features and showed that it actually reveals a new development in the author's story or argument<sup>83</sup> or a concluding statement in Matthew's Gospel.<sup>84</sup> These general features may be illustrated by Mt 17.21D.05. Consequently, one would expect a pericope about a saying of Jesus to end with a conclusive δέ rather than a καί, which could indicate that the final section was probably truncated at the end of Mt 17.20, as it appears in Codex Vaticanus and its support.

Therefore, the close examination of the passage in Matthew within the Gospel tradition and including the support of the two strands of manuscript evidence in both Matthew and Mark, raises a few questions compared to the consideration of the side-by-side Mt-Mk comparison in NA<sup>28</sup>: why is there, in Luke, no conclusion to the pericope, while the Mustard Seed saying exists in the same Gospel elsewhere (Lk 17.5-6)? Why is Mt 17.20 unparalleled in Mark in this pericope and why does Luke end the story at Lk 9.42 while appearing in a different context?<sup>85</sup> Is the absence of the reference to the Mustard Seed in Mk 9.28 the result of doubts about the Apostles' power, leading to its removal in post-apostolic times?<sup>86</sup>

These parallels, once their textual variation is indicated, show that the question of the presence of Mt 17.21 in D.05 or its absence in B.03 is complex; more precisely, the consideration of its presence as a harmonisation with Mark despite the different contexts seems to ignore the wider question of the exact composition of the text of the Gospels in this pericope.

#### Mt 20.26-27 – par. Mk 10.43-44

Mt 20.26 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἐάν θέλῃ ἕν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἕσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,  
[27] καὶ ὅς ἐάν θέλῃ ἕν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἕσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·

<sup>83</sup> See this chapter, note 49.

<sup>84</sup> 'This suggests that the author's primary intent in relating the episode is to lead up to that conclusion' (*ibid.*, 74).

<sup>85</sup> Most of the questions can be answered by the customary view of seeing the absence of Mt 17.21 as a deliberate removal operated by Matthew from his Markan source, but this conclusion is a reflection of NA<sup>28</sup> as the text of reference. See e.g. '[Matthew] has substituted for Mark's final sentence another, longer conclusion, the saying about faith moving mountains' (DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 720).

<sup>86</sup> See note 29.



CHAPTER 5

ⲣⲡ) ἐστίν B D Z 0281 sa<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* (ἔσται) ⲛ C K L N W Γ Δ Θ 085 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565  
579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 Ⲙ lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo

Further vll: [26] ⲣ 3 1 2 4 (μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθαι) B | 3 4 1 2 (μέγας γενέσθαι  
ἐν ὑμῖν) C (579) 1424 (ff<sup>1</sup>) | ὑμῶν μέγας γενέσθαι L Z 892 | ⲣἔστω ⲛ<sup>2</sup> L 892  
*pm* lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo ([27] ⲣ ἐν ὑμῖν πρῶτος εἶναι W 1241 | εἶναι ὑμῶν πρῶτος B  
| ⲣἔστω B Γ 1424 *pm* mae bo)

Mk 10.43 οὐχ οὕτως δέ ⲣἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας ⲣγενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ⲣ<sup>1</sup>ἔσται ὑμῶν  
διάκονος. [44] καὶ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ⲣ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι ᾗ πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος

[43] ⲣἔσται A C<sup>3</sup> K N Γ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 28 565 579 892 1241 1424 2542 Ⲙ q bo<sup>mss</sup> | *txt*  
(ἔστιν) ⲛ B C \* D L W Δ Θ Ψ 700 lat co | ⲣεἶναι 0146 (D Θ 700)<sup>87</sup> it | ⲣ<sup>1</sup>  
ἔστω ⲛ C Δ 565 2542 [44] ⲣ ὑμῶν εἶναι D W *f*<sup>1</sup> 565 2542 | ὑμῶν γενέσθαι A  
C<sup>3</sup> K Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> Ⲙ | *txt* ⲛ B C\* L (Δ) Θ (*cf vs 43* ⲣ) Ψ 0146<sup>vid</sup> 28 579 700 892  
1241 1424 c ff<sup>2</sup>

Mt 20.26 follows the request of the mother of James and John to have them sit next to Jesus in the Kingdom, and occurs just before the remarkable longer text of Mt 20.28D.05. Jesus answers with the statement ‘It shall not be so among you’ (Mt 20.26a) after talking about the relationship between masters and servants. The future ‘shall not be’ (ἔσται) is read in most manuscripts against the present in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus. Because the parallel reading in Mk 10.44 also uses the future (in NA<sup>28</sup>!), the Bezan reading is considered to be a harmonisation. Other manuscripts (including Codex Sinaiticus) have the present form of the verb (ἐστίν) in Matthew and the future in Mark which is considered to be original. The matter is even more complex since the verb and its variant forms occur thrice in both Matthew and Mark.<sup>88</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the present form ἔστιν in Mt 20.26a is found in Alexandrian and Western witnesses while the future form ἔσται is supported by other Alexandrian witnesses and Byzantine manuscripts, in majuscules, minuscules and early versions, showing thereby two clear strands of textual tradition. The change is therefore unlikely to be accidental and must have occurred as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> century. The Committee proposes a B-rating for the first ἔσται based on the fact that:

Although the combination of B and D in support of ἐστίν is not insignificant, the Committee judged that the preponderant weight of the external

<sup>87</sup> The Bezan reading is in brackets in the critical apparatus as the word order is different: ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι.

<sup>88</sup> There is a Lukan parallel in Lk 22.26-27 but the context is close but the variant discussed here is not present in these verses.

## CHAPTER 5

evidence supports the future tense. The same variation occurs also in the parallel at Mk 10.43.<sup>89</sup>

However the presence in Mt 20.26-27 of three occurrences of the verb ‘to be’ along with a triple use in the parallel passage in Mark makes the entire picture complicated, since each of them are variant. For this reason, all forms will be displayed here below based on Swanson’s horizontal presentation, and isolating the forms of the verb ‘to be’ within Matthew and Mark.<sup>90</sup>

### Matthew 20.26-27

ἔστιν	ἔσται	ἔστω	B
ἔστιν	ἔστε	ἔστε	D
ἔστε	ἔστε	ἔστε	ℵ*
ἔστε	ἔστω	ἔστε	ℵ <sup>c</sup>
ἔστε	ἔσται	ἔσται	Δ Θ Π f <sup>1.13</sup> 700 788 1346
ἔσται	ἔσται	ἔστω	Γ 579 1424 ℞
ἔσται	ἔσται	ἔσται	C K U W 33 565
ἔσται	ἔστω	ἔστω	2 28 1071
ἔστε	ἔστω	ἔσται	H L M S 157
ἔσται	<i>om.</i>	ἔσται	N

### Mark 10.43-44

ἔστιν	ἔσται	ἔσται	B D L W Θ Ψ 700
ἔστιν	ἔστω	ἔσται	ℵ C* Δ
ἔσται	ἔσται	ἔσται	AKMUII f <sup>13</sup> 2 <sup>c</sup> 28 157 579 1071 1346 1424 ℞
ἔσται	ἔστω	ἔσται	C <sup>c</sup> 565
ἔσται	<i>om.</i>	ἔσται	2* N

From this presentation, it can be seen that the second finite form of the verb ‘to be’ is variant in Matthew (ἔσται/ἔστω, with two streams of tradition). Mk 10.43a itself has a *v/l* (ἔστιν/ἔσται, two streams) as well as Mk 10.43b (ἔστιν/ἔστω, two streams). There is a high verbal similarity in Mark and Matthew, though not identical. Interestingly, the verse printed in NA<sup>28</sup> reflects the reading of Codex Sinaiticus in its original form (ℵ\*) only. The indication that Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae are harmonising with Mark comes from the fact that Mark apparently uses the present form, applying the principle of ‘the discordant reading is best.’ The multiplicity of forms as well as the apparent and related wording in the two Gospels does not allow us to conclude with certainty which form is more likely to be original. Moreover, the number of variants points to the devel-

<sup>89</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 42.

<sup>90</sup> The itacistic form has been left to match the original writing of the manuscripts but clearly ἔστε means here ἔσται.

opment of the texts at a very early stage, most probably close to the time of the composition itself.

In terms of internal evidence, two possible sources of cross-harmonisation can be detected. The first one would be due to the verbal proximity between the two Gospels, Mark and Matthew; the second one, to the symmetry within the verse and the extra statement in Mt 20.27. For the sake of clarity, Mt 20.26-27 and Mk 10.43-44 in Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae and Codex Sinaiticus are presented below:

### Matthew

v.26 οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,	B
οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,	D
οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,	ℵ*
οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔστω ὑμῶν διάκονος,	ℵ <sup>c</sup>
v.27 ... ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·	D
... ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·	ℵ
... ἔστω ὑμῶν δοῦλος·	B

### Mark

v.43

οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν ὑμῶν διάκονος	B
οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστιν ὑμῶν διάκονος	D
οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστω ὑμῶν διάκονος	ℵ

v.44

καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος	ℵB
καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ὑμῶν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος	D

The confusion in forms is related to the difficulty in understanding what Jesus actually said. Did the example of masters and servants in the world lead to a future status of the disciples? Is there an injunction to be a servant (imperative present ἔστω) or is it a factual consequence? The extreme similarity between Mark and Matthew may certainly indicate a common source (whether Mark and Matthew or potentially another source), a factor that favours natural cross-contamination. Equally, Matthew could have decided to put the Markan sentence in the future. If we assume the Markan verse to be original in its ℵB form,<sup>91</sup> and that Matthew has used this verse in his composition, the problem remains over why ἔστιν was modified to ἔσται (the other way round would be understood to be a harmonisation). Dain reminds us that the scribal copying process typically con-

<sup>91</sup> The variant γένεσθαι/ἔσται is interesting since the idea of present and future is precisely the conflict that happens in the parallel Matthean verses.

sisted of memorisation of the verse or a piece of verse to be copied.<sup>92</sup> In this case, the scribe would have mentally remembered the final ‘sound’ of the verse, i.e. ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται and reproduced οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν by homophony, because of the multiple forms involved.

Though a possible speculation, the harmonising explanation of the discordant reading is too simplistic and ignores the verbal polymorphism in the parallel passages as well as in the Matthean verse itself. More important, indicating harmonisation with Mark ignores the fact that the parallel passages are equally variant and that the Bezan reading in Matthew may or may not be considered as harmonistic depending on which reading is considered.

#### Mt 24.29 – par. Mk 13.24-25

Mt 24.29 Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἵ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται

ἱ p) ἐκ Ἄ D 0281 | ἀπὸ B *rell*

Mk 13.24 ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, [25] καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες ἵ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται.

[25] ἵ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες (πίπτοντες L aur) K L Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 1241 ℳ aur l vg sy<sup>h</sup> | οἱ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. ἔσονται πίπτοντες D | ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες f<sup>13</sup> 28 2542 sy<sup>hmg</sup> | ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. πεσοῦνται W (565 700) e | *ixi* (ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες) Ἄ (A: ἐκπίπτ.) B C Θ Ψ (579) 892 1424 a i

This long quotation involving several Jewish sources<sup>93</sup> deals with the coming of the Son of Man and is secure across the tradition with the exception of the use of ἐκ instead of ἀπὸ in the expression [the stars will fall] ‘from heaven.’ Although the passage is found in the three Synoptics, I will study this passage in the Matthew-Mark section because of the high verbal agreement between these two Gospels, the Lukan parallel (Lk 21.25-27) being more allusive with only a low to moderate verbal agreement.

In terms of external evidence, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae as well as the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> c. Alexandrian majuscule 0281 are the only manuscripts to attest the reading with ἐκ against the rest of the tradition which reads ἀπὸ, which is the only variant in this verse. The corresponding parallel passage in Mark reads ἐκ consistently across the man-

<sup>92</sup> A. DAIN, *Les Manuscrits* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975) 41-6.

<sup>93</sup> See DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 257 n. 199 for a list of potential influences from the Jewish Scriptures, as well as inter-testamental and early Christian literature.

uscripts, although the expression ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες, is syntactically variant with a number of witnesses reinforcing the preposition with the compound verb ἐκπίπτω.

In terms of internal evidence, the two expressions ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ can be regarded as synonymous.<sup>94</sup> Since ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is less usual in the Scriptures,<sup>95</sup> it is more likely that it was replaced by the more frequent expression ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, which would suggest a secondary character of the variant reading in Mt 24.29D.05. However, it cannot be overlooked that the expression ἐκ/ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is variant in the NT,<sup>96</sup> and that generally Codex Bezae has frequent variant readings ἐκ for ἀπό and *vice versa*.<sup>97</sup> In Mark, the presence of the compound verb ἐκπίπτω *vs.* πίπτω in a few manuscripts may have naturally attracted the preposition ἐκ.

Mt 27.28,31 – par. Mk 15.17,20

Mt 27.28 καὶ Ἦ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν Ἦ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ

Ἦp) ἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ D it (sy<sup>s</sup>) | τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ 33 sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo<sup>ms</sup> |  
txt (om.) & B rell

Further vll: Ἦ ἐκδύσαντες &<sup>2a</sup> B D 1424 it vg<sup>mss</sup>

Mt 27.31 καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, Ἦ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα ὁ καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι.

Ἦ ἐκδύσαντες & L 33 892 | ὁ & 33 892

Mk 15.17 καὶ ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν Ἦ πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον·

Ἦp) χλαμύδα κοκκίνην καὶ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 700 2542<sup>s</sup> 1844

<sup>94</sup> Specifically, the Hebrew knows only one possibility i.e. ܥܡܫܬܪܗ (Aramaic: ܢܗܦܫܪܗ). Although grammars often mention a difference between the two prepositions, only a few scholars have studied the variant readings implying the use of one versus the other. Read-Heimerdinger noticed that Codex Bezae is more inclined to use ἐκ than the Alexandrian tradition and shows an initially stronger attachment than ἀπό to that which is left (J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 187–92 [192]), which may be the case here.

<sup>95</sup> The following references read ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Ralph's LXX and NA<sup>28</sup>: Gn 8.2, Dn 4.23, Mt 24.29, Mk 8.11, Lk 9.54, Jn 6.38.

<sup>96</sup> From the four instances of ἐκ/ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in NA<sup>28</sup>, Mt 24.29 has ἀπό in most manuscripts (ἐκ in & D 0281), as well as Mk 8.11 (ἐκ in &<sup>45</sup> W f<sup>13</sup>). Jn 6.38 has ἀπό in &<sup>66</sup> A B L T W Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 1241 1844 12211; Did (ἐκ in & D K Γ Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 892 1424 &).

<sup>97</sup> ἀπό in Codex Bezae *vs.* ἐκ in Codex Vaticanus: Mt 28.2; Mk 1.26; 5.30; 7.26; 16.3; Lk 10.7; 11.6; 20.6; 23.55; Jn 3.31; 6.42; 12.32; Ac 7.3; 15.29; 18.1; 22.6; ἐκ in Codex Bezae *vs.* ἀπό in Codex Vaticanus: Mt 24.29; Lk 8.2; 9.5,54; 16.30; Jn 6.38; 21.10; Ac 3.26; 5.2,34; 12.20; 16.39,40; 17.2; 21.16 (YODER, *Concordance*, s.v. ἐκ, ἀπό). For a linguistic and text-critical study of the differences between ἀπό/ἐκ in variant readings, see READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 187–92.

Mk 15.20 καὶ ὅτε <sup>□</sup>ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῶ, <sup>`</sup> ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν <sup>τ</sup>τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ῥιμάτια αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ῥίνα σταυρώσωσιν <sup>ῥ</sup> αὐτόν.

<sup>□</sup>D | <sup>τ</sup>p) τὴν χλαμύδα καὶ Θ <sup>f</sup>(<sup>1</sup>).<sup>13</sup> 565 700 2542<sup>s</sup> 1844 | ῥιμάτια D | ῥιμάτια τὰ ἴδια A K N P Γ <sup>f</sup>1.13 28 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 2542<sup>s</sup> 1844 <sup>℣</sup> | ἴδια ῥιμάτια αὐτοῦ (-Θ 892) <sup>⊗</sup> Θ 892 | *txt* (ῥιμάτια αὐτοῦ) B C Δ Ψ | ῥίνα σταυρώσωσιν A C D L N P Δ Θ <sup>f</sup>13 33 1424 | ῥίνα σταυρωθῆ 28 | ὥστε σταυρῶσαι <sup>f</sup>1 2542<sup>s</sup> 1844 | *txt* (ῥίνα σταυρώσωσιν) <sup>⊗</sup> B K Γ Ψ 565 579 700 892 1241 <sup>℣</sup> | <sup>°</sup>⊗ D <sup>f</sup>1 28 700 1424 1844 <sup>ff</sup>2 k

Mt 27.28-31 is part of the Passion pericope. In the NA<sup>28</sup>, the text runs as follows: the soldiers stripping Jesus (ἐκδύσαντες), put a scarlet robe on him (χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτοῦ), twisted some thorns into a crown, put it on his head, gave him a reed, knelt before him and mocked him (v. 29). Then, ‘they spat on him, and took the reed and struck him on the head’ (v.30). After mocking him, they ‘stripped him of the robe and put his own clothes on him’ and ‘led him away to crucify him’ (v.31). The passage is paralleled in Mk 15.17-20 with a similar sequence of events, but the soldiers clothed him first (ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτόν) in a purple cloak (πορφύραν). Because Mt 27.28D.05 reads a ‘purple cloak’ (ῥιμάτιον πορφυροῦν)<sup>98</sup> which is verbally similar to Mark, NA<sup>28</sup> identifies this reading as a harmonisation.<sup>99</sup> The difficulty to understand which garment Jesus wore in this scene is responsible for the variations.

In terms of external evidence, the Bezan reading is only supported by the Old Latin and to some extent the Sinaitic Syriac against almost the rest of the tradition, except one minuscule (33) and a non-negligible number of early versions which read τὰ ῥιμάτια αὐτοῦ (‘his clothes’). A second variant reading is ἐνδύσαντες (‘clothing’) attested in <sup>⊗</sup>2<sup>a</sup> B D 1424 it vg<sup>mss</sup> against ἐκδύσαντες (‘stripping’) supported by the rest of the tradition. These two variant readings give raise to three different readings: the text of the entire verse may either say ‘and stripping him, they put around him a scarlet robe’ (NA<sup>28</sup> text, e.g. Codex Sinaiticus) or ‘and clothing him, they put around him a scarlet robe upon him’ (Codex Vaticanus), or ‘and clothing him with a purple cloak, they put around him a scarlet robe’ (Codex Bezae). A horizontal presentation of Mt 27.28 will help understanding the disparity of readings (the three readings <sup>⊗</sup>B D are in boldface):

- ‘Stripping him’

καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν	χλαμύδα κοκκίνην	περιέθηκαν αὐτῶ	<sup>⊗</sup>
καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν		περιέθηκαν αὐτῶ	χλαμύδα κοκκίνην A <sup>℣</sup> K
			[M N U W Δ Π <sup>f</sup> 1 565 579 700 1071
καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν	εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν	περιέθηκαν αὐτῶ	χλαμύδα κοκκίνην 157

<sup>98</sup> Πορφυροῦν is an Attic word for the adjective πορφυρέος meaning *purple*. Πορφύραν is another derivative.

<sup>99</sup> The opinion is shared by Holmes in his discussion of the variant reading (‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 156).

καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην 33

- ‘Clothing him’

καὶ ἐνδύσαντες αὐτὸν	χλαμύδα κοκκίνην	περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ	B <sup>8c</sup>
καὶ ἐνδύσαντες αὐτὸν	εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ χλαμύδαν κοκκίνην	περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ	D
καὶ ἐνδύσαντες αὐτὸν	περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ	χλαμύδα κοκκίνην	1424

Similarly, both verses Mk 15.17,20 have numerous variants with regard to which cloth is put on Jesus and when:

Mk 15.17

καὶ ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν	πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ	
[πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον		8BD
καὶ ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν χλαμύδα κοκκίνην καὶ	πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ	
[πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον		Θ

Mk 15.20a

ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν	τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ	B
ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα καὶ	τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ	Θ
ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν	τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια	D

From the identification of these variant readings in both Gospels, it can be suggested that the variant readings witnessed by early Greek majuscules (8BDΘ) and versions must have appeared at an early stage of the textual transmission raising divergent readings at the same place in both Matthew and Mark; they demonstrate that the identity of the cloth was questioned.

In terms of internal evidence, the number of variants involved in the description of the initial scene suggests that it gradually became a difficult task to describe what cloth Jesus wore during this scene and which one was removed or put on him. If the question of which clothes Jesus wore were simple, it is unlikely that variation would have happened, especially since Mark is clear on the fact that ‘they clothed him’ (ἐνδιδύσκουσιν, secure) despite the variant in Matthew. Nevertheless, there must have been a genuine reason for scribes to hesitate over an apparently simple description: the question is therefore not only to understand if Bezan Matthew ‘inserts’ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ in the text, but what the initial reading of Mt 27.28 was likely to have been and how the various *vll* came into being.

Although Metzger suggests that ἐνδύσαντες is a ‘correction suggested by the nudity at the time of the flagellation,’ and that ‘the sequence of stripping (ἐκδύσαντες) and clothing again is paralleled by verse 31<sup>100</sup>’ the several readings cannot be separated as they are intrinsically linked because of the presence or absence of the type of cloak(s) worn by Jesus (scarlet robe or purple cloak) and which one was put on or removed.

<sup>100</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 57.

Two independent considerations may help resolve the problem: first, by considering Scrivener's text of Codex Bezae, it is to be noted that the point dividing the line and reflecting units of sense (καὶ ἐνδύσαντες αὐτὸν· εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν, fol. 98b) suggests that the verse was probably read as follows: καὶ ἐνδύσαντες αὐτὸν / εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ / καὶ πλέξαντες / στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, i.e. 'and they clothed him: it was a purple garment and a scarlet robe they put around him, and, twisting, it was a crown of thorns they put on his head.' Secondly, as it has been presented in chapter 2, discourse analysis explains the importance of the preverbal position (marked) as opposed to the postverbal one (default), and can be applied for Mt 27.28 in the case of χλαμύδα κοκκίνην. As a matter of fact, Codex Vaticanus alone<sup>101</sup> reads the verb περιτίθημι twice, for the act of putting around both a scarlet robe and a crown of thorns on Jesus' head (χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ.... περιέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ). While both compound verbs περι-τίθημι and ἐπι-τίθημι are grammatically correct, the variant reading may indicate a confusion that occurred early in the transmission between what the soldiers put around (περιτίθημι) Jesus. By reading aloud during the copying activity,<sup>102</sup> a scribe may have repeated περιτίθημι twice before writing, inducing thereby a confusion of what was really put around Jesus, and the first nominal phase, εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν καί, was removed. The first clause, once separated, became intransitive resulting in a further correction from ἐνδύσαντες, where an object is expected, into ἐκδύσαντες like Mt 27.28~~01~~.

Finally, besides the description of a story involving two items of clothing, it may be suggested that the association of the two colours κόκκινος and πορφυροῦς had a special meaning found in the Jewish Scriptures, since they refer to the curtain of the Tabernacle or the priestly vestments at the time of the Exodus.<sup>103</sup> This reference may have been less obvious to later generations and its emendation was not thought to erase a Jewish allusion to Jesus' prefiguration of the Temple which prevails in Codex Bezae.

In conclusion, the consideration of the presence of the Bezan phrase εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν as a harmonisation with Mark does not solve the reason for the existence of so many variants in the verse. However, the stylistic arrangement of the clauses and the presence of similar compound verbs may have confused scribes and generated variant readings as suggested above. A further justification for the possibility of the Bezan reading to be earlier resides in the two colours of the garments worn by Jesus prefiguring the Temple's veil, a detail that a 1<sup>st</sup> c. Jewish audience would not have missed.

---

<sup>101</sup> The variant reading is not indicated in the NA<sup>28</sup>: only B.03 reads περιέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ where the rest of the tradition has ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

<sup>102</sup> A. DAIN, *Les Manuscrits* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975) 22,44–6.

<sup>103</sup> Regarding the Tabernacle: 'blue and purple and scarlet stuff,' πορφύραν καὶ κόκκινον (Exod. 25.4; 26.1.31.36; 27.16 and 37.3.5.16; 39.12) mostly in the expression καταπέτασμα ἐξ ὑακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας καὶ κοκκίνου ('curtains of fine twined linen and blue and purple and scarlet stuff,' Heb. פרכת תכלת וארגמן); regarding the Vestments of the Priesthoods (Exod. 28.5,8,15,33; 31.4; 35.6,25; 36.9-10,12,15; 31.36, 2 Chr. 2.6,13, 3.14 and Sir. 45.10). In Hebrew, ארגמן ('purple') for πορφυροῦν indicated shades of red, with more or less blue. See the discussion on these colours in relation to Jesus' clothes in J.D.M. DERRETT, 'Ecce homo Ruber (John 19.5 with Isaiah 1.18; 63.1-2),' *BibOr* 32 (1990) 215–29.



## II. 4. Conclusions

It can be concluded from the study of the alleged harmonisations of Bezan Matthew with Mark that, when the text of Mark is secure, the usual criteria for identifying a harmonistic reading clearly make the *vll* in question in Mt D.05 a scribal emendation. Indeed, Codex Bezae systematically has a different reading compared to Codex Vaticanus in the references discussed above; the most discordant reading appears to be taken by text critical principles applied mechanically without taking into account the intrinsic nature of the parallels.

Furthermore, when the Markan parallel is itself variant, a harmonisation with Mark represents too superficial an approach that would deserve more scrutiny. Though a clear-cut conclusion has proven not to be possible most of the time, since the reasoning becomes rapidly speculative, conclusions involving discourse analysis or a detailed observation of the parallel passages in their textual forms show some consistency in the Bezan reading. Finally, the amount and diversity of textual witnesses from other text-types supporting the Bezan reading are remarkably large and cannot be dismissed.

## III. Harmonisation in Bezan Matthew with Luke Only

This section will introduce the 11 passages in which the variant readings are indicated as harmonising in Bezan Matthew with a parallel passage in Luke. As indicated in the Matthew-Mark section, I will distinguish between the six cases where Luke is firm in the corresponding parallel verse (II. 2), and the five cases where the Lukan parallel exhibits variant readings (II. 3). The reason for the existence of parallels between Matthew and Luke has long been addressed and questioned within the Synoptic Problem. Two main theories remain to explain syntactical resemblances between Matthew and Luke:<sup>104</sup> (1) the Two Source Hypothesis (henceforth '2SH') revisited by Streeter as the Four Source Hypothesis (henceforth '4SH') which points to Mark and a common source 'Q' independently used by Matthew and Luke and (2) the Goulder-Farrer Hypothesis, where the similarity is simply due to the fact that Luke used the Gospel of Matthew as well as Mark's to write his own.<sup>105</sup> The results of the following analysis may have implications for this issue, something to which I shall return in the conclusion of this work.

### III. 1. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Firm Lukan Reading

The following six examples list the verses where the Bezan reading appears to be the result of a harmonisation with a firm Lukan parallel.

---

<sup>104</sup> See R.L. THOMAS, *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002) on the various hypotheses (defence and responses) to the Synoptic Problem.

<sup>105</sup> On a full and synthetic description on the possible explanations of the Synoptic Problem, see S.C. Carlson's website <http://www.hypotyposis.org/synoptic-problem> (accessed 01.10.2013), including a complete bibliography by Alan Bill (<http://www.gospelorigins.com/GospelOrigins.pdf>, accessed 01.10.2013).

Mt 1.25 – par. Lk 2.7

Mt 1.25 και οὐκ ἐγίνωσκειν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν· και ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

Ⲛ(Lk 2.7) τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς (–D<sup>c</sup> L d q) τὸν πρωτότοκον C D K L N W Γ Δ 087  
565 579 700 892 1241 1844 12211 ℳ aur d f ff<sup>d</sup> q vg sy<sup>p,h</sup> | txt (υἱόν) Ⲙ B Z<sup>vid</sup>  
071<sup>vid</sup> f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 it mae sy<sup>s,c</sup> (sa bo)

Further vll °B\* 579

Lk 2.7 και ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, και ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν και ἀνέκλιεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ, διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι

ⲠW | txt (τὸν πρωτότοκον) B rell | ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ K Γ Δ Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892  
1241 1424 2542 ℳ | ἐπί Ⲙ\* | txt φάτνῃ (ἐν) Ⲙ<sup>1</sup> A B D L W Θ Ξ 700 1844 co;  
Eus

Mt 1.25 is the last verse of the pericope on Jesus’s Birth (Mt 1.18–25 par. Lk 2.1–7) where it is said that Joseph ‘knew her not until she had borne a son; and [he] called his name Jesus.’ Codex Bezae reads ‘her first born son’ instead of ‘son’ which resembles the Lukan parallel.<sup>106</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence of five words is again divided between two strands of tradition, one supporting Codex Bezae by attesting the entire phrase τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον (‘her first-born son’),<sup>107</sup> which is identical<sup>108</sup> to the verbal clause introduced by ἔτεκεν in Lk 2.7.<sup>109</sup> Despite the fact for those preferring the Alexandrian text, the weight of ⲘB in the Matthean reading strips all the other manuscripts, the existence of a second weighty strand of tradition supporting Codex Bezae deserves some consideration.<sup>110</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, the verb ἔτεκεν may have attracted the natural addition of a more explicit object than a bare υἱόν thereby reminding the scribe of the Lukan verse.<sup>111</sup> The question why a scribe would have omitted αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον as in Codex

<sup>106</sup> Holmes analysis this *v* as a Christological variant (‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 226).

<sup>107</sup> The personal pronoun αὐτῆς is absent from codex Regius, the Latin page of Codex Bezae and the 7<sup>th</sup> c. CE codex Monacensis q, and, interestingly in a later hand of Codex Bezae.

<sup>108</sup> Codex Washingtonianus omits τὸν πρωτότοκον, a singular reading, most probably to reduce the risk of portraying Mary as a mother of more than one child.

<sup>109</sup> It has been often argued that Luke’s intention was not to specify that Mary may have had more than one child as the term meant ‘first-born’ in 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE. See R.E. BROWN–P.J. ACHTEMEIER, *Mary in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978) 153 n. 343.

<sup>110</sup> MwQH-theorists proposing a Matthan origine to the text of Matthew may be interested here in taking the hypothesis of the Bezan reading as the Matthean source reading ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον το και οὐκ ἐγίνωσκειν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν· και ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν from which the Lukan clause would have originated.

<sup>111</sup> The proximity in the wording between the two passages causes Metzger to confirm an interpolation from Lk 2.7 and the reading of υἱόν is granted an ‘A’ grade (METZGER, *Commentary*, 8).

Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus could be answered in terms of either (a) theological reasons – the question of the first-born child may have implicitly linked Mary with more children which was disputed (b) or for literary reasons: the Lukan passage focuses on Mary ('she gave birth, wrapped him, laid him') while Matthew focuses on Joseph (he woke, took, knew her not until [she] bore a son, he called him'). Amphoux proposes the Bezan variant to be original, citing in evidence a Jewish culture, while Codex Vaticanus and its support insist on the simple phrase adapting to the Greek-Roman world.<sup>112</sup> The scribe equally may have wanted to delete the reference to Mary in this Joseph-centred passage.

Furthermore, the lexical proximity with adjacent verses may well have generated a harmonisation with the immediate context (Mt 1.21//1.23) in the case of Alexandrian witnesses:

Mt 1.21 τέξεται δὲ υἱόν      καὶ καλέσεις      τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν,  
Mt 1.23 τέξεται δὲ υἱόν      καὶ καλέσουσιν [D.05:καλέσεις] τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

In conclusion, both Alexandrian and 'Western' readings in Mt 1.25 can both be explained as the result of a harmonisation (vertical for B.03, horizontal for D.05). This explanation is however in conflict with the principles of shorter *vs* longer readings and the tendency to assimilate with parallel passages. Finally, the theological bias in the first centuries to affirm Mary's virginity against the idea of her having more children after Jesus may lie behind the origin of the shorter reading as the consequence of a deliberate withdrawal ('theological diorthosis').

#### Mt 5.25 – par. Lk 12.58

Mt 5.25 ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ, ἕως ὅτου εἶ <sup>ς</sup>μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ<sup>2</sup>, μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς <sup>τ</sup>τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ·

<sup>τ</sup>p) σε παραδῶ K L W Γ Δ Θ 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 1844 ℳ lat sy<sup>c.p.h</sup> co  
| σε παραδώσει D | *txt* (om.) Ϝ<sup>64vid</sup> Ϟ B 0275 f<sup>1.13</sup> 892 k; Cl

Further vll: <sup>ς</sup> ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ K Γ Δ Θ 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup>  
sa<sup>mss</sup> mae; Cl | *txt* (μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) Ϟ B D L W 0275 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 892 1844 it  
sy<sup>s.c.p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>; Did

Lk 12.58b... μήποτε <sup>τ</sup>κατασύρη σε πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν, καὶ ὁ κριτῆς σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς <sup>τ</sup>φυλακὴν.

<sup>112</sup> 'Les deux variantes sont en définitive équivalentes ; l'une vient de la vieille culture judéo-hellénistique, l'autre cherche la simplicité pour s'adapter au monde gréco-romain' (International Seminar on 'Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament : Entre Philologie et Histoire,' 15-16 March 2010, Avignon [France]). See C.-B. AMPHOUX *et al.*, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014) 29.

Mt 5.25 is part of the Sermon on the Mount dealing with reconciliation to one's accuser in the event that the accuser might 'hand you over to the judge and the judge *hand you over* to the guard and you will be put in prison.' The italics identify the presence of words in two different strands of Matthean tradition, but firmly present in Luke. The Bezan form is mentioned in the critical apparatus as potentially harmonising (presumably with Luke).

In terms of external evidence, and despite numerous variant readings in Mt 5.25, the verse is identical in its wording between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus except for the presence of *σε παραδώσει* in D.05 against its absence in B.03. The two manuscripts represent again two distinctive strands of tradition. Codex Bezae has a slightly different verbal form of the indicative future instead of the subjunctive aorist found in the witnesses supporting the other longer reading. The usually strong weight of ⲚB as well as the early papyrus Ⲕ<sup>64vid</sup> favours the originality of the shorter form but the wide geographical support for both the presence and absence of *σε παραδῶ* (or *παραδώσει* for D.05) must reflect an early change which cannot be the result of a coincidental correction by different scribes.

In terms of internal evidence, two things need to be noticed by comparing the parallel texts:

Mt 5.25 D.05	Mt 5.25 B.03	Lk 12.58b
μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντίδικος	μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντίδικος	μήποτε κατασύρη σε
τῷ κριτῇ	τῷ κριτῇ	πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν
καὶ ὁ κριτὴς <u>σε παραδώσει</u>	καὶ ὁ κριτὴς ↑ ↑	καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδώσει
τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ	τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ	τῷ πράκτορι
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ
εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ	εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ	εἰς φυλακὴν

**Table 8: Textual Comparison of Mt 5.25//Lk 12.58 in D.05 and B.03**

Firstly, though the shorter form is usually favoured as more likely to be original, the absence of *σε παραδῶ/παραδώσει* attested by the longer form could equally be explained as a scribal correction to delete a useless or stylistically poor repetition of the second verb. Secondly, the future tense in Bezan Matthew could be a further argument in favour of harmonisation since Luke has the same tense in Lk 12.58: equally, however, it could reflect a Latinism or a cross-contamination with d5 (*ne forte tradat<sup>113</sup> te adversarius iudici et iudex tradat te ministro*) rather than an 'import' from Luke. With respect to Lukan influence specifically, could the scribe incorporating this form in Matthew have 'remembered' the Lukan text, which would justify a harmonisation? This is quite unlike-

<sup>113</sup> The Latin has the subjunctive as introduced by the conjunction *ne*.

ly because of the differences between the texts (word order, verbs, nouns)<sup>114</sup> and the Matthean tendency to use παραδίδωμι (Mt: 26, Mk: 19, Lk: 16, Ac: 13). The lexical proximity between the two texts (Luke and Matthew) points either to a common source that can be reconstructed ('Q') or to the influence of one author upon the other. Luke treats the passages in a different way with a well-chosen vocabulary: the *hapax legomenon* κατασύρη in D c e (sy<sup>c</sup>) could indicate that an editorial change to Matthew's favourite use of παραδίδωμι (Mt: 26, Mk: 19, Lk: 16, Ac: 13) may have happened; the deliberate stylistic effect based on nominal repetitions in Matthew (πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν/ὁ κριτής/τῷ πράκτορι/ὁ πράκτωρ) rather than verbal ones in Luke (κατασύρη/ παραδώσει) is evident. Finally, the verse was self-explanatory without σε παραδῶ/σει as and these two words would have rather dropped either accidentally or by simplification of a useless repetition at an early stage.

Traditional text critical rules favour internally and externally the Alexandrian reading. A closer look at the two readings show that the longer reading can be defended in an equally rational way, even if the original form cannot be determined with absolute certainty.

#### Mt 5.44 – par. Lk 6.28

Mt 5.44 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν <sup>†</sup> ἵνα καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς

<sup>†</sup> p) εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς (ὕμιν D\*) καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς D\*<sup>1</sup> K L W Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℣ lat sy<sup>(p).h</sup> mae; (Athen Cl) Eus | txt (om.) & B f<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> mae; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Or Cyp

<sup>†</sup> p) καὶ (-W; Eus) προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηραζόντων ὑμᾶς (ἡμᾶς Θ\*, -D; Eus) καὶ D K L W Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℣ lat sy<sup>(p).h</sup>; (Athen Cl) Or<sup>pt</sup> Eus | txt (καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν) & B f<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> mae; (Ir<sup>lat</sup>) Or<sup>pt</sup> Cyp

Lk 6.27 Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, [28] εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηραζόντων ὑμᾶς.

[28] ἵνα ὑμῖν ℣<sup>75</sup> L Δ Θ Ψ pm<sup>115</sup>

Mt 5.44 is one of the sayings embedded in the Sermon on the Mount which is paralleled in Luke 6.28 and concerns the injunction to push the boundaries of love further by lov-

<sup>114</sup> Specifically: verb (κατασύρη/παραδώσει), noun (τῷ πράκτορι/ τῷ ὑρηρέτη, ---/ὁ ἀντίδοκος), position of σε.

<sup>115</sup> This is the only *vI* mentioned in NA<sup>27</sup>. Interestingly, περὶ is sometimes substituted by ὑπέρ (Swanson: περὶ & B L 579 700 ℣<sup>75vid</sup> / ὑπέρ A f<sup>13</sup> 2\* 69 124 33 1071 788 TR A D ℣ K M P U Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 2<sup>c</sup> 28 157).

ing one's enemies. Some manuscripts read a sequence of three imperatives as in Luke, while others have two imperatives in a row. Mt D.05 has the 'longer' reading.<sup>116</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the longer reading Mt 5.44aD.05 is supported by a wide range of mainly Caesarean and Byzantine Greek witnesses, few versions and early 3<sup>rd</sup> /4<sup>th</sup> c. Fathers against  $\aleph$ B and few early but geographically diverse versions. Mt 5.44bD.05 corresponds to alternative wording found in the almost firm verse of Luke (Lk 6.28) against a similar profile of witnesses as Mt 5.44a. The two variants have therefore undisputed early and diverse support that only be concluded that both readings were present at an early stage (2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> c.). Both variants are considered as explicit harmonisations of Lk 6.27-28<sup>117</sup> but I will discuss them as a single harmonistic variant as it was proposed in the preceding edition NA<sup>27</sup> since the readings closely match the same Lukan parallel. The reason for the originality of the Alexandrian reading apparently resides in the importance traditionally given to  $\aleph$ B and the closeness to Luke but either side of the tradition cannot result from scribal fanciness in changing the text for the sake of it.

In terms of internal evidence, the strong affinity with between Mt 5.44D.05 and Lk 6.27-28 can naturally lead to the conclusion that the longer reading in Bezan Matthew is a harmonisation with Luke. A comparison between the Matthean and Lukan verses in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae will provide the exact nature of the similarities and the differences:

Mt 5.44D.05	Mt 5.44B.03	Lk 6.27–28D.05	Lk 6.27–28B.03
ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμεῖν,	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,	[27] Ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖν λέγω	Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς
		τοῖς ἀκούουσιν·	ἀκούουσιν·
ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς	ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς	ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς	ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς
ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,	ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν	ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,	ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,
<u>εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς</u>			
<u>καταρωμένους ὑμῶν</u>			
	↑ ↑	καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς	καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς
	↑ ↑	μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,	μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,
	↑ ↑ ↑	[28] εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς	εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς
<u>καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς</u>	↑ ↑	καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς,	καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς,
<u>μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς</u>			
καὶ προσεύχεσθαι	καὶ προσεύχεσθε	προσεύχεσθε	προσεύχεσθε
ὑπὲρ τῶν	ὑπὲρ τῶν ↑	ὑπὲρ τῶν	περὶ τῶν
<u>ἐπηρεαζόντων</u>		ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς	ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.
<u>καὶ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς</u>	↑ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς		

Table 9: Textual Comparison of Mt 5.44//Lk 6.28 in D.05 and B.03

<sup>116</sup> Davies and Allison contend that 'the long text is probably an expansion under the influence of Lk 6.27-8 or oral tradition' (*Matthew*, I, 553 n.68) though they demonstrate on the same page that the Lukan part corresponding to the Bezan text is unlikely to be original.

<sup>117</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 13.

First, the side-by-side comparison of the two passages shows that the two verbal clauses (εὐλογεῖτε... and καλῶς ποιεῖτε...) in Mt D.05 are in the exact inverted order of the Lukan one, as it occurs elsewhere in other Matthew/Luke parallel passages<sup>118</sup> suggesting a redactional feature preserved in Codex Bezae and some manuscripts, unless one argues that one of the two clauses were re-introduced at a later time at the ‘wrong’ place.

Further, the reading of the end of Mt 5.44D.05 typically looks like a conflation<sup>119</sup> of the two texts of Mt 5.44 and Lk 6.28. It is, besides, unlikely that all the strands of tradition variously supporting Codex Bezae would have also conflated the two portions of texts, unless all the manuscripts in diverse regions (Egypt, West, Antioch) would have equally made the same ‘slip’ or blindly followed the same archetype. It can just as equally be proposed that the end of Mt 5.44b had originally the longer reading ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρειαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς where Codex Vaticanus and its support would represent a jump from like to like (homoioteleuton) because of the similarity of the words τῶν ...όντων ὑμᾶς / ὑπὲρ τῶν ...όντων ὑμᾶς, as well as the overall verbal closeness in [ἀγαπ]ᾶτε τοὺς [ἐχθρ]οὺς ὑμῶν, [εὐλογ]εῖτε τοὺς [καταρωμέν]ους ὑμῖν [καλῶς ποι]εῖτε τοῖς [μεισ]οῦ[σιν] ὑμᾶς [καὶ προσεύχεσθαι ὑπὲρ] τῶν [ἐπηρειαζ]όντων [καὶ διωκό]ντων ὑμᾶς.

Despite the absence of absolute certainty of how the original reading looked like, the conclusion in favour of a harmonisation is not as straightforward as it seems. Moreover, it may well be that the Matthean passage as read in Codex Bezae reflects the transmission of the text at an extremely early stage (possibly including the time of composition of the text itself) and could be explained as an independent editorial selection from a common source (e.g. ‘Q’?)<sup>120</sup> which originally bore the two clauses and a common double ending.

The traditional principles of textual criticism favour the shorter reading, although the effort involved in ‘adding’ such a large piece of Lukan material makes an accidental ‘addition’ unlikely, and more importantly the phenomenon of ‘addition’ of material from Luke fails to explain the inverted clause order. If Codex Bezae and its support reflect the original state of the text, the withdrawal of the two clauses bearing a similar meaning could then well be deliberate, because the envisaged action of forgiving was regarded as unpalatable to the Jewish readers of Matthew. A last proposal would be that εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μεισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς was simply lost through homoioteleuton.

---

<sup>118</sup> This type of inversion is not uncommon as it can be seen in the Temptation pericope. See G. HOWARD, ‘Stylistic Inversion and the Synoptic Tradition,’ *JBL* 97 [1978] 375–89 [384].

<sup>119</sup> A conflation is besides not a harmonisation as the *p*) sign in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> may potentially imply.

<sup>120</sup> Interestingly, the IQP (International Q Project) also prints ‘persecuting’ in the reconstructed Q version in double square brackets indicating a certain probability only: J.M. ROBINSON, P. HOFFMANN and J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis, including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000) 83.

Mt 18.10-11 – par. Lk 9.10

Mt 18.10 Ὁρᾶτε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἑνὸς τῶν μεικρῶν τούτων ᾧ λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἔν οὐρανοῖς διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσιν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς [11]<sup>τ</sup>

<sup>τ</sup>(Lk 19.10) [11] ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ (-Δ) υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (+ ζητῆσαι καὶ 579 892<sup>c</sup> c sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>, + ζητῆσαι L<sup>mg</sup>) σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός D K L<sup>mg</sup> N W Γ Δ Θ<sup>c</sup> 078<sup>vid</sup> 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>c.p.h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | txt & B L<sup>txt</sup> Θ\* f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 892\*e ff<sup>t</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Eus

Further vll: [10] see I. 1

Lk 19.10 ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός

No vll

In this passage which concludes the Temptations to Sin (Mt 18.6-10) and precedes the Parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt 18.12-15), Codex Bezae and a few manuscripts read ‘for the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost’ (which is technically Mt 18.11, omitted in NA<sup>27</sup>), a wording close to Lk 19.10 (firm across all manuscripts). In Luke, the sentence concludes the story of Zacchaeus. If one reads the Gospels in the edition of Nestle-Aland without taking account of manuscript evidence, the phrase would qualify as ‘L’-Material in Streeter’s terminology,<sup>121</sup> i.e. Lukan material that is absent in the other Synoptics. The consideration of the Bezan text in Matthew if original would then rather qualify as ‘Q’-material in current scholarship.

In terms of external evidence, the presence of this verse is divided between two strands of tradition of diverse manuscripts. The versions are equally divided between the presence and absence of the verse. Despite the early character of the manuscripts attesting one or the other, the presence of the verse in the margin of Codex Regius and as a correction in Codex Koridethi (Θ<sup>c</sup>) may indicate an accidentally reinserted verse, which reinforces the idea of an later addition. Metzger grants the omission of the verse a B-grade based on the diversity of the manuscripts involved, concluding that:

There can be little doubt that the words ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ζητῆσαι καὶ) σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός are spurious here, being absent from the earliest witnesses representing several textual types (Alexandrian, Egyptian, Antiochian), and manifestly borrowed by copyists from Lk 19.10. The reason for the interpolation was apparently to provide a connection between ver. 10 and verses 12–14.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>121</sup> B.H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1924) 199.

<sup>122</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 36.



Actually, the manuscripts attesting the presence of the verse are equally diverse and the affirmation that it is ‘manifestly borrowed’ is much too straightforward as an explanation since all Q-passages in Matthew are *per se* verbally close to Luke. Moreover, the Bezan reading is not exactly the same as Luke, while the presence of the two words ζητῆσαι καί (interestingly supported by L<sup>mg</sup> 579 892<sup>c</sup> *al/c sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>*) can be suspected to be a harmonisation aimed at bringing the two verses into a perfect match.<sup>123</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, the wording of Mt 18.11D.05 is apparently Lukan (τὸ ἀπολωλός, cf. Lk 15.4, ἀπολέσας in Lk 15.4, τὸ ἀπολωλός in Lk 15.6, τὸ ἀπολωλός in Lk 15.8, ἀπολέση, ἀπώλεσα in Lk 15.9, ἀπολωλός in Lk 15.24), which is a text-critical criterion usually used to exclude the Bezan verse as original. Nevertheless, the combination of ‘saving’ with the ‘lost’ is equally Matthean and Lukan.<sup>124</sup> In terms of discourse analysis, the introduction of γάρ being always retrospective,<sup>125</sup> it cannot be considered as an introduction to the Parable of the Lost Sheep but a conclusion to the Temptations to Sin. Even so, this preposition can be seen as a connective aimed at linking v. 10 to 12ff with the figure of the Good Shepherd ‘(seeking and) saving that which was lost.’ Actually, it can be seen in Matthew’s use of the Jewish Scriptures that this very theme of the True Shepherd in Ezekiel (Ezek. 34.11-31) was taken to introduce the parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt 18.12-13) in a similar way and with a high degree of verbal similarity: ζητεῖ, σώζω, πλανώμενον and τὸ ἀπολωλός). Indeed, Ezek. 34.12,16a,22LXX read:

[12] ‘As a shepherd seeks out (ζητεῖ, כבדק) his flock when some of his sheep have been scattered abroad,

so will I seek out (ἐκζητήσω, רבא ) my sheep;

and I will rescue them from all places where they have been scattered on a day of clouds and thick darkness.

[16a] I will seek (ζητήσω, רבא) the lost (τὸ ἀπολωλός, תהנה), and I will bring back the strayed (τὸ πλανώμενον, תהנה), and I will bind up the crippled’

[22a] I will save my flock (σώσω τὰ πρόβατά μου, יצאני יתעשוהו), they shall no longer be a prey;

The wording in Ezekiel is closer to Matthew’s parable of the Lost Sheep than to Luke’s parallel (which does not read ‘the strayed’ or ‘seek’ but ‘leave’ and ‘find’) so that

---

<sup>123</sup> MwQH-theorists, who claim Luke took from Matthew, could even see the inclusion of the Bezan verse in Matthew as original and the Lukan verse as a slight expansion (ζητῆσαι καί) of Matthew as opposed to the classical view of the verse to be ‘L’-Material. For such specialists, this material in common with Mt D.05 and Luke could be considered as ‘Q-material.’

<sup>124</sup> Mt. 8.25, 16.25; Mk. 8.35; Lk. 6.9, 9.24, 19.10.

<sup>125</sup> Background material introduced by γάρ provides explanations or expositions of the previous assertion. The presence of γάρ constrains the material that it introduces to be interpreted as strengthening some aspect of the previous assertion, rather than as distinctive information (LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 91).

the introductory verse of Mt 18.11D.05 cannot be considered as a harmonisation with Luke but more probably as an original construction based on Ezekiel's text and introducing the following two verses. Furthermore, the tradition would have gradually associated Lk 19.10 with the conclusion of Zacchaeus' parable only and found its position after Mt 18.10, a mistake that was corrected by withdrawing it from Matthew. Indeed, Mt 18.11D.05 makes apparently no sense after Mt 18.10 when disconnected from the Ezekiel passage, as would happen given an inferior knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures by later scribes.

Though speculative, this hypothesis has the merit of giving an explanation to the absence for Mt 18.11 in the Alexandrian tradition and can explain at the same time the difference between the wording in Matthew and Luke, rather than leaving external evidence to decide by weighing Codex Bezae against  $\aleph$ B.

#### Mt 24.31 – par. Lk 21.27-28

Mt 24.31 και ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος <sup>τ</sup> μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυναΐξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρων <sup>φ</sup> οὐρανῶν ἕως <sup>ο</sup> [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν<sup>τ1</sup>

<sup>τ1</sup>*p*) ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀναβλέψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν D it | *txt* (om.) B *rell*

Further vll: <sup>τ</sup> φωνῆς B K Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 892<sup>c</sup>  $\aleph$  sa sy<sup>hmg</sup> | καὶ φωνῆς D 1241 lat | *txt* (om.)  $\aleph$  L W Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 892\*1424 l2211 (e) sy<sup>s.p.h</sup> mae bo; Eus | <sup>τ</sup> τῶν Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 700 | <sup>ο</sup>  $\aleph$  D K L W Γ Δ 565 579 1241 1424 l2211  $\aleph$  | *txt* (τῶν) B Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 700 892

Lk 21.27 καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ ἰμετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. [28] ἰἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἰἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.

[27] ἰκαὶ δυνάμει πολλῇ καὶ δόξῃ D e (sy<sup>s.c</sup>) [28] ἰἐρχομένων D 13 ἰἀνακαλύψατε W Ψ *f*<sup>1</sup>

This verse is part of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse found in Mt 24-25 after the series of woes to the Pharisees and before the Passion narrative beginning at Mt 26. It is taken from a pericope on the Coming of the Son of Man (Mt 24.29-31). Although the passage shares common material with the three Synoptics,<sup>126</sup> the claimed harmonisation in

<sup>126</sup> The passage Mt 24.29-31 (par. Lk 21.25-28) can be also paralleled with Mk 13.26-27, but the verse in question, Mt 24.31b in D.05, as will be presented, is shared only between Matthew and Luke.

Bezan Matthew (designated here as Mt 24.31b)<sup>127</sup> reads a sentence which is textually closer to Lk 21.28.

In terms of external evidence, the presence of an extra 15 words is weakly attested (only Codex Bezae and the Old Latin) against the rest of the tradition. Moreover, the extra material in Mt D.05 is strikingly close to Lk 21.28<sup>128</sup> apart from a few minor differences. The two minor variant readings in Luke<sup>129</sup> have no impact on the analysis of Mt 24.31b and will be taken as firm and, as a result, classified in secure Luke parallels.<sup>130</sup> The similarity is strong and yet not a verbatim repetition. The early support of the entire Old Latin suggests that the Bezan reading dates as early as the second century and that it was followed with confidence. It further suggests that the reading was rapidly isolated in the tradition and that all the other manuscripts have followed a different archetype at an early stage, to the extent that no Alexandrian, Byzantine or Caesarean witness was contaminated.

In terms of internal evidence, both the Mt-Lk passages occur before the Parable of the Fig Tree and the verse in question could well appear to be as an ideal transition. The ‘addition’ is too large to have crept into the text via scribal distraction. The table below will show the progression of Jesus’ speech within the context in the Synoptics including Mark in the two representative codices Vaticanus and Bezae. The insertion of Mark in the below table, despite its absence of influence on the alleged harmonisations, will be discussed thereafter.

#	Mt 24.30-31 D.05	Mt 24.30-31 B.03	Mk 13.26-27 D.05	Mk 13.26-27 B.03	Lk 21.27-28 D.05	Lk 21.27-28 B.03
1	[30] καὶ τότε φανήσεται ...	καὶ τότε φανήσεται...	[26]			
	καὶ κόψονται τότε πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν	καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν	καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ	καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ	καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ	καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ

<sup>127</sup> See HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 139.

<sup>128</sup> Close but not identical: Mt D.05 ἀναβλέψατε (*lift up*), Lk D.05/B.03 ἀνακύψατε (*look up*).

<sup>129</sup> Two verbs are variant in Lk 21.28: the first one reads ἀνακαλύψατε in W Ψ f<sup>1</sup> instead of ἀνακύψατε which is shared by Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae. The second one is read in D 13 only and is apparently a fault, since ἐρχομένων instead of ἀρχομένων would make no sense when preceding γίνεσθαι (‘coming to take place’ instead of ‘begin to take place’).

<sup>130</sup> There are two variant readings in Lk 21.28, which do not have any impact on the question potential harmonisations between Matthew and Luke. Codex Bezae (with minuscule 13) reads ἐρχομένων in error, as corrected by Scrivener, and also in J. READ-HEIMERDINGER and J. RIUS-CAMPS, *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus* (NTTSD 45; Leiden: E.J.Brill, 2014) 92. The alternative verb for ἀνακύψατε is found in a few witnesses that do not include Codex Bezae or Codex Vaticanus or Codex Sinaiticus. The further variants are τὰς κεφαλὰς/τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν (unnoticed in NA<sup>28</sup>) and ἀναβλέψατε/ἀνακύψατε.

CHAPTER 5

#	Mt 24.30-31 D.05	Mt 24.30-31 B.03	Mk 13.26-27 D.05	Mk 13.26-27 B.03	Lk 21.27-28 D.05	Lk 21.27-28 B.03
	νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πολλῆς καὶ δόξης·	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δόξης καὶ πολλῆς·	δυνάμειος πολλῆς καὶ δόξης	δυνάμειος πολλῆς καὶ δόξης	καὶ δυνάμει πολλῆ καὶ δόξη.	μετὰ δυνάμειος καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.
2	[31]		[27]			
	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος καὶ φωνῆς μεγάλης,	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος ὕψωνης μεγάλης,	καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους	καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους		
3	καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπὸ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως ὕψων ἀκρων αὐτῶν.	καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπὸ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως τῶν ἄκρων αὐτῶν.	καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπὸ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.	καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπὸ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.		
4	24.31b <u>ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γείνεσθαι ἀναβλέψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν</u>	24.31b <i>om.</i>			21.28 ἐρχομένων δὲ τούτων γείνεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὕψων διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν.	21.28 ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γείνεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν.
5	Parable of the Fig Tree	Parable of the Fig Tree	Parable of the Fig Tree	Parable of the Fig Tree	Parable of the Fig Tree	Parable of the Fig Tree

**Table 10: Textual Comparison of Mt 24.30-31 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03**

From this synoptic view in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus, the composition of the verses in the three Gospels is visibly different: the text can virtually be divided into four parts (1) the Son of Man is seen in glory, (2) the angels are sent forth (3) the elected ones are gathered [Matthew/Mark] (4) people are asked to watch. Mt D.05 has all four parts, but the three first parts only in *8B vell*, Mark has the three first parts and Luke has the first and fourth parts. A deliberate conflation of the passages in Luke and

Mark to generate Mt 24.30-31D.05 is a possibility in theory. However, the original inclusion of v.31b may be justified by a deliberate arrangement of the passage whereby a succession of *καί*, embedded between two *δέ*-clauses, confers a coherent<sup>131</sup> structure to the passage as illustrated below where the *δέ*-clauses are slightly shifted as suggested below:<sup>132</sup>

- [24.29] εὐθέως δὲ ...  
 [30] καὶ τότε φανήσεται  
 καὶ κόψονται τότε (B.03: τότε κόψονται)  
 [31a] καὶ ἀποστελεῖ ...  
 καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν ...  
 [31b] ἀρχομένων δὲ...

Indeed, because the passage in Luke is far less dense than in Matthew, it is more likely that this sequence represents an original progression in the discourse. As a result, and following discourse analysts' conclusions from functional grammar on the differences between *καί* and *δέ* in a discourse,<sup>133</sup> it may even be suggested that the abrupt ending after a succession of *καί* without any final conclusion introduced by a final *δέ* may actually point to a deletion of v. 31b at an early stage of the composition/copy.

While it can be noticed that the deletion of *ἀρχομένων δὲ...ὕμῶν* could be due to homoioteleuton (*ὕμῶν...ὕμῶν*), Mt 24.31b also sounds like a hopeful promise that contextually contrasts with the need for eschatological readiness and it may have been omitted to introduce the Parable of the Fig Tree.<sup>134</sup> Consequently, it can be argued that the verse was accidentally deleted at a very early stage rather than deliberately added.

From these observations, it can be seen that there is intrinsically no straightforward explanation for the addition or omission of Mt 24.21bD.05: either its presence is seen as a harmonisation with Luke or its omission is construed as a harmonisation with Mark. It could be suggested that either the Bezan text could also reflect a text close in its form to the document from which Mark would have omitted the fourth part or Luke would have taken parts 1, 2 and 4 or in the copying the text of this parable in Matthew and Mark it being verbally close than in Luke, scribes would have deliberately omitted Mt 24.21bD.05 as a misplaced inclusion.

The usually followed text-critical rule favours the shorter reading and particularly given the importance of the support of external evidence.<sup>135</sup> The alternative explanations

---

<sup>131</sup> Coherence is not a synonyme for 'making sense.' Coherence 'refers to the continuity of meaning that enables the hearer of a discourse to make sense of what is said. The concept is similar to cohesion, but whereas cohesion refers to the surface devices employed to achieve unity of a discourse, coherence has to do with its inner purpose as determined by the speaker' (READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 39).

<sup>132</sup> See Folio 83b in Scrivener's edition. Scrivener respects the presentation and the two *δέ*-clauses are clearly marked graphically, reinforcing the idea of a deliberately structured passage.

<sup>133</sup> See LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 72.

<sup>134</sup> In this case, Mt 24.31D.05//Luke 21.38 would then be regarded as a minor agreement against Mark.

<sup>135</sup> Holmes sees in this variant reading a 'striking harmonization to Luke,' confirms its origin in the late second century and claims that the 'Bezan text of Luke was not the source of the added verse' (HOLMES, 'Early Scribal Activity,' 139).

proposed should be looked into from the perspective of the Synoptic Problem. If the presented hypotheses are right, Mt 24.21bD.05 would simply be the result of material common originally between Matthew and Luke.

Mt 24.45 – par. Lk 12.42

Mt 24.45 Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος Ἐπὶ τῆς ἰατρικῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ;

ἰατρικῆς D K Γ f<sup>1</sup> 700 1424 ℳ e sy<sup>s</sup> | οἰκίας ℞ 0281 565 579 892 q | txt (οἰκετείας) B L W Δ Θ 067 0204 f<sup>13</sup> 33 1241 (l844 l2211) lat sy<sup>p,h</sup>

Further vll: ἰατρικῆς K W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565<sup>vid</sup> 579 700 892 1241 1424 l844 l2211 ℳ lat sy | txt (om.) ℞ B D L 067 0204 0281 f<sup>1</sup> 33 it; Ir<sup>lat</sup>

Lk 12.42 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος<sup>τ</sup>, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς ἰατρικῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ<sup>ο</sup> [τὸ] σιτομέτριον;

ἰατρικῆς D c e (sy<sup>c</sup>) | txt (om.) B rell | ἰατρικῆς N W Θ Ψ 700 1241 1424 | διαδοῦναι ℞\* | διαδιδόναι ϳ<sup>75</sup> | txt (διδόναι) B rell | ° ϳ<sup>75</sup> B D f<sup>13</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | txt (τό) ℞ A K L N P Q W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 070 f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 ℳ

Mt 24.45 is the introductory verse to the Parable of the Faithful or Unfaithful Servant (Mt 24.45-51) which concludes part of the more general discussion on the coming of the Son of Man and readiness. Mt 24.45 initiates the rhetorical question ‘Who then is the faithful and wise servant, whom his master has set over his household, to give them their food at the proper time?’ (Mt 24.45) where ‘over his household’ is ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας in Codex Vaticanus and ἐπὶ τῆς ἰατρικῆς in Codex Bezae, as in Lk 12.42.

In terms of external evidence, there are three strands of tradition: one reading ἰατρικῆς (e.g. Codex Bezae), which reflects the phrase firmly used in Lk 12.42, and two ‘non-harmonised’ readings deriving from οἶκος, *house*: οἰκετεία (e.g. Codex Vaticanus) and οἰκία (e.g. Codex Sinaiticus). The weight of each strand is strong enough to prevent identifying the initial/original reading with certainty because of the early character and geographical diversity of all manuscripts involved.

In terms of internal evidence, the first part of the verse is virtually identical in Matthew and Luke. There seems to have arisen textual questions concerning the words ἰατρικῆς, οἰκία and οἰκετεία. Based on usual text-critical criteria, the ‘non-harmonising’ reading is more likely to be original. In terms of vocabulary, ἰατρικῆς has the first meaning of *servicing, service, care*, rendered by one person to another, also *healing*, finally and by metonymy, *servants*.<sup>136</sup> Freiberg considers it synonymous with the rarer οἰκετεία,

<sup>136</sup> BDAG, s.v. ἰατρικῆς.

*household, household attendants, servants.*<sup>137</sup> The reading found in Codex Sinaiticus is closer to the usual meaning of ‘house,’ while Codex Vaticanus is closer to ‘household,’ equivalent to the Latin *familia*. Depending on the manuscripts, Matthew describes a master (κύριος) putting in charge a slave (δοῦλος) over his *θεραπεία* or *οἰκία* or *οἰκετεία*, while in Luke, he puts a steward (οἰκονόμος) in charge on his *θεραπεία*. Therefore, an assumed authorial choice by Matthew of a δοῦλος as opposed to Luke,<sup>138</sup> ruling over other servants (*θεραπεία*) is likely to have been extrapolated to a much higher level, where the δοῦλος was offered to rather rule over the entire family (Codex Vaticanus) rather than only over other domestics, hence the use of *οἰκετεία*. Finally, the rarity of *οἰκετεία* could have been corrected into the more usual, less specific, *οἰκία*, unless the noun was accidentally contracted.

A harmonisation with Luke is certainly a plausible explanation. But it may also be that the verses in Matthew and Luke originate from the same source that used *θεραπεία*. *Οἰκετεία* would have then been preferred to show the size of the task given to the slave. In short, the similarity with Luke may reflect harmonisation but there is an equal probability that the phrase was originally found in the source common to Matthew and Luke.

### III. 2. Harmonisations in Mt D.05 with a Variant Lukan Reading

There are five cases for which the alleged harmonisation in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> refers to a reading in Luke which is itself variant.

#### Mt 5.39 – par. Lk 6.29

Mt 5.39 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ’ ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει ἑῖς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

<sup>F</sup>p) ἐπί κ<sup>2</sup> D K L Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ | txt (εἰς) κ\* B W 1844

Further vll: ῥαπίσει D K L Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 892 1241 ℳ mae bo | txt (ῥαπίζει) κ B W 33 700 1424 1844 | δεξιὰν σου σιαγόνα K L Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 700 1424 l 844 pm | δεξιὰν σιαγόνα κ W f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1241 pm a f (h); Or<sup>lat</sup> Cyr | σιαγόνα σου D k sy<sup>s,c</sup> | txt (δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου) B; Eus

Lk 6.29 τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἔπι τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης.

<sup>137</sup> BDAG, s.v. *οἰκετεία*.

<sup>138</sup> MwQH-theorists could view in these variant readings a further evidence of the originality of the Matthean verse in its Bezan version where Luke would have simply changed δοῦλος in οἰκονόμος (a word preferred by Luke, cf. Lk 12.42, 16.1,3,8) and kept *θεραπεία* from (Bezan) Matthew. In this respect, Luke could be seen as having improved the language of Matthew in this verse, if he has used Matthew as a source without recourse to the hypothetical Q.

ⲓⲫ) εἰς Ⲭ\* D P W Θ 700 892 2542; Cl Or | ⲓⲫ) δεξιάν Ⲭ\* 579 1241 1424  
(bo<sup>mss</sup>)

Mt 5.39 is one of Jesus' comments on retaliation: 'if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.' There is a textual variant in the way 'on the right cheek' is read (εἰς or ἐπί) but equally whether the possessive pronoun σου is inserted or not ('your right cheek' as opposed to 'the right cheek'). Luke (6.29) has a similar saying where the preposition is also variant according to the manuscript tradition. The Matthean variant in Codex Bezae is typically understood to be an example of harmonisation with Luke where the same preposition is found but, it must be noticed, also as a variant.

In terms of external evidence for Matthew, the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Washingtonianus and lectionary 844 read εἰς while a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae and mostly Byzantine and Caesarean manuscripts read ἐπί.<sup>139</sup> The wide range of manuscripts supporting ἐπί is too large to decide for either an accidental or a deliberate harmonisation with Luke. A horizontal reorganisation of the verbal phrase in Mt 5.39, arranged according to the use of the preposition, will help to clarify the complexity of the readings.<sup>140</sup>

## Use of εἰς

ῥαπίξει	εἰς τὴν δεξιάν	σιαγόνα σου	B
ῥαπίξει	εἰς τὴν	δεξιάν σιαγόνα	Ⲭ W

## Use of ἐπί

ῥαπίσει	ἐπὶ τὴν	σιαγόνα σου	D
ῥαπίσει	ἐπὶ τὴν	δεξιάν σιαγόνα	f <sup>1</sup> 157
ῥαπίξει	ἐπὶ τὴν	δεξιάν σιαγόνα	33 1071
ῥαπίξει	ἐπὶ τὴν	δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα	700 1424
ῥαπίσει	ἐπὶ τὴν	δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα	Ⲛ K L M U Δ Θ Π f <sup>13</sup> 2 [28 565 579 788 (1346)]

This presentation shows the variation in the preposition, the presence or absence of 'right' (δεξιάν), the position of the personal pronoun 'your' (σου), if present, and the tense of the verb. Equally, Luke reads alternatively ἐπί or εἰς but the verb governing these two prepositions is τύπτω, which is conjugated as a present participle in the dative (τῷ τύπτοντι). The rest of the phrase is similar to Matthew in terms of meaning though, different in terms of wording. Again, a horizontal reorganisation of the Lukan phrase will help:

τῷ τύπτοντί σε	εἰς τὴν	σιαγόνα	D W Θ 700
τῷ τύπτοντί σε	ἐπὶ τὴν	σιαγόνα	Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> A B Ⲛ K L M P Δ Λ Π Ψ [f <sup>1.13</sup> 2 33 157 565 1071]

<sup>139</sup> Again, Codex Sinaiticus corrects in line with Codex Bezae.

<sup>140</sup> SWANSON, *Matthew, ad loc.*



τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σιαγόνα  $\aleph^*$  28 579 1424

If one concentrates on the prepositions only, the alternation in Matthew/Luke is as follows:

εἰς/εἰς	$\aleph^*$ W
εἰς/ἐπί	$\aleph^c$ B
ἐπί/ἐπί	K L M Δ Π f <sup>1.13</sup> 2 28 33 157 565 579 [1071 1424 $\aleph$ ]
ἐπί/εἰς	D Θ 700

As for Matthew, δεξιάν as well as the personal pronoun σου are variant in terms of presence, absence or position (postnominal or prenominal). Identifying ἐπί in  $\aleph^2$  D L Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33  $\aleph$  in Matthew as a harmonisation follows the usual principle concerning discordant readings in two Gospels, but neglects the fact that Lk 6.29D.05 reads εἰς together with  $\aleph^*$  P W Θ 700 892 2542; Cl Or and is in this respect a discordant reading itself, which technically excludes the possibility that Matthew is being harmonised with Luke. Furthermore, it seems as if the conclusion of a harmonisation in Codex Bezae was based on a comparison with the Nestle-Aland text rather than with the parallel passage in the corresponding MS.

In terms of internal evidence, both prepositions are used after the two verbs ραπίζω, ‘to slap’ and τύπτω, ‘to smite.’<sup>141</sup> Τύπτω, a more common word referring to a rather violent gesture may be a catchword referring to the passage when Jesus is mocked (Mt 27.30) and where the preposition used is invariably εἰς (ἔτυπτον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ), a detail that the editor of Codex Bezae may have noticed. Actually, τύπτω + ἐπί is more characteristic of ‘hitting something’<sup>142</sup> rather than ‘slapping with a hand,’ the latter being closer to the idea brought by ραπίζω ἐπί.<sup>143</sup> Εἰς is also evenly spread in the Septuagint and indifferently exchanged with ἐπί translating the Hebrew על or על which is not a harmonisation but a grammatical possibility. If we take the Lukan phrase τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα as original, there is no apparent reason for any ‘correction’ εἰς > ἐπί or ἐπί > εἰς in Matthew, although the correction from  $\aleph^*$  to  $\aleph^2$  may well show that a deliberate scribal change may have occurred for some reason.

The conclusion that this is a harmonisation is scarcely valid because of the equally discordant reading in the parallel passages of Codex Bezae. If there is harmonisation, it is in those manuscript that read the same preposition whether εἰς or ἐπί.

<sup>141</sup> BDAG, s.v. ραπίζω and τύπτω.

<sup>142</sup> ‘Moses strikes the water’: τύπτω..ἐπὶ ὕδωρ, מיםהעל, Exod. 7.17 and ‘Abner smote [him] in the belly’: τύπτει.. ἐπὶ τὴν ψόαν, שמוכהל, 2Sam. 2.23).

<sup>143</sup> ‘Like slapping a man on his cheek’ (ὡς ραπίζων ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ, Hos. 11.4).

Mt 11.19 – par. Lk 7.35

Mt 11.19 ἤλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν, Ἴδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς

ῥ*p*) τῶν τέκνων B<sup>2</sup> C D K L N Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>s.c.hmg</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae | πάντων τῶν ἔργων *f*<sup>13</sup> (k) | *txt* (τῶν ἔργων) ℞ B\* W sy<sup>p.h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo; Hier<sup>mss</sup>

Lk 7.34-35 ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἴδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. [35] καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

[35] ῥ*2-4* *I* (τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων) A K P Γ Δ E 33 565 1424 ℳ | *p*) *2-4* (τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς) D L Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 1241 2542 | πάντων (-℞<sup>2</sup>) τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς ℞ | *txt* (πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς) B W *f*<sup>13</sup> 579 892

In this passage, Jesus exposes the inconsistency of the crowds in condemning him for eating and drinking yet condemning John the Baptist who was neither eating nor drinking, concluding with an enigmatic proverbial statement ‘Yet wisdom is justified by her deeds’ (℞ B *al*), or, according to some manuscripts, ‘by her sons’ (B<sup>2</sup> D Θ *al*). In most manuscripts, Luke has ‘sons’ with similar variation on τέκνων/ἔργων.

In terms of external evidence, there are again two weighty distinctive strands of textual traditions where τέκνων is read instead of ἔργων. It is interesting to note that B.03 was corrected to τῶν τέκνων, a reading that matches Codex Bezae. At the same time, the parallel passage in Luke mainly reads τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς with a difference in the presence and position of πάντων.<sup>144</sup> Since ἔργων is read in one MS, even if Codex Sinaiticus is a corrected version, it can be deduced that the original Lukan reading is τέκνων, despite the isolated variant of the significant manuscript ℞.01 reading πάντων (-℞<sup>2</sup>) τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς.<sup>145</sup> Finally, the weight of each strand of tradition cannot be conclusive unless ℞B are understood as superior to the others.

In terms of internal evidence, the verbal proximity between the two verses with the exception of ἔργων/τέκνων increases the chances of cross-harmonisation and at the same time there should be technically a saying in a unique form probably uttered by Jesus not two. While almost undoubtedly confident in a harmonisation with Luke, the Committee sees in the confusion of the two words the ‘ambiguity of the unpointed Aramaic אבדה, which may be pronounced *ābādeh*, ‘her works,’ or *ābdeh*, ‘her servants.’ This

<sup>144</sup> J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) 110 assigns a secondary character to πάντων in Lk 7.35.

<sup>145</sup> It is unclear why the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> assigns a *p*)-sign to the Bezan reading because of its absence of the pronoun but not to ℞.01 which reads ἔργων like in Mt 11.19, which can be surely understood as a harmonisation (METZGER, *Commentary*, 24). Actually, the harmonisation should be rather pointed out as *2-4* (τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς) D L Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 1241 2542 | *p*) πάντων (-℞<sup>2</sup>) τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς ℞.

hypothesis of an Aramaic source is the best solution to explain the variant: Jesus said one thing that was then written differently. There is equally no explanation why a scribal activity could have mistakenly generated ἔργων from τέκνων, unless a deliberate editorial correction harmonised with Mt 11.2 ('Now when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ [τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ], he sent word by his disciples').

The textual examination is important here: as the exegetes mostly refer to Matthew and Luke in the eclectic text, the two readings are taken as firm in each Gospel and discussed separately,<sup>146</sup> with 'the deeds' being identified with Matthew and 'the children' with Luke. Others will see that Matthew changed the hypothetical Q reference from 'children' into 'deeds.'<sup>147</sup> MwQH-theorists may see a simple Matthean source for Luke in a consistent reference to 'the sons' only: If Luke has chosen 'τέκνων,' it may simply mean that the Greek word in Matthew was τέκνων!

Concluding that a harmonisation has taken place does not solve the problem of the position of πάντων or its complete absence in Matthew. Matthew and Luke in their Bezan text are identical, probably because the text was unique at the beginning.

#### Mt 20.28 – par. Lk 14.8–10

Mt 20.28 ὡςπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>(cf. Lk 14.8-10) ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε· ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ (+μή sy<sup>c</sup>) ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνήσαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους (<sup>c</sup>εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους ἀνακλίνεσθε Φ), μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἶπῃ σοι; ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνηθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσης εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ (-Φ) ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· συνάγε (ἄγε Φ) ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον (χρησιμώτερον Φ) D Φ (it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>c.hmg</sup>) | *lxi* (om. ) B *rell*

Lk 14.8 ὅταν κληθῆς ὑπὸ τινος <sup>□</sup>εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν, μήποτε ἐντιμότερός <sup>ο</sup>σου ἢ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, [9] καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι· δὸς τούτῳ τόπον, καὶ τότε <sup>†</sup>ἄρξῃ μετὰ αἰσχύνῃς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν. [10] ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῆς, πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσε εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον, ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκὼς σε <sup>†</sup>ἐρεῖ σοι· φίλε, προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον <sup>ο</sup>πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι.

<sup>146</sup> Hence the introductory sentence 'Matthew 11.19 and Luke 7.35 contain a proverb that insists that "wisdom [σοφία] is justified by her deeds" (Mt 11.19) or "by all her children" (Lk 7.35),' in T.E. PHILLIPS "Will the Wise Person Get Drunk?": the Background of the Human Wisdom in Luke 7:35 and Matthew 11:19,' *JBL* 127 (2008) 385–96 [385]. The article still mixes the two as being equally valid when saying 'It is justified by all its children (and their deeds)' and 'After all, everyone knows that wisdom is justified by her children (or its deeds).' (*ibid.*, 395).

<sup>147</sup> C. DEUTSCHE, 'Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol,' *NovT* 32 (1990) 13–47 (34).

[8]  $\square \mathfrak{P}^{75}$  b sa | txt (εἰς γάμους) B rell |  $\circ \mathfrak{P}^{75}$  579 | txt (σου) B rell |  $\text{r}^{\text{h}}$   
κεκλημένος  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$  it bo | ἤξει D (sy<sup>c</sup>) | txt (ἢ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ) B rell [9]  
ἔση D e | txt (ἄρξῃ) B rell [10]  $\text{r}^{\text{h}}$  εἰπῆ A D K W Γ Δ Ψ  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 700 1424  
2542  $\mathfrak{M}$  | txt (ἐρεῖ)  $\mathfrak{P}^{75.97}$   $\aleph$  B L N Θ 579 892 1241 |  $\circ \mathfrak{P}^{97\text{vid}}$  D K W Γ Δ Ψ  
565 700 1424 2542  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>s</sup> | txt (πάντων)  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$   $\aleph$  A B L N Θ  $f^{1.13}$  33 579  
892 1241  $\pi$  r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>c.p.h</sup>

After James and John's mother's request to Jesus that her children 'sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your kingdom,' Mt 20.28 ends in the Nestle-Aland with the words 'Even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.' Codex Bezae, amongst few other manuscripts, reads an extra 61 words. The first edition of Metzger's *Commentary* mentioned that Mt 20.28 was an interpolation that 'is a piece of floating tradition, an expanded but inferior version of Lk 14.8–10.'<sup>148</sup> The critical apparatus introduces the reference with the abbreviation *cf.* for *confere* as an isolate case.<sup>149</sup>

In terms of external evidence, this longer verse is also present in a similar form in the Byzantine Codex Bezae<sup>150</sup> and the Old Latin witnesses as well as some Vulgate manuscripts and the Curetonian Syriac version, while the rest of the tradition attests the absence of the verse. Black, in contrast, analyses the Greek of the text and points to an Aramaic *Vorlage*.<sup>151</sup> Holmes details the external evidence among the Greek manuscripts and the Fathers and accepts some proximity with Luke, though concludes that the 'dependence on Luke is unlikely' due to the significant difference in style and vocabulary.<sup>152</sup> He carefully lists all the conclusions proposed in the scholarship but does not add to the proposals. On the other hand, Amphoux sees the shorter text of this passage the withdrawal of a diatessaronic variant.<sup>153</sup> While the proximity with the witnesses of the Old Latin is nothing unusual because of its assumed dependence on the 'Western' text,<sup>154</sup> the high similarity of the quote in codex  $\Phi$ .043, in an early Syriac version, and some Vulgate manuscripts (traditionally supporting Alexandrian readings) is worth underlining for it precludes a straightforward conclusion of contamination confined to the West. In Luke, the verses are relatively stable, though the mention of a wedding in Lk 14.8—the main

<sup>148</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 43.

<sup>149</sup> See note 49 in Chapter 4 III. 2.

<sup>150</sup> See note on Codex Bezae in Matthew in Greek Majuscules Chapter 2 IV. 2.

<sup>151</sup> M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998) 171-5.

<sup>152</sup> HOLMES, 'Early Editorial Activity,' 92.

<sup>153</sup> 'La suppression serait en somme, la reprise, dans la tradition des Évangiles séparés, d'une variante introduite dans le Diatessaron pour ne pas répéter un parole déjà dite.' (AMPHOUX, *L'Évangile selon Matthieu*, 255)

<sup>154</sup> H. KÖSTER, *Introduction to the New Testament, History and Literature of Early Christianity*, vol. 2 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000) 34.

CHAPTER 5

difference between Lk 14.8-10NA<sup>28</sup> and Mt 20.28D.05—is not present in the important early papyrus  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ , which usually agrees with Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.<sup>155</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, the wording in both Gospels needs to be studied. Some words in Mt D.05 are ‘un-Matthean’ and even rare in the NT, e.g. *αὐξήσαι* (‘to grow’),<sup>156</sup> *δειπνήσαι* (‘to dine’),<sup>157</sup> *ἐνδοξότερός* (‘worthier’),<sup>158</sup> *καταισχυνθήσῃ* (‘shall be put to shame’),<sup>159</sup> and *χρήσιμον* (‘useful’)<sup>160</sup>. The protagonist of this verse is referred to as the *δειπνοκλήτωρ* (‘host,’ lit. ‘caller of supper’), a *hapax legomenon* with a typical Koine Greek morphology (noun created from the adjunction of a verb and a noun). Last, Atticistic forms *ἔλαττον*<sup>161</sup> and *ἤττονα*<sup>162</sup> do not even appear in the Gospels. While the passage clearly resembles Luke 14.8-10, the vocabulary differs in most places as the synoptic view below will show. Further, Mt 20.28D.05 is far from being a possible harmonisation since the language is largely different although the idea of humility (by moving downwards rather than upwards) remains. The common parts between Luke and Matthew are lexical as the synoptic view below will help to identify:<sup>163</sup>

Mt 20.28D.05	Mt 20.28B.03	Lk 14.8-11D.05	Lk 14.8-11B.03
<i>ὡςπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν</i>	<i>ὡςπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν</i>		
<i>ὕμεις δὲ ζητεῖτε· ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι.</i>	<i>om.</i>		
<i>εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνήσαι μὴ</i>	<i>om.</i>	<sup>8</sup> <i>Ὅταν κληθῆς εἰς γάμον,</i>	<sup>8</sup> <i>Ὅταν κληθῆς ὑπό τινος εἰς γάμους,</i>

<sup>155</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  and B.03 agree 92% in Luke (EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 247–73. The absence of the mention of the wedding feast could reinforce the idea of a true parallel with Matthew 20.28D.05, where the context of a wedding would be an early but secondary textual change.

<sup>156</sup> The only other use in Matthew is Mt 13.32.

<sup>157</sup> Used only once in the Gospels in the institution of the Lord’s supper in Lk 22.20 (absent in Codex Bezae) and 1 Co 11.25 translating ‘after supper’ (*μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι*).

<sup>158</sup> *ἐνδοξος* is used twice in the aorist infinitive in the Gospels: Lk 7.25, 13.17 as *honoured, glorious* (clothes, things).

<sup>159</sup> The verb is found 61 times in the Greek Bible, however none in the Gospels (rest of NT: *Rom.* 5.5; 9.33; 10.11; 1 Co. 1.27; 11.4f,22; 2 Co. 9.4; 1 Pet. 2.6; 3.16).

<sup>160</sup> The adjective as such or conjugated is only found in the LXX (Gen. 37.26; Tob. 4.18; Tbs. 3.10; 6.4; 2 Ma. 12.12; Prov. 17.17; Wis. 8.7; 13.11; Sip. 1.5; Sir. 7.22; 10.4; Zech. 6.10,14; Ep. Jer. 1.58; Ezek. 15.4) and in one occurrence only in the NT: 2 Tim. 2.14.

<sup>161</sup> OT: 6, NT: 2 (1 Tim. 5.9, Heb. 7.7). *ἔλαττον* is equivalent to the Hellenistic Greek *ἔλασσον*.

<sup>162</sup> OT: 14, NT: 2 (1 Co. 11.17, 2 Co. 12.15); *ἤττονα* is equivalent to the Attic *ἤττων*, Hellenistic Greek *ἤσσω*, Ionic *ἔσσω*.

<sup>163</sup> Like in Appendix 1, boldface indicates different words between manuscripts of the same Gospel, underlined words correspond to the presence of one word in one manuscripts as opposed to its absence in the other one, an arrow indicate the word absent in one manuscript as opposed to its presence in the other one.

CHAPTER 5

Mt 20.28D.05	Mt 20.28B.03	Lk 14.8-11D.05	Lk 14.8-11B.03
ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθῶν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἶπη σοι;		μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν, μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ἦξει <sup>9</sup> καὶ ἐλθῶν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι·	μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν, μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ἦ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, <sup>9</sup> καὶ ἐλθῶν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι,
ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ.	<i>om.</i>	Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον, καὶ τότε ἔσῃ μετὰ αἰσχύνῃς ↑ ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν.	Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον, καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετὰ αἰσχύνῃς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν.
ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων,  ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ·	<i>om.</i>	<sup>10</sup> ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῆς εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον ἀνάπιπτε, ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκώς σε εἶπη σοι·	<sup>10</sup> ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῆς, πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσε εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον, ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκώς σε ἐρεῖ σοι,
συνάγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον		Φίλε, προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· καὶ τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον ↑ τῶν συνανακειμένων ↑ . <sup>11</sup> ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινοῦται, καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψοῦται.	Φίλε, προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι. <sup>11</sup> ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

Table 11: Textual Comparison of Mt 20.28//Lk 14.8-11 in Mt D.05 and B.03

The above table highlights the numerous verbal similarities and the syntactical flow in Mt 20.28D.05 and Lk 14.8-10 (despite the absence of a perfect correspondence and the presence of the context of a wedding), but also demonstrates that the text of Lk 14.8-10 has undergone variation of a rather stylistic character.<sup>164</sup> This work will not speculate further on the origin of either the withdrawal or the addition of this passage but can only note the surprising presence of this longer reading in unrelated manuscripts. The proximity of the words as well as the themes could simply refer to a different source (e.g. 'Q') or an expansion from Mt D.05 by Luke. While Streeter, as well as most scholars, would classify this passage as pure 'L' or from a 'L-document' because the

<sup>164</sup> A natural and further work could reside in examining if the variant readings in the Lukan passage correspond to the use of the Bezan parallel in Matthew. As an example, it could be speculated that the *vll* in Lk 14.8-10B.03 correspond to more elaborated wording that the same passage in Codex Bezae and that Lk 14.8-10D.05 looks closer to Mt 20.28D.05 in these loci: ἦξει/ἦ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (Mt: ἐπέλθῃ), καὶ τότε ἔσῃ/καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ (Mt: ἔτι κάτω χώρει), εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον ἀνάπιπτε/πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσε εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον, (Mt: ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον), ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον τῶν συνανακειμένων/τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι (Mt: καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον).

parable found in Lk 14.8-10 appears only in the Gospel of Luke and not in the other Synoptics, it is worth noticing that if the presence of Mt 20.28D.05 were original the passage would re-qualify the passage as possibly ‘Q’ and Mt 20.28D.05 as a source for Luke.<sup>165</sup> This theoretical approach suggests that in this case, the borders of Q are no longer defined by the reconstruction from NA<sup>28</sup> but may vary according to the text of reference.<sup>166</sup>

In terms of the structure of Mt 20.28D.05, the passage fits well after the request of James’ and John’s mother by highlighting the importance of humility as opposed to her arrogant position. Apparently, Jesus accepted her request (Mt 20.23) but this passage clarifies what a true disciple should not be in the first place. The question of James’ and John’s position in the Church after the Resurrection may well have generated the early withdrawal of this parable, in order not to compromise their leading role.

The presence of such an important piece of text cannot have crept accidentally but the addition of so much substantial material—a phenomenon that does not happen to that extent in Bezan Matthew—rather suggests that Mt 20.28D.05 is an ancient testimony of a portion of text originally present but later withdrawn. The unusual addition in the critical apparatus of NA28 of the mention ‘*cf.*’ is a short way to explain that there is a genuine question which goes beyond harmonisation.

Mt 24.41 – par. Lk 17.34ff

Mt 24.41 δύο ἀλήθουσai ἐν τῷ ἱμύλω, μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται<sup>†</sup>.

<sup>†</sup> *p*) δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται D *f*<sup>13</sup> it vg<sup>s</sup> | *txt*  
(*om.*) B *rell*

Further *vll*: ἱμύλωνι D Θ 0281 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 892 1241 1424 l2211 *pm* | *txt*  
(ἱμύλω) ⋈ B K L W Γ Δ 067 33 579 *pm*

Lk 17.34-35 [34] λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης ὁμιᾶς, ὁ<sup>1</sup> εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἠαφεθήσεται [35] ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσai ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ὁ ἡ μία παραλημφθήσεται, ἡ δὲ ἕτέρα ἠαφεθήσεται. [36]<sup>†</sup>

<sup>165</sup> MwQH-theorists would see the opposite to Metzger’s proposal that Mt D.05 is an inferior version of Luke’s passage and detect Mt 20.28D.05 as a source for an improved version found in Luke. Black leaves the conclusion open that ‘[Mt 20.28D/Lk 14.8-10] may have come from the Greek Q.’ (BLACK, *Aramaic Approach*, 175).

<sup>166</sup> A further work of interest could reside in taking the text of the Synopsis proposed by J. Read-Heimerdinger and J. Rius-Camps (*A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus* [NTTSD 45; Leiden: Brill, 2014]) and reconstruct a ‘Q text’ from Codex Bezae and evaluate the differences with the usual text of Q proposed by J. Kloppenborg (J.M. ROBINSON, P. HOFFMANN and J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis, including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* [Leuven: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000] and J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *Q Parallels. Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* [Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988]). The variability of the Q text would then need further explanation since its text is understood as having a firm format.

[34] °B c vg<sup>mss</sup> | °<sup>1</sup> A D K L N W Γ Δ Ψ 565 700 1241 1424 ℳ | txt (ὁ) ℞<sup>75</sup>  
 ℞ B Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 579 892 2542 | ρ) ἀφίεται D K [35] □ vs ℞\* l vg<sup>ms</sup> | ° A K L N  
 W Γ Δ Ψ 565 700 892 1424 ℳ | txt (ἡ) ℞<sup>75</sup> ℞<sup>1</sup> B D Q Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 579 1241 2542 |  
 ρ) καὶ ἡ A D K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 565 700 1424 2542 ℳ sy<sup>h</sup> | ἡ Q 1241 | txt (ἡ  
 δέ) ℞<sup>75vid</sup> ℞<sup>1</sup> B L f<sup>13</sup> 892 | τ [36] ρ) δύο ἔσονται (- D 579) ἐν τῷ (-D) ἀγρῶ,  
 εἷς παραλη(μ)φθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος (ἡ δὲ ἕτερα f<sup>13</sup>) ἀφεθήσεται D f<sup>13</sup> (579)  
 700 lat sy

Mt 24.36-46 is a passage on the importance of Watchfulness introduced by the saying ‘But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only’ (Mt 24.36). The rest of the passage describes that the coming of the Son of Man will be like in the era of Noah, ‘two men will be in the field; one is taken and one is left’ (v. 40), ‘two women will be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left’ (v. 41), concluding that ‘Watch therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming’ (v.42). Codex Bezae reads, *contra* ℞B, at the end of v. 41 ‘δύο ἐπὶ κλείνης μειᾶς εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται’ (‘two [are] in one bed, one will be taken and one will be left’), which is reminiscent of Lk 17.34 thereby leading to the potential conclusion of a harmonistic addition.<sup>167</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence of Mt 24.41b is supported by Codex Bezae, family f<sup>13</sup> and Latin versions against the rest of the tradition. The principles of textual criticism would value the weight of the manuscripts attesting the absence of these nine words as more important than Codex Bezae. However, the reading in the minuscules of f<sup>13</sup> may indicate that the variant is not typically ‘Western’ and one may wonder why it has not ‘contaminated’ other manuscripts if the ‘addition’ were accidental. The change is therefore possibly deliberate. Interestingly, the parallel text of Luke (Lk 17.36) is equally variant with a similar significant presence of a entire sentence in Codex Bezae, f<sup>13</sup>, the old Latin, Syriac and two noticeable minuscules 579 and 700 but is absent in all other manuscripts.<sup>168</sup> Amphoux identifies the Bezan reading as a diatessaronic reading imported from the Latin.<sup>169</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, it is true that the passages in Matthew and Luke are so close verbally that cross contamination may well have happened, making the original text difficult to identify at first glance. For this reason, the two texts in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus will be displayed synoptically:

<sup>167</sup> See HOLMES, ‘Early Editorial Activity,’ 140

<sup>168</sup> The Committee of the 1994 text affirmed the secondary character of Lk 17.36 with a {B}-rating but upgraded their judgment towards {A} in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition with the same comment: ‘Although it is possible that ver. 36, δύο ἐν ἀγρῶ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται may have been accidentally omitted through homoioteleuton (an accident that happened to ver. 35 in ℞\* and a few other witnesses), in view of the weighty manuscript authority supporting the shorter text (℞<sup>75</sup> ℞ A B L W Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 28 33 565) it is more probable that copyists assimilated the passage to Mt 24.40 (METZGER, *Commentary*, 142-3). Actually, the verse has itself variant readings as specified in the critical apparatus.

<sup>169</sup> ‘[...] le codex de Beze ne représente pas la tradition du texte antérieure du Diatessaron, mais atteste une leçon diatessaronique introduite par le biais du latin (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 258).



	Mt 24.40-41D.05	Mt 24.40-41B.03	Lk 17.34-36D.05	Lk 17.34-36B.03
1	[40] τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ,  εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται·	[40] τότε ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ,  εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται·	[34] λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς δύο,  ↑ εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφίεται·	[34] λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς,  ὁ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται·
2	[41a] δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ,  μεία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μεία ἀφίεται.	[41a] δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ,  μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται.	[35] ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό,  ἡ μία παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ἡ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται.	[35] ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό,  ἡ μία παραλημφθήσεται, ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται.
3	[41b] <u>δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς</u>  <u>εἷς παραλαμβάνεται</u> <u>καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται</u>	[41b] <i>om.</i>	[36] <u>δύο ἐν ἀγρῷ.</u>  <u>εἷς παραλημφθήσεται</u> <u>καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται.</u>	[36] <i>om.</i>

Table 12: Textual Arrangement of Mt 24.40f//Lk 17.34ff in D.05 and B.03

This passage is all the more interesting since the apparent harmonisation with the presence of ‘extra’ material in Mt D.05 echoes a variant reading in Luke itself (παραλαμβάνω and ἀφίημι in the present passive [Lk 17.34D.05, Mt 24.40–41D.05] vs future passive [Lk 17.34B.03]). From the synoptic view above, one can read Mt 24.40-41 as a true inversion of Lk 17.34-36 in Codex Bezae (Mt: two in the field/two in the windmill/two on the bed, i.e. 1–2–3//Lk: two on the bed, two grinding [in the windmill]/two in the field, i.e. 3–2–1). Such an inversion is a textual feature which was already studied above.<sup>170</sup> Conversely, if one reads the same passage in Codex Vaticanus, a similarly structured opposition appears while the parallelism is less visible: in the field/in the windmill//on the bed/grinding [in the windmill]. If this is a harmonisation, it is curious that it has happened at the exact same place in the two different Gospels and that the chiasmic structure has been introduced. Also, Mt 24.41b, close in wording to Lk 17.36, is not a simple ‘copy and paste’ action from the scribe who apparently deliberately kept the internal construction.

The reason for the withdrawal of the third example in Matthew can also be due to its possible reference to homosexuality (‘δύο,’ *two*, is understood here as two men in bed as opposed to two women grinding.<sup>171</sup> There would not be such thoughts in Luke since it directly follows the presentation of a heterosexual activity (‘they were marrying and

<sup>170</sup> See Mt 5.44 – par. Lk 6.28 in Chapter 5 III. 1 and Mt 16.23 – par. Mk 8.33 in Chapter 5 II. 2.

<sup>171</sup> The variant reading ὁ ἕτερος /ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα found only in *f*<sup>13</sup> in Lk 17.36 seems to aim at a similar disambiguation, unless it is a harmonisation with v. 35.

giving in marriage' ['until the day that Noah entered the ark'] (v.38): the Lukan parallel would still betray the existence of this third reference in Matthew.

It could be conjectured that the reference to the number 'two' due to the reference of marriage would have prompted the withdrawal of a third example at a very early stage of the textual transmission. Equally, the wording can well point to a common source ('Q') which would contain the three references,<sup>172</sup> unless Luke D.05 has taken from Mt D.05 and applied the same stylistic inversion, a rare but already illustrated phenomenon in Mt 5.44//Lk 6.28<sup>173</sup> or the Temptation pericope.<sup>174</sup> As in the previous example of Mt 20.28D.05//Lk 14.8-10, Matthew and Luke could well have originally attested a triad, where the reconstruction of Q would be reproduced from Bezan Matthew and Luke. Without going into further speculation involving source criticism, one can at least conclude that the Bezan verse in Matthew studied here is not a straightforward harmonistic addition.

### Mt 25.27 – par. Lk 19.23

Mt 25.27 ἔδει <sup>ς</sup>σε οὖν<sup>ς</sup> βαλεῖν ῥτὰ ἀργύριά μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ

ῥp) τὸ ἀργύριον  $\aleph^2$  A C D K L Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892 1241 1424 l844 l2211  
 ℣ sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo; Cl | txt (τὰ ἀργύρια)  $\aleph^*$  B W Θ 700 sa<sup>mss</sup>

Further vll: <sup>ς</sup>οὖν σε A D K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 ℣ latt | txt (σε οὖν)  $\aleph$  B C L Θ 33 700 892 l844 l2211

Lk 19.23 καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἔδωκάς <sup>ς</sup>μου τὸ ἀργύριον<sup>ς</sup> ἐπὶ τράπεζαν; καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ῥαὐτὸ ἔπραξα<sup>ς</sup>.

<sup>ς</sup>τὸ ἀργύριον μου D K N W<sup>c</sup> Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1424 ℣ | txt (μου τὸ ἀργύριον)  
 $\aleph$  A B L W<sup>\*</sup> Θ Ψ 0182 33 579<sup>vid</sup> 892 1241 2542 | ῥἔπραξα αὐτό D K N W Γ

<sup>172</sup> The question has been raised as to whether Matthew and Luke (from the Nestle-Aland text) independently reduced to two episodes from an original three in Q, which would explain the Bezan variant. This proposal is founded on a similar triad in *Apoc. Zeph. 2,1-4* (two men on a road, two women grinding at the mill, two (a man and a woman) on one bed): DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 382.

<sup>173</sup> See Mt 5.44 in III. 1.

<sup>174</sup> Although the Temptation pericope is common to the Synoptics (Mt 4.1-11, par. Mk 1.12-13//Lk 4.1-13), the Markan one is limited to two verses only, while Matthew and Luke have a high level of similarity structured around a triple temptation. Nevertheless, Matthew has the following sequence: a) 'If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread' (4.3) 'If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down (4.6) c) 'All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me I will give you all the kingdoms of the world' (4.9), while Luke has a) c) b), with an impressive degree of similarity pointing either to a common source ('Q') in the Double Source Hypothesis or to Matthew if Luke took from Matthew (Goulder-Farrer, i.e. Matthew without Q Hypothesis, henceforth MwQH). This phenomenon has been widely discussed in the literature and will be not be detailed here. For further references related to the two hypotheses, see P. PARKER, *The Gospel before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1953) 61-3 and A.W. ARGYLE, 'Evidence for the View that Luke Used St. Matthew's Gospel,' *JBL* 83 (1964) 392 for each case.

Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1424 2542 ℳ lat | αὐτὸ ἀνέπραξα A Θ | txt (αὐτὸ ἐπραξα) ⋈ B  
L Ψ 0182 579 892 1241 f r<sup>1</sup>

Mt 25.14-30 documents the Parable of the Talents. Mt 25.27 concludes that the ‘wicked and slothful servant’ (v. 26) ‘ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and at my coming I should have received what was my own with interest.’ Depending on the manuscripts, ‘my money’ is read τὰ ἀργύρια μου or τὸ ἀργυρίον μου, i.e. in the plural or in the singular. As Luke uses the singular, manuscripts reading the singular in Matthew are considered to be harmonising with Luke. The *p*-sign is nonetheless not unequivocally referring to Luke, and a vertical harmonisation with Mt 25.18 (‘καὶ ἔκρυψε τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ’) is equally possible.

In terms of external evidence, the reading τὰ ἀργύρια μου is attested by major representatives of different text-types (Alexandrian, Byzantine and Caesarean) and early versions, while the singular is equally well attested including Codex Bezae, the early Father Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–c. 215) and Egyptian versions. Interestingly, a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus corrected the plural to the singular.

Although a harmonisation with Luke could have taken place in several manuscripts, it is highly unlikely since the manuscripts supporting the singular are unrelated and yet the variant reading appeared as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. The parallel verse in Luke only attests the singular but the accompanying pronoun is either in post-nominal (τὸ ἀργύριον μου, default order) or pre-nominal position (μου τὸ ἀργύριον, highlighted, marked order), both with support divided into two strands. Whatever the position of the pronoun, the form is firmly singular in Luke, which is further confirmed by the pronoun αὐτό, while the pronoun does not change places in Matthew. The external evidence, unless following the alleged supremacy of ⋈B, is not conclusive; specifically, there is no explanation as to why numerous manuscripts have the plural form of ‘money’ in the later part of the passage, which deals with the servant with one talent only.

In terms of internal evidence, it can be noted that the use of the word *τάλαντον*, pl. *τάλαντα*, to designate a large unit of money<sup>175</sup> is purely Matthean (Mt: 13 [3 in the singular, 10 in the plural]). The forms of ‘money’ in the later part of the passage Mt 25.26-27 corresponding to the last servant with one talent are all in the singular and ἀργύριον would certainly appear as a natural correction from an irrelevant plural form, rather than be a harmonisation with Luke. However, it is to be noted that the use of the singular ἀργύριον is more Lukan (Mt: 1, Mk: 1, Lk: 4, Ac: 2), while the plural is again purely Matthean (Mt: 8). Furthermore, a correction of ἀργύριον into ἀργύρια in Mt 25.27 would be more tenable as the passage deals with the talent that the servant was hiding and the last part of the verse is in the singular (τὸ ἐμόν).<sup>176</sup> Less convincingly, it could be

<sup>175</sup> ‘A measure of weight varying in size [...] then a unit of coinage [...] whose value differed considerably [...] but was always comparatively high.’ (BDAG, s.v. *τάλαντον*)

<sup>176</sup> This would tally with the proposal of MwQH-theorists who see the discordance between the initial reference to ten pounds in Matthew and the ten servants in Luke and the final retribution in Luke of three servants only as an illustration of editorial fatigue which betrays Luke’s dependence on Matthew (M.S.

thought that the plural form is a vertical harmonisation with *τάλαντα* (Mt 25.15-16,20,22,28) or, as previously introduced, *ἀργύριον* (Mt 25.18).

The numerous manuscripts of value supporting both readings make it difficult to decide which one is more likely to be original unless the superiority of  $\aleph B$  is assumed. For the various reasons adduced above, the plural form as supported by Codex Vaticanus and others is the *lectio difficilior* and has greater chances to have generated the other readings. However this is not because of harmonisation, but because of the corrective character of the singular.

### III. 3. Conclusions

The examination of the alleged harmonisations of Bezan Matthew with Luke has proven unsatisfactory with regard to a straightforward confirmation of their secondary character. In text-critical discussions, the external evidence has surely the tendency to give more credit to some manuscripts in this case, whose strength is reinforced by the existence of dissimilarity where there are verbally close parallels in Luke. This study suggests that the reading in Bezan Matthew goes far beyond an ‘import’ from Luke but may reflect the editorial construction of the Gospel itself. Indeed, the overlaps between Luke and Bezan Matthew could potentially be qualified as ‘Q’-material, usually referred to by Synoptists as the Two Document Hypothesis. A serious obstacle is overlooked however for, since discussion on the Synoptic Problem on common textual material between Matthew and Luke usually relies on the text of the Nestle-Aland, “‘Western’ overlaps” are left uncommented. Once only does it appear that such ‘Western’ ‘additions’ were judged as reflecting a form of Q known to Matthew ( $Q^{Mt}$ ) as opposed to Luke (in turn,  $Q^{Lk}$ ),<sup>177</sup> summarised by Brown as follows:

‘Western’ additions to Matthew sometimes seem to be a reading of  $Q^{Mt}$  suppressed by the editor of Matthew, but restored in the later history of the text. So [Matt.] xvi.2–3 is the missing  $Q^{Mt}$ -version of Luke xii, 54–6 (apparently Q); the Western text of Matt. v,44 restores the full reading of Luke vi. 27–8; [Matt.] xx,28a is the missing version of Luke xiv.7–10 [...]. Cf. further the variant readings at Matt. vii.21–2; xviii. 11,20; xx.16; xxiii.13 (*sy*<sup>s</sup>).<sup>178</sup>

Unfortunately, this comment is relegated to a footnote, whereas such a powerful statement would have deserved more expansion. The research presented here may in the light of Brown’s earlier allusions serve to put forward a different view on alleged harmonisation in Bezan Matthew with Luke. More than that, it provides sound reasons for a serious reconsideration of the textual borders of ‘Q.’

---

GOODACRE, *The Synoptic Problem. A Way through the Maze* [London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2001] 164), and in this case, of Bezan Matthew.

<sup>177</sup> For a clarification of the concept of the Q-recensions  $Q^{Mt}$  and  $Q^{Lk}$ , see F. NEIRYNCK, ‘ $Q^{Mt}$  and  $Q^{Lk}$  and the Reconstruction of Q,’ in *ETL* 66 (1990) 385–90.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, ‘The Form of “Q” Known to Matthew,’ *NTS* 8 (1961) 27–42 [36 n.3].

## Chapter 6

### APPARENT HARMONISATIONS IN BEZAN MATTHEW WITH PARALLELS IN BOTH LUKE AND MARK

This chapter continues the previous discussion on apparent harmonisations and will focus on passages where Matthew, Luke and Mark share a highly similar wording and where NA<sup>28</sup> indicates harmonisation in Codex Bezae. Passages that are common to the three Synoptics are particularly difficult to treat because of the number of potential interrelationships involved: Matthew can potentially harmonise with Mark and/or Luke as well as with another Matthean passage (in the case of doublets or repetition), making potentially  $2^4=16$  different combinations for a variant reading between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus to reflect a different passage. Furthermore, the question remains as to whether the supposition that Bezan text of Matthew ‘harmonises’ with Luke or Mark is based on Bezan Mark or Bezan Luke or a reading in a different manuscript.

Preliminary study to this work reveals that the nature of the Bezan variants in Matthew that are paralleled in both Mark and Luke either reflect stereotyped expressions (usage) or discourse features (deliberate repetitions or structural doublets) found in variable form with each Gospel, or, in the other cases, a verbally close phrasing in the parallel Gospel passage.

I will divide the variant readings of Bezan Matthew in this chapter into two sections: section I will discuss expressions that are immediately repeated or appear as a standard expression inclined to variation, while section II will analyse the remaining Bezan variants that occur in isolation.

#### I. Apparent Harmonisations of Mt D.05 with Both Luke and Mark in Repeated Word- ing

Within the category of apparent harmonisations within the Synoptics, variant readings are found in wording/expressions that occur more than once with each Gospel. They can be categorised into three types: *repeated words or expressions in isolation* (i.e. same wording in the immediate context), *doublets* (material in high verbal agreement appearing in two different, mostly distant, contexts) and *frequently recurring occurrences*. These cases, where the text repeats information, are potentially ideal targets for both vertical and horizontal harmonisations. From the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, I have counted 17 such variant readings (five of the first type, four of the second, eight of the third), which will now be examined in turn.

##### I. 1. Repeated Words or Expressions in Isolation

This first section will deal with repetitions that occur when the same word or group of words appears twice (or more) in the immediate context. In Matthew, this phenomenon

occurs three times and will be presented in the relevant sections: in Mt 9.6 (I. 1. 1), Mt 9.27 and 20.31–32 (I. 1. 2) and 16.13 (I. 1. 3).

### I. 1. 1. Series of Imperatives

The verb ‘to rise’ in Mt 9.6 is subject to textual variation in Codex Bezae. I will include the immediate context in my analysis.

#### Mt 9.5-7 – par. Mk 2.9,11,12a//Lk 5.23-25

Mt 9.5 τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἄφίενται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; [6] ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἔγερθεῖς ἄρον σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. [7] καὶ ἐγερθεῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

[6] ὐ) ἔγειρε (+ καὶ D) B D 0281 sy | txt (ἐγερθεῖς) ⋈ C K L N W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup>  
33 565 579 700 892 1424 l844 l2211 ℳ q

Further vll: [5] ἄφεώνται C K L N W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424  
l844 l2211 ℳ it | ἀφίονται ⋈\* D | txt (ἀφίενται) ⋈<sup>2</sup> B lat [7] no vll

Mk 2.9 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἄφίενται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει; [11] σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. [12a] καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων κτλ.

[9] ἄφεώνται A C (D) K L W Γ Δ Θ 0130 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424  
2542 l2211 ℳ b sy | txt (ἀφίενται) ⋈ B 28 565 lat | ἔγειρου B L Θ 28 | καὶ  
ἄρον σου τὸν κράβαττόν Γ Δ 0130 2542 pm | ἄρον σου τὸν κράβαττόν 33 | ἄρον  
τὸν κράβαττόν σου C D (cf. ὐ) L f<sup>1</sup> 579 700<sup>c</sup> 1424 l2211 f l q vg<sup>cl</sup> | τὸν  
κράβαττόν σου 700\* | p)–W f<sup>13</sup> b c e | txt (καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου) ⋈<sup>88</sup> ⋈  
A B K Θ 28 565 892 1241 pm lat; Eriph | ὐ) ὑπαγε ⋈<sup>88</sup> ⋈ L Δ 892 bo? | (11)  
ὑπαγε (περιπάτει 33) εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου D (cf. ὐ) 33 a ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> | txt (περιπάτει) A B  
C K W Γ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 28 565 579 700 1241 1424 2542 l2211 ℳ lat sy sa; Eriph  
[11] no vll [12a] ἔναντίον A C D K Γ Δ 0130<sup>vid</sup> f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 2542 l2211 ℳ |  
ἐνώπιον Θ 28 33 1241 1424 | txt (ἔμπροσθεν) ⋈<sup>88</sup> ⋈ B L (W) 579 700 892

Lk 5.23 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφέωνται σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει; [24] ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ· σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιον σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. [25] καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἔφ’ ὃ κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.

## CHAPTER 6

[23] ῥ σου αἰ ἁμαρτίαι & D W Θ 1844 12211 (C 33 1241) ἰ σοι αἰ ἁμαρτίαι N Ψ  
 lat ἰ txt (σοι αἰ ἁμαρτίαι σου) A B K L Γ Δ Ξ f<sup>1,13</sup> 565 700 892 1424 2542 ℳ it  
 sy [24] ῥ λέγει D 1424 ἰ p) παραλυτικῶ & C D L N W Θ Ξ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 700  
 1241 1424 ἰ txt (παραλελυμένῳ) A B K Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 565 892 2542 1844 12211 ℳ ἰ r<sup>1</sup>  
 p) ἄρον & D 1424; Mcion<sup>T</sup> ἰ p) τὸν κράβαττόν D 1424 c r<sup>1</sup>; Mcion<sup>T</sup> ἰ τ<sup>1</sup> καί &  
 D 1424; Mcion<sup>T</sup> [25] ῥ τήν κλίνην D sa (e sy<sup>p,h</sup>)

In Mt 9.5-7 Jesus' healing of a paralytic and forgiveness of his sins lead to a controversy and the latter is regarded as blasphemy by some of the Jewish scribes. The miracle is emphasised by the use of repeated wording making the parallel between sins and disease stronger and focusing on the effect of the miracle itself:

### Mt 9.5

Which is easier, to say, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say,  
 'Rise and walk'? (ῥ Ἐγειρε καὶ περιπάτει)

### Mt 9.6

But that you may know that [...] he then said to the paralytic  
 'Rise, take up your bed and go home' (ῥ Ἐγερθεῖς [v/ ἔγειρε] ἄρόν ... ὕπαγε...)

Mt 9.7 And he rose and went home. (καὶ ἔγερθεῖς ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ)

Because of a clear internal structure based on a succession of imperatives, the aorist participle in the second saying (9.6) can be identified as a discordant reading and can therefore be regarded as the most likely original form on the basis of the traditional text critical principle of discordance, as opposed to the imperative ἔγειρε, which is the reading in both Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus against, amongst others, Codex Sinaiticus.

In terms of external evidence, the series of triple imperatives ἔγειρε ἄρον ... ὕπαγε... is read in B (+ καί D) 0281 sy while the participial form before the double imperative ἔγερθεῖς ἄρον ... ὕπαγε... is supported by the rest of the textual tradition. The diversity of witnesses shows that a corruption must have occurred at a very early stage of the textual transmission. However, its presence in only two strands of textual tradition suggests that the change occurred only once leading to these two readings. However, the analysis should not involve Matthew only, as both Luke and Mark have a similar repeated structure involving textual variants as well (within the verse itself and most importantly for this study, with variants in the tenses used for the two verbs). Therefore the harmonisation could be due either to the immediate context, or to parallel passages, or to an original common source that would have been well known at the time of the edition of the Gospels.

Indeed, in Mark (2.9,11), the first occurrence of the command (2.9) is subject to extreme variation with a wide range of textual support for multiple forms, which sug-

gests some scribal difficulty with expressing the command, while the second occurrence (Mk 2.11) is perfectly secure with a firm triple imperative. Even more interesting is the singular Bezan variant where the two occurrences (ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει;) are repeated verbatim in v. 9 and 11 in contrast to all other witnesses.

In Luke, the first occurrence (Lk 5.23) is firm with two verbs in the imperative (ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει) while the second one (Lk 5.24) is secure for the imperative ἔγειρε and the rest of the verse is highly variant in terms of mood, lexis, presence or absence of the second connective (ἄρον/ἄρας, κράβαττον/κλινιδίον, καί/om.) and interestingly, the varying participle is not ἐγειρθείς but ἄρας. For the third verb in Lk 5.24, the witnesses consistently read πορεύου instead of ὑπάγε. Therefore the question of the form of the imperative may hide an original editorial structure whose initial form is difficult to identify.

The status of all the variant readings found in the three Gospels makes it extremely difficult to determine the original form, and as a result ‘harmonisation’ is a facile and unsatisfactory conclusion. However the presence of highly variant verbal forms in all Synoptics suggests a fair amount of *diorthosis* in the first few centuries, rather than careless scribal activity.

In terms of internal evidence, though ἔγειρε is indeed found twice in both Luke and Mark as opposed to ἐγειρθείς in the witnesses mentioned above in Matthew, the use of the participial form may reflect an improvement of the Greek by preferring hypotaxis to parataxis, in which case the imperative form is more likely to be original. Indeed, while the more discordant reading, i.e. ἐγειρθείς, is more likely to be original on the basis of traditional text critical rules, the scribes may nevertheless have wanted to emphasise the final clause, i.e. ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, by deliberately using the participial mode to background the verb rise. The support of  $\mathfrak{B}^{88}$  & L Δ 892  $\text{bo}^?$  in the Mk 2.9 reading ὑπάγε instead of περιπάτει could well explain the development wherein Codex Bezae reflects the original Markan text with a deliberate redactional repetitive structure and where the verbal clause would have been abbreviated later. Similarly, ὑπάγε would have been replaced by περιπάτει by successive scribal contaminations from Matthew and Luke at a very early stage. Though quite speculative, it would nevertheless be interesting to take into account the Bezan text of Mark where καὶ περιπάτει would then qualify as a minor agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. This fact is further supported by variant readings involving the presence or absence of the connective καὶ and participial forms and moods. Actually, any atomistic analysis of these two verses may further conceal the fact that Mt 9.7 uses the participle aorist passive (καὶ ἐγειρθείς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ) with no variants and therefore, the participial form in Mt 9.6&.01 and its support could equally be a vertical harmonistic reading. Furthermore, despite the fact that the expression ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρον (Mt D.05) was probably originally uttered in Aramaic, it is important to note that the Peshitta does not use the conjunction (ܐܘܪܟܝܢܐܘܬܐܘܢ, ܠܗܝܩܘܡ). This fact may well indicate that the presence of καὶ in Codex Bezae reflects an earlier editorial amend-



ment and not a Semitism.<sup>1</sup> This favours the hypothesis that the omission of the connective *καί*, probably due to the third coordinated imperative (*καί ὑπάγε*) is likely to be the result of an improvement of the language, in which case the text would have evolved from *ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρον* (as in Codex Bezae) to *ἔγειρε ἄρον* (as in Codex Vaticanus) and finally *ἐγειρθεὶς ἄρον* (as in Codex Sinaiticus), either by attraction of v.7 or by stylistic improvement. Such a presentation has the merit of explaining all the other readings.

Concluding that the use of the imperative in Mt 9.6BD is a harmonisation constitutes something of a misuse of the usual text critical principles, which precludes an interesting investigation of the composition of the text itself, as well as overlooking a possible attraction to Mt 9.7. Indeed, the best assumption is probably that the miracle was identified by the audience of that time as key in Jesus' ministry and simply reflects the triple Aramaic imperative 'rise, take up and go' ( *קום שקול ערסך, במהר צמחל גרמלך, חיל לביתך*, ויל לבית) and the use of the conjunction before the third verb only. Furthermore, the possible dual meaning of *ἔγειρε* ('stand' and 'resurrect') may constitute a deliberate allusion to the resurrection which is less evident with the participial form: *ἐγειρθεὶς* only mentions the miracle of the paralytic taking his bed and going home at the expense of a first step in a resurrected life carried by *ἔγειρε*.

### I. 1. 2. The Titles of Jesus

In Mt 9.27 as well as 20.30-31, Jesus heals two blind men who each cry out 'have mercy on us Lord Son of David,' an expression that is found in two alternative forms: *υἰέ* or *υἰός*, i.e. apparently in the vocative or the nominative, or where 'Lord' (*κύριε*) is present or absent making four possibilities, with two strands of textual support, one following Codex Bezae and one Codex Vaticanus.

I will first present a preliminary overview if the two titles before looking at examples in greater depth.

#### I. 1. 2. 1. Alternation *υἰός* *Δαυίδ*/*υἰέ* *Δαυίδ*

Each occurrence of the alternation *υἰέ*/*υἰός* reflects a different type of potential harmonisation: while this variation appears only once in Mt 9.27 and can only be a horizontal harmonisation, the same type of variant readings appear in Mt 20.30 *and* 20.31 where the *v*l can represent a horizontal and/or a vertical harmonisation. These three cases will now be reviewed successively.

The cry 'Son of David [have mercy]!' addressed to Jesus appears eight times in the Synoptic Gospels, almost always with variant readings.<sup>2</sup> The pericopes of the blind men meeting Jesus involve people with various identities, whether the solitary Bartimaeus in Mark, two anonymous blind men in Matthew or the beggar at Jericho in Matthew and Luke. The cry is heard once (Mt 9.27, 15.22) or twice (Mt 20.30f, Mk 10.47f, Lk

<sup>1</sup> Principle clauses are classified by linguists as frames of reference or background information (see chapter 2).

<sup>2</sup> Except Lk 18.38; the eight occurrences are divided into two instances within a non-repeated context: Mt 9.27, 15.22 and three in a repeated context: Mt 20.30-31, Mk 10.47-48, Lk 18.38-39, see next page.

CHAPTER 6

18.38f) and the phrase ‘son of David’ can be found each time with either the –ε or –ος vocative form either in the vocative or in the nominative. From these multiple repetitions, it is not surprising to find variant readings with potentially horizontal and/or vertical harmonisations, accounting for the *p*) sign in the critical apparatus of Mt 9.27 and 20.30f.

Before analysing the apparently harmonistic readings in these three occurrences, it may prove fruitful to present synoptically the variant readings by isolating the phrase ‘son of David’ or ‘Lord, son of David’ in the corresponding passages and parallels. For this purpose, various representatives of the textual tradition, i.e. Codex Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Bezae, Koridethi, Washingtonianus and families 1 and 13, which present the phrase differently, will be chosen:

Reference	Healing of	Manuscripts	First Mention	Second Mention
Mt 9.27	Two Blind Men	Ⲭ	υιέ Δαυίδ	(no second mention)
		B	υιός Δαυίδ	
		D	υιέ Δαυίδ	
		Θ	υιέ Δαυίδ	
		W	υιός Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	υιέ Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	κύριε υιέ Δαυίδ	
Mt 20.30f	Two Blind Men At Jericho	Ⲭ	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	υιοῦ Δ. (Ⲭ*), υιέ Δ. (Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> )
		B	κύριε υιός Δαυίδ	
		D	υιέ Δαυίδ	
		Θ	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	
		W	κύριε υιός Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	κύριε υιέ Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	Ἰησοῦ υιός Δαυίδ	
Mk 10.47f	Bartimaeus	Ⲭ	υιέ Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ	υιέ Δαυίδ
		B	υιέ Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ	
		D	υιός Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ	
		Θ	υιέ Δαυίδ	
		W	ὁ υιός Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	ὁ υιός Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	Ἰησοῦ υιός Δαυίδ	
Lk 18.38f	Blind Beggar Near Jericho	Ⲭ	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	Ἰη. υιοῦ Δ. (Ⲭ*) Ἰη. υιέ Δ. (Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> )
		B	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	
		D	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	
		Θ	Ἰησοῦ υιέ Δαυίδ	

Reference	Healing of	Manuscripts	First Mention	Second Mention
		W	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ	υἱὲ Δαυίδ
		<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ
		<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ
Mt 15.22	Canaanite Woman	Ⲡ	υἱὲ Δαυίδ	(no second mention)
		B	υἱὸς Δαυίδ	
		D	υἱὸς Δαυίδ	
		Θ	υἱὸς Δαυίδ	
		W	υἱὸς Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	υἱὲ Δαυίδ	
		<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	υἱὲ Δαυίδ	

Table 13: Textual Variants of the Expression *Son of David*

With regard to the phrase ‘Son of David,’ all the references displayed above seem to show immense variability, along with the presence or absence of Jesus’ name. There are actually three main reasons that may have led to the variation between υἱός and υἱέ. First, when addressed directly, the vocative case υἱέ, ‘Son,’ may be used but so may the nominative case (known by grammarians as ‘nominative for addressee’ or ‘nominative for vocative’).<sup>3</sup> Because nominative and vocative can both be used in a context where one or more persons address somebody, the possible forms υἱέ or υἱός can naturally have generated variant readings. Second, the abbreviation of the two forms found in the manuscripts (*nomina sacra*) i.e.  $\overline{\Upsilon\text{C}}$  and  $\overline{\Upsilon\text{E}}$ , where c and e look very similar, particularly with the middle bar fading away with time and wear, could explain the generation of one or the other variant reading. Third, the vocative may be the result of a scribal effort to ‘correct’ the nominative which tended to be used when addressing deities and for greater emphasis.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the inclusion of titles (e.g. κύριος, Ἰησοῦ) also occurs as a *vl* and perhaps influences the variant readings concerning the noun ‘Son.’ The complexity is even more enhanced by the repetitions of the addressee and by its presence in parallel Gospels, which might suggest possible harmonisations, vertically and/or horizontally.

Returning to the occurrences presented in the grid, the first and last ones reflect one command only: NA<sup>28</sup> shows that Mt 9.27 follows three strands of traditions based on the use of the nominative or the vocative with or without the title ‘Lord.’ Mt 15.22, included in the parable of the Canaanite woman, is also variant in a similar way (υἱὸς Δαυίδ and υἱὲ Δαυίδ) but the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> surprisingly does not refer to the variant reading as a harmonisation in this passage. It is very possible that any difference from

<sup>3</sup> D. WALLACE, *The Basics to New Testament Syntax* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000) 36.

<sup>4</sup> C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006) 141–3.

the printed text of NA<sup>28</sup> is being viewed as a harmonising reading but this judgement seems bound to external evidence only. Equally, it is quite unlikely that the original reading can be established. The *p*) sign would seem out of place in these cases.

### I. 1. 2. 2. Presence or Absence of Κύριε

Variant readings described above affect some occurrences of the title Κύριε, 'Lord,' throughout the Synoptic Gospels and a preliminary overview will be helpful. Indeed, it appears in the vocative 58 times in the NA<sup>28</sup> text of the Synoptics, mostly in Matthew and Luke (Mt: 31, Mk: 1, Lk: 26), and it is stable in most of the cases, except in the following occurrences where it can be present or absent, change its position, or even both:<sup>5</sup>

Mt 8.6 *om.* κύριε  $\aleph^*$  k sy<sup>s.c</sup>; Hil

Mt 20.30 κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς B, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς  $\aleph$  D Θ, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς κύριε,  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$  C W

Mt 20.31 κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς  $\aleph$  B D Θ, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς 700, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε C W  $\mathfrak{M}$

Lk 9.59 *om.* κύριε B\* D

Lk 13.25 κύριε κύριε A D Θ  $\mathfrak{M}$ , κύριε  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$   $\aleph$  B

Lk 14.22 *om.* κύριε D

Lk 19.18 κύριε ἡ μὲν σου A D W  $\mathfrak{M}$ , κύριε ἡ μὲν σου  $\aleph$  B, μὲν 579

Lk 22.49 τῷ κυρίῳ D, αὐτῷ 0171<sup>vid</sup>, αὐτῷ κύριε A W Θ, κύριε B

The presence or absence of κύριε as well as its position in the phrase is apparently to some extent unstable. While there is no straightforward conclusion as to which reading is earlier than the other, although it is more likely that the title was added rather than withdrawn, the question of the significance of Jesus' titles was challenged in the 60s, specifically over the understanding of κύριε, whether as a main Christological title,<sup>6</sup> a synonym of Son of David,<sup>7</sup> the Son of Man,<sup>8</sup> or, finally, the highest title in Matthew.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, titles referring to Jesus, i.e. 'Son of David' and 'Son of God,' are of primary importance in the First Gospel<sup>10</sup> and they are used in both vocative and nominative cases in the Greek text. The variation is more likely to reflect a theological concern or an adaptation to the context (simple 'Sir' rather than 'Lord') than a harmonisation.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Only representative manuscripts are mentioned in order not to make the presentation unwieldy.

<sup>6</sup> G. BORNKAMM, G. BARTH and J. HEINZ, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960) 30–32.

<sup>7</sup> G. STRECKER, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962) 118–20, 123–6.

<sup>8</sup> W.D. DAVIES, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1964) 96–9, 360.

<sup>9</sup> W. TRILLING, *Das wahre Israel; Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (StANT 10; 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Munich: Kösel, 1964) 21–51.

<sup>10</sup> J.D. KINGSBURY, 'The Title "Son of David" in Matthew's Gospel,' *JBL* 95 (1976) 591–602 [591]; D. VERSEPUT, 'The Role and Meaning of the "Son of God" Title in Matthew's Gospel,' *NTS* 33 (1987) 53–6.

<sup>11</sup> Read-Heimerdinger studied the variant readings between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Jesus' titles in Acts D.05 but no reference is made with regard to variation in the declension (J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* [JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002] 256–74).

The instances for υἱός/υιέ combined with the presence or absence of κύριε will now be examined. Because of the identical nature of the context in which υἱός/υιέ appear, and the likelihood of accidental corruption in the copy, only the external evidence will be presented in the following section. If one were to look into the internal evidence, and assuming that the large number of horizontal and vertical passages involved will not lead to any skewed conclusion—a highly unlikely endeavour—it can be briefly commented as follows: it is true that the likelihood of ‘correcting’ the nominative into the vocative is greater than the other way round. Nevertheless, as already concluded above, Codex Bezae does not present a systematic correction of this kind. This presentation indicates that describing any alternative reading from the printed text in the NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonising is not as straightforward as it may appear, and is probably even the least plausible solution. On the variant Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς shared by Codex Bezae, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, it is questionable that a scribe would have mentally thought of a parallel Gospel to match its reading, meaning that a harmonisation may not be at stake here. Rather, liturgical use of the wording Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς may have yielded the Bezan reading (supported by Codex Vaticanus), which was not retained by the Committee. The most that can be said is that the matter of the titles and expressions aimed at rendering the two men’s petition to Jesus either was led by the wish to make a faithful reproduction of the master copy or it reflects an accidental memorising process of contiguous expressions with a high degree of similarity. The result of the confusion may even indicate that the two expressions were asymmetric, for if they were equivalent, it can be thought that they would have generated fewer variant readings.

### I. 1. 2. 3. Examples

#### Mt 9.27 – par. Mk 10.47f//Lk 18.38f

Mt 9.27 Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν ὁ[αὐτῷ] δύο τυφλοὶ κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

ⲓ p) υιέ ⋈ C D K L Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892\*1424 pm | κύριε υιέ N f<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> | txt (υἱός)  
B W 565 (700) l844 l2211 pm

Further vlf: °B D 892 (k) | txt (αὐτῷ) ⋈ C K L N W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 579  
700 1424 l844 l2211 ℞ lat sy<sup>h</sup>

Mk 10.47 καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ἰαζαρηνὸς ἐστὶν ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν· υἱὲ Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με. [48] Ɱκαὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με. √

[47] ⲓ p) Ναζωραῖός ⋈ A C K Γ f<sup>13</sup> 565 (579) 700 1241 1424 2542 ℞ ff<sup>2</sup> | Ναζωρηνός  
D 28 l\* q<sup>c</sup> | txt (Ναζαρηνός) (B) L W Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 892 lat; Or | ⲓ p) υἱός D K 2542 (f<sup>13</sup> 565); Or<sup>pt</sup> | ὁ υἱός A W Γ f<sup>1</sup> 700 ℞ | κύριε υἱός 28 | txt (υιέ) ⋈ B C L Δ Θ Ψ  
579 892 1241 1424; Or<sup>pt</sup> [48] ⱮW 1241 2542 | p) υἱός D | ὁ υἱός f<sup>1</sup> | κύριε υἱός 28 |  
Ἰησοῦ υιέ f<sup>13</sup>

Lk 18.38 καὶ ἐβόησεν λέγων· Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με. [39] καὶ οἱ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα Ἦ σιγήσῃ, αὐτὸς δὲ ὀπολλῶ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· Ἦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με.

[39] Ἦ σιωπήσῃ Ἰ A K Q Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℞ | *txt* (σιγήσῃ) B D L P T W Ψ | ὀ D c sa | Ἦ *p*) υἱός D | Ἦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ Ἰ *f*<sup>1.13</sup>

The story of the healing of the blind in Mt 9.27 can also be found both in Mark (Mk 10.46–52, with one blind man only, named Bartimaeus) and Luke (Lk 18.35-43, only one blind but anonymous man).

In terms of external evidence, taking the two readings found in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus against κύριε υἱέ found in N *f*<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>c</sup>, it can be seen that the variants in Matthew are well divided into two strands of textual tradition with regard to the nominal form. The vocative υἱέ is supported by a large range of diverse manuscripts including Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae against the nominative υἱός supported by Codex Vaticanus, Codex Washingtonianus, minuscules 565 and 700 and two lectionaries. The reason for tagging the vocative as harmonistic is probably due to fact that the vocative is more likely to appear as a correction of the nominative due to the context (a cry) rather than the other way round. However, as mentioned in the beginning of this section, both parallels in Mark and in Luke appear in a repeated form ‘Son of David’ with a mixture of cases: Mk 10.47-48 first read υἱός in D K 2542 (*f*<sup>13</sup> 565) Or<sup>pt</sup> with a *p*)-sign<sup>12</sup> *contra* υἱέ in Ἰ B C L Δ Θ Ψ 579 892 1241 1424 Or<sup>pt</sup> and the second occurrence is υἱός in D (also suggested as a harmonisation in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>) *contra* υἱέ in Ἰ B and almost<sup>13</sup> all of the remaining tradition (*stricto sensu* this is a harmonisation as well). Luke uses the secure clause Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με but the second occurrence of υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με (v. 39) is variant, where Codex Bezae (only) reads the nominative υἱός against the rest of the tradition.<sup>14</sup>

In short, the consistent readings of υἱέ in Codex Bezae in Mark are proposed as potential harmonisations in the critical apparatus while the nominative, consistently read in Codex Vaticanus and others, is not. Similarly, in Luke 18.38, the blind beggar by Jericho calls Jesus ‘Son of David’ which is transcribed twice by the vocative (B *rell*) against once in the vocative then in the nominative in Codex Bezae. The latter is identified in NA<sup>28</sup> as a harmonisation despite the discordant reading.

From these observations, it can be concluded that there is no systematic correction from the nominative into the vocative or vice versa, and that there is no such intrinsic

<sup>12</sup> A W Γ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 ℞ read the article ὁ and minuscule 28 reads κύριε υἱός. On the wider discussion of variant titles of Jesus and its probable origins, see B.D. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 47–118.

<sup>13</sup> All manuscripts except *f*<sup>1</sup> (ὁ υἱός) and 28 (κύριε υἱός) and *f*<sup>13</sup> sa (Ἰησοῦ υἱέ).

<sup>14</sup> Ἰ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> add Ἰησοῦ before the vocative.

sic scribal habit in Codex Bezae. Similarly, where identical forms are found in Codex Vaticanus they are not claimed as harmonisations in NA<sup>28</sup>, even though other manuscripts show a discordant reading. Finally, although the variation in the vocative/nominative throughout the Gospels deserves further research in itself, which goes beyond the scope of this work, to conclude that this variant reading is a harmonisation is evidently too simplistic.

Mt 20.30 – par. Mk 10.47//Lk 18.38 and Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30//Mk 10.47//Lk 18.38

Mt 20.30 καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, ῥ᾽Ελέησον ἡμᾶς, [κύριε] ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ.

ⲓⲡ) υἱέ Ⲡ<sup>45</sup> C D 085 0281 *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424 *pm* | Ἰησοῦ υἱέ Ⲭ L N Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 700 892 c e h n sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo | *txt* (υἱός) B K W Z Γ Δ *pm*

Further vll: ῥ κύριε ἐλέησον ὑμᾶς B L Z 085 0281 892 lat sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | ἐλέησον ὑμᾶς Ⲭ D Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 700 it sy<sup>c</sup> mae | *txt* (Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε) Ⲡ<sup>45vid</sup> C K N W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1241 1424 Ⲙ f q sy<sup>p,h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup>

Mk 10.47-48 καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ἰαζαρηνός ἐστὶν ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν· ῥ υἱέ Δαυὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με. [48] ⲡ καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῶ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· ῥ υἱέ Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με. ὡ

[47] ⲓⲡ) Ναζωραῖός Ⲭ A C K Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 (579) 700 1241 1424 2542 Ⲙ ff<sup>2</sup> | Ναζωρηνός D 28 I\* q<sup>c</sup> | *txt* (Ναζαρηνός) (B) L W Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1</sup> 892 lat; Or | ⲓⲡ) υἱός D K 2542 (*f*<sup>13</sup> 565); Or<sup>pt</sup> | ὁ υἱός A W Γ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 Ⲙ | κύριε υἱός 28 | *txt* (υἱέ) Ⲭ B C L Δ Θ Ψ 579 892 1241 1424; Or<sup>pt</sup> [48] ⲡ W 1241 2542 | ⲓⲡ) υἱός D | ὁ υἱός *f*<sup>1</sup> | κύριε υἱός 28 | Ἰησοῦ υἱέ *f*<sup>13</sup>

Lk 18.38 καὶ ἐβόησεν λέγων· Ἰησοῦ υἱέ Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με. [39] καὶ οἱ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῶ ἵνα ῥ σιγήσῃ, αὐτὸς δὲ ὡ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· ῥ υἱέ Δαυὶδ, ἐλέησόν με.

[39] ῥ σιωπήσῃ Ⲭ A K Q Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 Ⲙ | *txt* (σιγήσῃ) B D L P T W Ψ | ὡ D c sa | ⲓⲡ) υἱός D | Ἰησοῦ υἱέ Ⲭ *f*<sup>1,13</sup>

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ῥ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, ῥ᾽Ελέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε ὁ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ.

ⲓⲡ) υἱέ Ⲭ<sup>(\*)</sup>.1 C D L N 085 0281 33 579 892 1241 1424 | *txt* (υἱός) B K W Z Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 565 700 Ⲙ

ⲓ(30) Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς Ⲭ B D L Z Θ 085 0281 *f*<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | *txt* (Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε) C K N W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 Ⲙ f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c,h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae

Further *vll*: ρ̄ ἔκραζον  $\aleph^{2a}$  C K N W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424  $\aleph$  |  
 ἐκραύραζον Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> | ἐκραύρασαν  $\aleph^{45}$  | *txt* (ἔκραξαν)  $\aleph^{*-2b}$  B D L Z 085 0281  
 700 892

Parallels: see above (Mt 20.30 – par. Mk 10.47//Lk 18.38)

The two verses Mt 20.30-31 are a doublet of the preceding encounter of a blind man with Jesus (the double mention here against a single one in Mt 9.27). This occurrence will be addressed in this section and not the following one, which is dedicated to doublets, because of the obvious potential influence of the immediate context. There are three harmonisations in these two verses that are interconnected.<sup>15</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the first *v*l *υἰέ/υἰοί*, appears in the two verses in question with three strands of tradition along with the presence or absence of Ἰησοῦ, then two strands (absence of Ἰησοῦ) totalising seven readings according to the use of the vocative or nominative with or without the presence of Ἰησοῦ where Codex Bezae consistently reads the vocative as opposed to Codex Vaticanus which reads the nominative in both cases (though not identified in NA<sup>28</sup> as a harmonisation!). In the second *v*l, there are also three strands of tradition where the presence or absence and position of Κύριε in the expression Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς are involved, for which a linear presentation of ten representatives manuscripts of each possibilities, as presented in Swanson's *Matthew* will show that all possible combinations are found in the textual tradition:

[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. B
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἰὲ Δαυίδ. D
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἰὲ Δαυίδ. C
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ...	[31] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. W
[30] -----	[31] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἰὲ Δαυίδ. 579
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε Ἰησοῦ υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ $\aleph^*$
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε Ἰησοῦ υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἰὲ Δαυίδ $\aleph^C$
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε Ἰησοῦ υἱὸς Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. Θ
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Ἰησοῦ υἱὸς Δαυίδ...	[31] κύριε Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>
[30] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Ἰησοῦ υἰὲ Δαυίδ...	[31] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ. 700

The above horizontal presentation shows an extreme variety of possibilities where no MS has a unique arrangement. Such variety would appear to indicate either a deliberate change in the wording or an accidental copying process. Harmonisation, therefore, is an unlikely explanation. Codex Bezae could potentially reflect an early stage of the development before the later addition of titles like κύριε or the mention of Ἰησοῦ or ultimately the conflated reading κύριε Ἰησοῦ in v.30. The presence of κύριε is however well

<sup>15</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 43-44.



attested, despite the variation in its position in v.31, which in turn must have influenced its repetition in v.30 in the memorising process of the scribe.

The range of *vll* presents, as before, a relatively impressive list of manuscripts supporting the Bezan reading and all manuscripts seem to be following two distinct strands of tradition. The notable agreement of  $\mathfrak{B}^{45}$  (3<sup>rd</sup> c.; extant in rare parts of Mt 20-21 and 25-26 only)<sup>16</sup> in v.30 with Codex Bezae against Codex Vaticanus may even indicate that the vocative is more likely to be original. However, the presence or absence of κύριε (always in the vocative when present) and its position (before or after ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς) makes determining the most likely original reading practically impossible. Even the Committee responsible for the NA<sup>28</sup> text confesses that the choice made in the Nestle-Aland is the ‘least unsatisfactory solution’ and proposes a C-rating for both readings, without suggesting a solution to the vocative/nominative υἱός in Mt 20.30f.<sup>17</sup> This statement of dissatisfaction leading to such a conclusion was already expressed by Kingsbury, who had earlier published an article discussing the differences in the conclusions of the various critical editions Legg, Nestle-Aland and UBS.<sup>18</sup>

In conclusion, and while any further hypothesis with regard to the original reading beyond this presentation will be speculative, one may only comment at this stage that any proposal of harmonisation is too simplistic and ignores the most straightforward reading in its own right.

### I. 1. 3. Repetition of a Pronoun

The final instance of possible harmonistic reading in the immediate context arises in Mt 16.13 where a sentence is apparently repeated in a similar or exact same form.

#### Mt 16.13 (Mt 16.15) – par. Mk 8.27,29a//Lk 9.18,20

Mt 16.13 Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων, Τίνα <sup>τ</sup>λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι <sup>ο</sup>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

<sup>τ</sup> *p*) με D K L Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1241 1424 1844 12211 (C W)  $\mathfrak{M}$  it vg<sup>mss</sup> (sy<sup>s.c</sup>); Ir<sup>lat</sup> | *txt* (om.)  $\mathfrak{N}$  B 0281 579 700 c vg sy<sup>p.h</sup> co; Or

Further *vll*: <sup>ς</sup> 2 3 1 4 (οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι)  $\mathfrak{N}^2$  D 579 700 a b e q; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | 2-4 1 (οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι λέγουσιν)  $\mathfrak{N}^*$  | 1 4 2 3 (λέγουσιν εἶναι οἱ ἄνθρωποι) *f*<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>1</sup> | °D

Mt 16.15 λέγει αὐτοῖς<sup>τ</sup>· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;

<sup>16</sup> Mt 20.24–32; 21.13–19; 25.41–26.39.

<sup>17</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 43.

<sup>18</sup> KINGSBURY, ‘Title “Kyrios”,’ 254 n.31.

ⲧ ⲟ̀ Ἰησοῦς C 33 1241 it vg<sup>cl</sup>

Mk 8.27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς ῥὰς κώμας Καισαρείας ἰ τῆς Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς, Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; [29a] καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς, Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; κτλ.

[27] ῥ Καισαρείαν D it | [29a] no vl

Lk 9.18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι ῥ αὐτὸν ὁ προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας ῥ συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς λέγων, Τίνα με ῥ λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι ῥ εἶναι [20] εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν ⲧ τοῦ θεοῦ.

[18] ῥ αὐτοὺς D | ⲟ D a c e sy<sup>c</sup> | ῥ συνῆντησαν B\* f | συνήχθησαν 1424 | ῥ οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν Ⲭ\* B L Ξ f<sup>1</sup> 892 2542 | λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι A 579 1241 1424 e sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | txt (λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι) Ⲡ<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>2</sup> C D K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700  
Ⲙ [20] ⲧ (+ τὸν 892) υἰὸν D 892 it bo<sup>mss</sup>

In this verse, Matthew reports Jesus asking the question ‘who do people say the Son of Man is?’ or ‘who do the people say I am, the Son of Man?’ depending on whether the pronoun με is present or absent in the manuscripts. Two verses later (v.15), the question is put directly to the disciples ‘who do you think I am?’ Such syntactical repetition occurs in the parallel passages Mk 8.27,29, and Lk 9.18,20, where the firm double presence of the pronoun με in the Synoptics may have led to the conclusion that the Bezan Matthew vl is harmonising.

In terms of external evidence, the absence or presence of the personal pronoun in the first occurrence (Mt 16.13) is divided into two strands of textual tradition of similar weight. The second occurrence (Mt 16.15) is secure in Mt while it is firm in the two parallel occurrences of Mark and Luke. The firmness of the presence of με in the parallel passages led the Committee to conclude that the absence of the pronoun is more likely to be original,<sup>19</sup> confirmed by its being a *lectio brevior*. These considerations usually argue against Codex Bezae and its support, despite the wide geographical distribution. It is interesting to see that in this case, the text critical principle of the discordant reading (i.e. as in Codex Bezae *contra* ⲬB) is *not* applied here. Moreover, the similarity of the saying may simply point to Jesus’ original words, in which case a deliberately repeated wording would have been used in Aramaic (ܝܠܝ) and scribes would have simply omitted the pronoun because the object τὸν υἰὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was already present. Nevertheless, the atomistic consideration of the presence/absence of με ignores the instability of the entire interrogative clause across the Synoptics where the word order is highly variant, thereby indicating a textual difficulty, as the following grid (with a few representatives of each text form) will illustrate:

<sup>19</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 34.

Mt 16.13b	Τίνα με	οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι;	υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;	D
Mt 16.13b	Τίνα	οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι;	τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;	ℵ <sup>2</sup>
Mt 16.13b	Τίνα	οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; λέγουσιν	τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;	ℵ*
Mt 16.13b	Τίνα	λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι	τίν υἶα τον ἀναιποιν	B
Mt 16.13b	Τίνα με	λέγουσιν εἶναι; οἱ ἄνθρωποι	τὸν υἶόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;	f <sup>1</sup>
Mk 8.27b Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;				firm
Lk 9.18b	Τίνα με	λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι;		℘ <sup>75</sup> D ℵ <sup>2</sup>
Lk 9.18b	Τίνα με	οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι;		ℵ*B
Lk 9.18b	Τίνα με	λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;		A

Indeed, the verb λέγουσιν in Mt 16.13 is read at three different positions (between the subject and the infinitive complement [ℵ<sup>2</sup> D 579 700 a b e q; Ir<sup>lat</sup>]; after the infinitive [ℵ\*]; after the subject [B *rell*]). Furthermore, the infinitive is sometimes placed immediately after the interrogative pronoun (f<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>1</sup>). Interestingly, while Mk 8.27b is firm (the clause is reduced to its minimum), Luke also exhibits textual variance in word order (℘<sup>75</sup> ℵ<sup>2</sup> C D K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700 ℳ have the neutral order, ℵ\* B L Ξ f<sup>1</sup> 892 2542 have a fronted and therefore highlighted subject οἱ ὄχλοι).<sup>20</sup> It is interesting to note that the reading of Codex Alexandrinus, supported by a few manuscripts (579 1241 1424 e sa<sup>mss</sup> bo), reads οἱ ἄνθρωποι instead of οἱ ὄχλοι, a potential harmonisation with Matthew or Mark – unnoticed according to the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. The correction of Codex Sinaiticus to accord with Codex Bezae in both Matthew and Luke is interesting: this instability of the wording may well mean that the sentence corresponds to a *logion* of importance, originally uttered by Jesus, and that it was deemed to be consistent a particularly important passage worthy of highlighting.

In terms of internal evidence, the short, and firm, Markan clause may suggest that its form is more likely to be original and corresponds to the one uttered by Jesus. However, the variability in Luke and Matthew implicitly reflects textual problems and scribal difficulties. As seen above, Luke has the secure pronoun but also exhibits variants in the rest of the verse. In Matthew, not only is the pronoun variant, but so is the second object, the articular phrase ‘Son of Man,’ which is a feature supported by the entire tradition except Codex Bezae where the nominal phrase is anarthrous.<sup>21</sup> This second object makes more sense without με as it avoids an unclear reading with a double subject: in this respect the withdrawal of με may translate a correction of a *lectio difficilior*, in which case Codex Bezae is more likely to be original. Only Matthew, against Mark and

<sup>20</sup> On the importance of word order and its impact on variation, see chapter Chapter 3 IV.

<sup>21</sup> This absence of the article reflects the way the article is omitted in Greek to distinguish the complement from the subject. See J.C. CALLOW, ‘Constituent Order in Copula Clauses: A Partial Study,’ in D.A. BLACK (ed.) *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992) 68-89.

Luke, includes the phrase [τὸν] υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, changing thereby the meaning according to the presence or absence of με ('Who do men say that the Son of man is?', in B.03 and its support, *versus* 'Who do men say that I am, [the] Son of man?', in D.05 *et al.*). This change could well be editorial rather than simply scribal.

It can therefore be understood that Codex Bezae truly reflects the question 'Who do you think that the people say I am, the Son of Man?' from an original Matthean redaction. It may be speculated that the Matthean verse is the consequence of an authorial expansion from Mark, but where the omission of με in Mt 16.13 – except Codex Bezae – was deliberate and aimed at simplifying the complexity of the presence of a double object. From the readings in the Synoptics, it appears that the object 'Son of Man,' being unique in Matthew as opposed to Mark and Luke, is more likely to be responsible for the varying presence of the pronoun, because of the double object, than that inter-Gospel harmonisation has brought about *vll.*

## I. 2. The Case of Doublets

How doublets in Matthew according to Codex Bezae, referred to as potential harmonisations in the critical apparatus of the NA<sup>28</sup>, are subject to textual variation will now be investigated. By doublets is meant statements that repeat in one way or another the same or similar information.<sup>22</sup> This information is conveyed in parallel passages within the same Gospel, which occur many times in the Scriptures as a recurrent phenomenon. They have been discussed in various publications relating to both the Tanakh<sup>23</sup> and the New Testament.<sup>24</sup> Other studies have been conducted globally<sup>25</sup> or individually in the books of Matthew,<sup>26</sup> Luke,<sup>27</sup> Mark<sup>28</sup> or Acts.<sup>29</sup> Identifying a doublet is quite difficult

<sup>22</sup> J.C. HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (2<sup>nd</sup> rev. edn; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909) 80.

<sup>23</sup> On the doublets found in Jeremiah and Joel, see M. ALFRED, 'A propos des doublets du livre de Jérémie. Réflexions sur la formation d'un livre prophétique' in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Prophecy. Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday 6 September 1980* (BZAW 150; Berlin/New York, 1980) 106–20; A.R.P. DIAMOND, 'Portraying Prophecy: Of Doublets, Variants and Analogies in the Narrative Representation of Jeremiah's Oracles – Reconstructing the Hermeneutics of Prophecy,' *JSOT* 57 (1993) 99–119; M. DAVID, 'Nonrecurring Doublets in the Book of Joel,' *CBQ* 56 (1994) 56–67; J.D. MACCHI, 'Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie' in A.H.W. CURTIS and T. ROEMER (eds), *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception* (BETL 128; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997) 119–150; G.H. PARKE-TAYLOR, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000). Outside the Prophets, only the Book of Lamentations in the Tanakh was studied under the light of doublets: D. MARCUS, 'Non-Recurring Doublets in the Book of Lamentations,' *Hebrew Annual Review* 10 (1986) 177–95.

<sup>24</sup> S.P. BROCK, 'Doublet and its Ramifications,' *Biblica* 56 (1975) 550–3; B.R., MOORE, *Doublets in the New Testament* (Dallas, TX: SIL, 1993).

<sup>25</sup> G. VAN OYEN, 'The Doublets in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Gospel Study,' *ETL* 73 (1997) 277–306.

<sup>26</sup> HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae*, 80–99.

<sup>27</sup> H.T. FLEDDERMANN, 'The Doublets in Luke,' *ETL* 84 (2008) 409–44; HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae*, 99–106.

<sup>28</sup> F. NEIRYNCK, 'Duplicate Expressions in the Gospel of Mark,' *ETL* 48 (1972) 150–209; *ibid.* (ed.), *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction* (BETL 31; rev. ed.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988); C. FOCANT, 'La fonction narrative des doublets dans la section des pains. Mc 6,6b–8,26' in F. VAN SEGBROECK, C.M. TUCKETT, G. VAN BELLE and J. VERHEYDEN (eds), *The Four Gospels 1992, Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 100; Leuven, Peeters-University Press 1992) 1039–63; R. STEIN, 'Duality in Mark,' in P. FOSTER, A. GREGORY, J.S. KLOPPENBORG and J. VERHEYDEN (eds), *New Studies in the Synoptic*

since there are repetitions that are not doublets but rather correspond to fixed or semi-fixed expressions ('rise on the third day,' 'cast into the gehenna' etc...); these latter will be discussed in section I. 3. I will distinguish repetitions and doublets by following the rationale that a repetition occurs in the immediate context and consists of only few words (typically one to three words), while a doublet occurs in a full clause or is more embedded in a different context and appears only twice (*contra* frequently occurring expressions).

There are three verses in Matthew of which Bezan variants are identified as harmonistic readings in the Nestle-Aland but they are also embedded within a doublet, thereby involving a potential cross contamination with three different texts (the other Matthean doublet, and Mark and Luke where there is no doublet). These verses are Mt 5.32, 19.9 on the question of divorce and Mt 16.4 on the sign of Jonah. These double passages in multiple Gospels within different manuscripts will generate such an intricate complexity that objective conclusions are well nigh impossible. In an attempt to address the issue, the problem will be depicted in detail. The verses will be identified by their parallel references along with their doublet(s).

### I. 2. 1. The Divorce Passages

In the two following variant readings on the divorce passages, a synoptic view of the four passages in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus only will show the complex structure of the texts and the potential textual cross-contamination:

Mt 5.31-32D	Mt 5.31-32B	Mt 19.9D	Mt 19.9B	Mk10.11-12D	Mk10.11-12B	Lk16.18D	Lk16.18B
Ἐρρήθη δέ,	Ἐρρέθη δέ,						
ὡς ἄν	ὡς ἄν						
ἀπολύση	ἀπολύση						
τὴν γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα						
αὐτοῦ, δότω	αὐτοῦ,						
αὐτῇ	δότω αὐτῇ						
ἀποστάσιον	ἀποστάσιον						
ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω	λέγω δὲ	λέγω δὲ	καὶ λέγει	καὶ		
ὑμῖν ↑ ὡς ἄν	ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς	ὑμῖν	ὑμῖν	αὐτοῖς,	λέγει αὐτοῖς,		
ἀπολύση τὴν	↑ ὁ ἀπολύων	ὡς ἄν	ὡς ἄν	ὡς ἄν	ὡς ἄν	πᾶς ὁ	πᾶς ὁ
γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα	ἀπολύση τὴν	ἀπολύση	ἀπολύση	ἀπολύση	ἀπολύων	ἀπολύων
αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ	γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα	τὴν γυναῖκα

*Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008. Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 253–280. On a different approach to doublets in Mark, see J. RIUS-CAMPS, 'Le Codex de Bèze : une base indispensable pour une édition de L'Évangile de Marc,' *CCO* 5 (2008) 255–95: in this article, Rius-Camps analyses the articularity of the proper noun 'Jesus' in recurring passages and concludes that the Gospel is constituted by an original Gospel which was expanded. His is different from the usual understanding of doublets in the rest of the scholarship (Hawkins finds only one doublet in Mark; cf. *ibid.*, 99).

<sup>29</sup> P. TAVARDON, *Le texte occidental et le texte alexandrin des Actes des Apôtres. Doublets et variantes de structures* (CRB 37; Paris: Gabalda, 1997).

CHAPTER 6

Mt 5.31-32 D	Mt 5.31-32B	Mt 19.9D	Mt 19.9B	Mk10.11-12D	Mk10.11-12B	Lk16.18D	Lk16.18B
παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας	παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας	αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας	αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας	αὐτοῦ και ἄλλην γαμήση	αὐτοῦ και γαμήση ἄλλην	αὐτοῦ και γαμῶν έτέραν	αὐτοῦ και γαμῶν έτέραν
ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι	ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι	↑ ↑ ↑	ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι	μοιχαῖται ἐπ' αὐτήν·	μοιχαῖται ἐπ' αὐτήν·	μοιχεύει,	μοιχεύει,
↑ ↑ ↑	καὶ ὁ <sup>30</sup> ἀπολελυμένη	καὶ ↑ ↑	καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένη	καὶ ἐὰν γυνή ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἄλλον	καὶ ἐὰν αὐτῇ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἀνδρα αὐτῆς	καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένη ↑ ↑	καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένη ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς
↑	γαμήσας	γαμήση ἄλλην	γαμήσας ↑	γαμήση μοιχαῖται	γαμήση ἄλλον	γαμῶν	γαμῶν
↑	μοιχαῖται	μοιχαῖται	μοιχαῖται		μοιχαῖται.	μοιχεύει	μοιχεύει

Table 14: Textual Comparison of the Divorce Passages in D.05 and B.03

Each intra- or inter-Gospel parallel is subject to a high degree of variation in the second part of each verse concerning what happens to a man who divorces his wife. Although only Matthew, as opposed to the other Synoptics, has (twice) the ‘exclusion clause’<sup>31</sup> (παρεκτός λόγου), the presence of Jesus’ explanation on divorce appears in total four times and all verses involved are subject to textual variation. Due to the contentious nature of the topic of divorce, it is not surprising that textual corruptions have occurred. Nevertheless, determining the original wording or concluding if one reading is the consequence of a true harmonisation will be, by essence, difficult to assert objectively or categorically.

Mt 5.31-32 (Mt 19.9) – par. Mk 10.11-12//Lk 16.18

Mt 5.31 Ἐρρέθη δέ· ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον [32] ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ‘πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων’ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι, ‘καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχαῖται’<sup>3</sup>

[32] ρ) ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ D 579 pm it sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo | txt (πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων) B rel

Further vll: ‘καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχαῖται B sa?; Or | -D a b k; OI<sup>mss</sup> | txt (καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχαῖται) & K W Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 892 1424 1844 (L Θ 579 1241) ℣ lat? sy<sup>h</sup> sa? mae bo

<sup>30</sup> It is not to forget that the majority of manuscripts reads καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ... which echoes the preceding ὃς ἂν ... with a reading with is different from the ones found in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus.

<sup>31</sup> The ‘exemption clause’ was thoroughly reviewed a decade ago in D. Janzen’s article, ‘The Meaning of *Porneia* in Matthew 5.32 and 19.9: An Approach from the Study of Ancient Near Eastern Culture,’ *JSNT* 80 (2000) 66-80, examining the matter in the context of 1<sup>st</sup> c. Judaism and explaining that by ‘exception’ one should rather understand a point that will be discussed later but currently off-topic.

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ῥῶτι ὁς ἂν ἄπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ῥμὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται.<sup>ῥ</sup> ὧ

ῥ*p*) ὁς ἂν B D Z it | ὅστις 1424 | *txt* (ὅτι ὁς ἂν) & *rell* | ῥμὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην (*om.* καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην N) ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι C\* N | (5.32) παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι B *f*<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>1</sup> bo | παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται D *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 it (*sy*<sup>c</sup>) sa mae | *txt* (μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται) & C<sup>3</sup> K L (-καί W) Z Γ Δ Θ 078 565 579 700 892 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  I vg *sy*<sup>s.p.h</sup> | ὧ καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (ἀπολυμένην Θ 565, + ἀπὸ ἀνδρός 579) γαμῶν (γαμήσας B K Z Γ 700 892  $\mathfrak{M}$ ) μοιχᾶται B C\* K N W Z Γ Δ Θ 078 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat *sy*<sup>p.h</sup> bo | ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμῶν ἀπολελυμένην μοιχᾶται  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>25</sup> mae | *txt* (*om.*) & C<sup>3</sup> D L 1241 it *sy*<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

Mk 10.11 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ῥῶς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν· [12] καὶ ἐὰν ῥαὐτὴ ῥἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον<sup>ῥ</sup> μοιχᾶται<sup>ῥ</sup>.

[11/12] ῥἐὰν ἀπολύσῃ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς (ἐαυτῆς 2542) καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχ. καὶ ἐὰν ἀνήρ ἀπολ. τ. γυν.(+ αὐτοῦ 1, ἐαυτοῦ 2542; + καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην 1 2542 *sy*<sup>s</sup>) μοιχᾶται W 1 2542 *sy*<sup>s</sup> | ῥγυνὴ A D K N Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> 28 1241 (Θ 565 700 1424)  $\mathfrak{M}$  latt *sy*<sup>p.h</sup> | *txt* (αὐτῆ) & B C L Δ Ψ 579 892 co | ῥἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλω A K N Γ  $\mathfrak{M}$  f I vg *sy*<sup>p.h</sup> | ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς (-1241 1424) γαμήσῃ ἄλλω 579 1241 1424 (*cf.* ῥ) | ἐξέλεθ ἀπὸ τοῦ (-565) ἀνδρός καὶ ἄλλον γαμήσῃ (ῥγαμήσῃ ἄλλον 565) D *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 it | ἐξέλεθ ἀπὸ (+ τοῦ 28) ἀνδρός καὶ γαμήσει ἄλλον Θ 28 | ἐξέλεθ ἀπὸ ἀνδρός καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλω 700 | *txt* (ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον) & B C\*<sup>(2)</sup> L 892 (Δ Ψ) co

Lk 16.18 Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ῥὁ ἀπολελυμένην ῥἀπὸ ἀνδρός ῥγαμῶν μοιχεύει

ῥπᾶς & A K N P W Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  *sy*<sup>p.h</sup> | *txt* (*om.*)  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>75</sup> B D L 579 1241 2542 lat *sy*<sup>s.c</sup> co; Mcion<sup>T</sup> |  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>75</sup> 1241 | ῥἀπο ἀνδρός ῥ D *sy*<sup>s.c.p</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>

Mt 5.32 is part of a well-structured passage (5.19-48) where the behaviour within the community with regard to social matters is discussed by Jesus ('you have heard'/'but I tell you'). The centre of the passage deals with the status of divorce as stipulated in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 24.1-4) where Jesus reviews the status of a divorced person and its implication for the ex-partner's future marital life. The difficult nature of the theological and social concerns raised, depending on what was claimed by Jesus, is reflected

in the absence of homogeneity within the Synoptics and in the Matthean doublets as well as in the variant readings found in the manuscripts. The passages discuss the consequence for the marital status of men and women after divorce and occur twice in the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 5.31-32 and Mt 19.9). These passages have been widely discussed exegetically from a Christian<sup>32</sup> as well as from a Jewish perspective<sup>33</sup> but only a few papers focus on the text critical difficulties.<sup>34</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the variant reading  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \delta \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  in Mt 5.32, supported by most manuscripts, echoes Lk 16.18, while the reading  $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\eta$  in Codex Bezae, two secondary Byzantine representatives<sup>35</sup> and early versions (Latin, Syriac and Coptic), echoes the doublet in Mt 19.9, where the verbal similarity is high, specifically regarding the presence of the exclusion clause  $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon \pi\omicron\rho\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ . Significantly, the fact that there are only two strands of textual tradition in this *vl* suggests that there must have been a change at the very beginning of the transmission which cannot therefore be simply attributed to scribal error. Equally, the number of variant readings in the same variation-units in all three Synoptics illustrates the difficulty in identifying the words actually uttered by Jesus. Indeed, considering the other Synoptic passages, the parallel reading in Mk 10.11 is virtually firm<sup>36</sup> meaning that  $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\eta$  in Mt 5.32D.05 could be regarded as a harmonisation with Mark. Conversely, Mt 5.32B.03, reads  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \delta \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  like in Lk 16.18, however, since the Lukan reading is firm, it is not concluded that the Mt 5.32B.03 is harmonising, in contrast to Mt 5.32D.05. Which reading is harmonising when one is close to one parallel Gospel and the other reading is harmonising to another parallel Gospel? It seems that the textual critics have largely favoured the external evidence to decide. Actually, the peculiarity of Mt 5.32 is that it also echoes the

---

<sup>32</sup> G.J. WENHAM, 'Matthew and Divorce: An Old Crux Revisited,' *JSNT* 22 (1984) 95-107; C.L. BLOMBERG, 'Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage, and Celibacy: An Exegesis of Matthew 19:3-12,' *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990) 161-96; J.M. WEIBLING, 'Reconciling Matthew and Mark on Divorce,' *Trinity Journal* 22 (2001) 219-35; L. SANCHEZ NAVARRO, 'Mt 19,3-9: una nueva perspectiva,' *EstB* 58 (2000) 211-38.

<sup>33</sup> M.N.A. BOCKMUEHL, 'Matthew 5,32; 19,9 in the Light of Pre-Rabbinic Halakhah,' *NTS* 35 (1989) 291-5; R. NEUDECKER, 'Das „Ehescheidungsgesetz“ von Dtn 24,1-4 nach altjüdischer Auslegung. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der neutestamentlichen Aussagen zur Ehescheidung,' *Biblica* 75 (1994) 350-87; J.A. FITZMYER, 'The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *To Advance the Gospel. New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) 79-111.

<sup>34</sup> One can quote the following references with text critical discussions: J. DUPLACY, 'Note sur les variantes et le texte original de Matthieu 19,9,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *Études de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (BETL 78; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987) 387-412; M.W. HOLMES, 'The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,' *JBL* 109 (1990) 651-64; C. MARUCCI, 'Clausole matteane e critica testuale. In merito alla teoria di H. Crouzel sul testo originale di Mt 19,9,' *RivBib* 38 (1990) 301-25; D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 75-94.

<sup>35</sup> The 13<sup>th</sup> c. minuscule 579 is said to be Byzantine in Matthew (B.M. METZGER and B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* [4<sup>th</sup> edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005] 89) while 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> c. CE majuscule 0259 (Codex Climaci Rescriptus, originally referred to by Gregory as lectionary *l*1561) is entirely Byzantine (extant parts in Matthew: 21.23-41; 27-31; 22.40-23.1; 23.1-25; 24.42-46; 24. 25.14; 26.24-32; 26.40-49; 27.9-19; 27.39-48; 27.64-28.3; 28.4-10; see ALAND-ALAND, *Text*, 126).

<sup>36</sup>  $\aleph$ B $\Delta$  read  $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  but W, minuscules 1 and 2542 and sy<sup>s</sup> with minor variations, have  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ .



doublet at Mt 19.9<sup>37</sup> and is found in a similar form in the preceding verse (Mt 5.31, *ὅς ἄν*). If Mt 5.32D.05 were a harmonisation, it is not clear whether it harmonises with Mark or with the immediate context. While Holmes concludes that there is a ‘[clear and] deliberate cross-harmonisation between the two passages,’ he recognizes even so that ‘it seems somewhat odd, therefore, that the concluding words in each sentence – *ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι* (5.32) and *καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχεῖται* (19.9) – were not also harmonised.’<sup>38</sup> On the phrase in question in this section, the external evidence does not help us determine with which passage Codex Bezae harmonises.<sup>39</sup>

In terms of internal evidence, both readings make sense as the passage shows an interwoven structure of *ὅς*- and *πᾶς*-clauses showing the opposition between what was said before Jesus and what Jesus now says (‘You have heard that it was said ... ‘whoever’ ... But I say to you that ‘everyone who...’) with an idea of generalisation where the move from a commandment in the second person (e.g. *οὐ φονεύσεις*) or ‘whoever’ (e.g. *ὅς δ’ ἂν φονεύσῃ*) to ‘anyone’ is best expressed with *πᾶς ὁ* + participle rather than *ὅς δέ*,<sup>40</sup> specifically in the first passage passage using *Ἰηκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη*, and reproduced in the next one (Mt 5.27-29). This structure can be demonstrated from the passage Mt 5.21-48 as ordered below following the NA<sup>28</sup> text (the words in question, i.e. *ὅς δέ*, *πᾶς*, are in bold):

<sup>21</sup> Ἰηκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐ φονεύσεις· **ὅς δ’ ἂν** φονεύσῃ,...

<sup>22</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν

**ὅτι πᾶς ὁ** ὀργιζόμενος ...· **ὅς δ’ ἂν** εἶπῃ ... **ὅς δ’ ἂν** εἶπῃ· ...

<sup>23</sup> **ἐὰν** οὖν ...

<sup>24</sup> ἄφες ... καὶ ὑπάγε ...

<sup>25</sup> ἴσθι ...

<sup>26</sup> ἀμὴν λέγω σοι,

<sup>28</sup> Ἰηκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· οὐ μοιχεύσεις.

<sup>28</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν

**ὅτι πᾶς ὁ** βλέπων ... <sup>29</sup> εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ...

<sup>31</sup> Ἐρρέθη δέ· **ὅς ἂν** ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, ...

<sup>32</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν

**ὅτι πᾶς ὁ** (ν) ἀπολύων ... καὶ **ὅς ἂν** ...

<sup>33</sup> Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ...

<sup>34</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν

μη ὁμόσαι ὄλως·...

<sup>38</sup> Ἰηκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· ...

<sup>39</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ...

ἀλλ’ ὅστις σε ....

<sup>37</sup> The absence of *ὅτι* in B D Z it in Mt 19.9 is regarded in NA<sup>28</sup> as a harmonisation.

<sup>38</sup> M.W. HOLMES, ‘The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,’ *JBL* 109 (1990) 651-64 [663].

<sup>39</sup> Metzger claims a assimilation with Mt 5.32 due to the ‘[expansion of] copyists who accommodated the saying to the prevailing text of 5.32’ (METZGER, *Commentary*, 38).

<sup>40</sup> *πᾶς ὁ* + participle mimics the Hebrew verb+שׁוּן as in Exod 21.17 or Lev 20.14,17 and *ὅς δέ* echoes the Hebrew שׁוּן לַ as in Lev 6.11, 15.21 or Num 19.16. See J.W. JOHNSTON, *The Use of Πᾶς in the New Testament* (New York/Washington/Baltimore: Peter Lang, 2004) 99.

- <sup>40</sup> καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι...
- <sup>41</sup> καὶ ὅστις σε ...ὑπαγε... <sup>42</sup> τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός....
- <sup>43</sup> Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· ἀγαπήσεις ....
- <sup>44</sup> ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν·
- ἀγαπᾶτε ... <sup>45</sup> ὅπως ...
- <sup>46</sup> ἔάν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ...
- <sup>47</sup> καὶ ἔάν ...
- <sup>48</sup> ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν

As one can see from the reorganised passage, the expressions used are based on a regular alternation (three times in NA<sup>28</sup> or in Codex Vaticanus, twice only in Codex Bezae) between ‘you heard that whoever’ (Ἠκούσατε ὅτι... ὅς δ’ ἄν) and ‘but I tell you, anyone who’ (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν... ὅτι πᾶς+participle, then ὅς δ’ ἄν...). In the case of the present passage (5.31-32), the reading ὅτι πᾶς fits this logic and could be seen as either a deliberate editorial form, or an internal harmonisation. Conversely, the fact that Luke reads πᾶς (Lk 16.18, firm) and Mark ὅς ἄν (Mk 10.11, firm) would explain the Alexandrian form in Matthew as harmonising with Luke and the Bezan form with Mark.

Therefore, while the Bezan phrase at Mt 5.32 can be seen as a harmonisation with v. 31, the majority reading ὅτι πᾶς ὁ could also have reflected a correction to match a more regular structure. The complexity of guessing the original reading then arises because the Matthean structure can be explained in two different ways: either (a) the first passage (v. 21-34) is based on an alternation ὅς ἄν/ὅτι πᾶς ὁ + participle, after which an interpolation of ‘you’ particularises the discourse (singular: vv. 38-41, then plural: vv. 43-47) or (b) a three-part discourse with first a generalisation in Jesus’ counterproposals followed by a focus on the individual (ὅς ἄν/ὅς ἄν). The latter form reflects the Bezan reading and, in this respect, could also commence a second part of the discourse focused on the person. These options will not help in identifying the original reading since both are equally possible.<sup>41</sup>

While it would be spurious to give a definite conclusion because of the number of cross-references potentially involved, the variant reading in question could well point to a theory for the very construction of the text of the Gospels: Matthew could have copied Mark, but the importance of including Jesus’ logia would have reinforced the universal character of his saying among the first communities which would have been corrected in Matthew rather than the other way round. Besides, it must be asked if Luke’s firm πᾶς-reading would have generated a back-contamination of the Matthean text? Indeed, the ὅς ἄν-clause sounds less restrictive than the clause with ὅτι πᾶς followed by the participle. In this respect, it seems more likely that a general statement such as ‘if one divorces’ is more inclined to be corrected into the stricter interdiction ‘anyone who divorces...’. An alternative explanation may also be that the alleged harmonisation results from the simplistic explanation that a distracted scribe created this reading.

---

<sup>41</sup> Parker concludes his study by admitting that the complexity of the texts makes it impossible to go back to the original wording used by Jesus (PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, 93).

The original text is difficult to reconstruct for this variation-unit. Nevertheless, the conclusion suggesting a harmonisation may hide a more complex matter involving the history of the text and its transmission. Concluding that a harmonisation has taken place is mostly based on the external evidence on the basis of the traditional favouring of the Alexandrian text, but the internal evidence poses more problems than it actually solves.

Mt 19.9 (Mt 5.32) – par. Mk 10.11-12//Lk 16.18

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται.<sup>ῆ τ</sup>

ῆp) ὁς ἂν B D Z it | ὅστις 1424 | txt (ὅτι ὁς ἂν) & rell

Further vll: cf. critical apparatus in the preceding case on Mt 5.32

Mt 19.9 corresponds to the doublet discussed in the previous case though concerns a different variation unit. The matter is complex since three variants are reported in the critical apparatus, two with a *p*) sign, one with a reference to Mt 5.32. The critical apparatus suggests that the absence of ὅτι after λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν in Codex Bezae, as well as Codex Vaticanus, is potentially a harmonisation, *contra* its presence. Mark does not read the conjunction after the similar introduction to speech. Luke utters a similar saying, but without an immediate introduction with a verb of speaking (the last introduction was at Lk 16.15, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς without ὅτι). This is the only case among all the harmonisations in Matthew indicated by NA<sup>28</sup> where the absence of a word qualifies as a harmonisation.

In terms of external evidence, the overwhelming weight of the presence of ὅτι supported by Codex Sinaiticus and most of the remaining tradition argues against its absence in the key manuscripts Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae, the Alexandrian 6<sup>th</sup> c. palimpsest codex Dublinensis Z.035, and the Old Latin (NA<sup>28</sup> adds the reading of minuscule 1424, not indicated in NA<sup>27</sup>). Because the absence of the conjunction is secure in Mk 10.11, its absence in Codex Bezae *et al.* was presumably regarded in Nestle-Aland as a harmonistic reading based on the principle that a discordant reading (in this case: the absence in Mark and the presence in Matthew) is more likely to be original. This would mean that its absence in BDZ and the Old Latin reflects a deliberate removal of the original ὅτι in Mt 19.9. It is difficult to understand, however, how scribes would have been prompted to think of the absence of the conjunction in Mk 10.11 and why they would have removed the original ὅτι. Indeed, the word ὅτι is already subject to high textual variation, where it may or may not be retained. In total, there are nine occurrences in the Synoptics where ὅτι is variant against 391 occurrences in the first three Gospels:

- (1) Presence in Codex Bezae and its supporters *contra* its absence in other manuscripts:

CHAPTER 6

Lk 7.28	Ⲁ ⲟⲩⲓ ⲟⲩ ⲙⲓⲕⲣ. ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲩ D   <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ B <i>rell</i>
Lk 9.27	Ⲁⲡ) ⲁⲗⲗⲏⲑⲩⲱⲥ ⲟⲩⲓ ⲡ <sup>45</sup> K   ⲟⲩⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲏⲑⲩⲱⲥ D   <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ B <i>rell</i>
Lk 12.27	Ⲁⲡ) ⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ A D L Ψ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 892 1424 it; Cl   <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ ⲡ <sup>45.75</sup> B K Q W Γ Δ Θ 070 565 579 700 1241 2542 Ⲙ a vg

(2) Absence in Codex Bezae and its supporters *contra* its presence in other manuscripts:

Mt 5.32	<i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ D   <i>txt</i> ⲟⲩⲓ B <i>rell</i> <sup>42</sup>
Mt 6.16	<i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ B D <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1844 12211 it   Ⲁⲟⲩⲓ K L W Γ Δ Θ 33 579 892 1241 1424 Ⲙ lat
Mt 19.9	Ⲁⲡ) <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ B D Z it   ⲟⲩⲓⲥ 1424   ⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ <i>rell</i>
Mt 19.24	<i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ B D K W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 1241 1424 Ⲙ   Ⲁⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ C L Z 0281 579 892 12211 aur
Mt 26.29	<i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ ⲡ <sup>45</sup> Ⲭ B D Z Θ 0281 <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 892* 12211; Ir <sup>lat</sup>   Ⲁⲡ) ⲟⲩⲓ A C K L W Γ Δ 565 579 700 892 <sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 1844 Ⲙ f ff <sup>2</sup> r <sup>1</sup> vg <sup>mss</sup>
Lk 4.25	<i>txt</i> ( <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ) A B D K N Γ Δ 0102 565 2542 12211 Ⲙ lat   Ⲁⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ L W Θ Ψ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 e f l
Lk 13.35	<i>txt</i> ( <i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ) ⲡ <sup>45vid.75</sup> Ⲭ B D L Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 579 1241 2542 it   Ⲁⲟⲩⲓ A K N W Γ Δ Ψ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 565 700 892 1424 Ⲙ lat sy
Lk 18.29	<i>om.</i> ⲟⲩⲓ Ⲭ* D Δ lat   <i>txt</i> (ⲟⲩⲓ) B <i>rell</i>

This list demonstrates that there is a slight tendency towards the absence of ⲟⲩⲓ in Codex Bezae against the rest of the tradition. However, it is clear that the textual tradition is fairly evenly divided between the inclusion and exclusion of the particle, and that the explanation of its absence or presence does not necessarily reflect a harmonistic tendency.

Therefore, the reason for tagging the absence of ⲟⲩⲓ as a harmonisation seems to have been as follows: (a) Mt 5.32 retains the conjunction (although this is inaccurate, see footnote above) (b) Mt 19.9, in BDZ and it, lacks the conjunction as in Mt 5.32 (c) the parallel passages in Lk 16.18 and Mk 10.11 consistently lack the conjunction and must have caused its absence in some witness of Mt 19.9. However, regarding this as a harmonisation with the parallel passage in Mark is unlikely since the conjunction is already subject to variation.

In terms of internal evidence, Mt 19.9 is similar in form to Mt 5.32 introduced by ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμεῖν, although Codex Bezae does not read the conjunction ⲟⲩⲓ *contra* Codex Vaticanus in the former verse. Equally, Mt 19.9 is embedded in a series of Ἠκούσατε ⲟⲩⲓ ἐρρέθη ...λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν with or without ⲟⲩⲓ (or similar, i.e. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν or ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν

<sup>42</sup> The absence of variant reading in Nestle-Aland is actually erroneous: while Mt 5.32 appears from the critical apparatus as secure, Codex Bezae does not read ⲟⲩⲓ as can be seen from the MS itself.

etc.) which appears in the NT 18 times with ὅτι (Mt: 11, Mk: 0, Lk: 4, Jn: 3)<sup>43</sup> while ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν without ὅτι appears more often (29 cases: Mt 14, Mk 2, Lk 10, Jn 3).<sup>44</sup> Discourse analyst specialist S. H Levinsohn draws attention to the fact that, while indirect speech is known to be used in order to report words,<sup>45</sup> it ‘does not explain *why* an author chooses to report certain speeches indirectly.’<sup>46</sup> For reported speech, he concludes that in Luke-Acts and John, the presence of ὅτι in reporting direct speeches ‘signals that the speech terminates some unit or, at least, explicates some previous point.’<sup>47</sup> Specifically when following λέγω σοι/ὑμῖν, ‘the norm is for ὅτι not to follow the formula’ and that ‘assertion[s] introduced with ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι/ὑμῖν that lack ὅτι typically introduce new points.’<sup>48</sup> When applied to textual criticism, the presence or absence of ὅτι in a reported speech – unless truly accidental – may then also reflect a deliberate purpose of the author/scribe. If Levinsohn’s conclusions can be applied to Matthew, specifically to chapter 5 which is rich in the expression ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, the lack of ὅτι could then mean that nothing is newly asserted by Jesus but is simply a re-statement of what was already known within Judaism.

In short, ὅτι in these parallel passages can be read as a vertical or horizontal harmonisation and a conclusion in any direction is speculative: its presence could be argued as a harmonisation to the doublet in Mt 5.32 and the overall structure of Mt 5.21-48 and its absence to the doublet or immediate context.

### I. 2. 2. The Sign of Jonah

There are two apparent harmonisations in Mt 16.4 on the Sign of Jonah which will be analysed together.

#### Mt 16.4 (Mt 12.39) – par. Mk 8.12-13//Lk 11.29

Mt 16.4 Γενεὰ πονηρὰ <sup>□</sup>καὶ μοιχαλὶς ἔσμεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ ἔσμεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ <sup>⋈</sup>. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

□p) D it

ϛp) ζήτεῖ σημεῖον καὶ D\* b c e | σημεῖον ζήτεῖ καὶ D<sup>c</sup> Θ | σημεῖον αἰτεῖ καὶ B\* | -  
700

<sup>43</sup> Mt 5.22,28,32; 6.29; 8.11; 12.6,36; 17.12; 19.9,23,28; Lk 4.24; 18.14,29; 19.26; Jn 14.10; 15.15; 16.20.

<sup>44</sup> Mt 5.34,39,44; 6.16; 8.10; 10.23; 11.11; 12.31; 17.20; 19.24; 21.21; 24.2; 25.12; 26.29; Mk 13.37; 14.9; Lk 4.25; 7.9,28; 9.27; 12.4,5,8,22,27; 13.35; Jn 12.24; 13.20; 16.7.

<sup>45</sup> The so-called ὅτι *recitativum* is used to report speech but ‘[Grammarians] offer no explanation as to why ὅτι is sometimes present and sometimes absent with direct speech’ (S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* [2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Dallas: SIL International, 2000] 261).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 266, 269.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 266. Levinsohn bases his conclusions on NA<sup>27</sup> text but I have assumed here that the changes between NA<sup>27</sup> and NA<sup>28</sup> have no impact on his proposals.

CHAPTER 6

Further vll: <sup>τ</sup>ρ) τοῦ προφήτου C K N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1241 1424  
 ℞ it vg<sup>cl</sup> sy mae bo | txt & B D L 579 700 lat sa

Mt 12.39 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται ἢ αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.

No *vll*<sup>49</sup>

Mk 8.12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἢ γενεὰ αὕτη ἠζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν ἠλέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον. [13] καὶ ἀφείς αὐτοὺς ἠάλιν ἐμβὰς ἠπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

[12] ἠσημεῖον αἰτεῖ **Ϟ**<sup>45</sup> | σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ A K N W Γ 0131 *f*<sup>13</sup> 1424 ℞ | txt &  
 B C D L Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 28 33 565 579 700 892 (<sup>ς</sup>1241) 2542 | ἠλέγω B L 892 | - **Ϟ**<sup>45</sup>  
 W [13] ἠέμβας ἠάλιν εἰς (τὸ) πλοῖον A K N Γ 0131 *f*<sup>1</sup> ℞ (it) vg sy<sup>h</sup> sa | <sup>ς</sup>**Ϟ**<sup>45</sup>  
 D W Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 28 33 565 579 700 892 2542 | εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἠπῆλθεν ἠάλιν (*et om.*  
 ἠπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν) 1241 (1424) | txt (ἠάλιν ἐμβὰς) & B C L Δ

Lk 11.29 Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροισομένων ἠρῆατο λέγειν, Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ὀγενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστίν· σημεῖον ἠζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ<sup>τ</sup>.

<sup>ο</sup>(*om.* γενεὰ) C K W Γ Δ 565 579 1424 2542 *l*2211 *pm* sy<sup>p</sup> | <sup>τ</sup>ρ) ἐπιζητεῖ C D  
 K W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 070 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424 *l*2211 ℞ | txt (ζητεῖ) **Ϟ**<sup>45vid.75</sup>  
 & A B L E 700 892 2542 | <sup>τ</sup>ρ) τοῦ (-Δ) προφήτου A C K W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 070 *f*  
<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892<sup>c</sup> 1424 *l*2211 ℞ e f q r<sup>1</sup> vg<sup>cl</sup> sy<sup>s.p.h</sup> bo | txt (*om.*) **Ϟ**<sup>45.75</sup> & B  
 D L E 700 892\* 1241 2542 lat sa bo<sup>mss</sup>

This passage (Mt 16.1-4), in which the Pharisees and Sadducees ask Jesus for ‘a sign’ and Jesus answers that ‘an evil *and adulterous* generation *seeks for a sign*, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah’ (Mt 16.4a; italics reflect the *vll* in Codex Bezae and its support), involves two potentially harmonistic readings in Codex Bezae. The verse in question is a doublet with the passage in chapter 12 (Mt 12.38-42) where the scribes and Pharisees ask the same question. The two *vll* will be studied simultaneously, first the external evidence then the internal evidence.

In terms of external evidence, the shorter reading γενεὰ πονηρὰ is read in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin while the longer one, i.e. γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς is supported by the rest of the textual tradition. However, the preceding doublet (Mt 12.39) has the full reading unanimously. Despite the fact that the shorter reading is the discordant one

<sup>49</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> does not mention any variant reading in Mt 12.39 but it appears that ‘αὐτῇ *pro* σοι D’ is noted in Scrivener’s section dedicated to minor variants (SCRIVENER, *Codex Bezae*, 430). The consultation of the manuscript itself shows a clear scrap under AYTH (<http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-NN-00002-00041/62>, accessed 01.05.13). The apparatus should there be corrected as follows: ἠαὐτῇ D\* | σοι B D<sup>c</sup> *rell*.

(the doublet in Mt 12.39 has the long reading), the conclusion is based on the isolated status of the support in Greek (Codex Bezae only) and the ‘Western’ character of the *Vetus Latina*. Kilpatrick is in favour of omitting *καὶ μοιχαλὶς*,<sup>50</sup> like in Codex Bezae, probably because of the preference to the *lectio brevior* principle. The agreement of the entire Old Latin tradition allows to date the shorter reading to the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE.

In terms of internal evidence, the apparent harmonisation in Mt 16.4D.05 is unlikely to be the result of the Lukan reading: indeed, Luke reads the expression as a statement, with a different syntax and without mentioning *καὶ μοιχαλὶς*: *ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ ἐστίν* (the second *γενεὰ* is omitted in some manuscripts, see above) and without the mention of the crowd being adulterers. Mark does not mention this expression as such (Mk 8.12 *Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη*) in the parallel passage or anywhere else in the Gospel. Equally, the former occurrence in Mt 12.39 is far from existing in an immediate context remembered by a scribe. Finally, the two verses from the doublet are highly similar but yet sufficiently different in the Bezan text to be a simple redundancy.<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, there is some precedence in the phrase *γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς* in the Jewish Scriptures<sup>52</sup> and it may therefore have been known to the audience and therefore, scribes may have been inclined to ‘supplement’ an original shorter reading with *καὶ μοιχαλὶς*.

From these considerations, it is quite unlikely that the shorter reading in Mt 16.4D.05 is the result of a scribe remembering the Lukan words since the syntax is fairly different or with Mark. It appears more evident that the longer reading *γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς* reflects an early correction aimed at matching a more emphatic expression found in an earlier passage or in the Scriptures. The weak external evidence is probably responsible for the choice by the Committee of the shorter reading being secondary but the association with a *p*-sign sounds like a bit of an exaggeration.

Regarding the second variant reading in question in Mt 12.39, i.e. *σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ/ζητεῖ σημεῖον*, and in terms of external evidence, the first Matthean doublet (Mt 12.39) is virtually firm and reads *ἐπιζητεῖ*, while the second one (Mt 16.4) reads *ζητεῖ* (except the original hand of Codex Vaticanus which reads *αἰτεῖ* with preverbal object *σημεῖον*, while minuscule 700 and a few other minuscules omit the phrase). Luke reads the two forms *ἐπιζητεῖ* (tagged in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic in C D W Θ Ψ 070 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 ℳ) and

<sup>50</sup> Kilpatrick does not specify a reason but would ‘probably omit’ the words (G.D. KILPATRICK, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946] 87).

<sup>51</sup> The second verse of the doublet reads Mt 16.4NA<sup>28</sup> *γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ*, i.e. with a noticeable change in the pronoun *σοι* against Mt 12.39’s *αὐτῇ* which may indicate a deliberate switch in the addressee of the message. This 2<sup>nd</sup> p.sg. pronoun was explained by Paulson as a deliberate ecclesiological feature (G.S. PAULSON, ‘Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae and Washingtonianus in the Gospel of Matthew’ [Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2013] 262).

<sup>52</sup> The expression *πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς* is rare in the Bible: it appears once in Hosea (3.1) where the prophet is asked to marry an adulteress, symbolizing thereby the prostitution of Israel with other gods. In this text, Yahweh asks Hosea to ‘go again, love a woman who is beloved of a paramour and is an adulteress’ (LXX: *γυναῖκα ἀγαπῶσαν πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶν*, MT: *פַּתְּוּמַנְפָּת רַע וּמְנַחֵם הַשָּׂנֵא*) which can be anticipated as a fixed expression. It may be argued that Mk 8.38’s ‘adulterous and sinful generation’ is the origin of the Matthean and Lukan expressions (B. WARD-POWERS, *The Progressive Publication of Matthew: An Explanation of the Writing of the Synoptic Gospels* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010) 336).

ζητεῖ (P<sup>45vid.75</sup> & A B L Ξ 700 892 2542) and the object σημεῖον is always in preverbal position. Finally, Mark reads ζητεῖ σημεῖον in &BD and supporting witnesses, against the inverted word order and compound verb σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ in A K N W Γ 0131 *f*<sup>13</sup> 1424 &M, while P<sup>45</sup> has the singular reading σημεῖον αἰτεῖ (as in Mt 16.4B.03). This multiplicity of readings shows that finding the original one is by no means straightforward and that the scribes were potentially puzzled by which wording to use<sup>53</sup> and how to order words. Typically, the word order was often changed, highlighting the interest in addressing a specific focus. Specifically, the distance between the passages cannot be explained as a harmonisation with the immediate context, and the proximity of the wording in both passages in the same context (doublet) is likely to point to a unique original saying, i.e. γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ, uttered by Jesus himself.

In terms of internal evidence, although this time there are more than two strands of textual tradition, a presentation looking closely at Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in the doublets as well as in Luke and Mark will be displayed for ease of reference:

Mt 12.39D	Mt 12.39B	Mt 16.4D	Mt 16.4B	Mk 8.12D	Mk 8.12B	Lk 11.29D	Lk 11.29B
...	...			... Τί	... Τί	...	...
Γενεὰ	Γενεὰ	Γενεὰ	Γενεὰ	ἡ γενεὰ	ἡ γενεὰ	Ἡ γενεὰ	Ἡ γενεὰ
πονηρὰ	πονηρὰ	πονηρὰ	πονηρὰ	αὕτη	αὕτη	αὕτη γενεὰ	αὕτη γενεὰ
καὶ	καὶ	↑	<u>καὶ</u>			πονηρὰ	πονηρὰ
μοιχαλὶς	μοιχαλὶς	↑	<u>μοιχαλὶς</u>			ἐστίν·	ἐστίν·
σημεῖον	σημεῖον	<u>ζήτει</u>	<u>σημεῖον</u>	ζητεῖ	ζητεῖ	σημεῖον	σημεῖον
ἐπιζητεῖ,	ἐπιζητεῖ,	<u>σημῖον,</u>	<u>αἰτεῖ,</u>	σημεῖον;	σημεῖον;	ἐπιζητεῖ	ζητεῖ
				ἀμὴν λέγω	ἀμὴν λέγω		
				ὑμεῖν,	ὑμῖν,		
καὶ σημῖον	καὶ σημεῖον	καὶ σημίον	καὶ σημεῖον	εἰ δοθήσεται	εἰ	καὶ σημεῖον	καὶ σημεῖον
οὐ	οὐ	οὐ	οὐ	τῇ γενεᾷ	δοθήσεται	οὐ	οὐ
δοθήσεται	δοθήσεται	δοθήσεται	δοθήσεται	ταύτη	τῇ γενεᾷ	δοθήσεται	δοθήσεται
σοὶ εἰ μὴ	<u>αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ</u>	αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ	αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ	σημῖον.	ταύτη	αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ	αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ
τὸ σημίον	τὸ σημεῖον	τὸ σημίον	τὸ σημεῖον		σημεῖον.	τὸ σημεῖον	τὸ σημεῖον
Ἰωνᾶ	Ἰωνᾶ	Ἰωνᾶ.	Ἰωνᾶ.			Ἰωνᾶ	Ἰωνᾶ
τοῦ	τοῦ						
προφήτου.	προφήτου.						

Table 15: Textual Comparison of the Sign of Jonah Passages in D.05 and B.03

<sup>53</sup> Moulton quotes Dean Robinson by assigning a ‘directive’ sense to some compound verbs with ἐπι-, amongst which ἐπιζητέω: ‘Closely akin to these are the composita in which the preposition may be described as directive, indicating the concentration of the verb’s action upon some object: in these cases the simplex will be general and the composition special in its force, the one may be abstract and the other concrete.’ (MOULTON, *Grammar*, vol. 2, 312). The move from ζητέω to ἐπιζητέω could potentially picture Jesus’ desperation towards a generation ‘seeking for a sign’ only as opposed to really ‘strive for a sign’ where the sign is, from a discourse analysis perspective, less highlighted than the fact of searching is.



From this presentation it seems that in Mt 12.39 (a) the object *σημεῖον* is always in a highlighted preverbal position (b) the verb ‘seek’ is rendered by the compound verb *ἐπιζητεῖ*. In the second occurrence, i.e. Mt 16.4, Codex Bezae has the default order verb–object, as in Mk D.05 but unlike Lk D.05 against the preverbal order (and verb substitution) in Codex Vaticanus (c) Mt 16.4D.05 has the simplex verb against the compound verb<sup>54</sup> in Bezan Luke where the object is in highlighted preverbal order. From these considerations, the second variant reading in Mt 16.4D.05 cannot be described as a harmonisation with Luke (neither Lk 11.29D.05 nor B.03) but only with Mark and that despite a different wording in the rest of the verse. Ironically, the word order and use of *σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ* is identical in Mark B.03 and Mt 16.4B.05, which in turn could be regarded as a harmonisation in Codex Vaticanus, although this is not the explanation given in NA<sup>28</sup>, probably because of the weight of the external evidence in favour of the Alexandrian reading.

In conclusion, the Matthean doublet is apparently not responsible for any source of corruption because the textual distance is too great, but neither can this be a straightforward inter-Gospel harmonisation. The importance of word order, though this is an often neglected consideration among textual critics, is demonstrated by the correction of a later hand of Codex Bezae to ‘almost’ tally with the Alexandrian reading (the simple verb still remains uncorrected).

### I. 3. Frequently Occurring Expressions

There are four instances in Matthew where variant readings in Codex Bezae are identified as harmonisations, and where each *v*l can be explained as a deliberate or accidental scribal change to conform to a more usual way of expressing the idea ‘He who has ears, let him hear,’ where the Greek may or may not include the infinitive *ἀκούειν* in *ὁ ἔχων ὄτα ἀκουέτω* (I. 3. 1); ‘to be cast into the Gehenna,’ which can be expressed with *ἀπέρχομαι* or *βληθῆναι* (I. 3. 2); ‘resurrect after three days,’ where the alternative reading ‘on the third day’ (*μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* vs. *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*) can be found along with two forms of the verb (*ἐγερθῆναι* [raise up]/*ἀναστῆναι* [rise]) or combination thereof (Chapter 6 I. 3. 3); finally, the presence or absence of the personal pronoun in the phrase ‘his disciples,’ i.e. *οἱ μαθηταί*, or *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* (I. 3. 4). These expressions will be now examined in turn. Because they occur frequently, I will use in each case the same presentation and isolate the Matthean verse where the apparent harmonising reading is mentioned in the critical apparatus, along with the parallel passages, but the other occurrences of the same expression will be detailed in the explanatory section of each variant reading.

#### I. 3. 1. ‘He Who Has Ears’

The phrase ‘He who has ears to hear, let him hear’ is found as a longer and a shorter reading depending on whether or not it includes the infinitive ‘to hear’.

---

<sup>54</sup> By *compound verb* it is understood ‘a simplex verb and a preposition that has been affixed to it’ (D.A. BLACK, *Learn to Read New Testament Greek* [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994] 61).

Mt 13.9 – par. Mk 4.9//Lk 8.8

Mt 13.9 ὁ ἔχων ὄψα ἰακούετω

ἰρ) ἀκούειν 8<sup>2</sup> C D K N W Z Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 88  
 lat sy<sup>c.p.h</sup> co | *txt (om.)* 8\* B L a e ff<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s</sup>

Mk 4.9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὁς ἔχει ὄψα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω<sup>ἰ</sup>.

ἰκαὶ ὁ συνείων συνίετω D it vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup>

Lk 8.8 [...] ὁ ἔχων ὄψα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.

No *vll*

In this occurrence, which concludes the Parable of the Sower, Codex Bezae along with other manuscripts retains the longer reading, as always found in other Gospels.

In total, there are seven occurrences of this proverbial saying in the Gospels, which concludes a discourse, three in Matthew, and two each in Mark and Luke.<sup>55</sup> While the two occurrences in Luke and in Mark<sup>56</sup> firmly support the longer reading, Matthew is the only Gospel which systematically shows two distinct strands of textual tradition, one supporting the shorter, one the longer. The following table will illustrate the distribution of the variants.

Ref.	Context	Reading	<i>vll</i>	Presence	Textual Support of the Longer Reading
Mt 11.15	Jesus praises John the Baptist	ὁ ἔχων ὄψα	ἰακούετω	ἀκούειν	8 C K L N W Z Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892 1424 1844 12211 88 lat sy <sup>c.p.h</sup> co; Ju (against B D 700 k sy <sup>s</sup> )

<sup>55</sup> Mt 11.15 (Jesus praises the Baptist); 13.9 (Parable of the Sower); 13.43 (Explanation of the Parable of the Weeds); Mk 4.9 (Parable of the Sower); 4.23 (Lamp under a Bushel Basket/The Purpose of Parables); Lk 8.8 (The Yeast of the Pharisees and of Herod); 14.35 (The Parable of the Sower). Interestingly, there is no occurrence in John of this expression.

<sup>56</sup> Actually, Mk 4.9 has a further longer reading with the presence of καὶ ὁ συνείων συνίετω in D it vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup>.

Ref.	Context	Reading	<i>v</i> l	Presence	Textual Support of the Longer Reading
Mt 13.9	The Parable of the Sower	ὁ ἔχων ὦτα	<sup>τ</sup> ἀκούετω	ἀκούειν	<i>p</i> ) $\aleph^2$ C D K N W Z Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 $\aleph$ lat sy <sup>c.p.h</sup> co (against $\aleph^*$ B L a e ff <sup>1</sup> k sy <sup>s</sup> )
Mt 13.43	Jesus explains the Parable of the Weeds	ὁ ἔχων ὦτα	<sup>τ</sup> ἀκούετω	ἀκούειν	$\aleph^2$ C D K L N P W Γ Δ 0106 <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 892 1241 1424 /844 $\aleph$ it vg <sup>cl</sup> sy co (against $\aleph^*$ B Θ 0242 700 a b e k vg <sup>st</sup> )
Lk 8.8	Parable of the Sower	ὁ ἔχων ὦτα		ἀκούειν ἀκούετω	Longer reading secure
Lk 14.35	About Salt	ὁ ἔχων ὦτα		ἀκούειν ἀκούετω	Longer reading secure
Mk 4.9	Parable of the Sower	ὁς ἔχει ὦτα		ἀκούειν ἀκούετω <sup>τ</sup>	καὶ ὁ συνείων συνείετω
Mk 4.23	The Purpose of Parables	τις ἔχει ὦτα		ἀκούειν ἀκούετω	Longer reading secure

**Table 16: Textual Variants of the Expression *He Who Has Ears, Let Him Hear***

As can be seen from this table, Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, Washingtonianus and families 1 and 13 as well as most of the Byzantine minuscules consistently have the longer reading, while the Old Latin, Codex Bezae, Regius and Koridethi have one or the other. Codex Vaticanus and the original hand of Sinaiticus are more stable in terms of the shorter reading (Mt 13.9 $\aleph$ .01 and Mt 13.43 $\aleph$ .01 were corrected into the longer reading while Mt 11.15 $\aleph$ .01 remains uncorrected with the longer reading). Clearly, explaining Mt 13.9D.05 as a harmonisation ignores the complexity of the overall picture of variation in this expression.

If one focuses on the external evidence of Mt 13.9, the attestation is fairly evenly divided between the shorter reading of ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούετω which is supported by the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Regius, as well as a few early Latin and Syriac versions, and the longer reading of ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω which is supported

by the corrected form of Codex Sinaiticus and Western, Byzantine and Caesarean Greek witnesses, as well as some early Latin, Syriac and Coptic versions. The shorter reading is secure in Lk 8.8 while Mark 4.9 does not use a participial clause but a relative one, and D it vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup> ‘add’ *καὶ ὁ συνείων συνείτω*. The Committee attributed a B-rating to the *v*l in Mt 13.9 and refers the reader to Mt 11.15, where it is concluded that the shorter reading is more likely to be original due to its absence in ‘such important witnesses as B D 700’!<sup>57</sup> Although this explanation fits the context of Mt 11.15, it does not apply to 13.9 since Codex Bezae has the longer reading.

Even if the shorter reading is more likely to be original and the longer one can be regarded as the result of a scribal correction, it is still intriguing that Luke and Mark show no trace at all of the shorter reading in any manuscript, including Codex Bezae. Even more interesting is the consistency of the witnesses in the three Matthean expressions where C W f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 ℳ consistently have the longer reading. Codex Bezae, however, has the shorter reading in Mt 11.15 as opposed to Mt 13.9,43, which may indicate that the scribe has not systematically ‘corrected’ a shorter reading unless this process is viewed as purely accidental. Equally, Codex Sinaiticus has the shorter reading in Mt 13.9,43 but a later hand corrected it into a longer version. The systematically short reading supported by Codex Vaticanus in Matthew is significant and makes it similar to Codex Bezae. The impressively diverse list of manuscripts on both sides makes a firm conclusion problematic, except to say that it points to an early process of correction.

In terms of internal evidence, the expression ‘*He who has ears, let him hear*’ is read three times in Matthew (Mt 11.15; 13.9,43), all with variant (i.e. shorter or longer) readings, twice in Mark (Mk 4.9,23) and twice in Luke (Lk 8.8; 14.35), the latter four occurrences being all secure (i.e. as longer forms). From the reading of NA<sup>28</sup> it appears that the expression is consistently ‘shorter’ in Codex Vaticanus across the three Matthean passages and it can be easily concluded that any difference, *viz.*, the ‘addition’ of the infinitive ἀκούειν is a corruption aimed at restoring the ‘usual’ fuller form found in the Lukan and Markan readings despite the difference in the wording [ὁ ἔχων/ὁς ἔχει/τις ἔχει] ὅσα ἀκούειν ἀκούέτω. On the other hand, the Semitic context and the use of the Jewish Scriptures could equally have associated the infinitive ἀκούειν with ‘ears,’ as it does for the verb ‘to see’ with ‘eyes,’ or the verb ‘to understand’ with ‘mind.’<sup>58</sup>

Conversely, the reason for which Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus could have withdrawn the infinitive perhaps because of homoiarcton where the scribe’s eye slipped with the sequence ΔΚΟΥΕ(ΙΝ)ΔΚΟΥΕ(ΤΩ) where the consistency of Codex Vaticanus in Matthew can be appealed to. Furthermore, the infinitive may have been found unnecessary in Greek, which led to its withdrawal in ℞B.

<sup>57</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 24, 27.

<sup>58</sup> The phrase ‘ears to listen and eyes to see’ actually appears only once in the Jewish Scriptures (Dt 29.3MT ועינים לראות ואזניים לשמע) translated in the Septuagint as *καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν καὶ ὅσα ἀκούειν*.

Finally, it is to be noticed that the variant reading in Mt 13.9 is suggested to be a harmonisation in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, yet not in Mt 11.15 or 13.43.<sup>59</sup> Whether the shorter or longer reading is more likely to be original, claiming that the Bezan reading is harmonistic in Mt 13.9 bears a too highly preconceived idea of a harmonising tendency, as the Alexandrian reading could equally be signalled as harmonising (with Luke and Mark). Thus, arguing for a harmonisation in these passages on the basis of Codex Vaticanus may be spurious as Burgon once noticed.<sup>60</sup> An atomistic analysis conceals a more frequent phenomenon where the original reading cannot be identified with certainty.<sup>61</sup>

### I. 3. 2. 'Be Thrown into Gehenna'

The reference to γέεννα ('hell') can be found 11 times in various places in the Synoptic Gospels (none in John), out of which seven involve the concept of 'going/being thrown to hell,' where the verb is subject to textual variation. Only once, however, is the reading of Codex Bezae considered in the critical apparatus to be a harmonising within a Matthean passage.

#### Mt 5.29 – par. Mk 9.47

Mt 5.29 εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου ἵ βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν

ⲓ ρ) ἀπέλθῃ D 700<sup>mg</sup> it sy<sup>s.c</sup> (mae) bo | txt (βληθῆ) B *rell*

Mk 9.47 Καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἐκβαλε αὐτήν· καλὸν σε ἐστὶν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὁ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα ἵ βληθῆναι εἰς ὀτὴν γέενναν<sup>τ</sup>.

ⲓ ἀπελθεῖν D f<sup>1</sup> 1424 i sy<sup>s</sup> | εἰσελθεῖν 1241 c | -W | txt (βληθῆναι) B *rell* | °B L Ψ 28 |<sup>τ</sup> τοῦ πυρός A C K N Γ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 1241 1424 2542 ℣ lat sy<sup>p.h</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup> | txt (om.) ⋈ B D L W Δ Ψ 0274 f<sup>1</sup> 28 565 579 700 892 it sy<sup>s</sup> co

The expression 'to go into hell' (ἀπελθεῖν εἰς γέενναν) and '[be] thrown into hell' (βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν) is found in Matthew, Mark, and once in a slightly modified way in

<sup>59</sup> The reason may be that Mt 11.15 has no parallel in the Synoptics, though a vertical harmonisation could well be possible.

<sup>60</sup> '[...] Therefore, when Tischendorf in the preceding verse on the sole authority of ⋈B and a few Latin copies, omitting the word ἀκούει[...], I can but reflect on the utter insecure basis on which the Revisers and the school which they follow would remodel the inspired Text.' (J.W. BURGON, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, being the Sequel to 'The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels'* [Reprint 1998; London: G. Bell, 1896] 38).

<sup>61</sup> '...recovering the original contexts in which [Jesus] so spoke is an impossible task' (DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 259).

Luke,<sup>62</sup> in apparently interchangeable and variant forms. Both expressions are scattered across the Synoptic Gospels in contexts of warnings. The prepositional phrase εἰς γέενναν associated with each of these two verbs can be found in Mt 5.29f; 18.9, Mk 9.43, 45, 47 and Lk 12.5.<sup>63</sup> The critical apparatus suggests that the reading in Mt 5.39D.05 is a harmonisation (with Mark) since Codex Vaticanus reads βληθῆναι as opposed to ἀπελθεῖν.

In terms of external evidence, the alleged harmonistic Bezan reading μὴ [...] ἀπέλθῃ εἰς γέενναν is supported by the marginal readings in the Caesarean minuscule 700, Latin and Syriac versions, as well as the Middle Egyptian and Bohairic against βληθῆ in the rest of the textual tradition. Apparently, Mk 9.47D.05 also uses the verb ἀπελθεῖν. Actually, if one follows this reasoning and compares the Matthean and Markan verses, technically Codex Vaticanus also harmonises with Mark, since Mk 9.47B.03 reads βληθῆναι, a feature which is not mentioned in the critical apparatus.<sup>64</sup> However, the problem is greater than the bare comparison of the two verses since the apparently editorial redundancy occurs in both Matthew and Mark. Lastly, these verses are also found in a repeated manner (Mt 18.8-9) referring to the hand and eye,<sup>65</sup> which are almost firm in their entirety (only αὐτόν and καὶ εἰ, the imperatives ἔκκοψον and ἔξελε and the word order of two coordinated nouns are variant), and specifically, it is the verb βληθῆναι which is used in the expression of *going to hell*:

Mt 18.8 Εἰ δὲ ἡ χεὶρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλὸν σοὶ ἐστὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἢ κυλλὸν ἢ χωλὸν<sup>2</sup>  
ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον

Mt 18.9 καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλὸν σοὶ ἐστὶν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν  
ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμούς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

Before proceeding further, the following table will help to identify the points of variation in the seven occurrences where γέενναν is mentioned with either βληθῆναι or ἀπελθεῖν. The reference and the text, along with the variant readings and corresponding support are indicated:

Ref.	Text	Variant Reading	Support
Mt 5.29	βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν	<i>txt</i> ⲓ ρ) ἀπέλθῃ	Ⲡ B <i>rell</i> D 700 <sup>mg</sup> it sy <sup>s.c</sup> (mae) bo

<sup>62</sup> Only once (Lk 12.5), Luke uses the expression ‘cast into hell’ (ἐμβαλλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν) which appears in a passage which is not shared by the other Synoptics. The variant reading reflects the two forms βαλλεῖν (Ⲡ<sup>45</sup> [D] W; Mcion<sup>T.E</sup> Cl<sup>ex Thd</sup>) and ἐμβαλλεῖν (Ⲡ B *rell*).

<sup>63</sup> Once, in Mt 5.22, εἰς τὴν γέενναν (τοῦ πυρός) is used with the verb ‘to be guilty of,’ ἔνοχος ἔσται.

<sup>64</sup> Moreover, the absence of article before γέεννα in B L Ψ 28 would further support the possibility of a harmonization.

<sup>65</sup> A section has been dedicated to the doublets (Chapter 6 I. 2). However, since the present intention is to deal with frequently occurring expressions, the verse will be treated here.

CHAPTER 6

Ref.	Text	Variant Reading	Support
Mt 5.30	Ὶεις γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ	<i>txt</i>	Ⲡ B <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 892 sy <sup>c</sup> bo (lat mae)
		Ὶ(29) βληθῆῃ εἰς γέενναν	K (L) W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 565 579 700 [1241 1424 1844] Ⲙ f vg <sup>ms</sup> sy <sup>h</sup> sa
		□ και ει ...ἀπέλθῃ	D vg <sup>ms</sup> sy <sup>s</sup> bo <sup>ms</sup>
Mt 18.9	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν	no <i>vll</i>	Ⲡ B <i>rell</i>
Mk 9.43	Ὶἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν	<i>txt</i>	Ⲡ <sup>2b</sup> A B C K N Γ Θ 565 579 1241 1424 2542] Ⲙ aur l vg (sy <sup>h</sup> sa) bo <sup>(mss)</sup>
		εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	Ⲡ <sup>2b</sup> A B C K N Γ Θ 565 579 1241 1424 2542] Ⲙ aur l vg (sy <sup>h</sup> ) (sa) bo <sup>(mss)</sup>
		Ὶἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν	Ⲡ <sup>2a</sup> L Δ Ψ 0274 700 892 sy <sup>p</sup>
		ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	W <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 28 sy <sup>s</sup>
		βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, ὅπου ἐστὶν τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	D k (a f)
		εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	Ⲡ* (r <sup>1</sup> )
Mk 9.45	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν <sup>T F</sup>	<i>txt</i>	Ⲡ B C L W Δ Ψ 0274 <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 28 892 b k sy <sup>s,p</sup> co
		<sup>T</sup> (43) εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	A D K N Γ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 565 579 (700) 1241 1424 2542] Ⲙ (lat sy <sup>h</sup> )
		<sup>F</sup> [46]	<i>ut</i> [44]
Mk 9.47	Ὶβληθῆναι εἰς ὁτὴν γέενναν	<i>txt</i>	Ⲡ B <i>rell</i> (° B L Ψ 28)
		Ὶἀπελθεῖν εἰσελθεῖν	D <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 1424 i sy <sup>s</sup>   -W 1241 c
Lk 12.5	Ὶἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν	<i>txt</i>	Ⲡ B <i>rell</i>
		Ὶβαλεῖν	Ⲡ <sup>45</sup> (D) W; Mcion <sup>T,E</sup> C  <sup>ex Thd</sup>

Table 17: Textual Variants of the Expression εἰς τὴν γέενναν

From this table, it can be seen that the two verbs ἀπελθεῖν and βληθῆναι (and partially their word order) almost systematically and all across the Gospels undergo variation

(with the notable but isolated exception of the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, which always uses εἰσηλθεῖν). Luke has a different type of variation (ἐμβαλεῖν/βαλεῖν) and only Mt 18.9 and Mk 9.45 have no variation. Finally, the Markan and Matthean passages, subject to major variation, all reflect the passages on the Temptations to Sin starting with the anaphora καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζη σε, thereby potentially pointing to a single source, whether Mark, Matthew or a different document.

Since Mark displays the highest number of occurrences of this expression, I will start with Mk 9.43-48. In order to simplify the examination of the multiple variant readings, I have summarised the text of Mk 9.43-47, according to the part of the body involved, as supported by four main representatives i.e. Codices Bezae, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus:

Reference	Body Part	B.03	Σ.01*	D.05	A.02
Mk 9.43	χείρ (hand)	ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν ὅπου ἐστὶν τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον
Mk 9.44		<i>om.</i>	<i>om.</i>	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...
Mk 9.45	πούς (foot)	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν	εἰς τὴν γέενναν βληθῆναι	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον
Mk 9.46		<i>om.</i>	<i>om.</i>	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...
Mk 9.47	ὄφθαλμός (eye)	βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν	ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν	βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός
Mk 9.48		ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννεται	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ<ξ>...	ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ...

Table 18: Distribution of the Expression βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν in Mark

From this grid, it can be seen that the verbs are variant despite the apparent ‘fixed’ nature of the expression and that no MS has a systematic preference, and they even change the wording in the course of the same passage (Codex Vaticanus reads ἀπελθεῖν then twice βληθῆναι, Codex Bezae reads βληθῆναι twice then ἀπελθεῖν, Codex Sinaiticus reads εἰσελθεῖν then twice βληθῆναι).



Mt 5.29 and 5.30 both start with the pattern ‘if your right [eye/hand] causes you to sin’ [...] ‘it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be thrown into hell.’ The final clause of each verse ends in a slightly different way (different verb and different position of the prepositional phrase) in Codex Vaticanus and most of the other manuscripts:

v. 29 ...βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν,

v.30...εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ

Nevertheless, Codex Bezae, supported by a wide range of early versions (Latin, Syriac, Bohairic), does not read the second verse. As a result, the external evidence cannot determine that the variant reading in Bezae is harmonising despite the decision apparently taken in the critical apparatus.

In terms of internal evidence, the structure of Mt 5.29-30 may well have induced scribal slips because of homoioarcton or homoioteleuton:

Mt 5.29–30

[29]

a. εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε,

b. ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·

c. συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν.

(v.30 is absent in Codex Bezae)

[30]

a. καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιὰ σου χεὶρ σκανδαλίζει σε,

b. ἔκκοψον αὐτήν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·

c. συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου

βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν

[εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ    ⋈ B f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 sy<sup>c</sup> bo (lat mae)    [v/

K (L) W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 700

[1241 1424 /844 ℣ f vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> sa

Therefore it is usually explained that the reason for omitting v.30 is that the scribe’s eye, as he wrote Codex Bezae, would have slipped because of the similarity of the two verses [29a]//[30a],[29b]//[30b],[29c]//[30c]. However this explanation is somewhat weak, specifically because the end of [29c] and [30c] cannot be identified with certainty, and also because they are different according to the manuscripts, and even different within some manuscripts: indeed, if one understands the ⋈B reading as more likely to be original, [29c] would end with βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν and [30c] with εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ which would be sufficiently different not to have the two verses mixed up by a scribal slip. In consequence, the reason why Codex Bezae reads the prepositional phrase in post verbal position is then still unexplained. If the Byzantine/Caesarean (W Θ f<sup>13</sup> ℣) reading is chosen as generating the others, the double ending could constitute a cause for homoioteleuton. That said, Codex Bezae has ἀπέλθῃ εἰς γέενναν in [30c], which would remain inexplicable. Finally and strikingly, the association ‘eye’/ἀπελθεῖν/εἰς γέενναν is

*only* to be found in Mk 9.47D.05. Therefore I would like to speculate that the text of Matthew had originally only *one* sentence involving only the *eye* (at the expense of the foot and the hand, which add nothing to Jesus' saying) and that the ending of Mt 5.29 was precisely ἀπέλθῃ εἰς γέενναν. In consequence, whether Matthew took his text from Mark (Markan priority) or if both took it from a different source, the reading of a single reference to the eye and the expression ἀπελθεῖν εἰς γέενναν in Mt 5.29D.05 and in Mk 9.47D.05 could explain the omission of Mt 5.30. The reading ἀπηλθῃ in Mt 5.29D.05 would not be a harmonisation but the original text standing before Matthew and Mark, with Mark expanding it into a triadic form (well repeated in the 'Western' text with its triple reference to the worm not dying and the fire not quenching), and Matthew into a doublet (see I. 3. 2 in this chapter). Interestingly, Matthew's doublet in 18.8f mentions the hand and foot only, not the eye, which would confirm that Mt 5.29D.05 may well be a reference to the eye (only) as a complement to the foot/hand again confirming the original absence of Mt 5.30.

In conclusion, if a harmonisation of Mt D.05 with Mark were to be considered, it is shown here that the external evidence based on Mt 5.29 and Mk 9.47 is not satisfactory, particularly since Codex Vaticanus could potentially reflect a similar harmonisation, and since the internal evidence based on a homoioteleuton or homoioarcton would neither explain the absence of Mt 5.30D.05 nor the reading ἀπελθεῖν. Finally, there is no obvious explanation for the use of either ἀπελθεῖν or βληθῆναι since all appear in a non-systematic way unrelated to a specific MS. The reconstruction proposed in the previous paragraph has the merit of explaining the Bezan readings from Mark to Matthew in this context, even beyond the originality or secondary character of ἀπελθῃ, and although it is somewhat speculative, it has to be said that any explanation would involve the reconstruction of the initial text. In any case, harmonisation is an unsatisfactory explanation of Mt 5.29D.05 and conceals a more complex picture of the text's construction.

### I. 3. 3. 'Resurrect on the Third Day'

This section will be devoted to the frequently occurring expression 'rise on the third day,' which is mentioned in the combination of ἐγερθῆναι/ἀναστῆναι with τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ/μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, potentially offering four different ways of expressing the same idea. There are three occurrences where Bezan variants in Matthew are proposed in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> as potentially harmonistic. Because all three variants reflect the same expression, they will be considered together.

#### Mt 16.21; 17.23; 20.13 and parallels

Mt 16.21 Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν<sup>2</sup> καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων<sup>τ</sup> καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *p*) μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι D (it) bo | *txt* (τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι) B  
*rell*

Further vll: Ἰησοῦς Χρῆστος & B\* sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo | -&<sup>2a</sup> 579 892; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | txt (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) &<sup>2b</sup> C K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1241 1424 (-ὁ B<sup>2</sup> D) ℳ latt sy sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | C K L W Γ Δ 565 ℳ lat | txt (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν) & B D Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 e sy; (Ir<sup>lat</sup>) | τ τοῦ λαοῦ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 1424 mae

Mt 17.23 καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔγερθήσεται. καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα

ρ) μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας D it sy<sup>s</sup> bo | txt (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) B rell

Further vll: K | ρ) ἀναστήσεται B f<sup>13</sup> 892 1424

Mt 20.19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτόν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔγερθήσεται

ρ) ἀναστήσεται B C<sup>2</sup> D K W Γ Δ Θ 085 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 1241 1424 l844 ℳ | txt (ἐγερθήσεται) & C\* L N Z 579 892; Or

These three occurrences in Matthew correspond to Jesus announcing his resurrection. All expressions are indicated in the NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonising either in terms of the use of ‘three days’ and ‘rise’ or a mix thereof across Matthew and parallels. In what follows, I will use the term ‘combination’ to refer to the clause generated from one of the verbs ἐγείρω/ἀνίστημι (in any grammatical form) and τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ/μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (or alternative form: τῇ τρίτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ/μεθ’ ἡμέρας τρεῖς).

In terms of external evidence, the observations of the three occurrences in question show that there is a high level of instability across the textual tradition with regard to the combination. On the basis of NA<sup>28</sup>, there are 15 references to the ‘third day’ in the Gospels and Paul’s Epistles and eight of them concern Jesus’ direct announcement of his resurrection. I will consider here only the latter type of occurrences.<sup>66</sup> In order to see the different interactions between the Synoptics and the textual tradition for the combination in question, I will present the Greek tradition according to Swanson’s *Matthew* of the three announcements in full to see the variation in the alternation τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ/μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας as well as ἐγερθῆναι/ἀναστῆναι (as infinitive or indicative future passives):<sup>67</sup>

#	Reference	Verb	‘Third Day’	‘Rise’	Support	ρ)
1 <sup>st</sup>	Mt 16.21	ἀποκτ.	τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθῆναι ἐγερθήσεται	B rell 28 565 1424	

<sup>66</sup> Also in the contexts excluding Jesus’ direct announcement of his resurrection in the Gospels, the phrases involving ‘the third day’ exist in both states, i.e. ‘on the third day’ or ‘after three days’: in Lk 2.46 (The Boy Jesus at the Temple, μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς) and Jn. 2.1 (Wedding at Cana, τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ B Θ f<sup>13</sup>, ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ & D rell) they are variant, while in similar contexts, i.e. Mt 27.63 (The Guard at the Tomb, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας), Lk. 24.7 (Two Men at the Tomb Reveal The Risen Christ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ), and Lk 24.46 (Jesus Appears to the Emmaus Disciples, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ), they are always secure.

<sup>67</sup> Only the Greek evidence will be presented here as found in Swanson’s *Matthew*.

CHAPTER 6

			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστῆναι	157	
			.....ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθῆναι	33	
			μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἀναστῆναι	D	p)
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Mt 17.23	ἀποκτ.	τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθήσεται	K <i>rell</i>	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστήσεται	B <sup>c</sup> f <sup>13</sup> 788 1346*	p)
			τῆ τρί ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστήσεται	B*	
			τῆ τρις ἡμέρα	ἀναστήσεται	1346 <sup>c</sup>	
		ἀποκτ.	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἐγερθήσεται	D	p)
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Mt 20.19	μαστ/ἀποκτ.	τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστήσεται	B C <sup>c</sup> D ℞ K M U W Δ Θ Π f <sup>1.13</sup> 2 28 33 157 565 700 788 1071 1346 1424	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθήσεται	℞ C* L N 579	p)
1 <sup>st</sup>	Mk 8.31	ἀποκ.	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἀναστῆναι	℞ B D N 2* <i>rell</i>	
			μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἐγερθῆναι	1424	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστῆναι	W f <sup>1.13</sup> 28 565	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθῆναι	579	
			τῆ .....	.....	33	
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Mk 9.31	ἀποκ.	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἀναστήσεται	℞ B C* D L Δ Ψ 579	
		ἀποκ.	τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστήσεται	A C <sup>c</sup> K M N U ℞ Θ Π 2 118 124 157 565 700 1071 1424	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθήσεται	f <sup>1.13</sup>	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγείρεται	W 28	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Mk 10.34	μαστ/ἀποκ.	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	ἀναστήσεται	℞ B C D L Δ Ψ	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστήσεται	A ℞ K M N U W Θ Π f <sup>1.13</sup> 2 28 157 565 700 1071	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθήσεται	1424	
#	Reference	Verb	'Third Day'	'Rise'	Support	p)
1 <sup>st</sup>	Lk 9.22	ἀποκ.	τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθῆναι	℞ B ℞ <sup>75c</sup> ℞ L M U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Ψ 2 28 33 124 700 788 1071 1424	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἀναστῆναι	A C K Π f <sup>1</sup> 69 157 565	
			τῆ τρίτῃ	ἐγερθῆναι	℞ <sup>75*</sup>	
			τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ	ἐγερθήσεται	1346	
			μεθ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς	ἀναστῆναι	D	

2<sup>nd</sup> -----

3 <sup>rd</sup>	Lk 18.33 μαστ/ἀποκ. τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη	ἀναστήσεται	B D W 124 <i>rell</i>
	τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη	ἐγερθήσεται	L 157
	τῆ ἡμέρα τρίτη	ἀναστήσεται	Θ
	τῆ τρίτη ἡμέρα	ἀναστήσεται	Δ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565 <sup>sup</sup> 1071 1424

Table 19: Textual Variants of the Expression ‘On The Third Day’

From this grid, it appears that all combinations are truly possible and that there is no clear tendency for a manuscript to ‘stick’ to one specific combination. Thus, there seems to be no systematic use for the nominal phrase or verb. Among all the manuscripts involved, the earliest are Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae (and  $\mathfrak{B}^{75*}$  in the case of Lk 9.22) which only agree from time to time. The consideration of Codex Bezae in Matthew even leads to the surprising observation that Codex Bezae almost consistently reads the opposite to that of Codex Vaticanus: even when Codex Vaticanus alternates the verbs, Codex Bezae does likewise, but the other way round. In Mark, all three manuscripts agree with the reading *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται/ἀναστῆναι* against the other combination in many other manuscripts. Luke’s first announcement (Lk 9.22) also shows a variety of readings, but Codex Bezae reads the combination *μεθ’ ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἀναστῆναι* (supported by the Old Latin and Marcion),<sup>68</sup> while the second is not included by Luke and the last announcement (18.33) is mostly read *τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη ἀναστήσεται*.<sup>69</sup> From the consideration of the external evidence, early witnesses such as  $\aleph$ BD testify that the change could have been effected in the 4<sup>th</sup> c., and that scribes did not stick to any fixed formulation.

In terms of internal evidence, no clear pattern appears from the three Matthean announcements that could be explained as potentially original. However, the consistency of the three announcements in the principal uncials of Mark, ignoring the actual diversity of its readings in other witnesses, could lead to the conclusion that Mark has influenced Bezae Matthew.<sup>70</sup> However, such a conclusion would further ignore that (1) the

<sup>68</sup> Marcion is excluded from Swanson’s Matthew. It could be further argued that the Bezae reading reflects the Latin way of specifying the ‘third day’ as ‘after three days’ (confirmed by the support of the Old Latin) though the support of Sinaitic Syriac and Bohairic Coptic would need to be explained. Harris explains the Bezae reading as an influence from the Latin but does not look at the Synoptic question: ‘We shall find that the Latin translator renders such a term as τῆ τρίτη ἡμέρα by *post tres dies*, or *post tertium diem*. When, therefore, the reviser with his little Latin and less Greek goes over the text, he finds an apparent discord between the languages; although the translator meant by *post tertium diem*, *the third day after*. And so he corrects the Greek.’ (J.R. HARRIS, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* [Cambridge: University Press, 1891] 91).

<sup>69</sup> The absence of variants in the entire verse in NA<sup>28</sup> is noteworthy. There are still variant readings mentioned in Swanson’s edition.

<sup>70</sup> Only the first edition of Metzger’s *Commentary* refers to a comment on these variant readings, while the second edition removed any such mention (‘μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας’ as ‘typically Markan and was con-

firm reading τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in the third Matthean announcement is different from the first two; (2) the first two announcements are systematically different from those in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus with regard to both phrases and verbs; (3) if Mt D.05 had been influenced by Mark, it is odd that the verb ἐγεροθήσεται, in the second announcement, was not changed into ἀναστήσεται; (4) there could equally be a vertical harmonisation in all manuscripts favouring the reference to ‘τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ’.

As has often been observed in this examination, the harmonistic character of the first two Bezan expressions seems to be driven by the external evidence in general and the importance of  $\aleph B$  in particular. A deeper analysis of the internal evidence, however, reveals a more complex picture than is usually observed.

Summarizing the evidence, any readings can be the result of either a vertical or horizontal harmonisation. Furthermore, it looks as if only the identical wording of Mt D.05 and the Markan reading is responsible for its classification as a harmonisation, resulting from the theory of Markan priority. However, this explanation only partially applies since ἐγεροθήσεται is read in Mt 17.23D.05 or τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in Mt 20.19D.05. Even if it could still be held that the scribe was distracted once or twice across the Gospels when copying the text, the conclusion that a harmonisation has taken place in Codex Bezae fails to consider the three occurrences, the irregularity of the readings, the multiplicity of alternative readings, and the erratic wording of the combination. Rather, this is a true textual difficulty, very possibly linked to theological causes. Indeed, the correction is more likely to have occurred from ‘after three days’ into ‘on the third day’ to reflect the final form of the creed promulgated during the First Council of Nicaea in 325, but gradually emerging in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. and 3<sup>rd</sup> c., which may have generated ‘orthodox corruptions’ with the change of ‘after three days’ into ‘on the third day,’ thus making ‘after three days’ a more likely original reading. Equally, ἐγείρω may be thought to better echo a Christological reference to Jesus’ resurrection than ἀνίστημι which has a causal sense (‘make to rise up’). Since this theological consideration was specifically discussed in the first centuries of the Church,<sup>71</sup> it may be speculated that ἐγεροθήσεται is a corrected form of an original ἀνίστημι.

The Bezan reading could well mirror a common text initially shared by the three Evangelists, which was then corrected to match early Christian faith at an early stage. Some manuscripts reflect this correction, others the absence of correction, leaving to the diversity of the two forms found. That the scribe has harmonised with a parallel Gospel in Codex Bezae is a little far-fetched, given the interwoven possibilities.

---

formed by copyists to the much more frequently used expression, τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ’ (METZGER, *Commentary*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., 107).

<sup>71</sup> H.K. MACARTHUR, “On the Third Day”, *NTS* 18 (1971) 81-6.

## I. 3. 4. ‘(His) Disciples’

In this last case of frequently repeated expressions, the presence or absence of the personal pronoun in the phrase οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ) is addressed (hereafter longer and shorter reading respectively).

The question of the presence of the pronoun in this specific phrase was addressed by Elliott in a publication in which he argued for its originality.<sup>72</sup> After analysing the shorter and longer readings used to describe ‘the/his disciples,’ he concludes that, even though discordant readings are generally more likely to be original, the longer reading is probably the original form. Ellingworth revisited this analysis and briefly commented on each occurrence of the phrase in the Gospels, considering both external and internal evidence and argued for the authenticity of the ‘atypical’ reading within a manuscript’s ‘typical’ usage: ‘where a witness (or group of witnesses) contains a reading contrary to its general tendency, this could be considered a supplementary factor in favour of such a reading.’<sup>73</sup>

The presence of the pronoun in the phrase in question can also be linked to the history of Greek which moved between Post-Classical Greek where ‘the sense of belongingness was lost with the consequence that we now have an accumulation of unemphatic personal and possessive pronouns’<sup>74</sup> and Koine Greek where the noun may or may not bear a pronoun to simply translate e.g. ‘disciples,’ despite the apparent redundancy. The presence or absence of possessive pronouns in variant readings may simply reflect these linguistic changes. I now turn to the example of Mt 14.15, where the fuller reading as found in Codex Bezae is suggested to be a harmonisation in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>.

Mt 14.15 – par. Mk 6.35//Lk 9.12

Mt 14.15a ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἑλέγοντες, Ἐρημὸς ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρεῖληθεν<sup>2</sup>. ἀπόλυσον<sup>ϕ</sup> τοὺς ὄχλους

<sup>ϕ</sup> p) αὐτοῦ C D K L W Γ Δ Θ 0106<sup>vid</sup> f<sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy | txt (οἱ μαθηταί) ℞ B Z<sup>vid</sup> 33 892 l844 l2211 b e k

Further vll: <sup>ϕ</sup> ℞ Z f<sup>1</sup> l844 l2211 | txt (ἤδη παρεῖληθεν) B C D K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 0106 f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ latt sy<sup>h</sup> | <sup>ϕ</sup> οὐν ℞ C Z f<sup>1</sup> 892 1241 sy<sup>hmg</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | txt (om.) B D K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 0106 f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1424 l844 l2211 ℳ lat sy sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo<sup>ms</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Elliott summarises the question of the pronoun in the phrase ‘[his] disciples’ in his review of the first edition of Metzger’s *Commentary* (see J.K. ELLIOTT, ‘United Bible Societies’ Textual Commentary Evaluated,’ *NovT* (17) 1975 130–50 [140]) and discussed the matter again in *ibid.*, ‘Μαθητής with a Possessive in the New Testament,’ *TZ* 35 (1979) 300-4; reprinted in *ibid.*, *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Cordoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1992) 139-45.

<sup>73</sup> P. ELLINGWORTH, ‘(His) Disciples,’ *NovT* 42 (2000) 114–26 [125].

<sup>74</sup> CARAGOUNIS, *New Testament Greek*, 147.

Mk 6.35 Καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς ἡγενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή.

Ἦγιν– Ⲙ D | αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν (λέγοντες N) N Γ 1241 1424 Ⲙ (aur c f q sy<sup>h</sup>) | αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν (+ αὐτῷ f<sup>13</sup>) W f<sup>1.13</sup> 28 2542 | οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ (-I2211) D K 565 700 I2211 (a b) sy<sup>s</sup> | οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν A | οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον Ⲙ\*Θ 579 | txt (αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον) Ⲙ<sup>2</sup> B L Δ 0187<sup>vid</sup> 33 892

Lk 9.12 Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλω κώμας καὶ ἄγρους καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὐρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

Ἦp) τοὺς ὄχλους Ⲡ<sup>75</sup> Ⲙ<sup>2a</sup> 565 1424 lat sy<sup>c.p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | τούς A C D K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ξ Ψ 33 565 892 1424 Ⲙ | εἰς τοὺς 892 | txt (om.) Ⲡ<sup>75</sup> Ⲙ B f<sup>1.13</sup> 579 700 1241 2542 | ⲠD

Mt 14.15 occurs at the beginning of the ‘Feeding of the Five Thousand,’ where ‘(his) disciples’ come to see Jesus to ask him to send the crowds away. The passage is paralleled in Mark (6.35) with a firm inclusion of the personal pronoun: NA<sup>28</sup> analyses therefore the presence of αὐτοῦ as a harmonistic addition in Mt 14.15D.05. Although in Luke, the disciples are referred to as οἱ δώδεκα, making technically the above reference a Mt-Lk parallel, a quick investigation of all occurrences of οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ) in the Synoptic Gospels shows equivalent variations of this kind hence its inclusion here.

In terms of external evidence, the tradition is fairly evenly divided between two strands of tradition, some supporting the presence of the pronoun (D *et al.*) and some its absence (Ⲙ B *et al.*) in Mt 14.15. The optional use of the pronoun in Greek (and Latin) is responsible for the divided support even within the Old Latin witnesses: it seems that the scribes have deliberately amended the text they were copying one way or the other. In Mark, while the longer reading is firmly attested, the position or even the presence of αὐτῷ after προσελθόντες (Ⲙ\* Θ 579 may have missed the first αὐτῷ but a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus added the pronoun) is variant. This phenomenon cannot be coincidental since stylistic considerations could have led to the deletion of the personal pronoun, to avoid repetition. The external evidence cannot be conclusive unless one takes ⲘB as having greater weight than the manuscripts supporting the longer reading.

In terms of internal evidence, Mark and Matthew are in strong agreement, while Luke is only contextually close. Mk 6.35 reads the possessive pronoun across the textual tradition, though the clause involved (αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον) is highly variant with four different word orders and two different tenses, implying different meanings (specifically, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον in B.03 and its support which means ‘coming to him, the disciples said,’ while προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, in D.05 and allies which means ‘approaching, his disciples said to him’) while Mat-



thew clearly reads ‘coming to him,’ and only the personal pronoun is uncertain. Therefore, the question is more about the potential interaction of *αὐτῷ* with *αὐτοῦ* than a pure harmonisation with Mark.

If we focus on the variant readings *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ/οἱ μαθηταί* involving Codex Bezae in Matthew, there are nine Mt D.05/B.03 agreements<sup>75</sup> against ten disagreements.<sup>76</sup> One further reference (Mt 8.21) shows divided manuscript support for the shorter and longer reading but Codex Bezae is lacunose there and it cannot be said whether the agreement would have been with or against Codex Vaticanus (the support of the Old Latin, which includes d5, in Mt 8.21 would still be an argument ‘against’). The critical apparatus suggests that Mt 14.15D.05 is harmonising (implicitly with Mark), most probably on the basis that Mark firmly has the longer reading. However, if one looks at all the variants where Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus disagree, the critical apparatus does not systematically refer to a harmonisation, particularly when the reading in *ⲚB* could potentially suggest one. In order to give a full picture, the following grid lists all the references in Matthew where *οἱ μαθηταί* (declined or not) occurs with or without *αὐτοῦ*:

Entry	References	Shorter reading	Longer reading	Pericope	Markan Parallel	Markan Reading	Support	Lukan Parallel	Lukan Reading	Support
1	Mt 8.21 (D lac.)	Ⲛ B 33 it sa	ⲧⲧ C K L N W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 Ⲫ844 Ⲫ2211 Ⲛ sy <sup>h</sup> sa	Jesus Cleanses a Leper	-	-	-	Lk 9.53	(not a disci- ple)	-
2	Mt 14.15	ⲧⲧ Ⲛ B <i>Z</i> <sup>vid</sup> 33 892 Ⲫ844 Ⲫ2211 b e k	<i>p</i> ) C D K L W Γ Δ Θ 0106 <sup>vid</sup> <i>f</i> <sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 700 1241 1424 Ⲛ lat sy	Feeding the Five Thou- sand	Mk 6.35	<i>οἱ</i> <i>μαθηταί</i> <i>αὐτοῦ</i>	all MSS but posi- tion of neigh- bouring pronoun is highly variant	Lk 9.12	<i>οἱ</i> <i>δώδεκα</i>	all MSS
3	Mt 14.22	ⲧⲧ Ⲛ C D L W	<i>p</i> ) B K P Θ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	Jesus Walks on the Wa-	Mk 6.45	<i>τοὺς</i> <i>μαθητάς</i>	all MSS	(no paral-		

<sup>75</sup> Mt 15.12,32,36; 16.5,20; 17.10; 19.25; 26.8,26.

<sup>76</sup> Mt 14.15,22; 15.33; 19.10; 26.1,36,40,45,56; 27.64.

CHAPTER 6

Entry	References	Shorter reading	Longer reading	Pericope	Markan Parallel	Markan Reading	Support	Lukan Parallel	Lukan Reading	Support
		Γ Δ 067 0106 0277 <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 700 1241 <i>pm</i> lat	565 579 892 1424 1844 12211 <i>pm</i> it vg <sup>mss</sup> sy co?	ter		αὐτοῦ		lel in (Luke)		
4	Mt 15.12	<i>txt</i> & B D Θ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 579 700 892 e	C K L N W Γ Δ 0106 <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 ℞ lat sy	Things That Defile	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Mt 15.32	& W Θ 700 1844 12211 a	<i>txt</i> B <i>rell</i>		Mk 8.1	Both shorter and longer read- ings	τοὺς <i>μαθητάς</i> ( <i>txt</i> & D L N 0131 <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 28 892 12211 latt sy <sup>h</sup> bo) τοὺς <i>μαθητάς</i> αὐτοῦ (A B K W Γ Θ <i>f</i> 13 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 2542 ℞ sy <sup>sp</sup> sa bo <sup>ms</sup> )	-	-	-
6	Mt 15.33	<i>txt</i> & B <i>f</i> 13 579 700 892 1241 lat sa <sup>mss</sup> bo	C D K L N P W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 565 1424 1844 12211 ℞ c f q sy	Feeding of the Four Thousand	Mk 8.4	οἱ <i>μαθηταὶ</i> αὐτοῦ	all MSS	-	-	-
7	Mt 15.36	<i>txt</i> & B D Θ	<i>p</i> ) C K L N P	Feeding of the Four	Mk 8.6	τοῖς <i>μαθηταῖς</i>	all MSS			

CHAPTER 6

Entry	References	Shorter reading	Longer reading	Pericope	Markan Parallel	Markan Reading	Support	Lukan Parallel	Lukan Reading	Support
		<i>f</i> <sup>1-13</sup> 33 579 700 892* 1241 c ff <sup>t</sup> bo	W Γ Δ 565 892 <sup>c</sup> 1424 l2211 ℞ lat sy	Thousand		<i>αὐτοῦ</i>				
8	Mt 16.5	<i>txt</i> & B C Θ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 892 (D 700) (e) sa <sup>ms</sup>	K L N W Γ <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424 ℞ lat sy sa <sup>mss</sup> mae bo  -Δ	The Yeast of the Phari- sees and the Sadducees	Mk 8.10 (preced- ing perico- pe)	<i>οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</i>	all MSS	-	-	-
9	Mt 16.20	<i>txt</i> & B C D 579 700 sa <sup>mss</sup>	K L W Γ Δ Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1-13</sup> 33 565 892 1241 1424 ℞ lat sy co	Peter's con- fession in Caesarea	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Mt 17.10	<i>txt</i> & L W Z Θ <i>f</i> <sup>1</sup> 33 700 892 lat sa bo <sup>pt</sup>	B C D K Γ Δ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 ℞ f ff <sup>2</sup> q sy mae bo <sup>pt</sup>	The Trans- figuration	Mk 9.11	No mention	-	-	-	-
11	Mt 19.10	℞ <sup>7vid</sup> & B Θ e ff <sup>t</sup> g <sup>1</sup> sa <sup>ms</sup> mae	<i>txt</i> ℞ <sup>25</sup> C D K L N W Z Γ Δ 078 <i>f</i> <sup>1-13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℞ lat	Teaching About Di- vorce	Mk 10.10	<i>οἱ μαθηταὶ</i>	all MSS	-	-	-

CHAPTER 6

Entry	References	Shorter reading	Longer reading	Pericope	Markan Parallel	Markan Reading	Support	Lukan Parallel	Lukan Reading	Support
			sy sa <sup>ms</sup> bo (λέγουσιν ἑαυτοῦ) μαθηταὶ [αὐτοῦ]. Ϟ <sup>25</sup> (*)							
12	Mt 19.25	txt Ϟ B C* D K L Z Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 l2211 lat sy <sup>sp</sup> sa bo	C <sup>3</sup> W Γ f <sup>1</sup> 1241 1424 Ϟ ff <sup>1</sup> sy <sup>c</sup> mae	The Rich Young Man	Mt 10.25	(πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς)	-	-	Lk 18.26	(οἱ ἀκού σαν- τες)
13	Mt 26.1	□D	txt B rell	The Plot to Kill Jesus	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Mt 26.8	txt Ϟ <sup>45vid64v</sup> id Ϟ B D L Θ 0293 f <sup>13</sup> 33 700 892 l844 lat co	A K W Γ Δ f <sup>1</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 Ϟ c f q sy sa <sup>ms</sup>							
15	Mt 26.26	txt B rell	0298 1424	Lord's Sup- per	Mk 14.22	αὐτοῖς	all MSS	Lk 22.19	πρὸς αὐτοῦς	all MSS
16	Mt 26.36	txt B K L Γ Δ 067 0281 33 565 579 700 892 1241 Ϟ vg <sup>ms</sup> sy <sup>h</sup> sa <sup>ms</sup>	Ϟ A C D W f <sup>1</sup> 1424 lat sy <sup>sp</sup> sa <sup>ms</sup> mae bo	Jesus prays in Gethsem- ane	Mk 14.32	τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ	all MSS	Lk 22.39	οἱ μαθη- ταὶ	all MSS
17	Mt 26.40	txt Ϟ B rell	D* it vg <sup>d</sup> sy <sup>sp</sup> bo	Jesus prays in Gethsem- ane	Mk 14.37	αὐτοῦς	all MSS	Lk 22.46 45	πρὸς τοῦς μαθη- τάς	all MSS

Entry	References	Shorter reading	Longer reading	Pericope	Markan Parallel	Markan Reading	Support	Lukan Parallel	Lukan Reading	Support
18	Mt 26.45	<i>txt</i> & B <i>rell</i>	D W Γ 579 ℳ lat sy <sup>sp</sup> bo	Jesus prays in Gethsemane	Mk 14.41	αὐτοῖς	all MSS	Lk 22.45	πρὸς τοὺς μαθηταίς	all MSS
19	Mt 26.56	<i>txt</i> & D <i>rell</i>	B 0281 <sup>vid</sup> it vg <sup>mss</sup> sy <sup>s</sup> sa	The Betrayal and Arrest of Jesus	No exact parallel	-	-	No exact parallel	-	-
20	Mt 27.64	& B arm geo <sup>pt</sup>	<i>txt</i> A C D K L W Γ Δ Θ <sup>f</sup> 1,13 33 565 579 <sup>vid</sup> 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℳ latt sy co	The Guard at the Tomb	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 20: Textual Variants of the Expression οἱ μαθηταί (αὐτοῦ)

From the above grid and the distribution of the *p*)-sign, it can be observed that there are clearly some inconsistencies in the identification of οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ as harmonic:

- Entries 2, 3, 7: the external evidence is divided and the longer reading is identified as a harmonisation (*p*)-sign) as the parallel passage(s) consistently attest to the longer reading.
- Entries 6, 8, 11, 17, 18: the external evidence is divided but the reading in Matthew that corresponds to the one in the parallel passage is not identified as a harmonisation (no *p*)-sign).
- Entry 5: the parallel passages are themselves divided with some manuscripts having the shorter reading and some the longer reading, as in Matthew, a fact which is overlooked (Mt 15.32B.03 could be regarded as harmonising with Mk 8.1B.03 and Mt 15.32&.01 could be regarded as harmonising with Mk 8.1&.01, while Mt 15.32D.05 would have the discordant reading against Mk 8.1D.05)
- Entries 1, 4, 9, 10, 14, 19, 20: there are no parallel passages to the Matthean reading or the reference to the disciples appears implicitly (e.g. ἐπηρώτων), or via a pronoun (e.g. αὐτοῖς, πρὸς αὐτούς) or an alternative wording (οἱ δώδεκα) and the weight of the external evidence is instrumental in the choice of the most probable original reading.

It is noteworthy that the presence of other pronouns (*αὐτοῖς, πρὸς αὐτοῦς*, etc.) can also interact and potentially influence the addition or withdrawal of *αὐτοῦ* in the phrase *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, whether in Matthew or more generally in the Synoptics. For this reason, I completed the above picture by counting the number of occurrences where the phrase *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* in Matthew occurs with or without a variant reading (irrespective of the external evidence), including the presence or absence of pronouns or pronominal phrases in the close vicinity, forms that can themselves be subject to variation.<sup>77</sup> I presented these results in the following table (‘Neighbouring Extra Pronoun’ is abbreviated ‘NEP’):

No <i>vll</i> in the Expression <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ)</i>					<i>vll</i> in the Expression <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ)</i>								
Shorter Reading <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ</i>		Longer Reading <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</i>			Shorter Reading <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ</i>		Longer Reading <i>οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</i>						
NEP		No NEP		NEP		No NEP		NEP		No NEP			
<i>novll</i>	<i>vll</i>	<i>novll</i>		<i>vll</i>		<i>novll</i>		<i>vll</i>		<i>vll</i>			
10	0	6		10	3	9		10	1	5	2	1	3

Table 21: Influence of a Neighbouring Pronoun on the Expression *οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ)*

From this grid, it appears that most of the time, there is neither influence of the neighbouring pronoun nor tendency to complement a shorter reading with a pronoun or simplify a longer reading because of a ‘crowded’ sentence. Further, from the previous table, there is no clear tendency in Bezan Matthew to ‘add’ or ‘withdraw’ in favour of a shorter or longer reading in the expression in question. The presence of a pronoun close by may or may not have led to a stylistic withdrawal of the one attached to *μαθηταί*. In five cases (Mt 15.12,33; 17.10; 21.6; 26.56) the shorter reading is attested, while in only two cases (Mt 19.10<sup>78</sup> and 27.64) another pronoun is in the vicinity of *οἱ μαθηταὶ [αὐτοῦ]*. In fact, a discussion over the presence or absence of the pronoun as a result of harmonisation needs to be initiated.

Neither answer to the variation is conclusive: the *p*-sign is inconsistently used in the critical apparatus and the choice is mostly based on the external evidence that favours the Alexandrian reading.

#### I. 4. Conclusions

This section has extracted all the occurrences of a harmonistic reading in Matthew in Codex Bezae according to their references in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> when they correspond to a repeated expression. It appears that, while it can be justified that the readings in Bezan Matthew are a harmonisation with another parallel from the Synoptics on the basis of the comparison of a discordant against a non-discordant reading, the high number of parallel occurrences leads to the absence of any unequivocal conclusion.

<sup>77</sup> It is assumed that the reason for the presence or absence of neighbouring pronouns is the rearrangement aimed at simplifying the construction of the sentence by the editor.

<sup>78</sup> Interestingly, the presence of the direct object pronoun in this verse is itself subject to variation, being absent in  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}^*$ .

Furthermore, the reference to a ‘typical language of the Evangelist’ can rarely be applied to such expressions as they vary both lexically or grammatically within the same Gospel.

Now that the alleged harmonising character of the variant readings in Mt D.05 appearing in a synoptic context within repeated expressions has been assessed, I will now turn to instances where the Bezan variants are identified as harmonising without appearing in a context of repeated information, which will take up the rest of this chapter.

## II. Harmonisations of Bezan Matthew with Both Luke and Mark in Non-Repeated Expressions

The first section is devoted to potentially harmonistic variant readings in Bezan Matthew where the material in question is similar to Mark and Luke, without being the consequence of repetitions as defined above. Furthermore, while the analyses in ‘Mk-Mt passages only’ and ‘Mt-Lk passages only’ were guided by the firmness/variance of the other Gospel and mostly revealed two strands of variant readings, the harmonisation or cross-harmonisation between three Synoptics is too complex to be presented in this way. What I will do, because of the nature of the study involving three Gospels, is to differentiate between a claimed harmonistic reading reflected in the three Synoptics with (a) a high similarity or a verbatim agreement between the two other Gospels (II. 1) and (b) a low to moderate agreement in one or the other Gospel only, representing either a Matthew-Mark harmonisation within a Lukan context, or a Matthew-Luke harmonisation within a Markan context (II. 2).

### II. 1. High Verbal to Verbatim Agreement

There are ten instances of apparent harmonising variants in Mt D.05 according to the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> that can be judged to be in almost verbatim agreement with Mark and/or Luke. This section will analyse the said *vll* in decreasing order of length. It is noteworthy that six out of the ten instances involve one word only.

#### Mt 3.17 – par. Mk 1.11//Lk 3.22

Mt 3.17 και ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα<sup>τ</sup>· ὁὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

ῥ*p*) συ εἶ D a sy<sup>s.c</sup>; Ir | *txt* (οὗτός ἐστιν) B *rell*

Further *vll*: <sup>τ</sup>πρὸς αὐτόν D a b g<sup>1</sup> h sy<sup>s.c</sup>

Mk 1.11 και φωνὴ ῥέγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἰ· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

ῥ–έγένετο  $\aleph^*$  D ff<sup>2</sup> t | ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἠκούσθη (+λέγουσα l2211) Θ 28 565 l2211 | ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ W sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* (έγένετο)  $\aleph^2$  A B K L P Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 l844  $\aleph$  lat sy<sup>p</sup> co

Lk 3.22 καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ἵως περιστερὰν ἱεπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι· ἵσὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα ᾠ.

ἵωσει A K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1-13</sup> 565 700 892 1424 2542 l2211 ℣ | txt ℞<sup>4</sup> ⋈ B D L  
W 070 33 579 1241 | ἵεις D | ἵ(Ps 2.7) Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά  
σε D it; Ju (Cl) Meth Hil Aug

Mt 3.17 (par. Mk 1.11//Lk 3.22)<sup>79</sup> describes the voice heard at Jesus' Baptism. In Matthew, Jesus is described as the Son of God either in the second person singular (Mt D.05, Mark and Luke) or in the third person singular (Mt B.03), which may suggest a harmonisation in Codex Bezae and allies. The verses share a similar wording with the Transfiguration episode which also involves a voice from heaven. The analogy between the Transfiguration and the Baptism is well known.<sup>80</sup> This section discusses the text-critical issues of this specific case.

In terms of external evidence, the overwhelming weight of witnesses is against Codex Bezae, a reading which is only supported by one Latin manuscript alone, two early Syriac versions and Irenaeus suggesting the existence of the variant as early as the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE.

The Markan form is firm across the tradition. In most of the manuscripts reading the Lukan verse (including ⋈BD), the first verbal clause reflects Ps 2.7LXX, but there is external support for a mixed wording. The following presentation displays the differences between B.03 and D.05 across the Synoptics:

Mt 3.17D	συ εἶ	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,	ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.
Mt 3.17B	οὗτός ἐστιν	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,	ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.
Mk 1.11BD	σὺ εἶ	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.
Lk 3.22D	Υἱός μου εἶ σύ,		ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε
Lk 3.22B	σὺ εἶ	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

In this respect, Mt 3.17D.05 is not a harmonisation with Luke since Bezae Luke uses a different word order and a different second clause. It may be harmonising with Mark, however, though only in the first clause. The form found in Codex Vaticanus and its support is widely attested. It could be argued that the presence of ἐν ᾧ with of σὺ εἶ called for linguistic improvement, resulting in οὗτός ἐστιν.

<sup>79</sup> Jn 1.34 is also a parallel to the passage but will not be considered here because of the special status of the Gospel of John vis-a-vis the Synoptic Gospels.

<sup>80</sup> See G. DALMAN and D.M. KAY, *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language: Introduction and Fundamental Ideas*, Volume 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909) 276; D.A. LEE, *Transfiguration* (London: Continuum, 2004) 26; L.A. HUIZENGA, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden; Boston: E.J. Brill, 2009) 209; C.H. TALBERT, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010) 58.



CHAPTER 6

The wording involved here is highly similar to the Transfiguration episode found at Mt 17.5 (par. Mk 1.11//Lk 3.22), and therefore needs to be examined despite the difficulty of the multiple readings involved in the three Synoptics reproduced here below with their critical apparatus with only the variant reading worthy of mention:

Mt 17.5 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup>.

ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ C K L W Γ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy mae | αὐτοῦ ἀκούσατε Δ | *txt* (ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ) ℞ B D *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 l2211 ff<sup>1</sup>

Mk 9.7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός<sup>1</sup> ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup>.

Ἦν ἐξελεξαμην 0131 | *p*) ἐν ᾧ εὐδοκήσα ℞<sup>1</sup> Δ | ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ A K N Γ *f*<sup>13</sup> 700 2542 ℳ b f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>h</sup> | ἀκούσατε αὐτοῦ 28 1424 | -Δ | *txt* ℞ B C D L W Θ Ψ 0131 *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 892 1241 l844 lat | ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ ℞<sup>45vid</sup> W *f*<sup>13</sup> 1424 l844 | ἦλθεν A D K N Γ Θ (*f*<sup>13</sup> 28) 33 565 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>s.h</sup> sa | -W *f*<sup>1</sup> aur c k sy<sup>p</sup> | *txt* ℞ B C L Δ Ψ 579 892 (2542) l844 sy<sup>hmg</sup> bo

Lk 9.35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἰκούετε.

*p*) ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ A C\* K N P W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700 1424 2542 l844 ℳ it vg<sup>cl.ww</sup> sy<sup>(c)p.h.</sup>; Mcion<sup>T.E</sup> | *p*) ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα (εὐδόκησα C<sup>3</sup>) C<sup>3</sup> D Ψ (bo<sup>ms</sup>) | ἐκλεκτός Θ l | *txt* (ἐκλελεγμένος) ℞<sup>45-75</sup> ℞ B L Ξ 579 892 1241 a aur ff<sup>2</sup> l vg<sup>st</sup> sy<sup>s.hmg</sup> co

For convenience and because of the high density in variant readings, I have isolated the portion where B.03 and D.05 (and ℞.01 in the case where the B.03/D.05 reading is the same) are involved in the Transfiguration pericope:

Mt 17.5 [firm]	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα
Mk 9.7B.03/D.05	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ ἀγαπητός,
Mk 9.7℞ <sup>1</sup> <i>p</i> )	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα
Lk 9.35D.05 <i>p</i> )	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα
Lk 9.35B.03	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου	ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος

The first clause of the Transfiguration passage shares a high degree of similarity across the Synoptics with the Baptism pericope in most of the manuscripts (*contra* Bezae). The second (dependant) clause is either present (Mt, Mk -℞<sup>1</sup>, Lk -D) or absent

(Mk - $\aleph^1$ , Lk B), illustrating a difficulty during the construction of the text itself. Therefore, the words during Jesus' baptism shared by almost all manuscripts except Codex Bezae and support could technically be a harmonisation with the present episode as if the scribe would 'remember' that the voice makes the declaration in the third person. Be that as it may, what the voice said at the Baptism may well have raised a concern at a very early stage with its potential interaction with the Transfiguration, a difficulty that is reflected in the amount of alternative readings in the Synoptics.

Returning to the analysis of the Baptism pericope and in terms of internal evidence, the first clause of Matthew ( $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ) supports a dependent clause ( $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tilde{\omega} \epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$ ) which reflects a different structure from that in Luke and Mark with their two independent clauses ( $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota} \dots \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omicron\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$ ). The Bezan expression in Matthew is therefore not a blind copy and paste or a memorisation of an earlier text. It is unlikely that the scribe harmonised with the first part of Mark and left  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omicron\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$ . Interestingly, the Lukan expression is not firm: Codex Bezae, Old Latin manuscripts and Church Fathers read the exact wording of Ps 2.7LXX (itself identical to the MT:  $\text{בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך}$ ). Notably, Massaux mentions that Justin Martyr—who overwhelmingly used Matthew—quotes  $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota} \sigma\upsilon$  which is close to the Bezan reading (though in the reverse word order).<sup>81</sup> Ehrman proposed an analysis which accepts the Bezan reading as original and explains that the Alexandrian reading  $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota} \delta\acute{\omicron} \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma, \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omicron\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$  was an early correction for anti-adoptionistic reasons.<sup>82</sup>

In short, the voice at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration differ in Codex Bezae by delivering two distinct messages in the way they are expressed (God to Jesus in the first passage, God to the three disciples in the second one) against a single way in the majority reading (to the crowds with  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  during the Transfiguration, and to Jesus with  $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}$  in the Baptism episode). The variant in Mt 3.17D.05 should therefore not be analysed alone without taking account of the voice at the Transfiguration. The comparison between the two passages shows an underlying problem in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE as to the significance of the person of Jesus as Son of God which led to early variant readings. It may well be the the reading in Codex Bezae is an early trace of the text before it underwent 'theological diorthosis.'

#### Mt 9.15a – par. Mk 2.19 //Lk 5.34-35

Mt 9.15a  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\omicron} \Upsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma, \text{Μη δύνανται οί υίοι τοῦ Γυμφῶνος Ἑπενθεῖν ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστιν ὁ νυμφίος};$

<sup>81</sup> JUSTIN, *Dial.* 53,6 (É. MASSAUX, *L'influence de Matthieu dans la Littérature chrétienne avant St. Irénée* [Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950] 536).  $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon$  is in preverbal position in Justin's quote, highlighting therefore the fact of being 'my Son' while Codex Bezae has the personal pronoun before the verb emphasising thereby an address to Jesus which may have been understood as adoptionistic and subsequently removed. This Bezan order is that found in Ps 2.7LXX.

<sup>82</sup> EHRMANN, *Orthodox Corruption*, 68 and note 110. This is also noted in A.W. ARGYLE, 'Evidence for the view that St Luke used St Matthew's Gospel,' *JBL* (1964) 83, 390–6 (391) referring to Streeter's study.

CHAPTER 6

<sup>ϕ</sup>*p*) νηστεύειν D W (579) 1424 it sy<sup>p.hmg</sup> sa mae bo<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* (πενθεῖν)  
B *rell*

Further vll: <sup>ϕ</sup>νυμφίου D latt | *txt* (νυμφῶνος) B *rell*

Mk 2.19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς <sup>□</sup>ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν <sup>ϕ</sup>ὃ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστιν νηστεύειν; <sup>□</sup>ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν

<sup>□</sup>D W 28 1424 b i q bo<sup>mss</sup> | <sup>□</sup>1 (*om.* ὅσον) *p*) D W *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 700 it vg<sup>mss</sup> | ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν **Ϟ**<sup>88</sup> L 2542 | μεθ' αὐτῶν ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον A K Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 579<sup>vid</sup> 1424 **℣** f q sy<sup>h</sup> | ἔχουσιν μεθ' αὐτῶν τὸν νυμφίον 1241 l2211 | *txt* (ὅσον) **Ⲛ** B C Θ 28 (ἔχουσιν 565) 892 lat co

Lk 5.34 ὁ δὲ <sup>ο</sup> Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Μὴ ῥδύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ῥἐν <sup>ϕ</sup>ὃ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστιν ῥ<sup>1</sup>ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι; [35] ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

<sup>ο</sup>A K Γ Δ Θ Ψ 565 700 1424 **℣** lat sy<sup>p</sup> | *txt* **Ϟ**<sup>4</sup> **Ⲛ** B C D L W **Ξ** *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 892 1241 2542 l844 l2211 *f* sy<sup>h</sup> co | ῥ*p*) δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ **Ⲛ**\* D it sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>; (Mcion<sup>T</sup>) | ῥἐφ' ὅσον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν D e | ῥ<sup>1</sup> νηστεύειν **Ⲛ**\* D it; (Mcion<sup>T</sup>) | ποιῆσαι νηστεύειν A C K L W Γ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 (579) 700 892 1424 l844 l2211 **℣** | *txt* (ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι) **Ⲛ**<sup>2</sup> B **Ξ** 1241

Mt 9.15 is the second verse of the pericope on the Question about Fasting (Mt 9.14–17). It comes immediately after John's disciples question 'Why do we and the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not fast?' (9.14). Jesus' answer is (9.15) in most of the textual tradition is 'Can the wedding guests<sup>83</sup> mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?' Codex Bezae reads 'fast' instead of 'mourn.'

In terms of external evidence, νηστεύειν, 'to fast,' is found in the Byzantine Codex Washingtonianus and minuscule 1424 as well as early versions (Latin, Syriac, Coptic) conferring the reading a wide range of geographical evidence, which cannot be disregarded. Πενθεῖν, 'to mourn,' is supported by the rest of the tradition which is judged to be more original on the basis of the principles of textual criticism that accord primary

<sup>83</sup> Slightly beyond the subject, it is equally interesting to note that the three Synoptics mention *the wedding guests* as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, except Codex Bezae in Matthew which reads with the support of the Old Latin οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφίου, i.e. *the son of the bridegroom*. Νυμφών, νυμφῶνος, ὁ is technically 'the wedding hall' or 'the bridal chamber' while οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος are the 'bridegroom's attendants, that group of the wedding guests who stood closest to the groom and played an essential part in the wedding ceremony' (BDAG, s.v. νυμφῶν). Similarly, νυμφίος is a *bridegroom* (BDAG s.v. νυμφίος) translated in the LXX from the Hebrew בָּרִמָּה. The Bezan reading οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος looks like the *lectio difficilior* ('the sons of the bridegroom!') and would have been corrected into νυμφῶν. Since, apart from this exception, the entire tradition has οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, the Bezan reading in Matthew may seem to reflect a Latinism although Davies and Allison explain this phrase as a Semitism from the Aramaic *bene hahuppa* quoted in *t. Ber.* 2.18, *b. Sukka* 25b (DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 109).

importance to the external weight of attestation. What should be noted is that while the external evidence is against Codex Bezae, the geographical support for its reading is broad.

In terms of internal evidence, the structure of the three Gospels is highly similar but rather complex as the synoptic display below demonstrates. For the sake of convenience, Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus are presented here synoptically in their parallel passages:

Mt 9.15 D	Mt 9.15 B	Mk 2.19 D	Mk 2.19 B	Lk 5.34 D	Lk 5.34 B
καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
αὐτοῖς ὁ	αὐτοῖς ὁ	αὐτοῖς	αὐτοῖς ὁ	εἶπεν πρὸς	εἶπεν πρὸς
Ἰησοῦς,	Ἰησοῦς,		Ἰησοῦς,	αὐτούς,	αὐτούς,
Μήτηρ	Μὴ δύνανται	Μὴ δύνανται	Μὴ δύνανται	Μὴ δύνανται	Μὴ δύνασθε
δύνανται οἱ	οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ	οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ	οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ	οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ	τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ
υἱοὶ τοῦ	νυμφῶνος	νυμφῶνος	νυμφῶνος	νυμφῶνος	νυμφῶνος
νυμφίου	πενθεῖν				
νηστεύειν					
ἐφ' ὅσον	ἐφ' ὅσον	ἐν ᾧ	ἐν ᾧ	ἐφ' ὅσον	ἐν ᾧ
		ὁ νυμφίος	ὁ νυμφίος	ἔχουσιν τὸν	ὁ νυμφίος
				νυμφίον	
μετ' αὐτῶν	μετ' αὐτῶν	μετ' αὐτῶν	μετ' αὐτῶν	μετ' εαυτῶν	μετ' αὐτῶν
ἐστὶν ὁ	ἐστὶν ὁ	ἐστὶν	ἐστὶν		ἐστὶν
νυμφίος;	νυμφίος;				ποιῆσαι
		νηστεύειν	νηστεύειν;	νηστεύειν;	νηστεύσαι;
			ὅσον χρόνον		
			ἔχουσιν τὸν		
			νυμφίον		
			μετ' αὐτῶν		
			οὐ δύνανται		
			νηστεύειν		

**Table 22: Textual Comparison of Mt 9.15a and Parallels in D.05 and B.03**

The three texts are very similar but arranged in a different fashion. The position of the verb *πενθεῖν/νηστεύειν* immediately after the subject in Matthew raises the question of whether a simple harmonisation with the other two Gospels is possible or whether Matthew underwent an early correction with no influence from the other Gospels. Actually, neither in Mark nor Luke nor in the entire Matthean passage is *mourning* in question: the entire passage is about *fasting*. Furthermore, Mark has variant readings that may be traced in Matthew and Luke.<sup>84</sup> The conclusion that a harmonisation has taken place arises more from the lack of an answer to the question about why scribes and al-

<sup>84</sup> MwQH-theorists would see the Lukan structure as a direct import of Matthew's against a more difficult explanation for having Matthew and Luke independently merge Mark's passage in the same way.

most the entire textual tradition would insert and copy the verb ‘to mourn’ in the middle of a passage dedicated to fasting during the presence of the bridegroom. The reason for introducing *πενθεῖν* could be that Matthew substituted ‘mourn’ for ‘fast’ to ‘strengthen the allusion to Jesus’ death’ and also, that ‘perhaps we should recall 6.16-8, where fasting is assumed but the outward signs of mourning are prohibited.’<sup>85</sup> If the passage is entirely on fasting, it could be speculated that the early transmission of the tradition focused on Jesus’ death, hence the use of ‘mourn.’

Mt 9.15b – par. Mk 2.20//Lk 5.35

Mt 9.15b ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> *p*) ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμεραῖς D it sy<sup>hmg</sup> | *txt (om.)* B *rell*

Mk 2.20 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

No *vll*

Lk 5.35 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

No *vll*

In this verse, Jesus concludes a passage about the Coming of the Son of Man saying ‘The days will come, when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast.’ The verse ends with ‘they will fast’ in Codex Vaticanus and allies, while Codex Bezae reads ‘they will fast *in those days*’ supported by versional evidence only. Mt 9.15a itself has a variant which is discussed below.

In terms of external evidence, although the agreement between the Old Latin and sy<sup>hmg</sup> may be interesting in itself,<sup>86</sup> the absence of manuscript evidence from the rest of the tradition causes it to be viewed as a potential addition. Notably, the Markan and Lukan forms of the phrase in question are firm.

In terms of internal evidence, the proximity between all Synoptics may well lead to the conclusion that Mt 9.15D.05 reflects a harmonistic addition with most probably

<sup>85</sup> DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 109, n.12. See also Lagrange: ‘Ce n’était pas changer de thème puisque le jeûne des Sémites était bien un usage de deuil ; on pourrait donc voir ici une nuance originale. Cependant, dans le contexte, il semble que Mt a voulu préparer l’impression que produit la fin du verset où la cause de la disparition du fiancé revêt donc un aspect spécialement funèbre’ (M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L’Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* [Paris: J. Gabalda, 1923] 183).

<sup>86</sup> See Ejenobo’s comment: ‘Agreements, for example, between Old Latin and Old Syriac witnesses may sometimes be due to common influence from Tatian’s Diatessaron’ (D.T. EJENOBO, ‘Textual Criticism: Its Value to New Testament Studies,’ *Asia Journal of Theology* 22 [2008] 126–41 [129]). On the other hand, Amphoux suggests that Bezan readings are often pre-diatessaronic ones (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Matthieu*, 256–7).

Luke (because of the plural ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις *contra* the singular ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in Mark – the two formulae are virtually equivalent) aimed at ‘supplementing the apparent missing part’ of the verse.

However, despite high verbal proximity, there is a notable difference over the place of the word καί as shown in the schematic presentation below:

Mt 9.15B.03	ὅταν	καὶ	τότε	ο
Mt 9.15D.05	ὅταν	καὶ	τότε	ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
Mk 2.20	ὅταν	καὶ	τότε	ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
Lk 5.35	καὶ ὅταν	τότε	ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις	

Indeed, it appears that the conjunction καί in Matthew and Mark appears in Luke as an adverb that can be translated into ‘and precisely when...then,’ which sounds like an emphatic rewording of his source (whether Mk, Mt or Q). In Matthew and Mark, the presence of the temporal adverb τότε, indicating a time for something to happen (‘then,’ ‘at that time’), does theoretically not require ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις as a further temporal clause and can easily be seen as superfluous and prompted emendation. Assuming Markan priority, it could be understood that Matthew either deleted the second temporary indication (as in Mt 9.15B.03 because of the cumbersome double temporal reference)<sup>87</sup> or turned the singular reference into a plural because of the earlier reference (ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι) as in Mt 9.15D.05 reflecting practice in the Scriptures.<sup>88</sup> The assimilation of Mt 9.15D.05 with Lk 5.35 is therefore not that obvious in view of the different place of καί in Luke.

The main verbal clause ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι and the adverb τότε have most probably resulted in the deliberate omission of ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις as an expression that was regarded as a redundant repetition. A deliberate or even accidental harmonisation is unlikely despite its being an evident conclusion at first sight.<sup>89</sup>

#### Mt 16.20 – par. Mk 8.30//Lk 9.21

Mt 16.20 τότε Ἦ δισεπίλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς Ἦ ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι Ἦ αὐτός ἐστιν Ἦ ὁ Χριστός

Ἦ *p*) ἐπετίμησεν B\* D e sy<sup>c</sup>; Or<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* (δισεπίλατο) & B<sup>2</sup> C K L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup>  
565 (579) 700 892 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> co; Or<sup>mss</sup>

Further *vll*: Ἦ αὐτοῦ K L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy co |  
*txt* (*om.*) & B C D 579 700 sa<sup>mss</sup> | Ἦ οὗτος D Θ q | Ἦ Ἰησοῦς &<sup>2</sup> C (D) K W Γ

<sup>87</sup> Davies and Allison simply note ‘Matthew also omitted Mark’s concluding “in that day” putting the relevant question in a footnote ‘was our Evangelist bothered by the singular “day”?’ (*Matthew*, II, 111 and note 128).

<sup>88</sup> The Scriptures prefer the singular (250x) translating ביום ההוא to the plural (75x) translating בימים ההם (Aramaic ביהון יומתא / בהון יומא / בהו יומא).

<sup>89</sup> From these considerations, and going a little further, MwQH-theorists may even propose that Luke knew the Bezan text of Matthew and took from it. Furthermore, the plural form in Mt 9.15D.05 and Lk 5.35 can constitute a ‘minor agreement’ against Mk 2.20.

579 892 1241 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo | txt (om.) ℞\* B L Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700  
1424 it sy<sup>c-p</sup> sa; Or

Mk 8.30 και ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

No vll<sup>90</sup>

Lk 9.21 Ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

No vll

Mt 16.20 immediately follows Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi and introduces Jesus' request for silence: 'Then he *warned* (διστείλατο) the disciples that they should tell no one that he was the Christ.' The word designated in italics is read using a Greek synonym (ἐπετίμησεν) in Codex Bezae in contrast to Codex Vaticanus and its support.

In terms of external evidence, there are again two distinct strands of textual tradition where 'warned' is attested: ἐπετίμησεν is supported by Codex Bezae and the original hand of Codex Vaticanus as well as early versions (one unique Latin witness, Palatinus e, and the Curetonian Syriac) and few manuscripts written by Origen, while διστείλατο, an apparent synonym,<sup>91</sup> is supported by a wide spectrum of key Greek manuscripts and equally early versions (℞ C L W Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> ℣ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> co Or<sup>mss</sup>) along with a later hand of Codex Vaticanus, thereby pointing to an early variant. The absence of a variant reading in Mk 8.30 and Lk 9.21 presumably led the Committee to conclude that Bezan Matthew is harmonising but the reason for Codex Vaticanus to correct its earlier original form may reflect the desire for improved language.<sup>92</sup> In this latter case, the Bezan reading probably takes the text back to the original Matthean redaction. Finally, the agreement between Codex Bezae and the original hand of Codex Vaticanus would need further investigation, especially in trying to understand what prompted a later hand to correct ἐπετίμησεν into διστείλατο.

In terms of internal evidence, διαστέλλομαι (τίνι) is a rare verb (always used in the middle voice, intransitively) which, apart from this passage, is found once in Matthew, none in Luke and five times in Mark.<sup>93</sup> The form displays no vll in Mark where Jesus requests the disciples not to disclose anything (with reference to μηδενί, *nobody*): the resurrection of a girl (Mk 5.43), the healing of a deaf man (Mk 7.36 x2), the yeast of the

<sup>90</sup> There is no variation according to Nestle-Aland. The consultation of the facsimile of the MS shows that in place of εἰπωσιν is read λέφωσιν in Codex Bezae. Ἐπετίμησεν is however firm.

<sup>91</sup> διαστέλλω (always in the middle διαστέλλομαι) to *order, give orders* (BDAG, s.v. διαστέλλω and διστελλόμεν) and ἐπιτιμάω *rebuke, reprove, censure* also *speak seriously, warn* in order to prevent an action or bring to an end (BDAG, s.v. ἐπιτιμάω).

<sup>92</sup> The testimony of Origen is of lesser importance here because of the fact that the Church Father (Fathers in general) could equally well harmonise for the same reasons as a scribe would (indeed, several manuscripts containing Origen's sermons include both verbs).

<sup>93</sup> The verb is used quite widely in the LXX (54 times) either with this meaning or that of *distinguishing from something*.

Pharisees (Mk 8.15) and after the Transfiguration only (Mk 9.9). In this respect, its use in Mark seems to be closely associated with the Messianic Secret (Jesus' command for silence regarding his messianic status), a relatively modern, though disputed, concept identified by Wrede as a redactional Markan motif.<sup>94</sup>

On the opposite, ἐπιτιμάω is more commonly used in the Gospels (Mt: 6 [7 B\*D], Lk: 11, Mk: 9)<sup>95</sup> than in the LXX (10 times). In Matthew, the verb is found when Jesus rebukes the winds and the sea (Mt 8.26), the crowds after healing the man with the withered hand (12.16), the possessed child's father (17.17), when the crowds rebuke the two blind men (20.31), Peter to Jesus (16.22), and the disciples to the children (19.13).

Summarising the passages where Jesus commands silence, it can be noticed that the verb introducing the command not to talk about the Christ in Matthew can either be λέγω, σιγάω, παραγγέλλω (with no variant reading) or the two verbs in question in this section:

Context	Matthew	Mark	Luke
Jesus Cleans a Leper	8.4 λέγει	1.44 λέγει	5.12 παρήγγειλεν
Jesus Heals a Deaf Man	-----	7.36 διεστείλατο	-
Peter's Confession	16.20 διεστείλατο (v/ ἐπετίμησεν B*D)	8.30 ἐπετίμησεν	9.21 ἐπιτιμήσας
Girl Restored to Life	-----	5.43 διεστείλατο	8.56 παρήγγειλεν
Deaf Man	-----	7.36 διεστείλατο	-----
Transfiguration	17.9 ἐνετείλατο	9.9 διεστείλατο	9.37 ἐσίγησαν

Table 23: Textual Variants of the Expression *To Command Silence*

The above reasoning comes to contradictory conclusions if the original reading is questioned. Indeed, both verbs may be equally explained as generating the other: ἐπιτιμάω could have been substituted for διαστέλλομαι being in more common use and as a harmonising correction to match the potential same textual origin as Mk 8.30-33 on Peter's Confession. The Markan use of διαστέλλομαι seems to reflect instances where the Messianic Secret is involved. The use of ἐπετίμησεν in Mk 8.30 instead of διαστέλλομαι would have been deliberately chosen by Mark because of the obviously different nature of the context of Peter's confession. Therefore, the original reading in Mt 16.20 is difficult to identify with certainty from assumptions on scribal habits: however, if Matthew drew from Mark, Matthew could well have naturally taken the same verb as evidenced in Codex Bezae. Conversely, Matthew may have been more familiar with the more widespread use of διαστέλλομαι, explanation that would in turn support the other strand of tradition. In any case, the authorial adaptation of Mark by Matthew becomes conceivable as opposed to a discussion on scribal habits due to the interwoven nature of the words.

<sup>94</sup> W. WREDE, *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J.C.G. GRIEG; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971).

<sup>95</sup> Mk 1.25; 3.12; 4.39; 8.30,32-33; 9.25; 10.13,48; Lk 4.35,39,41; 8.24; 9.21,42,55; 17.3; 18.15,39; 19.39; 23.40. There is either no variant reading at all in this verse, or, if any, the verb ἐπιτιμάω would not be altered.



## CHAPTER 6

Although the Bezan reading does look like a harmonisation, the above discussion suggests that the fact that both verbs can be found in parallel passages in related contexts makes a conclusion towards harmonisation far from being straightforward.

Mt 19.20 – par. Mk 10.20//Lk 18.21

Mt 19.20 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος, ὅτι πάντα ταῦτα ἐφύλαξα ἑκ νεότητός μου;

<sup>⊥p</sup>) ἐκ νεότητός μου (-D) ⑈<sup>2</sup> C D K W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700<sup>c</sup> 892 1241 1424  
12211 ℣ it vg<sup>cl</sup> sy co; Cyr † *txt* (om.) ⑈\* B L Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 579 700\* lat; Cyp

Further vll: ὅτι πάντα πάντα B D K Γ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 892 1424 *pm* ff<sup>d</sup> † *txt* (πάντα ταῦτα)  
⑈ C L W Δ Θ 33 565 579 700 1241 12211 *pm* sy<sup>h</sup>

Mk 10.20 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητός μου.

<sup>⊥</sup> ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (ἔφη C) A C D K N W Γ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 28 565 700 1241 1424  
2542 1844 12211 ℣ latt sy † *txt* ⑈ B Δ Ψ 0274 579 892 co

Lk 18.21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξα ἑκ νεότητός μου.

<sup>⊥p</sup>) μου ⑈ A K L N P W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 078 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424  
2542 ℣ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> † *txt* B D l

This verse occurs in the passage of the encounter of Jesus with the Rich Young Man. With reference to the commandments, the young man says ‘All these I have observed’ (D.05 ‘adds’ ‘from [my] youth,’ ἐκ νεότητός μου). This prepositional phrase is found in numerous manuscripts, with Codex Bezae omitting the pronoun.

In terms of external evidence, the presence or absence of ἐκ νεότητός μου is equally divided into two streams of early and diverse geographical support. Interestingly, two manuscripts, Codex Sinaiticus and minuscule 700, witness some corrections towards the longer reading. The testimony of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, the shorter reading against a longer reading and the similarity with other Gospels, tilt against the Bezan reading on the basis of traditional text-critical rules.<sup>96</sup> The longer reading ἐκ νεότητός without pronoun found in Bezan Matthew is identical to the form in the Lukan parallel (Lk 18.23B.03/D.05) where Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae share the absence of the pronoun against most of the textual tradition. Therefore the presence or absence of the pronoun along with the shorter or longer reading appear as changes creating two strands of tradition that happened as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. In terms of internal evidence, Mt

<sup>96</sup> ‘The scribes of many witnesses assimilated the account to the Synoptics by adding ἐκ νεότητός μου (Mk 10.20) or ἐκ νεότητός (Lk 18.21).’ (METZGER, *Commentary*, 40).

19.20D.05 is close to both Mark and Luke,<sup>97</sup> although the aorist active 1<sup>st</sup> p. sg. ἐφύλαξα is common to Matthew and Luke against Mark who has the aorist middle 1<sup>st</sup> p. sg. ἐφυλαξάμην – from φυλάσσω, an important verb in the Jewish concept of ‘keeping’ (Heb. רמז) ‘the Law,’ ‘the [Lord’s] word,’ ‘the ways,’ or ‘the precepts.’<sup>98</sup> In the Jewish Scriptures, the verb is rarely found with the complement ‘from my youth’ (מנערי, sometimes with ‘until now,’ עדהיוס הזה).<sup>99</sup> In this respect, the shorter reading would indeed sound closer to the Scriptures.

Moreover, the presence of ἐκ νεότητός μου seems to be redundant or even useless because of the presence of the subject νεανίσκος, ‘young man.’ Indeed, at the beginning of the Synoptic passages, the person in question is different: Matthew speaks of εἷς ‘one person’ (19.16) and so does Mark (10.17), without referring to a *young man* specifically, a detail which is, however, mentioned later in Mt 19.20,22, while Luke speaks of τις ἄρχων ‘a certain ruler’ (Lk 18.18). In this latter Gospel, the absence of reference to age may highlight the importance of the phrase ‘from my youth’ as the person may be seen as quite experienced or senior. Beyond the question of the inclusion or not of the pronoun, the question remains whether the text of Codex Bezae reveals a harmonisation with Mark or Luke? It is hardly tenable that it should be with Mark because of the lack of circulation of this Gospel in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. CE, but more conclusively because of the use of the middle voice ἐφυλαξάμην which could be assumed to be taken *verbatim*, while it is found in the active in Matthew. The verbal proximity with Luke makes the question even more valid; however, Luke talks about a potentially older person, in the sense that he can refer to his youth. Conversely, the fact of a young person talking about his youth is strange and the longer reading may thus correspond to the harder reading. The short reading is therefore more likely to be a softened reading, resulting as a correction of a redundancy.

The *vll* in this verse should be looked at more from the point of view of the construction and transmission of the text and the literary dependence of the Synoptics rather a rapid conclusion of a harmonisation being drawn. The presence or absence of the prepositional phrase with or without pronoun is less likely to be harmonisation than the consequence of the editorial construction of the Gospels.

Potentially, there could be also a case for arguing editorial ‘fatigue’ in Matthew, betraying the use of Mark: Matthew would have originally converted the Markan ‘ἐκ νεότητός μου’ into ‘ὁ νεανίσκος’ and thereby revised the verse, which originally spoke of εἷς. It could be argued, therefore, that the longer (Bezan) reading may simply reflect the expression originally found in Matthew or his sources.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Davies and Allison claim without question an assimilation to Mark (*Matthew*, III, 46 note 40) omitting the consideration of the variant reading in Luke.

<sup>98</sup> 2 Sam. 22.22; Ps. 16.4; 17.22; 118.55,67,168; Cant. 1.6.

<sup>99</sup> In this context, we have the only example of 1Ki 18.12 מנערי אתיהוה ירא, i.e. ‘I [your servant] have revered the Lord from my youth.’ Interestingly, the LXX uses the indirect style: 1Ki 18.12LXX ὁ δοῦλος σου ἐστὶν φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ.

<sup>100</sup> From a Goulder-Farrer hypothesis point of view, the Lukan text where ἐκ νεότητος [μου] is present after ταῦτα πάντα and ἐφύλαξα may well be traced back to the text of Matthew rather than the one of

Mt 21.1 – par. Mk 11.1//Lk 19.29

Mt 21.1 Καὶ ὅτε ῥῆγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ῥῆλθον εἰς Βηθφαγῆ ῥ<sup>1</sup> εἰς τὸ Ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, τότε ῥ<sup>2</sup> Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

ῥ<sup>1</sup> *p*) πρὸς  $\aleph$  D K L N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 12211  
 $\aleph$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* (εἰς) B C 33 it

Further vll: ῥῆγγισεν C<sup>3</sup> 892 b e ff<sup>2</sup> vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>c.p</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | ῥῆλθεν  $\aleph^*$  C<sup>3</sup> W Δ 892  
 e ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c.p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae; Or | ῥ<sup>2</sup> ὁ Ἰησοῦς  $\aleph$  C K L (N) W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579  
 892 1424  $\aleph$  | ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός 1844 12211 | -1241 | *txt* (Ἰησοῦς)  
 B D 700

Mk 11.1 Καὶ ὅτε ῥῆγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ῥ εἰς Βηθφαγῆ καὶ Βηθανίαν ῥ πρὸς τὸ Ὅρος ῥ τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

ῥῆγγίζεν D it sy<sup>p</sup> | ῆγγισαν *f*<sup>13</sup> | ῥ εἰς Βηθφαγῆ Ψ | καὶ (-700) εἰς Βηθανίαν D  
 700 lat | εἰς Βηθφαγῆ καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν  $\aleph$  C Θ | εἰς Βηθσφαγῆ καὶ Βηθανίαν B<sup>2</sup> Γ  
*f*<sup>1</sup> 1241 2542 *pm* | καὶ 1-4 (εἰς Βηθφαγῆ καὶ Βηθανίαν) A | *txt* B\* K L W Δ *f*<sup>13</sup>  
 28 565 579 892 1424 1844 *pm* fl q vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>(s)</sup> sa (bo) | ῥ τὸ B

Lk 19.29 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ῆγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγῆ καὶ ῥ Βηθανία[ν] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος ῥ τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν ῥ, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν

ῥ-νία  $\aleph^*$  B D\* | *txt*  $\aleph^2$  A D<sup>1</sup> K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241  
 1424 2542 1844  $\aleph$  | ῥ τῶν Ἐλαιῶν καλούμενον D | τῶν Ἐλαιῶν K 69 (e) sy<sup>s</sup>

Mt 21 tells the story of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem and sets the preliminary scene in Bethphage, when he came *to* the Mount of Olives to call two disciples. The equivalent of English 'to' is variously attested as *πρὸς* (Codex Bezae and support) or *εἰς* (Codex Vaticanus and support). Mark and Luke consistently read *πρὸς*.

In terms of external evidence, there are again two strands of tradition attesting each of the readings, though this time *εἰς* is supported by a much smaller number of manuscripts, among which is Codex Vaticanus. The reading *πρὸς* is supported by a highly diverse group of Western, Alexandrian, Caesarean and Byzantine manuscripts, among which is the early witness of Codex Sinaiticus. Interestingly, both Mark and Luke are firm as far as the phrase *πρὸς τὸ Ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν* is concerned. Since the discordant reading is assumed to be more likely original (and is supported by Codex Vaticanus), the Bezan reading is typically regarded as a harmonisation with Mark and Luke. The external evidence weighs against the relatively isolated reading of Codex Vaticanus, but de-

---

Mark or of a lost document. The absence of the pronoun in Mt D.05 and Luke B.03/D.05 may be even more conclusive in terms of the textual transmission and construction of the NT.

spite this the alleged ‘discordance’ is taken as determinative in NA<sup>28</sup>. The witnesses involved in this *v*l are quite early and give weight to this apparently insignificant variant reading.

In terms of internal evidence, the succession of occurrences of εἰς in the verse (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...εἰς Βηθφαγή...εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν) and the use of πρὸς in the Markan and Lukan parallels may have resulted in some confusion in the prepositions at an early stage of the composition. A presentation of the three parallel verses in the D.05/B.03 texts will help to clarify the overlaps:

Mt B	Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν	εἰς Ἱερ. καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Βηθφ.	εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν
Mt D	Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν	εἰς Ἱερ. καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Βηθφ.	πρὸς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν
Mk B	Καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν	εἰς Ἱερ. εἰς Βηθφ. καὶ Βηθ.	πρὸς τὸ Ὄρος τὸ Ἐλαιῶν
Mk D	Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγιζεν	εἰς Ἱερ. εἰς Βηθφ. καὶ εἰς Βηθ.	πρὸς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν
Lk B	Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν	εἰς Βηθφ. καὶ Βηθ.	πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν
Lk D	Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν	εἰς Βηθφ. καὶ Βηθ.	πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν καλούμενον

From this display, it is seen that the Mount of Olives receives in Mark and Luke a more intense focus than in Matthew because it is specifically associated with Bethphage, which is compatible with the difference in Greek of the two prepositions: while εἰς may be defined as a preposition implying a simple geographical direction,<sup>101</sup> πρὸς is more linked to a goal in itself.<sup>102</sup> This last point makes the Mount of Olives in Mt B.03 an equal place to Bethany, whereas Bethany could be expected to receive more focus due to the events that Jesus will suffer there. Moreover, questions remain: did Jesus go *to* (εἰς) the Mount of Olives or *to* Bethphage and then *to* (πρὸς) the Mount of Olives (Mt 24.3, 26.30) or did he go straight to the Mount of Olives and then left the place before coming back there twice? The absence of reference to Bethany in Matthew also reveals a difficulty due to the high verbal agreement in all three Synoptics, which raises the question of sources. However, the similarity of the three texts can not hide the multiple differences, which resist a single source explanation. Typically, the mention of Bethany in Mk/Lk, unlike Mt, may indicate an editorial reworking: in this respect, its reference in Bezan Mark with the preposition εἰς may have also confused scribes who may have judged it as unnecessary and linked it to Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. Actually, all Synoptics mention the Mount of Olives several times with either εἰς (normal font) or πρὸς (underlined) or with either one or the other depending on manuscripts (dotted underline): Mt 21.1; 24.3; 26.30 Mk. 11.1; 13.3; 14.26 Lk. 19.29,37; 21.37; 22.39. Lastly, the repetition of the preposition εἰς in Matthew may have naturally attracted a third one as attested by Codex Vat-

<sup>101</sup> εἰς denotes a movement of the body ‘into, in, towards,’ (BDAG, s.v. εἰς).

<sup>102</sup> πρὸς with the accusative equally means *towards, to* (BDAG, s.v. πρὸς) but the succession of εἰς and πρὸς may mean here that they *go to Bethphage [which is] by the Mount of Olives* although πρὸς would demand a dative in this case.

icanus, which is reinforced by a fourth mention in the following verse: εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν.

At first sight, the presence of πρὸς in Matthew can appear as a harmonisation with Mark and/or Luke but claiming that the scribe responsible for the correction of εἰς into πρὸς would have not remembered the Markan or Lukan mention of Bethany but, on the contrary, remembered πρὸς is hardly tenable. Had harmonisation really occurred in Bezan Matthew at 21.1, it is far more likely that the scribe would have made the text ‘match’ by including ‘Bethany’ which is mentioned by Luke and Mark, rather than simply changing εἰς into πρὸς. Further, it is far more possible that the εἰς may reflect a lack of understanding on how πρὸς is more forceful with regard to the importance of the relationship of Bethany (where Jesus will be arrested and equally the initial point to its death) rather than to the Mount of Olives.<sup>103</sup>

#### Mt 21.13 –par. Mk 11.17//Lk 19.46

Mt 21.13 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Γέγραπται, Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἱ ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

ἱ p) ἐποιήσατε C D K W Γ Δ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 1424 1844 (N 700 1241 12211)  
 ℣ | πεποιήκατε f<sup>1</sup>; Or<sup>pt</sup> | txt (ποιεῖτε) ℞ B L Θ 0281 892 bo; Or<sup>pt</sup> Cyr

Mk 11.17 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν ὁ αὐτοῖς, Οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἱ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν ἱ σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

°B f<sup>13</sup> 28 2542 b sy<sup>s</sup> sa | ἱ p) ἐποιήσατε αὐτὸν ℞ C D K N W Γ f<sup>13</sup> 28 1241  
 2542 1844 (°A Θ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 1424) ℣ | txt (πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν) B L Δ  
 Ψ 892; Or

Lk 19.46 λέγων αὐτοῖς, Γέγραπται, Ἐστὶ ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς<sup>†</sup>, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

ἱ ὅτι A C D K N W Ψ 33 lat sy | -℞\* Γ Δ 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℣ it | txt ℞<sup>2</sup>  
 B L Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 892 2542 c l co | ἱ ἔστιν A C\* D K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 33 565 700 ℣ lat  
 | κληθήσεται C<sup>2</sup> 1241 1424 e r<sup>1</sup>; Epiph | txt ℞ B L f<sup>1,13</sup> 579 892 2542 c (l) co

Mt 21.13 comes right after Jesus has cleansed the Temple by overturning the tables. He quotes Jer. 7.11 about the house of his Father, and attacks his fellow Jews by saying either they ‘made’ or ‘are making’ ‘my house a den of robbers’ according to the manu-

<sup>103</sup> It could be suggested that the Mount of Olives is the key element in the verse because it triggers the evocation of its importance as the place of the scapegoat. Bethany is more directly important because it is where his apostles are, but by mentioning the relationship between Bethany and the Mount of Olives the evangelists are anticipating the significance of the role of the Mount of Olives in Jesus’ death.

scripts. The Synoptics apparently use the verb in the aorist and, apart from the variant readings involving the verb in Matthew and Mark, display overall high verbal similarity in the wording of the three parallel passages which may have led to harmonisation. The critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> is not clear as to which parallel passage Mt 21.13D.05 is claimed to be harmonising with, but the secure form in Luke or with the Bezan form of Mk 11.17 (variant).

In terms of external evidence, the textual tradition in Matthew is for once divided into *three* strands: the aorist active ἐποιήσατε is found in Codex Bezae as well as Alexandrian and Byzantine witnesses, while the perfect active πεποιήκατε is shared by only the family of minuscule *f*<sup>1</sup> and some texts of Origen and, finally, the present ποιεῖτε is read in Alexandrian (among which  $\aleph$ B) and Caesarean witnesses. Mark is divided into two clearly marked strands of tradition where the perfect πεποιήκατε is found in Codex Vaticanus and other witnesses and the aorist is attested in early and geographically diverse manuscripts including Codex Bezae and Codex Sinaiticus, as well as Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses. Lastly, the manuscripts are firm in Lk 19.56b and consistently read the aorist indicative (ἐποιήσατε). The verbal form of ποιέω is therefore disputed in both Matthew and Luke and the perfect form ἐποιήσατε is suggested as harmonising in both Gospels in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> most probably in virtue of the principle of the discordant reading being more likely to be original.<sup>104</sup> The summary below lists the manuscripts according to their tenses in Matthew, Mark and Luke to ease the outlook on the complex situation:<sup>105</sup>

Matthew	Mark	Luke	Support
ποιεῖτε	πεποιήκατε	ἐποιήσατε	B L
ποιεῖτε	ἐποιήσατε	ἐποιήσατε	$\aleph$ $\Theta$
πεποιήκατε	ἐποιήσατε	ἐποιήσατε	<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>
ἐποιήσατε	ἐποιήσατε	ἐποιήσατε	C D K M N U W $\Gamma$ $\Pi$ <i>f</i> <sup>13</sup> $\aleph$ 2 28 33 118 157 565 579 700 1071 1424

**Table 24: Textual Variants of ποιέω in Mt 21.13 and Parallels**

This comparison shows that the idea of a harmonistic reading with another Gospel, as if there were only one single tense possible in the parallel passage, is flawed and should at least be contested. By weighing the external evidence, it is clear that the change of tense occurred at an early stage of the textual transmission and that it was sufficiently important to suggest a correction. Certainly, Codex Vaticanus has the discordant reading in all three Synoptics, but it may well be that the large strand of tradition following the Bezan reading showing the same verb, simply reflects the same source amongst the Synoptics, and Jer. 7.11LXX, feature that is confirmed by the almost identi-

<sup>104</sup> Generally unnoticed, the word order between the object (αὐτόν for ὁ οἶκός μου) and each verbal form of ποιέω in Mark is different (postverbal) from that of Luke and Matthew (preverbal) making the reading technically closer to Luke.

<sup>105</sup> I restricted the manuscript evidence to the Greek tradition only by using Swanson's *Matthew*.

cal syntax. Be that as it may, the tense of the verb was disputed at an early stage and witnesses have either followed their exemplar or created only one of the three possibilities presented here.

In terms of internal evidence, the high verbal similarity in the three passages certainly makes the idea of a harmonisation attractive. It is notable that Jer. 7.11LXX, from where Mt 21.13 was apparently taken, does not read the verb ‘make’ (the MT has the perfective היה, ‘it was’). In Jer 7.13, however, the aorist ἐποιήσατε is used (καὶ νῦν ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐποιήσατε πάντα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα, ‘and now, because you have done all these things’) to translate כַּכְּמַשׁ (‘you made,’ MT) in anticipation to a future (cf. Jer. 7.14LXX καὶ ποιήσω τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ κτλ., ‘therefore I will do to the house...’). The words uttered by Jesus are surely meant to indicate the fulfilment of the Scriptures and the tense is highly likely to have undergone changes for this reason. Compared with the other Gospels, the Lukan stability is noticeable as no manuscripts at all in this Gospel have a single variant in the clause, whether in the word order or in the tense of the verb. This reading may be taken as explaining the others. The word order in Luke is similar to that in Matthew, showing an emphasis on the object pronoun αὐτόν while Mark has a neutral order. The perfect focuses on the state of the house *having been made* a den of robbers, while the present suggests a description, both of which seem to be the result of a correction from an aorist which describes a ‘punctiliar,’ ‘point action,’ ‘snapshot action’.<sup>106</sup> Calling the Bezan reading a harmonisation seems to reflect a mechanical application of the text-critical principle favouring discordant parallel readings. However, it is more likely that the original text was simply shared by the three Synoptics, itself mirroring the prophecy in Jeremiah, and that a scribe more inclined to describe narratively a scene would have corrected the somewhat odd aorist into a more descriptive present or perfect.

Assuming Bezan Matthew has harmonised overlooks the similar scribal difficulty in the tense used in the original of Mark and the conflict between the use of the aorist in Jer. 7.13LXX and its potential clash with its actualisation in times of fulfilment. The original text may simply be the commonly shared clause which underwent contextual arrangement.

Mt 22.27 – par. Mk 12.22b//Lk 20.32

Mt 22.27 ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ

ᾤ (p) καὶ D K Γ Θ 0102 f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae  
bo | txt (om.) ⋈ B L W Δ f<sup>1</sup> 565 (e) sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup>

Mk 12.22b ἑξήκοντα πάντων ἡ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

ἑξήκοντα δὲ (γὰρ Δ) πάντων Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 33 565 700 2542 q co | ἑξήκοντα  
πάντων A Γ 1241 1424 pm l vg | -D c sa<sup>mss</sup> | txt ⋈ B C K L W Ψ 579 892 pm

<sup>106</sup> F. STAGG, ‘Abused Aorist,’ in *JBL* 91 (1972) 222-31 [222].

aur | <sup>s</sup> 4 I-3 (ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνή) A K Γ 700 1241 1424 2542 ℣ lat sy | txt  
(καὶ ἡ γυνή ἀπέθανεν) ⋈ B C D L Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1-13</sup> 28 33 565 892 (-καὶ W 579) it

Lk 20.32 ὕστερον ᾿καὶ ἡ γυνή ἀπέθανεν᾿

᾿p) δέ (-Δ f<sup>13</sup> 700 aur vg sy<sup>h\*\*</sup>) πάντων (-892) ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνή A K P W  
Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 565<sup>s</sup> 700 892 1424 (33 1241 2542) ℣ aur f q vg sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> | txt ⋈  
B D 579 (+δέ α.καὶ L l) ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo

In this passage, some Sadducees inquire about marital status in the world to come with particular reference to seven brothers who had been married to the same wife. Mt 22.27 concludes the story with a reference to the wife ‘also’ (καὶ) dying. The adverb is present in Codex Bezae and its support but absent in Codex Vaticanus and its support.

In terms of external evidence, the presence of καὶ in Matthew is supported by Western, Byzantine, Caesarean text-types and early versions (Old Latin, Syriac and Coptic), while its absence is attested by Alexandrian representatives, early Egyptian versions and the Byzantine witnesses W, Δ and f<sup>1</sup>. In the parallel verses of Mark and Luke, although καὶ is present in all manuscripts, the word order is highly variant with regard to the verbal clause which shows that the discourse is structured in a deliberate way: in Matthew, ‘wife’ is in the unmarked, post-verbal order in a position of natural salience at the end of the sentence. In Mark, most of the manuscripts have the reversed, highlighted order where the emphasis is put on the wife though Byzantine witnesses support the neutral, order unmarked of verb-subject.<sup>107</sup> Equally in Luke, the textual tradition is in dispute over word order with Byzantine manuscripts again mostly supporting the unmarked order. More generally, the entire passage is variant and is beyond the scope of this study but the numerous *vll* demonstrate the difficulty in restoring the original discourse. Given the spread of early attestation, the corruption of the text must have occurred at an early stage of the transmission and unless ⋈B are prejudged as more significant than the other manuscripts, the external evidence is not conclusive.

In terms of internal evidence, καὶ is adverbial in the three Synoptics and its absence does not change the meaning of the verse significantly.<sup>108</sup> The unmarked word order of the verbal clause in Matthew focuses on ὕστερον δέ, a favourite Matthean discourse feature and signalling eschatological times (Mt 21.29,37; 22.27; 25.11; 26.6) which is interestingly absent from Bezan Mark and therefore cannot be a harmonisation with the second Gospel. Equally, the reversed word order in Luke (except in Byzantine witnesses) and the absence of πάντων in most of the manuscripts (specifically ⋈BD) makes a harmonisation with Luke unlikely.<sup>109</sup> The phrase καὶ ἡ γυνή may therefore re-

<sup>107</sup> On markedness, see Chapter 3 IV. 5.

<sup>108</sup> Davies and Alison explain this as a rewording of Mark dropping the ‘unnecessary καὶ’ (*Matthew*, III, 226).

<sup>109</sup> MwQH-theorists would see Luke’s ὕστερον a trace of the use of Matthew. Luke’s καὶ could then potentially be a use of Bezan Matthew. It could also qualify as a minor agreement against Mark.



flect the original composition shared by all Synoptics. The adverb could have been removed at an early stage because of the different verb used in Mt 22.25 to designate the brothers' death, ἐτελεύτησαν, i.e. *passed away*, and could have undergone some linguistic improvement to avoid an improper 'the brothers passed away [...and] after them all, also the wife died.'

The presence or absence of *καί* can be explained as a harmonisation with Mark but equally, could be a simply a trace of the composition of Matthew from Mark. Its withdrawal could be an early scribal change where 'the wife died too' was simplified as 'the wife died' ('too' would have been seen as unnecessary) as it is the case in  $\aleph B$ .

Mt 24.17 – par. Mk 13.15// Lk 17.31

Mt 24.17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι Ἐὰν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ

Ἐρ) τι D Θ f<sup>1</sup> 33 1424 l2211 latt; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | τό  $\aleph^*$  | txt (τά) B *rell*

Further vll: καταβαίνετω K W Γ Δ f<sup>1,13</sup> 565 579 1241  $\aleph$  | txt (καταβάτω)  $\aleph^*$  ( $\aleph^2$  καταβήτω) B D L Z Θ 094 33 700 892 1424 l2211

Mk 13.15 ὁ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω Ἐμὴδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἄραι τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ

ὁ B 1424 2542 c co | καὶ ὁ D Θ 565 700 lat sy | txt  $\aleph$  A K L W Γ Δ Ψ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 579 892 1241  $\aleph$  | Ἐἰς τὴν οἰκίαν A D K W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 565 579 700 1241 1424 2542  $\aleph$  lat sy<sup>s,h</sup> | txt  $\aleph$  B L Ψ 892 c k sy<sup>p</sup> co | 2 I i.e. τί ἄραι B K L Ψ 892 | I i.e. ἄραι 2542 | txt (ἄραι τι)  $\aleph$  A D (W) Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 579 700 1241 1424  $\aleph$  latt

Lk 17.31 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι αὐτά, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἀγρῶ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιστρέψατω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.

NA<sup>28</sup> no vll<sup>110</sup>

The verse is found in all three Synoptics in the episode relating the Desolating Sacrilege (with reference to the expression βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in Mt 24.15). Matthew reads: 'let him who is on the housetop not go down to take *what* (τά) is in his house' (D.05 and its support have 'whatever' (τι)). Mark also uses the indefinite pronoun (τι) and Luke uses the personal pronoun αὐτά. The Bezan reading is therefore understood as a harmonisation with Mark. Fee favours the Alexandrian reading because of its being the *lectio*

<sup>110</sup> Interestingly, NA<sup>27</sup> reported a variant reading: ἡμέρα  $\aleph$  B D *rell* | ὥρα lat sy<sup>s,c</sup>.

*difficilior* in Matthew but confesses any conclusion on who has the original wording (Matthew or Mark) is a ‘tossup.’<sup>111</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the accusative neuter singular indefinite pronoun *τι* is found in a wide range of Western, Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses, while the accusative neuter plural definite pronoun *τά* is read in all other manuscripts including Codex Vaticanus. Interestingly, the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus has a third reading, *τό*, subsequently corrected to *τά*. These variants highlight a potential problem in identifying the complement or understanding what needs to be taken in the event of Desolation. In Mark, a two-strand tradition reads the pronoun *τι* before or after the verb *ἄραι*, while two manuscripts, namely Codex Washingtonianus and minuscule 2542, omit the pronoun, again reflecting the same difficulty. Luke firmly reads *ἄραι αὐτά* in syntax which is closer to Matthew than it is to Mark. Given the attestation, the similar types of correction in the Synoptics appear to have occurred at a very early stage.

In terms of internal evidence, the difficulty with identifying the pronoun’s gender must be examined in light of the wider context. Mt 24.17 and 18 both contain the infinitive *ἄραι*, with the second one having *τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ* (*his garment*) as the object, which also may be the reason for Codex Sinaiticus reading *τό*. Luke reads *εἰς τά* which refers to the preceding plural *αὐτά* and most probably to the editorial insertion of *τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ*.<sup>112</sup> The context of surprise is illustrated in a highly structured manner:

Mt 24.17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι τὰ/τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, [18] καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρέψατω ὀπίσω ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

Because of the concomitant surprise involved, the original reading may have been the indefinite *τι*: ‘Let him who is on the housetop/not go down/to take *whatever* is in his house.’ Actually, it is the Lukan vocabulary that reveals the allusion to the destruction of the Second Temple even more clearly: *ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος* (Heb. *לְבַיְתָא*), *τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ* (*יְצִיָּה*) and *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ* (*בבית*) are usual words found in the description of the Temple,<sup>113</sup> and may well allude to the events of 70 CE where there will not even be time to save the vessels of the Temple.<sup>114</sup> Mark and Matthew have a more precise description of the allusion with the indefinite *τι* pointing to *anything* in the house (but allegorically in the Temple), specifically as everything was destroyed there, not only the vessels, an allusion that was less understandable after Jews and Christians had parted and gone their sepa-

<sup>111</sup> G.D. FEE, ‘A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem,’ *NovT* 22 (1980) 12–24.

<sup>112</sup> Interestingly, *σκεύη*, -ης, ἡ, designates *equipment*, (*household*) *furnishings*, esp. of a ship’s gear or equipment (BDAG, s.v. *σκεύη*), while *σκεῦος*, -ους, τό has the general meaning of *thing*, *object used for any purpose at all thing*, *object* or more specifically *vessel*, *jar*, *dish*, etc. (BDAG, s.v. *σκεῦος*). Thayer identifies *σκεῦος* as the Septuagintal form of *יְצִיָּה* (THAYER, s.v. *σκεῦος*).

<sup>113</sup> The characteristic expression used for the Temple in the Jewish Scriptures is *τὰ σκεύη πάντα* (45 occurrences in the Jewish Scriptures).

<sup>114</sup> The similarity is drawn from the vocabulary in common with the Jewish Scriptures. Chrysostom analysed the entire chapter as an apocalyptic view of the destruction of the Temple based on the connective *οὖν* (v.15): ‘When the abomination of desolation should stand in the holy place. Whence [οὖν] He seems to me to be speaking of the armies.’ (J. CHRYSOSTOM, *Homily*, 76, 1 in MIGNE, PG, 57).

rate ways. This could account for the variant readings. Based on a consideration of the available data, the original form is unlikely to be identified with certainty.

The traditional text-critical principle of favouring the discordant reading identifies the Bezan reading as a harmonisation but a less atomistic approach to the text suggests that the context as well as the potential interaction between the sources of the Gospels have interfered in the composition of the text itself.<sup>115</sup>

Mt 26.55 – par. Mk 14.49//Lk 22.52-53

Mt 26.55 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις, Ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων συλλαβεῖν με; καθ' ἡμέραν ὧν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με.

ῥ<sup>p</sup>) πρὸς ὑμᾶς (A) C D K W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1-13</sup> 565 579 1241 (1844) ℳ latt sy<sup>p,h</sup> mae; Eus | *txt* (om.) ℞ B L 0281 33 700 892 1424 sy<sup>s</sup> sa bo

Further vll: ῥ 4 5 1-3 (ἐκαθεζόμεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) A (cf ῥ) W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 579 *pm* lat sy<sup>h</sup> | 4 1-3 5 (ἐκαθεζόμεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων) C (ἐκαθήμην D) K 1241 *pm* it sa bo; Eus | 1-4 (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν) *f*<sup>1</sup> | 4 1-3 (ἐκαθεζόμεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) 1424 | *txt* (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν διδάσκων) ℞ B L Θ 0281 33 700 892 1844 (cf ῥ) sy<sup>s,p</sup> mae

Mk 14.49 καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με· ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί.

[49] ῥ-τεῖτε (B) Ψ

Lk 22.52 Εἶπεν δὲ ῥ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ῥ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους· ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων; [53] ὧν καθ' ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἐξετείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτοῦς.

[52] ῥ ὁ Ἰησοῦς K L W Γ Δ Ψ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 ℳ | -D *f*<sup>1</sup> b e i l sy<sup>s,c</sup> | *txt* ℞<sup>75</sup> ℞ A B T Θ | ῥ πρὸς ℞\* Δ 700\* 892 2542 *pm* sy<sup>hmg</sup> | τοῦ λαοῦ D | ῥ<sup>1</sup> ἐξεληλύθατε A W Γ Δ 565 700 ℳ | [53] ῥ τό D 0171 | ὦν D | ῥ τὸ σκοτός D sa<sup>mss</sup>

This verse is from the story of Jesus' arrest. Jesus asks about the nature of his arrest since 'every day' (καθ' ἡμέραν) he 'was before you in the temple teaching,' according to

<sup>115</sup> Finally, if we assume an original τῆ in Mark and that Matthew took from Mark, τὰ can be explained as either an original editorial correction (B.03 reading) or as an identical 'import' from Mark (D.05 reading). Therefore, if the Synoptic text is compared within the text of the NA<sup>28</sup>, τὰ would be identified as a minor agreement, while the reading in Codex Bezae would qualify as a Matthew-Mark agreement.

Codex Bezae, while he ‘was in the temple teaching’ in Codex Vaticanus. The phrase ‘to you’ (πρὸς ὑμᾶς) is read in Mark and in a different way in Luke (μεθ’ ὑμῶν, ‘with you’) but absent in Mt B.03.<sup>116</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence or absence of the phrase πρὸς ὑμᾶς is once again fairly evenly split. With respect to the position of ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ and πρὸς ὑμᾶς the entire clause is variant, as the following list shows:

καθ’ ἡμέραν	ἐκαθεζόμεν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	διδάσκων	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με	A
καθ’ ἡμέραν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	ἐκαθεζόμεν	διδάσκων	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με	W Γ Δ
					[f <sup>13</sup> 565 579 lat sy <sup>h</sup> 38]
καθ’ ἡμέραν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	ἐκαθεζόμεν	διδάσκων	καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με Θ
καθ’ ἡμέραν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	ἐκαθεζόμεν	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	διδάσκων	καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με C K 1241
καθ’ ἡμέραν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	ἐκαθεζόμεν		καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με f <sup>1</sup>
καθ’ ἡμέραν		ἐκαθεζόμεν	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ		καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με 1424
καθ’ ἡμέραν	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	ἐκαθήμην	ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	διδάσκων	καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με D
καθ’ ἡμέραν		ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	ἐκαθεζόμεν	διδάσκων	καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με 8 B
					[0281 33 700 892 sy <sup>s</sup> ...]

The diversity of manuscripts showing variation on the position of πρὸς ὑμᾶς and ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ demonstrates a difficulty which cannot be neglected despite the apparent insignificant word order involved here: Bezae and its support read a double prepositional phrase in preverbal position while Codex Vaticanus and its support read only ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. If we consider only D.05 and B.03, both differ in (a) the position of ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, highlighted in Codex Vaticanus and in default position in Codex Bezae; (b) the presence (D.05) or absence (B.03) of πρὸς ὑμᾶς; (c) the tense of the synonymous verbs κάθημαι, ‘to sit,’ ‘to be seated,’ in the imperfect (D.05) and καθέζομαι, ‘to sit down,’ ‘to sit oneself’ in the aorist (B.03).<sup>117</sup> At the beginning of the verse, πρὸς ὑμᾶς, which refers to the crowds (εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις), was probably not understood to be important since it is already implied, while the rest of the tradition highlights the teaching *to [them]* rather than the location *in the Temple*. From this it can be seen that Codex Bezae highlights Jesus teaching rather than his place of sitting while teaching as in Codex Vaticanus.

In terms of the shared concepts and vocabulary, I have identified contact points between Codex Bezae and the prophecy received in Ezekiel 8.1 as can be seen below:

<sup>116</sup> The argument of the section is discussed in depth in L. PINCHARD, ‘Des traces vétérotestamentaires dans quelques variantes de Matthieu dans le codex de Bèze traditionnellement jugées harmonisantes,’ *NovT* 56 (2014) 1-13.

<sup>117</sup> Codex Bezae reads a different imperfect, ἐκαθήμην, from κάθημαι, *to sit down, seat oneself* followed by ἐν with the dative of place (G.B. WINER, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* [trans. and rev. W.F. Moulton, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959]) sec. 52, 4, 9) which is a singular reading. The rest of the tradition reads ἐκαθεζόμεν from καθέζομαι (1) as occupying a position of respect or authority, such as a teacher or councillor (Mt 26.55); (2) taking the position of a student (Lk 2.46); (3) reflexively *sit down, seat oneself* (BDAG, s.v. καθέζομαι and κάθημαι).

Ezek. 8.1LXX	Mt 26.55D.05
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἕκτῳ ἔτει ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μηνὶ πέμπτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐγὼ ἐκαθήμην ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ <sup>118</sup> καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Ἰουδα ἐκάθηντο ἐνώπιόν μου καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπ' ἐμὲ χεὶρ κυρίου	καθ' ἡμέραν  πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκαθήμην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με <sup>119</sup>

To review the exact correspondence with the original language, the Hebrew text is provided with the English translation:

ויהי בשנה הששית בששי בחמשה לחדש	In the sixth year, in the sixth month, on the fifth day of the month,
אני יושב בביתי	as I sat in my house,
וזקני יהודה יושבים לפני	with the elders of Judah sitting before me
ותפל עלי שם יד אדני יהוה	the hand of the Lord God fell there upon me

The prophecy given to the priest Ezekiel shows the position of the prophet before the elders, identified as those responsible for the offence [of arresting Jesus].<sup>120</sup> It can be suggested that the picture of Jesus being arrested identifies the Jews as the offenders as a re-enactment of the Ezekiel prophecy. Conversely, it could not be seen as an anti-Judaic bias because the common word *ἐκαθήμην* highlights the parallel of the entire passage with Ezekiel, a reference that must have been missed by the subsequent scribes who changed it into the near-synonym *καθέζομαι*. Indeed, there are numerous points of contacts between Ezek. 8.1 and Mt 26.55 is (1) temporal reference ('every day'/ 'in the sixth year,' 'in the sixth month,' 'on the fifth day of the month'); (2) the fact of sitting ; (3) in the house and the Temple (equivalent terms in Hebrew, בבית ); (4) the face to face situation (ἐνώπιόν μου/πρὸς ὑμᾶς); (5) the act of teaching/the environment of the elders of Judah; (6) the fact of being (not) seized/ 'the hand on me.' The similarity between the two texts Ezek. 8.1LXX and Mt 26.55D.05 is unlikely to be coincidental but the interesting singular Bezan reading *ἐκαθήμην* can equally not be a correction by a later scribe to restore the original Jewish allusion especially not at a late date. For the same reason, it is unlikely that the phrase *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* was added later to restore the parallelism between *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* and *ἐνώπιόν μου* after its omission.

<sup>118</sup> Significantly, the LXX does not translate the possessive in the Hebrew (בביתי) though the difference can be equalised between 'in the Temple' and 'in my house.'

<sup>119</sup> Actually, the corresponding parallel in Luke (22.53: οὐκ ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ), absent in Mt/Mk, is even closer to the Ezekiel passage. Interestingly, the mention of μεθ' ὑμῶν may translate an adaptation from the Matthean phrase in its Bezan context: in Matthew, Jesus teaches 'in front of you' while in Luke, he teaches 'among you.'

<sup>120</sup> J.P. BURNSIDE, *The Signs of Sin. Seriousness of Offence in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 364; London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003) 250. In particular, see chapter 6 (186–224) on the seriousness of sin in Ezek. 8.

To conclude, the presence of *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* in Bezan Matthew and its support may not be a simple harmonisation with Mark. Despite the high similarity among the three parallels, the wording is not close enough to have naturally attracted an ‘import’ of the phrase into Matthew to make it closer to the Second Gospel. Furthermore, the relationship with the Jewish Scriptures makes the event of Jesus’ arrest closer to a fulfilment of the prophecy found in Ezekiel rather than a simple historical account of Jesus’ arrest. The presence of the phrase in Codex Bezae may even allow us to trace the passage back to an original source. Conversely its absence could also reflect a simplification of a story whose parallelism was lost on subsequent readers.

## II. 2. Moderate Verbal Agreement

In the following eight occurrences, the close parallels within the three Synoptics are still as apparent as in the section before, but their separate wording is fairly different. The conclusion that there is, in some manuscripts, harmonisation with a different Gospel, but restricted to only part of the wording requires close re-examination, for it is open to challenge. This section will analyse the five *vll* indicated by a *p*)-sign in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>.

### Mt 9.17 – par. Mk 2.22//Lk 5.37-39

Mt 9.17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή ὄγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἔτι καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἔκχεϊται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ῥᾶ δὲ ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι συντηροῦνται

ῥ*p*) ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς D (g<sup>1</sup> k μ sy<sup>s</sup>) | *txt* (ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ) B *rell*

ῥ*p*) ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ D (a) k

Further *vll*: ῥ<sup>1</sup> I 3-6 2 7 (ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς βάλλουσιν καινοὺς) C 1424 1844<sup>c</sup> (-νέον 1844\*) 12211 | ἀλλ’ οἶνον νέον βάλλουσιν εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς 892 | *p*) ἀλλ’ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον 8<sup>x</sup> | °B co

Mk 2.22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἔκχεϊται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ῥᾶ δὲ ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς τ<sup>\</sup>

ῥ*p*) ῥήσσει (ῥήξει C 33) ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος (-ὁ νέος f<sup>13</sup> 28 579 700 c ff<sup>2</sup> q\*) τοὺς ἀσκοὺς A C<sup>2</sup> K Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 1241 1424 2542 88 e f sy<sup>h</sup> | διαρῆσσονται οἱ ἀσκοὶ W (a) bo<sup>ms</sup> | *txt* (ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς) 88 8<sup>x</sup> B C\* D L Θ 565 892 lat sy<sup>s,p</sup> sa | ῥ*p*) ἔκχεϊται (ἐκχυθήσεται 579; -D it) καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται (ἀπόλλυνται W; -L) 8<sup>x</sup> A C D K L W Γ Δ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 2542 (Θ 12211) 88 lat sy<sup>(p)</sup> sa | *txt* 88 B 892 bo | °D it bo<sup>ms</sup> | τ<sup>\</sup> βάλλουσιν W (e f) sy<sup>s,p</sup> | *p*) βλητέον 88 8<sup>x1</sup> A C K L Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 28 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 12211 88 lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* 8<sup>x</sup> B

Lk 5.37 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· [38] ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς ἱβλητέον.† [39]□□[καὶ] οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν ἑθέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ, Ὁ παλαιὸς ἱχρηστός ἐστιν.>`

[38] ἱρ) βάλλουσιν ⲛ\* D it sy<sup>p</sup>; Mcion<sup>A</sup> | βάλλεται W | ἱρ) καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται (τηροῦνται D) A C D K Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 892 1424 1844 12211 ℳ latt sy (bo<sup>mss</sup>); Mcion<sup>A</sup> | *txt* ⲡ<sup>4.75vid</sup> ⲛ B L W *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 700 1241 2542 co | [39]□ *p*) D it ; Eus | ° ⲡ<sup>4</sup> ⲛ<sup>2</sup> B 579 700 892 1241 | *txt rell* | ἑὐθέως A C<sup>2</sup> K Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700 892 1424 2542 ℳ latt sy | *txt* ⲡ<sup>4</sup> ⲛ B C\* L W *f*<sup>1</sup> 579 1241 co | χρηστότερος A C K Γ Δ Θ Ψ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 2542 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* ⲡ<sup>4</sup> ⲛ B L W 1241 sy<sup>p</sup>

Mt 9.17 belongs to the pericope on Fasting (9.14-17), ending with two proverbial statements about a new patch on an old garment and new wine in old wineskins. The verse is translated by the RSV as ‘neither is new wine put into old wineskins; if it is, the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins are destroyed; but new wine is put into fresh wineskins, and so both are preserved’: ‘the skins burst,’ however, is read as ‘the new wine will burst the wineskins’ in Codex Bezae, so appearing to harmonise with Mark. There is a second apparent harmonisation claimed in NA<sup>28</sup> where Codex Bezae reads ‘the wine is lost and the wineskins, too,’ again like Mark. The verse is present in all three Synoptics in similar forms.

Before investigating the external and internal evidence, it should be determined which particular parallel passage is involved in the alleged harmonisations. First, and as the critical apparatus indicates, the verse in Matthew is highly variant with four variant verbal clauses out of six. The Markan parallel is equally variant, while the Lukan one is secure in its first two verses Lk 5.37-38 (v. 39 is then quite variant, including the notable absence of the final part of the verse in Codex Bezae). Because of the complexity of the forms as well as the subsequent multiple readings in all three Gospels, the following presentation of the main text-types (Western, Alexandrian, Byzantine and Caesarean) will help to clarify the structure of the verses involved. Since the four text-types show variation, the best representatives of each (i.e. Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae, Codex Washingtonianus and Codex Koridethi) will be taken to illustrate the variety of readings, in their English translation and in all three Synoptics.

All three of the Gospels begin by saying, in one form or another, that no-one ‘throws’ (literally) new wine into old skins:

### Matthew

In Matthew ⲛ.01, B.03, W.032, Θ.038

- (1) the wineskins break apart
- (2) and the wine is spilled,
- (3) and the wineskins are spoilt

## CHAPTER 6

- (4) rather they throw new wine into new wineskins
- (5) and both are preserved

In Matthew D.05

- (1) the new wine bursts the wineskins
- (2) and the wine is spoilt
- (3) as well as the wineskins
- (4) rather they throw new wine into new wineskins
- (5) and both are preserved

### Mark

In Mark R.01, B.03

- (1) the wine will burst the wineskins
- (2) and the wine is spoilt
- (3) as well as the wineskins
- (4) rather the new wine in the old wineskins (no verb)<sup>121</sup>

In Mark D.05

- (1) the wine will burst the wineskins
- (2) and the wine
- (3) as well as the wineskins will be spoilt
- (4) ----

In Mark W.032

- (1) the wineskins are completely spoilt (διαρρήσσονται)
- (2) and the wine is spilled
- (3) and the wineskins are destroyed
- (4) rather new wine, they throw into old wineskins

In Mark Θ.038

- (1) the wine will burst the wineskins
- (2) and the wine is spilled
- (3) and the wineskins are destroyed
- (4) rather new wine must be thrown into old wineskins

In Luke, the verses are relatively stable (1-4) but (5-6) are fairly variant:

- (1) The new wine will burst the wineskins
- (2) And this [wine] will be spilled
- (3) And the wineskins are destroyed
- (4) Rather the new wine must be thrown (with minor *vll*)

---

<sup>121</sup> ‘...one throws’ is implied.



(5) ---- B W | and both are preserved (D)<sup>122</sup> ⊖

(6) ‘And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, “The old is good.”’<sup>123</sup>

All the differences in the Synoptics arise from a different focus on the character of the wine (‘new’ or without adjective) and its opposition to the wineskins. Furthermore the wording in each Gospel seeks explain what happens to the wine and the wineskins, i.e. whether the wine is spilled, shed or destroyed or whether both the wine and the wineskins are destroyed. The Synoptics show an impressively large difference in either the interpretation or the edition of the text and the variants apparently reflect the difficulty experienced by the scribes to make the saying consistent.

In terms of external evidence, in the first variation-unit (ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοῦς, D.05 *contra* ῥήγγυνται οἱ ἀσκοί B.03), Bezan Matthew has a near-singular reading<sup>124</sup> which undermines its originality, according to the customary standards, while the existence of only a few Latin manuscripts supporting Codex Bezae as opposed to the rest of the Vetus Latina raises other questions. Furthermore the verse ‘resembles’ the one in Mark although a closer look at the second Gospel points to a further difficulty in that the external evidence shows at least two clear-cut stands of tradition.

In the second variation unit of Mt 9.17 (ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί, D.05 *contra* ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται B.03), where Codex Bezae is supported by a weak number of witnesses (only two Latin codices), the absence of ἐκχεῖται echoes Mk 2.22, but in some manuscripts only, as the critical apparatus earlier suggests, while in some others, the verb is mentioned. Further, the word καὶ changes its function accordingly either as an adverb (‘also the wineskins burst,’ B.03 *et al.*) or connective (‘the wine bursts *and* the wineskins are spoilt’ &D *et al.*). These differences show an extremely dynamic *milieu* at a very early stage of the transmission. In order to gain more clarity, the next table will show a synoptic view of the passage in question in this section in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae only:

<sup>122</sup> τηροῦνται D\*, συντηροῦνται D<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>123</sup> Lk 5.39 is not paralleled in Mark and Matthew. For this reason, it will not be discussed, but is only mentioned.

<sup>124</sup> The Bezan reading is shared only partially with the 9<sup>th</sup> c. Latin Codex Sangermanensis I *g*<sup>1</sup> which contains Matthew only, the African Latin Codex Bobiensis *k* and Fragmentum Monacense (*μ*, a small fragment dated 650 containing only Matthew 9-10) and the early Sinaitic Syriac. These witnesses of Mt 9. are placed in brackets pointing to a partial agreement only. Indeed, the Latin texts are as follows. In *k*: neque mittunt vinum nouum (!) in utres veteres si quominus rumpit vinum utres et vinum perit et utres mittunt autem vinum novum in utres novos et utraque servantur. In *g*<sup>1</sup>: neque mittunt vinum novum in utres veteres alioquin rumpit vinum utres et vinum effundetur et utres peribunt sed vinum novum in utres novos mittunt et ambo conservabuntur. Fragment *m* is lacks the end: vinum novum in utres veteres alioquin rumpet (!) vinum utres et vinum et utres peribunt mittunt autem vinum novum in u<tres ...> (A. JÜLICHER, *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938], *ad loc*). The differences involve the tense of the verbs (*rumpit*: present [*k*], *rumpet*: future [*μ*], to burst), the choice of verbs (*perit*: is lost, *effundetur*: will be spilled; *servantur* [*k*]: will be saved; *conservabuntur* [*g*<sup>1</sup>]: will be preserved), the accordance with the subjects (*perit*: is lost, *peribunt*: are lost), and the connectives (*si quominus*, if not [*k*]; *alioquin*, otherwise [*g*<sup>1</sup>, *μ*]; *utraque* [*k*]: both, *ambo* [*g*<sup>1</sup>]: both together).

Mt 9.17D.05	Mt 9.17B.03	Mk 2.22D.05	Mk 2.22B.03	Lk 5.37D.05	Lk 5.37B.03
οὐδὲ	οὐδὲ	καὶ οὐδεὶς	καὶ οὐδεὶς	καὶ οὐδεὶς	καὶ οὐδεὶς
βάλλουσιν	βάλλουσιν	βάλλει	βάλλει	βάλλει	βάλλει
οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον
εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς
παλαιούς·	παλαιούς·	παλαιούς·	παλαιούς·	παλαιούς·	παλαιούς·
εἰ δὲ μῆγε,	εἰ δὲ μῆ,	εἰ δὲ μῆ,	εἰ δὲ μῆ,	εἰ δὲ μῆ γε,	εἰ δὲ μῆ γε,
ρήσσει ὁ οἶνος	ρήγνυνται οἱ	ρήξει ὁ οἶνος	ρήξει ὁ οἶνος	ρήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ	ρήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ
ὁ νέος τοῦς	ἀσκοί	τοῦς ἀσκούς,	τοῦς ἀσκούς	νέος τοῦς	νέος τοῦς
ἀσκούς,				ἀσκούς	ἀσκούς
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ↑	καὶ ὁ οἶνος	καὶ ὁ οἶνος	καὶ ὁ οἶνος	καὶ αὐτὸς	καὶ αὐτὸς
ἀπόλλυται	ἐκχεῖται			ἐκχυθήσεται	ἐκχυθήσεται
καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί·	καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	ἀπόλλυται	καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί
	ἀπόλλυνται·	ἀπολοῦνται.	καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί·	ἀπολοῦνται·	ἀπολοῦνται·
βάλλουσιν	ἀλλὰ	↑	ἀλλὰ	ἀλλὰ	ἀλλὰ
δὲ	βάλλουσιν	↑			
οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	↑	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον	οἶνον νέον
εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	↑	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς	εἰς ἀσκούς
καινοῦς, καὶ	καινοῦς, καὶ	↑	καινοῦς.	βαλλουσιν	βλητέον
ἀμφότεροι	ἀμφότεροι	↑		ἀμφότεροι	↑
τηροῦνται.	συντηροῦνται			τηροῦνται.	↑

Table 25: Textual Comparison of Mt 9.17 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03

From the synoptic view provided above, it must be acknowledged that it would be somewhat naïve to think that if Bezan Matthew harmonised, it did so with identical wording in a parallel Gospel in one particular manuscript. Indeed, if one compares Mt 9.17D.05 with its parallels, the adjective ‘new’ (qualifying the wine) is firmly present in Luke only and absent in Mark, while the absence of *ἐκχεῖται* in Matthew—almost singular in Bezae—is also absent in Mk 2.22 except for Mk 2.22 $\aleph$ .01. Furthermore, the word order in Mt 9.17D.05 does not reflect Mk 2.22D.05 but Mk 2.22B.03. Equally, in Mark, the notable absence of the *ἀλλά*-clause in D.05 may be analysed either as an accidental omission or as an original reading (supported by 2427 it bo<sup>ms</sup>) upon which subsequent manuscripts have added material at a very early stage. This highly complex picture of the textual status of this passage in the Synoptics points to an immense difficulty that any author or editor faced in reflecting Jesus’ exact original saying. The problem in identifying a possible original reading today is emphasised by the difficulty of understanding the parable itself, which generally remains unclear, despite Jeremias’ proposal that it is eschatological in meaning.<sup>125</sup> Looking for ‘the’ original reading with equally variant parallels from the external evidence is like throwing water into the Danaids’ jars.

In terms of internal evidence, Mt 9.17D.05 ‘resembles’ the Markan passage in Codex Bezae but there are many significant differences that undermine the possibility that the variant readings are harmonisations: the main verb *ρήσσει* is present in Bezan

<sup>125</sup> DAVIES—ALLISON, *Matthew*, III, 115.

Matthew as opposed to the future ῥήξει in Mark D.05, and in the active voice while Codex Vaticanus has the passive; Bezan Mark omits the reference to the ‘new’ wine (ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος) and both Mt D.05/Mk D.05 lack ἐκχεῖται; in Mt D.05 the word order of ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί is reverse of Bezan Mark, which may mean that Matthew highlights the wine at the expense of the wineskins as opposed to Mk D.05 which highlights both with a prominent preverbal position of the nouns; the δέ-clause (ἀλλά in Codex Vaticanus) is absent in Bezan Mark. Mt 9.17D.05 also ‘resembles’ Luke with the presence of the adjective νέος but differs from it in the absence of the verb ἐκχεῖται and the final clause introduced by δέ/ἀλλά. The presence of ἐκχεῖται may well have been added to an original Markan substrata to make the language clearer and more precise (both wine and wineskins would not be designated as being ‘destroyed’ but the first would be spilled, the other destroyed) and may indicate the rougher Bezan wording as more likely to be original. To summarise this complex situation, the following statements can be made:

- (1) The first alleged harmonisation of Mt 9.17D.05 (ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς) certainly resembles the wording Mk 2.22 in A C<sup>2</sup> K Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> *et al.* but is not verbally close to  $\mathfrak{B}^{88}$   $\aleph$  B C\* D L Θ 565 892 lat sy<sup>s-p</sup> sa (ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς). While A C<sup>2</sup> K Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> *et al.* are claimed to be harmonising (p)-symbol), this verse portion is technically not harmonising with the Markan parallel in Codex Bezae. It is however certainly different from the Alexandrian reading ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοί;
- (2) The second alleged harmonisation of Mt 9.17D.05 (ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί) resembles Mk 2.22 but the word order is different in Mk 2.22D.05 (καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, marked order) and the concluding clause (ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς) is absent in Mk D.05. The reason for claiming a harmonisation seems to be linked to the fact that the printed text in NA<sup>28</sup> is ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί, though it misses the fact that this is not the Bezan order in Mark. In turn, the text witnessed in Mk 2.22 by  $\aleph$  A C (D) K L (W) Γ Δ f<sup>1,13</sup> *et al.*, i.e. καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, is claimed to be harmonising, most probably because of the use of the verb ἐκχυθήσεται in Luke (secure reading). The interwoven texts implied by the shared status of the parallel passages have probably led to an overstatement in describing the variants as harmonising.

These differences demonstrate the simplistic nature of the conclusion that any harmonisation has taken place. It can at the most be concluded that the variant readings in the three Gospels reflect the difficulty faced by the scribes to know exactly what Jesus said and meant with this parable. In view of the range of readings in Mark and Luke, that Bezan Matthew is the result of a harmonisation is not the most likely or plausible explanation. Rather, it may be the consequence of an expansion of an earlier form of the Markan text, or a gradual construction of the texts at a very early stage.

Mt 12.1 – par. Mk 2.23//Lk 6.1

Mt 12.1 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπέινασαν καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν ἑστάχους καὶ ἐσθίειν

ἑστάχους D W 700 sa bo | *txt (om.) B rell*

Further vll: ἑστάχους ἐν W

Mk 2.23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδοῦ ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τὸς στάχους.

ἑστάχους διαπορεύεσθε B (C) D it | παραπορευόμενον 565 | πορεύεσθαι W (*f*<sup>13</sup>) | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{88}$   $\aleph$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$  700 892 12211 (A K L  $\Gamma$  *f*<sup>1</sup> 28 33 579 1241 1424 2542  $\mathfrak{M}$ ) | ὁδοποιεῖν τίλλοντες B *f*<sup>1</sup> 892 | ὁδοιποροῦντες τίλλοντες *f*<sup>13</sup> 565<sup>mg</sup> | τίλλειν D W it

Lk 6.1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων, καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς στάχους ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν<sup>1</sup>

ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ (δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ *f*<sup>13</sup>) A C D K  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Psi$  *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup>; Eriph | sabbato mane e | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^4$   $\aleph$  B L W *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1241 2542 it sy<sup>p,hmg</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> | οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν D b | 1 3 4 1 5-7 2 (τοὺς στάχους καὶ ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν ἤσθιον) D (e) *f* sy<sup>p</sup> | 3 4 1 2 5-7 (τοὺς στάχους καὶ ἤσθιον ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν) A C<sup>3</sup> K W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Psi$  *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> | 4 1 2 5-7 (στάχους καὶ ἤσθιον ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν)  $\aleph$  | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{4,75vid}$  B L 700 892 1241 2542 (+αὐτῶν C\* 579)

Mt 12 discusses two controversies on the Sabbath. Mt 12.1 introduces the scene where the disciples pluck ears of grain on that day. Codex Bezae retains the article<sup>126</sup> before σταχῦας as in Mark and Luke,<sup>127</sup> while in Codex Vaticanus the noun is anarthrous. The presence of the firm article in Mk/Lk is understood from the critical apparatus as an indication of harmonisation in Mt D.05.<sup>128</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence of τούς is supported by only a few, though not the least important manuscripts,<sup>129</sup> but the greater part of the tradition has

<sup>126</sup> Actually, Codex Bezae reads τοῦ, not τούς: a *sigma* was most probably dropped by haplography (ΗΡΞΔΑΝΤΟΤΟΥϞΤΑΧΥΔΑϞ>ΗΡΞΔΑΝΤΟΤΟΥϞΤΑΧΥΔΑϞ). I will assume τούς is the word that was deemed to be written.

<sup>127</sup> The critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> omits to mention that the word order is actually different (τίλλειν σταχῦας B.03/τούς στάχους τίλλειν D.05).

<sup>128</sup> Davies and Allison designate the presence of the article as Matthew's editorial feature which was 'restored' in the other manuscripts. (DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 306)

<sup>129</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> does not mention minuscule 28. Swanson's *Matthew* does (*ad loc.*). The consultation of the electronic version of the manuscript shows only a legible ις (τοῖς?) between ἤρξαντο and τίλλειν. See Page | 266

the anarthrous noun. Mk D.05 mentions the act of plucking only (the rest of the tradition reads ‘making their way’), Mt D.05 adds the eating, Luke the rubbing (Lk D.05 has ἤρξαντο in common with Mark and Luke) as the following layout shows:

### Matthew

καὶ	ἤρξαντο τοὺς στάχους τίλλειν	καὶ αἰσθίειν	D
καὶ	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχους	καὶ ἐσθίειν	B
καὶ	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν τοὺς στάχους	καὶ ἐσθίειν	W

### Mark

καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν τοὺς στάχους	D
καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	ἤρξαντο ὁδοποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους	B
καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους		⋈

### Luke

οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν τοὺς στάχους καὶ ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσὶν ἥσθιον	D
καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἥσθιον τοὺς στάχους ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσὶν		B

The textual tradition shows important variant readings in the three Synoptics signalling a difficulty at a very early stage of the transmission. The variant wording of each Gospel within the textual tradition suggests a difficult understanding of what was exactly not permitted in the scene according to Jewish law,<sup>130</sup> or how Jesus appears as a new Davidic character (*cf.* Mt 12.3f – par. Mk 2.25f//Lk 6.3f). Equally, each Gospel shows instability according to the textual tradition.

In terms of internal evidence, the two strands of textual tradition seem to be slightly different from each other. In the ‘Western’ reading, the disciples are plucking *the* (articlar) *ears of grain*, while the Alexandrian reading points less specifically to *some* (anarthrous) *ears of grain*. In terms of word order, Bezan Matthew highlights *the ears of grain* by inserting it before the infinitive (at the expense of the act of plucking) as opposed to the parallel verses.<sup>131</sup> The Bezan reading may reveal hereby an intimately

---

[http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA\\_28/GA\\_28\\_0035.jpg](http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA_28/GA_28_0035.jpg) (CSNTM [Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts] website, accessed 01.03.2014).

<sup>130</sup> Maccoby suggests that there is nothing ‘unjewish’ in the act itself (H. MACCOBY, *Judaism in the First Century* [IRSt; London: Sheldon Press, 1989] 46. Indeed, the act of plucking grain in a field refers to the Book of Deuteronomy and is not problematic: Deut. 23.25aRSV ‘When you go into your neighbour’s standing grain (ἐὰν δὲ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς ἀμητόν, כִּי תֵבַת בְּקִמָּתָךְ רַעַי), you may pluck the ears with your hand (συλλέξεις ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν σου στάχους, בִּידְךָ מִלֵּילַת בִּידְךָ).’ It is the question of the Sabbath which is then disputed within the passage (‘Look, your disciples are doing what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath.’ [Mt 12.2]) in reference to Exod. 34.21 (‘Six days you shall work, but on the seventh day you shall rest; in plowing time and in harvest you shall rest’).

<sup>131</sup> ἄρχω + verb + object is the expected default order in Koine Greek (See Chapter 3 IV. 4). Cf. e.g. ἤρξατο ὀνειδίξειν τὰς πόλεις [‘he began to upbraid the cities,’ Mt 11.20]; ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ [‘he began to rebuke him, Mt 16.22]], while ἄρχω + object + verb is an order where the object is in focus, in this case the ears of grain, which is the purpose of the discussion. Cf. LEVINSOHN, *Discourse Features*, 72.

shared body of knowledge with the hearer that can be seen in the presence of the anaphoric article and specific word order as opposed to Codex Vaticanus which simply narrates the scene. But beyond the understanding of which reading is more likely to be original in Mt 12.1—a difficult endeavour due to the multiple word order variations in all three Gospels, along with the presence or absence of reference to the disciples ‘walking though,’ ‘making their way’ (Mark) or ‘rubbing the ears’ (Luke)—the question remains whether the presence of the article τοὺς [στάχους] in a few manuscripts among which Codex Bezae is a harmonisation with Luke and Mark, both reading the article securely. Despite the multiple variants in the three Gospels, there is great consistency in Codex Bezae across the Synoptics which is hardly attributable to scribal distraction or the patient desire of an intimate accordance of all Gospels which would have deleted the reference to other details of the scene. Conversely, the Bezan reading ἤρξαντο τίλλειν τοὺς στάχους worded this way across the three Gospels in their Bezan form can well fit as the initial reading from which all other variant readings were generated. The addition of movement verbs, changes in word order to highlight one or the other element were added to the scene description.

The word order difference in Bezan Matthew, unnoticed in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, inclines the textual critic to focus only on the ‘extra’ presence of the article τοὺς in Codex Bezae and a few other manuscripts and to favour the idea of a harmonisation with Mark and Luke. However, it is more likely that the wealth of vivid details depicting the scene in Mark and Luke would have been naturally incorporated in Matthew—which is not the case. It is therefore hardly conceivable that the Bezan variant was generated by harmonisation.

#### Mt 13.13 – par. Mk 4.11-12//Lk 8.10

Mt 13.13 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς ᾠδοῦσιν αὐτοῖς λαλῶν, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνιούσιν<sup>1</sup>

‘p) ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούσωσιν μηδὲ συνῶσιν 1424 ff<sup>1</sup> sa mae | ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούωσιν (–σωσιν D) καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν (συνῶσιν D) μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν D Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> it; (Eus)

Further vll: ᾠδοῦσιν αὐτοῖς N Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 1424 | λαλῶ L c | λαλεῖ (ἐλάλει D<sup>1</sup>) αὐτοῖς D

Mk 4.11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς ὅτι πάντα γίνονται, [12] ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφελθῆν αὐτοῖς<sup>T</sup>

[11] ἔξωθεν B 1424 | °X D K W Θ 28 565 1424 2542 | txt A B C L f<sup>1,13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 M bo | ᾠδοῦσιν D Θ 28 565 1424 2542 it vg<sup>ms</sup> (sa) [12] ἀφελθῆσομαι D\* | αφήσω D<sup>1</sup> it | αφελθήσεται A K 565 | τὰ ἀμαρτήματα

CHAPTER 6

(+αὐτῶν Δ 700 1241 sy<sup>h\*\*</sup>) A D K Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 28<sup>c</sup> 33 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241  
1424 ℳ lat sy | txt (om.) ℞ B C L W f<sup>1</sup> 28\* 892\* 2542 b co

Lk 8.10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ ἴδωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

□ W 579 ff<sup>2</sup> | ἴδωσιν D L W E 1 700 2542

Mt 13.13 comes after the Parable of the Sower and explains why Jesus speaks in parables. In some manuscripts, specifically Codex Bezae, the reason why Jesus speaks in parable is ‘so that in (ἵνα) seeing they [i.e. the ones who are not the disciples] do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand,’ as in Luke and, to some extent, Mark. Other manuscripts, specifically Codex Vaticanus, read ‘because’ (ὅτι) instead of ‘so that’ (ἵνα), making their readings a ‘disharmonising’ one with Luke and Mark.<sup>132</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the ὅτι+verb+οὐ-clause is supported by the vast majority of the textual tradition as opposed to the ἵνα+verb+μή clause which exists as a shorter and longer (i.e. bearing a final μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν) form<sup>133</sup> attested by early versions and some Caesarean and Byzantine Greek manuscripts as well as Codex Bezae (this latter one having a singular subjunctive aorist ending matching the Markan and Lukan forms). The critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> is unclear whether the *p*-sign refers to both the shorter and longer readings or to the short one only. Be that as it may, the Committee strongly believes (B-rating) that scribes were influenced by the Markan and Lukan phrasing and altered ὅτι to ἵνα.<sup>134</sup> Because of the wide geographical support, the explanation of harmonisation is not satisfactory unless the phenomenon occurred at a stage early enough to have ‘contaminated’ an archetype, which led to identical readings in Syriac and Latin versions, Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses and D.05, before a large geographical diffusion.

In terms of internal evidence, the Matthean wording is ‘broadly’ close to Mark, Luke and Isa. 6.9-10LXX and prompted the idea of harmonisation. Nevertheless, some parts are closer to Luke than to Mark (absence of καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν) or vice versa (presence of μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν), and, finally, the main clause is syntactically fairly different between all Gospels and the LXX, as the table below shows:

Mt 13.13B.03	Mt 13.13D.05	Mk 4.11-12D.05	Lk 8.10	Isa. 6.9-10
--------------	--------------	----------------	---------	-------------

<sup>132</sup> Strictly speaking, the *p*-sign in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> suggests that the ‘shorter’ ἵνα-clause is a harmonisation in 1424 ff<sup>1</sup> sa mae only, but seems not to apply to Codex Bezae (‘longer’ ἵνα -clause ending in καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν) because of the separation bar, but the latter being verbally equivalent, it will be therefore analysed as a harmonisation.

<sup>133</sup> The manuscripts mentioned do not have the final μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν.

<sup>134</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 27.

## CHAPTER 6

Mt 13.13B.03	Mt 13.13D.05	Mk 4.11-12D.05	Lk 8.10	Isa. 6.9-10
διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ,  ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν  καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν	διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖ αυτοῖς  ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν  καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούσωσιν	ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς πάντα λέγεται,  ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν,  καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν	τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς,  ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν  καὶ ἀκούοντες	πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἀκοῆ  ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε  μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς
οὐδὲ συνίουσιν	καὶ μὴ συνῶσιν μήποτε  ἐπιστρέψωσιν	καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε  ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθήσομαι αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα	μὴ συνιῶσιν	

Table 26: Textual Variation of Mt 13.13 and Parallels in D.05 and B.03

It is well possible that the ὅτι-clause was replaced by an ἵνα-clause to match the more familiar formulation of both the Gospels and the LXX. However, the reading in Bezan Matthew does not unambiguously reflect either Mark or Luke or the LXX and seems even a wording of its own half-way between Mt 13.13B.03 and Isa. 6.9-10LXX. A correction from Codex Vaticanus is therefore unlikely, specially because of the main difference with the main clause between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus. Conversely, it may appear more conjecturable that ἵνα was smoothened into ὅτι to avoid the idea of Jesus ‘trapping’ the others by speaking in parables (‘I speak in parables so that by seeing they don’t see,’ etc.) and finally μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν would have been removed for its being a *lectio difficilior* (‘for fear they convert’ is hardly understandable with the initial main clause as it stands in Mt D.05).<sup>135</sup>

For these reasons, one cannot explain the ‘change’ from ὅτι into ἵνα as a harmonistic corruption to make the Matthean verse consistent with the other Gospels: if there had been harmonisation, one wonders why the scribe would not have been more influenced by more Markan or Lukan material. Therefore, while the Bezan reading in Matthew could well reflect a harmonisation that is the consequence of a scribal correction of an ‘unusual’ ὅτι-clause within a probably well-known passage from the Scriptures, the

<sup>135</sup> See Davies’ and Alison’s comments on Matthew’s withdrawing this portion ‘because it probably sounded too harsh’ (*Matthew*, II, 393). The authors, however, use the Nestle-Aland text to propose this conclusion, not the Bezan text.



ὄτι-clause in  $\aleph$ B could also be seen as a smoothening correction. It is arguable, therefore, that the construction of the texts of the Gospels could have been corrected at a very early stage when the Gospels were circulating separately, altering the common wording with ἴνα-clauses in an effort to smoothen the Markan/Lukan language from an originally purposive clause found as the original saying uttered by Jesus quoting Isa. 6.9-10LXX.<sup>136</sup>

Mt 26.28 – par. Mk 14.24//Lk 22.19-20

Mt 26.28 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου  $\tau$ τῆς  $\tau$ διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

$\tau$ p) καινῆς A C D K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 12211  $\aleph$  latt sy sa bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | txt (om.)  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>37.45 vid</sup>  $\aleph$  B L Z Θ 0298<sup>vid</sup> 33 mae bo<sup>ms</sup>; Ir<sup>amm</sup>

Further vll:<sup>137</sup>  $\tau$ τό A C K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844  $\aleph$  sy<sup>h</sup> | txt (om.)  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>37</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L Z Θ 33 12211

Mk 14.24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου ἵ τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν<sup>τ</sup>

ἵp) τὸ (-579 892) τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης A K P Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 28 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542  $\aleph$  lat sy sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | τὸ τῆς διαθήκης D\* W | -ff<sup>2</sup> | txt  $\aleph$  B C D<sup>c</sup> L Θ Ψ 565 k sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | ἵ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον D W Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 sy<sup>s.p</sup> | p) περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυν(ν)όμενον A K P Γ f<sup>1</sup> 28 700 1241 1424 2542  $\aleph$  sy<sup>h</sup> | txt  $\aleph$  B C L Ψ 892 |  $\tau$ p) εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν W f<sup>13</sup> a vg<sup>ms</sup> (sa<sup>mss</sup> bo) bo<sup>mss</sup>

Lk 22.19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου  $\square$ τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. [20] ἵ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως<sup>2</sup> μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.<sup>\</sup>

[19/20]  $\square$ τὸ ὑπὲρ ...εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν<sup>\</sup> D it | ἵp) 4 1-3 (ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον) A K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 892 1424 2542 1844  $\aleph$  lat sy<sup>(p).h</sup> | txt  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  B L 579 r<sup>1</sup> [20] om. (D it)

This verse is part of the Last Supper and presents Jesus identifying his blood as ‘of the [new] covenant,’ ‘new’ being present in some manuscripts only. The presence of the adjective in Mark is also subject to variation. The Lukan parallel seems to refer to ἢ καινὴ

<sup>136</sup> DAVIES–ALISON, *Matthew*, II, 393.

<sup>137</sup> There is an extra variant reading at Mt 26.28 that NA<sup>28</sup> does not mention but that was identified from the MS itself: τὸ περὶ πολλῶν B ] τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν D.

διαθήκη but not in Codex Bezae where Lk 22.19b-20 is omitted, resulting into a highly discussed textual problem.<sup>138</sup>

In terms of external evidence, the presence of the double article in Mt 26.28 and the adjective καινῆς is disputed across the manuscripts leaving three possible readings:

τὸ αἶμά μου	τῆς διαθήκης	τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχ.	Ϟ <sup>37.45vid</sup> Ⲛ B L Z Θ 33 l2211
τὸ αἶμά μου τὸ	τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης	τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχ.	A C K W Γ Δ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 [892 1241 1424 l844 ℳ
τὸ αἶμά μου	τῆς καινῆς διαθήκη	τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχ.	D

Applying text-critical principles, it is easier to explain the *addition* of καινῆς, to τῆς διαθήκης because of the Markan and Lukan wording and the force of later liturgical usage, once the Eucharist was established, rather than its deletion. Note, however, that deletion could have happened accidentally because of the triple succession of HC-endings. In Matthew, the reference to the blood as covenant is textually attested, but whether this is referred to as a ‘new’ covenant must have been in dispute in the early days of the Church.

In Mark, the double article τό plus adjective (τὸ αἶμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης) is supported by Byzantine representatives and early versions, but the absence of the adjective is found in Codex Bezae with further sub-variants depending on the presence or absence of the repeated article as presented below:

τὸ αἶμά μου	τῆς	διαθήκης	Ⲛ B C D <sup>c</sup> L Θ Ψ 565 k sa <sup>mss</sup> bo <sup>pt</sup>
τὸ αἶμά μου τὸ	τῆς	διαθήκης	D* W
τὸ αἶμά μου τὸ	τῆς καινῆς	διαθήκης	A K P Γ Δ f <sup>1.13</sup> 28 700 1241 1424 [2542 ℳ lat sy sa <sup>mss</sup> bo <sup>pt</sup>
τὸ αἶμά μου	τῆς	καινῆς διαθήκης	579 892

In Luke, on the other hand, the apparent presence of τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη should not obscure the fact that half of the verse (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον...τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον) is absent in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin, whether this is accidental or intentional. If the end of the verse truly ends with the blessing of the bread (excluding mention of the second cup), the variant in question must have happened at a very early stage.

All three Gospels have external attestation dating to the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. making the presence of καινῆς in Bezan Matthew a variant that is most probably more than a harmonisation resulting from scribal activity.

<sup>138</sup> The discussion on the ‘cup-bread-cup’ order goes beyond this work and is a major textual *crux*. See J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Eng. transl. N. Perrin; London: SCM Press, 1966) 138–59; G.D. KILPATRICK, ‘Luke xxii,’ in *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy* (The Moorhouse Lectures; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 28–42; on a more recent comprehensive study see B.S. BILLINGS, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b): An Historical-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (LNTS 314; T. & T. Clark, 2006).

In terms of internal evidence, the importance of the presence or absence of the adjective in Matthew, i.e. whether the covenant is new or not, has surely had an effect on the transmission of the Eucharistic words in post-Easter times. Paul, who wrote before the Evangelists, uses the adjective *καινή* in the similar context of 1 Cor 11.25. The presence in the Synoptics of the adjective *καινῆς* is disputed and cannot simply be regarded as a harmonisation:<sup>139</sup> indeed, even the shorter reading in Mt 28B could then be identified as a harmonisation with Mark. Furthermore, the Committee's suggestion that 'the word *καινῆς* has apparently come from the parallel passage in Luke (22.20)'<sup>140</sup> but such interpretation is partial since it is related to the reading of Lk 22.20 in Codex Vaticanus: such a case is therefore unlikely since, precisely, Bezan Luke does not read the 'wine bit' in Lk 22.20.<sup>141</sup>

Was the adjective added to the shorter text of Matthew? A shorter reading could well refer to Moses' spilling of wine upon the people Exod. 24.8<sup>142</sup> in which case the reading in Codex Bezae would reflect the early Eucharistic practice of the post-Easter communities before it was adapted to match Paul's wording. Was the adjective removed from the longer text? If we assume the original presence of the adjective due to the mention in Paul's letter and reflecting early liturgical practice, or to an allusion to Jer. 31.31MT (Jer. 38.31LXX),<sup>143</sup> the withdrawal of the adjective could either be accidental (series of endings in HC) or a deliberate harmonising with Mark (apparently secondary manuscripts read the adjective in Mark). However, the absence of 32 words in Lk 22.19b-20, i.e. a 'western non-interpolation,'<sup>144</sup> as if the Eucharistic words would only consist of the description of the cup and the bread, makes the analysis even more complex, specifically because the absence of this part causes there to be no reference to any 'covenant' at all.

The relevance of 1<sup>st</sup> c. theology to this variant makes a definite conclusion difficult to reach. Seeing a harmonistic reading in the presence of the adjective neglects the possible theological and/or liturgical considerations at play, which are just as likely to lead to its deletion as to its addition.

#### Mt 26.70 – par. Mk 14.68//Lk 22.57

Mt 26.70 ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο ἔμπροσθεν ἑπάντων λέγων· οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις†.

<sup>139</sup> Davies and Allison suggest 'an assimilation to Luke and Paul.' (*Matthew*, III, 472 n.119)

<sup>140</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 54.

<sup>141</sup> On the absence of Lk 22.20D.05, see J. RIUS-CAMPS, 'La fracció del pa [sense copa eucarística], ¿gest distintiu de les comunitats lucanes?' in *RTC* 25 [2000] 81-93. The author suggests that it is the breaking of the bread that was initially thought by Luke to correspond to the celebration of the Eucharist for the early communities, i.e. without reference to the cup.

<sup>142</sup> 'And Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people, and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words."' (...καὶ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἣς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων). The use of *περὶ* (*πάντων*) as in Mt 26.28D.05 contra B.03 (*ὑπέρ*) is noteworthy.

<sup>143</sup> 'Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah' (καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν [Jer. 38.31LXX]).

<sup>144</sup> See Chapter 2 III. 1. 3.

<sup>τ</sup>ρ) οὐδὲ (οὐτέ Δ) ἐπίσταμαι D Δ f<sup>1</sup> it sy<sup>s</sup> | txt (om.) B *rell*

Further vll: ἰαὐτῶν K 565 1424 | αὐτῶν πάντων A C\* W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 579 700<sup>c</sup>  
1241 *pm* | txt (πάντων) & B C<sup>2</sup> D L Z Θ 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 33 700\* 892 1844 *pm* verss

Mk 14.68 ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέγων, Οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον <sup>□</sup> [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν] \

<sup>□</sup>& B L W Ψ\* 579 892 c sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | txt A C D K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ<sup>c</sup> 067 f<sup>1.13</sup> 28  
33 565 700 1241 (+ εὐθέως a. ἀλέκτωρ 1424) 2542<sup>s</sup> ℳ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> (sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>);  
Eus

Lk 22.57 ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο <sup>τ</sup> λέγων, ᾿Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, γύναι.᾿

<sup>τ</sup>αὐτόν A D\* W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 565 700 1241 ℳ aur vg | txt ℞<sup>75</sup> & B D<sup>c</sup> K L T  
070 f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1424 2542 1844 it sy<sup>s,c,p</sup> co | γύναι Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν A K N W Γ  
Δ Θ 070 f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1424 2542 1844 ℳ lat sy | Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν D |  
txt ℞<sup>75</sup> & B L T Ψ 1241 co

Mt 26.70 is part of Peter's triple denial (Mt 26.69-75) where the disciple tries to escape from the maid's accusation of having been with Jesus, to which he answers 'I do not know what you mean.' The Bezan text seems to 'add' the verbal phrase 'nor [do I] understand' (οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι), which resembles the Markan parallel verse (14.68), hence the claim that a harmonisation has taken place. Luke is more straightforward and says 'I do not know him, woman' (Lk 22.57) with the only variant being with regard to the presence, absence or position of the vocative γύναι.

In terms of external evidence, a few Greek witnesses as well as early versions support the Bezan longer reading allowing the variant reading to be dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. The shorter reading is supported by the rest of the textual tradition which gives it considerable weight, although the large geographical distribution of the longer reading should not be neglected. Mark is firm with the presence of the double words without any variants across the textual tradition. It was noted earlier (Chapter 5 II. 1) that Mark was not circulating widely in the first centuries, which means that a harmonisation with Mark is unlikely at such an early date. Actually, Mt 26.70 actually corresponds to Peter's first denial out of a series of three with moving states of readings that may well have impacted the variant readings found in this verse. For this reason it is useful to separate out each denial in the three Gospels for more clarity:

### Matthew

---

First denial (Mt 26.70)

CHAPTER 6

Οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις	B
Οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι	D

**Second denial (Mt 26.72)**

Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον	firm
-----------------------	------

**Third denial (Mt 26.74)**

Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον	firm
-----------------------	------

**Mark**

---

**First Denial (Mk 14.68)**

Οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις	firm
---------------------------------------	------

**Second Denial (Mk 14.70a)**

∅	D (singular)
ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο	B <i>rell</i>

**Third Denial (Mk 14.71)**

Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε.	firm
---	------

**Luke**

---

**First Denial (Lk 22.57)**

Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, γύναι	ⱼ <sup>75</sup> Ɀ B L T Ψ 1241 co
Γύναι Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν	A W Θ 070 ℳ lat sy
Οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν	D

**Second Denial (Lk 22.58)**

ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί	firm
-------------------	------

**Third Denial (Lk 22.60)**

Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα τι λέγεις	Ɀ D sa
Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις	B <i>rell</i>

It could be thought that the apparent simplicity of the dialogue ('I do not know him/what you are talking about') should not have generated any variant readings. In actual fact, Matthew is relatively firm (the text for the second and third denials are verbally identical and secure). Mark exhibits a textually-secure first and third denial, while Codex Bezae does not mention any second denial (a singular reading against the rest of the tradition). Finally, Luke reads γύναι in three different ways in the first denial, the second denial is secure and the third denial is slightly variant with early support for the two readings involved. The question remains whether the longer reading in Mt D.05 is a harmonisation with Mk 14.68D.05. Can one assume that a scribe would have deliberate-

ly added οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι to match the Markan reading? In actual fact, the Bezan reading in Matthew is verbally different from the Markan one. Therefore, the textual form needs to be investigated further; otherwise it could just as easily be argued that the shorter reading in Matthew is a harmonisation with the existing second-century reading, supported by a Sahidic witness, as well as Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae. Thus, the external evidence is inconclusive and the construction of the text needs examination.

In terms of internal evidence, the exact Markan wording is different in two respects: firstly, both verbs are linked with the double adjunctive negative conjunctive construction οὐτε... οὐτε... and secondly, σὺ τί λέγεις is subordinated to the first double clause instead of the one in Bezan Matthew which reads οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις as a first clause after which οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι (a typical Matthean feature<sup>145</sup> meaning ‘not only but...’) is highlighted by its position at the end of the sentence.<sup>146</sup> Furthermore, ἐπίσταμαι is a rare word (only this occurrence in Mark and in Bezan Matthew for all Gospels) but, like οἶδα, translates the same Hebrew verb יָדַע, ‘to know’<sup>147</sup> therefore, while a repetition would not make sense in Hebrew, the Greek may have required the addition as a precision to distinguish the two forms from a sentence uttered in a Semitic language.

As to why variants have occurred at an early stage in the textual tradition in such an apparently easy-to-describe dialogue during which Peter claimed he did not understand what the maid said, it can be speculated the following. Since the post-Easter communities at some point were confronted with the matter of Peter’s status as leader of the apostles, his statements could have given rise to a textual corruption aimed at reducing the limitations of Peter’s understanding, or to ‘whitewash’ him in Black’s wording.<sup>148</sup>

Assuming that the scribes had a fair knowledge of the Scriptures, the predominant presence of οὐκ οἶδα without ἐπίσταμαι indicates that the presence of the latter could be the result of a ‘remembered’ piece of material from the first denial in Mark, aimed at clarifying the dual meaning of the Semitic יָדַע.<sup>149</sup> The expression οὐκ οἶδα is a solid leitmotiv across the Synoptics, which would explain the reason for the withdrawal of οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι, i.e. its potential contextual redundancy.

These two points need to be taken together with the fact that the οὐκ ... οὐδὲ structure is widely used by Matthew. Thus the conclusion that a harmonisation has tak-

<sup>145</sup> Ten occurrences: Mt. 10.24, 12.4,19,32, 13.1, 21.32, 23.1, 25.13,4, 27.14.

<sup>146</sup> It could be further argued that οὐτε and οὐδὲ are different: οὐδὲ: ‘and not, continuing a negation, yet differently from οὐτε; for the latter connects parts or members of the same thing, since τε, is adjunctive like the Latin *que*; but οὐδὲ, places side by side things that are equal and mutually exclude each other’ (THAYER, s.v. οὐδὲ, οὐτε).

<sup>147</sup> ἐπίσταμαι refers to ‘know’ as in ‘to be able to,’ ‘to understand’ and οἶδα, to ‘know’ e.g. God (BDAG, s.v. ἐπίσταμαι, οἶδα).

<sup>148</sup> M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998) 80. Similar evidence that the flaws of Peter’s character are attenuated or eliminated in all textual traditions of Luke-Acts compared with that transmitted by Codex Bezae is well documented J. RIUS-CAMPS and J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of the Bezan Text of Acts*, vol. 1, 127; vol.2, 283, 366 in reference to Acts 1.15-26;11.1-2; 12,1-17.

<sup>149</sup> Black quotes Torrey who sees in Mark (but actually in Bezan Matthew as well) a ‘mistranslation of the Aramaic which should have been rendered ‘I neither *know nor am I acquainted with him of whom you speak*’ reflecting the ambiguous and indeclinable particle ܐ (BLACK, *Aramaic Approach*, 80).

en place here is again too simplistic. That being so, the presence of οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι in Bezan Matthew could simply point to the same source as Mark (whether Mark itself or a different source) where the Greek used was trying to explicit the verb ὕψ from the start.

Mt 26.73 – par. Mk 14.70//Lk 22.59

Mt 26.73 μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προσελθόντες οἱ ἐστῶτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ἀληθῶς <sup>□</sup>καὶ σὺ ἔξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ <sup>τ</sup>ἡ λαλιά σου <sup>ρ</sup>δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ<sup>λ</sup>.

<sup>□</sup>p) om. καὶ σὺ D Θ f<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> | txt (καὶ σὺ) B rell

Further vll: <sup>τ</sup>Γαλιλαῖος εἶ καὶ C\* sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> | <sup>ρ</sup>ὀμοιάζει D it sy<sup>s</sup>

Mk 14.70 <sup>□</sup>ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο<sup>λ</sup>. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον <sup>□</sup>τῷ Πέτρῳ<sup>λ</sup>, Ἀληθῶς ἔξ αὐτῶν εἶ, <sup>ρ</sup>καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ<sup>λ</sup>.

<sup>□</sup>D (cf. ad v.69<sup>ρ</sup>)|<sup>□</sup>1 D a | <sup>ρ</sup>καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ καὶ ἡ (-Δ) λαλιά σου ὀμοιάζει (δηλοῖ N) A K N Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 28 (33) 892 1241 1424 ℣ q sy<sup>p,h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιῆ 579 | -W a | txt & B C D L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 565 700 2542<sup>s</sup> lat (sy<sup>s</sup>) sa bo<sup>pt</sup>; Eus

Lk 22.59 καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς ἄλλος τις διῖσχυρίζετο <sup>ρ</sup>λέγων, Ἐπ' ἀληθείας<sup>λ</sup> καὶ οὗτος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν.

<sup>ρ</sup>Ἐπ' ἀληθείας λέγω D

This verse describes Peter's third and final denial of Jesus (Mt 26,69-75, par. Mk 14.66-72, Lk 22.56-62) where the bystanders accuse him, saying 'Certainly you are [also you] one of them, [for you are Galilean and] [for your accent betrays you].'<sup>150</sup> Codex Bezae reads 'Certainly you are one of them,' omitting καὶ σὺ, and substituting 'for your accent betrays you (lit. 'makes you evident')' by 'for your accent resembles you.' In both Luke and Mark, καὶ σὺ is absent. The fact that Mt 26.73D.05 is like the text of Mark and Luke in not reading καὶ σὺ is apparently regarded in the critical apparatus of Matthew as the result of a scribal attempt to reduce discordance between the Gospels.

In terms of external evidence, the absence in Codex Bezae of καὶ σὺ is also supported by Codex Koridethi, family 1 and some early versions while the entire remaining part of the tradition attests its presence. The reason that the absence of these two words is tagged as harmonistic has more to do with the paucity of manuscripts support than anything else, despite the relatively diverse geographical evidence. This case is rather exceptional since here it is not the addition or substitution of a word or group of words

<sup>150</sup> The square brackets indicate the alternative wording in the textual tradition.

but the absence of *καὶ σὺ* which is regarded as a harmonisation. The variant reading must have been generated as an early stage of the transmission because of its wide geographical attestation and its early attestation.

In terms of internal evidence, the high level of variability of the verse among the traditions reflects textual uncertainty as to what the bystanders truly said. This has been examined at length by Holmes who concentrates on the second clause and confesses that the omission of *καὶ σὺ* remains ‘mysterious.’<sup>151</sup> All three Synoptics say similar things. Mark and Matthew use the second person singular and Luke reports the words indirectly. Mark has a firm first clause Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, where the prepositional phrase is fronted and in essence thus explicitly insists on Peter being *one of them*.

The absence of *καὶ σὺ* in Bezan Matthew is apparently recorded in the critical apparatus as a harmonisation because of its firm absence in Mk 14.70. However, a possible attraction from the previous *καὶ σὺ* in Mt 26.69 (secure) could have resulted in vertical harmonisation, thus highlighting the phrase in Codex Vaticanus and support as shown below:<sup>152</sup>

#### First denial

Mt 26.69                      *καὶ σὺ*            ἦσθα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου    B D *rell*

#### Second denial

Mt 26.71                      Οὗτος ἦν            μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου            B D *rell*

#### Third denial

Mt 26.73            Ἀληθῶς                      ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ,                      D Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> *sy*<sup>s</sup> *sa*<sup>ms</sup>  
                          Ἀληθῶς *καὶ σὺ*            ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ,                      B *rell*

On the other hand, it could be argued that the reason for the deletion of an original *καὶ σὺ* in the third denial could be the previous explicit address in the second person singular rather than a deliberate harmonisation with Mark. The examination of the rare use of the adverb ἀληθῶς in Matthew shows that it could be a highlighting device, specifically because of its use in key passages confessing the identity of Jesus: indeed, apart from Mt 26.73, ἀληθῶς is used in Mt 14.33b where Peter recognises Jesus as Son of God after confessing himself as a sinner: Ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ (D.05: Ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ εἶ σὺ); in Mt 27.54 where the centurion sees Jesus as the Son of God: ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος. In these three instances and despite the extremely close verbal similarity, the personal pronoun may or may not appear and cannot call determine a pattern one way or another. Therefore the original presence or absence of *καὶ σὺ* in Mt 26.73 cannot be certain.

<sup>151</sup> M.W. HOLMES, ‘The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,’ *JBL* 109 (1990) 651–64.

<sup>152</sup> Davies and Allison argue, though, that this confirms the originality of the two words: ‘it comes from the first denial (v. 69=Mk 14.67)’ (*Matthew*, III, 547).



The reason for considering the absence of the two words as secondary is linked to the paucity of manuscripts support rather than the result of an understanding of its addition. The reason for a withdrawal or addition nevertheless shows that the corruption occurred at a very early stage of the textual transmission with both forms crystallising into these two readings. There is equal reason to have added the two words to, or withdrawn them from, the original text.

Mt 28.8 –par. Mk 16.8//Lk 24.9

Mt 28.8 καὶ ἄπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

Ὶp) ἐξελθοῦσαι A D K W Γ Δ 0148 f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 l844 l2211  
 ℣ | txt (ἀπελθοῦσαι) 8 B C L Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33

Mk 16.8 ἰκαὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς Ὶτρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· Ὶκαὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Ὶ[[<sup>1</sup>Ὶ πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ὶ ἀπὸ Ὶ ἀνατολῆς ὀ<sup>1</sup> καὶ Ὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. ὀ<sup>2</sup> ἀμήν.]]

Ὶ κακούσασι Θ Ὶ καὶ ἀκούσαντες 565 Ὶ καὶ ἀκούσασι ἐξῆλθον καὶ W (099)  
 sy<sup>s.(p.hmg)</sup>

Further vll:<sup>153</sup> Ὶ φόβος D W it sa<sup>ms</sup>

Lk 24.9 καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι Ὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου Ὶ ἀπήγγειλαν Ὶ ταῦτα πάντα Ὶ τοῖς ἔνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς.

Ὶ D it Ὶ 8 D K Γ Δ Θ 070 565 1241 1424 pm c sy<sup>h</sup> Ὶ txt 8<sup>75</sup> A B L W Ψ  
 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 2542 l844 l2211 pm sy<sup>p</sup>

Mt 28.8 describes the reaction of the women at Jesus' tomb following the angel's command to announce the Risen Christ: they 'departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples.' Codex Vaticanus uses the participle ἀπελθοῦσαι ('went away') while the participle ἐξελθοῦσαι ('went out') is used in Bezan Matthew as in Mark – with some vll involving the participle ἀκούσασι ('heard') – but not as in Luke where the participle ὑποστρέψασαι ('turn back') is invariably used across the textual tradition.

<sup>153</sup> The rest of the critical apparatus to Mt 16.8 is complex and can be referred to in the NA<sup>28</sup>. Mark traditionally ends at ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ as in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus but the text continues in most of the other manuscripts. The discussion is beyond the scope of this work but has been discussed at length in the literature (see e.g. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, 124–47 with an in-depth summary of the question).

In terms of external evidence, the two readings can be divided into two groups with mostly Byzantine witnesses supporting the Bezan *v*l and Alexandrian and Caesarean witnesses supporting the ‘discordant’ verb. In the parallel text of Mark, most of the witnesses, including Codex Bezae, read *καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι* but some others, mostly Caesarean<sup>154</sup> or Western, read ‘and they heard’ (*κακούσασαι*) or the conflated reading (*καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἐξῆλθον*). Luke has the secure reading *ὑποστρέψασαι*, ‘they returned.’ Therefore the external evidence is conclusive only if supremacy is given to the Alexandrian witnesses *contra* Codex Bezae and assuming alternative readings in Mark are also secondary.<sup>155</sup>

In terms of internal evidence and to determine the likely original reading of Mt 28.8D.05, three things need to be understood from the passage in Matthew in the light of Mark’s and Luke’s reports of the women at the tomb: (1) the verb used to describe the women leaving the tomb, i.e. *ἐξέρχομαι* or *ἀπέρχομαι*; (2) the kind of tomb indicated (*μνημεῖον* can technically be a grave or a sepulchre or a burial monument)<sup>156</sup> to gauge the possibility of visiting (from the outside) or entering it; (3) the possible impact of scribal activity.

Firstly, the reaction of the women leaving Jesus’ empty tomb is expressed in a similar manner in all the Synoptics as can be seen from the following breakdown:

Mt 28.8	Mk 16.8	Lk 24.9	Meaning/Idea	Manuscripts
<i>ἀπελθοῦσαι</i> <i>ἐξελθοῦσαι</i>	<i>καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι</i> <i>κακούσασαι</i> <i>καὶ ἀκούσασαι</i> <i>ἐξῆλθον καὶ</i>	<i>ὑποστρέψασαι</i> (firm)	leaving/ hear- ing/returning	B+support D+support Θ+support W+support
<i>ἀπὸ τοῦ</i> <i>μνημείου</i> <i>μετὰ φόβου</i>	<i>ἀπὸ τοῦ</i> <i>μνημείου</i> <i>ἐφοβοῦντο</i>	<i>ἀπὸ τοῦ</i> <i>μνημείου</i> <i>εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς</i> <i>τρόμος καὶ</i> <i>ἔκστασις</i>	from the tomb ‘fear’	□ D φόβος D W τρόμος B <i>rell</i>
<i>ἔδραμον</i> <i>ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς</i> <i>μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ</i>	<i>ἔφυγον</i> <i>οὐδενὶ οὐδέν</i> <i>εἶπαν</i>	- <i>ἀπήγγειλαν</i> <i>ταῦτα πάντα</i> <i>τοῖς ἑνδεκα καὶ</i> <i>πᾶσιν τοῖς</i>	‘flee’ ‘proclaim’/‘not proclaim’	

<sup>154</sup> It is agreed that Codex Washingtonianus is Caesarean in Mark 5.31-16.20 (B.M. METZGER, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* [New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981] 82). This is confirmed by Lafleur (D. LAFLEUR, ‘The “Caesarean” Text of the Gospel of Mark: Lake Revisited,’ in *BABELAO* 3 [2014] 145-69 [158]).

<sup>155</sup> Metzger comments this variant reading as an assimilation done ‘by copyists to the parallel in Mk 16.8 where *ἐξελθοῦσαι* is firm.’ (METZGER, *Commentary*, 60).

<sup>156</sup> *μνημεῖον*, -ου, τό: ‘token of remembrance’, esp. for the dead (BDAG, s.v. *μνημεῖον*); or 1. *any visible object for preserving or recalling the memory of any person or thing*; 2. *a memorial, monument* (Aeschylus, Pindar, Sophocles, and following); in Biblical Greek so in Sap. 10:7; specifically, *a sepulchral monument*; in the Scriptures *a sepulchre, tomb* (THAYER, s.v. *μνημεῖον*).

Mt 28.8	Mk 16.8	Lk 24.9	Meaning/Idea	Manuscripts
		λοιποῖς		

Table 27: Textual Comparison of Mt 28.8 and Parallels and Meanings

From the lexical and scribal differences it can be seen that: the women ‘go away’ (ἀπελθοῦσαι, B.03 and its support), or ‘go out’ (ἐξελθοῦσαι, D.05 and its support) in Matthew. In terms of language style, ἐξέρχομαι can be considered as slightly more Markan than Matthean (Mt: 7; Mk: 12; Lk: 5; Ac: 7)<sup>157</sup> and ἀπέρχομαι is rarely and indistinctly used (Mt: 3; Mk: 5; Lk: 4; Ac: 0).<sup>158</sup> Since the numbers do not help in identifying a pure Matthean use of ἀπελθοῦσαι or ἐξελθοῦσαι in Mt 28.8, neither verb can be help to favour one or the other as generating the others:<sup>159</sup> the Bezan reading may reflect an absence of correction by Matthew *from* his Markan source and ἀπελθοῦσαι could either be an original editorial *or* a scribal correction. The differences in the verbs used in the three Gospels and in the manuscripts (‘go away,’ ‘hear [and go out],’ ‘go out’) indicate that there were both textual and theological concerns or difficulties raised when describing the reaction of the first witnesses to the resurrection. Indeed, the rest of the verse is highly similar in the three Gospels (esp. lexical resemblances, similar or opposite in meaning) pointing to a probable dependence on the sources, and also to a probable confusion in the scribal activity.

If we take account of the context from Mt 28.1 where the passage of the Women at the Tomb starts, they are said to be ‘going [to see the sepulchre]’ (ἦλθεν [θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον]). The ambiguity arises in Mt 28.8 from whether they simply went away *from* the tomb (ἀπελθοῦσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, B.03) or if they came *into* the burial chamber and left by exiting it (ἐξελθοῦσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, D.05). Rationally, the use of ἐξέρχομαι would imply an earlier entering which is not specified in Matthew<sup>160</sup> and would favour the Bezan reading. This confusion in the imagery is also due to the three words used to describe the location of where Jesus was laid: τάφος,<sup>161</sup> μνημεῖον, and μνῆμα<sup>162</sup> meaning that there is some confusion over the tomb itself and the possible cave containing the tomb. Μνημεῖον is used across all four Gospels while the words differ in the introduction to the passage: τάφος is mentioned in Matthew (Mt 28.1), μνῆμα in Luke (Lk 24.1), μνημεῖον in

<sup>157</sup> From Yoder’s *Concordance*, it appears that Codex Bezae at times prefers ἐξέπχομαι to ἔρχομαι and attests only twice a variation similar to Mt 28.8 (Mk 12.12, Ac 16.39). There is therefore no pattern behind this different reading (see YODER, *Concordance*, s.v. ἐξέρχομαι).

<sup>158</sup> No significant differences in Codex Bezae can be seen from the variant rearings in Codex Bezae (YODER, *Concordance*, s.v. ἀπέρχομαι).

<sup>159</sup> Ὑποστρέφω can be however considered as typically Lukan in NA<sup>28</sup> (Mt 0; Mk 0; Lk 7; Ac 1) so the replacement may well reflect an original change. There are two further cases of use of ὑποστρέφω in Codex Bezae, again in Luke-Acts (YODER, *Concordance*, s.v. ὑποστρέφω).

<sup>160</sup> Only Luke and Mark mention ‘entering the grave’: καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον (Mk 16.5) and εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ κτλ. (Lk 24.3)

<sup>161</sup> τάφος, -ου, ὁ: *grave, tomb* (BDAG, s.v. τάφος) ; 1. *burial*. 2. *a grave, sepulchre* (THAYER, s.v. τάφος).

<sup>162</sup> μνῆμα, -ατος, τό; a ‘sign of remembrance’, esp. for the dead (Hom. +), then gener. *grave, tomb* (BDAG, s.v. μνῆμα). See Thayer for μνῆμα 1. a monument or memorial to perpetuate the memory of any person or thing, 2. a sepulchral monument, 3. a sepulchre or tomb (receptacle where a dead body is deposited) (THAYER, s.v. μνῆμα).

Mk (16.2). However, while each Evangelist has a different way of naming the burial place, all mention the woman who went away ‘from the tomb’ (ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου).

On the one hand, the Bezan reading may be a harmonisation with the Markan reading since the absence of the phrase ‘entering the sepulchre’ may have caused the scribe to ‘remember’ that the women entered and exited the grave and ‘correct’ the Alexandrian reading. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the reading in Codex Vaticanus reflects a correction of ἐξελθοῦσαι into ἀπελθοῦσαι, since from the context it is not evident that the women had not entered the burial chamber (cf. v. 6 ‘Come, see the place where he was lying,’ v. 7 ‘and go quickly and tell’) meaning that they would immediately go away (ἀπελθοῦσαι), after the angel spoke (28.2 describes a situation that happened outside). The Bezan reading would then simply reflect Matthew’s editorial construction from Mark (a case of ‘fatigue’).<sup>163</sup>

Would the difference between manuscripts matter significantly? Apparently not, since the combination of verbs that are read in Mt 28.8D.05 is closely similar to a passage within Isaiah (Isa. 48.20LXX) where ἐξερχομαι / φεύγων ἀπὸ / ἀπαγγείλατε all translate a similar proclamation to the people (the common terms between the Greek and the Hebrew are in bold):

Isa. 48.20 LXX **ἐξελθε ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος φεύγων ἀπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων φωνήν εὐφροσύνης ἀναγγείλατε καὶ ἀκουστὸν γενέσθω τοῦτο ἀπαγγείλατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς λέγετε ἑρρύσατο κύριος τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ.**<sup>164</sup>

This verse is the literal Greek translation of the Masoretic text which says:

צאו מבבל ברחו מכשדים בקול רנה הגידו השמיעו זאת הוציאוה עד-קצה הארץ  
אמרו גאל יהוה עבדו יעקב (Isa 48.20)

This comparison suggests another explanation for the use of the verb ἐξερχομαι in Mark and Bezan Matthew, being a typical translation of צא in the LXX and since φη can equally be translated as ἀπό or ἐκ: Matthew would have recognised in Mark Isaiah’s prophecy a re-enactment of the liberation of the people rather than a simple description of women at a tomb. The use of ἀπέρχομαι may therefore simply be a very early correction that had missed the allusion to the Jewish Scriptures and narrated the incident as simple story. This may be further evidence to add to that already seen of Codex Bezae reflecting more not only a literal story but also a Jewish message independently of a consistent description of the event: there would be an intentional echo of the people who *go out* of Babylon/Chaldea and declare/proclaim/send it forth to the end of the earth, implicitly likening the resurrection to the prophecy of Isaiah ‘the Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob!’ The message might have been contained in Mark’s story and Matthew

<sup>163</sup> On the concept of ‘fatigue’ as an accidental inconsistency betraying the act copying of a source by an editor, see M. GOODACRE, ‘Fatigue in the Synoptics,’ *NTS* 44 (1998) 45-58.

<sup>164</sup> ‘Go forth from Babylon, flee from Chaldea, declare this with a shout of joy, proclaim it, send it forth to the end of the earth; say, “The LORD has redeemed his servant Jacob!”’

would have deliberately taken the same word, irrespective of whether or not the women actually entered into a tomb.<sup>165</sup>

### II. 3. Conclusions

This section discussed the 18 expressions that are found in the Synoptics in non-repeated contexts that are potentially harmonistic readings in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. Unlike section I, which was dedicated to a similar study of repeated wording, both internal and external evidence needed to be considered here in order to evaluate the variant readings without claiming any reference to alleged ‘usual’ modes of expression.

The Bezan readings discussed here always have a different reading from Codex Vaticanus. They are either supported by a few manuscripts (mainly early versions) or they belong to a strand of tradition that is competing with Codex Vaticanus. None can be discarded a priori.

When observed superficially, all readings studied in this section seem to be ‘obvious’ harmonisations with Mark and/or Luke, but a more precise investigation leads to the opposite conclusion: either the Bezan readings in question are also variant in the parallel passage(s), thereby pointing to a textual difficulty, or, despite similar syntax or wording, the parallel passages only partly share common material. Further, in some instances, it is unlikely that a scribe who was harmonising with a parallel passage to miss something as significant as a pronoun or article. In the case of two specific examples, it was even suggested that the readings reflect Jewish allusions that were accidentally erased because of further scribal activity. Finally, in some places, the Alexandrian readings could also be identified as harmonising, but the fact that Codex Vaticanus attests the opposite reading seems to have swayed the Committee.

In all cases, it appears that the deliberate change of the wording aimed at matching the parallel passage, i.e. a harmonisation, appears to be a simplistic, or at least partial, way of explaining a reading, and hides the complexity of the problem.

---

<sup>165</sup> The argument of the section is further discussed in L. PINCHARD, ‘Des traces vétérotestamentaires dans quelques variantes de Matthieu dans le codex de Bèze traditionnellement jugées harmonisantes,’ *NovT* 56 (2014) 1-13.



EXCURSUS - APPLICATION OF THE NESTLE-ALAND CRITERIA FOR  
HARMONISATIONS IN MATTHEW IN ⱭB

Before embarking on a conclusion chapter, an excursus is provided. It is designed to be an overview of the situation regarding harmonisation in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus as can be extracted from the NA<sup>28</sup> apparatus. It is not intended to be an in-depth investigation but rather to serve as a point of comparison with the alleged harmonistic readings in Bezan Matthew.

In order to offer an adequate comparison of the results with the preceding chapters, the alleged harmonistic variants will be ordered the same way as in Chapters 4-6, that is, according to the parallel Synoptic passage.<sup>1</sup>

### I. Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Sinaiticus

There are 24 *vll* identified in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic according to the criteria discussed in Chapter 4. In order to strictly reflect purely Synoptic parallels in Bezan Matthew as explained in Chapter 4 III. 3. 2, I have removed the instances where the alleged harmonisation in Mt Ɑ.01 is with John (Mt 13.57; 26.7; 27.49),<sup>2</sup> leaving thereby 21 of such occurrences in Mt Ɑ.01.<sup>3</sup>

Out of these 21 instances, there are nine where Mt Ɑ.01 departs from Mt B.03 and D.05. Four times, Mt Ɑ.01 agrees with Mt D.05 *contra* Mt B.03. Mt Ɑ.01 agrees once with Codex Vaticanus. Codex Vaticanus and Mt Ɑ.01 agree against Mt D.05. Where Codex Bezae is lacunose, it cannot be ascertained whether Mt Ɑ.01 or Mt B.03 would have been supported by Mt D.05 or not. In these places, Mt Ɑ.01 agrees once *with* Mt B.03 (Mt 8.9), and four times *against* B.03 (Mt 6.23; 8.10,13,29).

The table below summarises this situation.

Type of Agreement	No	References
Ɑ against BD	9	Mt 9.17; 11.21; 12.4; 15.37, 17.9; 19.16; 24.10,24, 27.42
ⱭD against B	4	Mt 9.27; 20.31; 21.1; 24.29
ⱭB against D	2	Mt 20.23
Ɑ with B (D <i>lac.</i> )	1	Mt 8.9

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 2 will provide the more familiar classification into absence, presence, alternative wording and word order differences: 1 omission in Mt 20.23; 5 additions in Mt 8.9,13; 11.21; 27.5; 27.49; 15 substitutions in Mt 8.29; 9.17,27; 12.4; 13.57; 17.9; 19.16; 20.31 (2x); 21.1; 24.10,24,29; 26.7; 27.42 and 3 word order differences in Mt 6.23; 8.10; 15.37.

<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, Mt 27.49 is a so-called ‘Western’ non-interpolation (see Chapter 2 III. 1. 3) where both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus read a portion of verse which is highly similar to a passage in John.

<sup>3</sup> The appendix will however list the 24 *vll* to complete the picture in the more familiar classification of presence, absence, alternative wording and word order differences.

Type of Agreement	No	References
Ⲙ against B (D <i>lac.</i> )	4	Mt 6.23; 8.10,13,29
Total	21	

Table 28: Agreements of Harmonistic Readings in Mt Ⲙ.01/B.03/D.05

A few comments will be provided below each parallel, without searching to evaluate the potentially history of the variant reading. In the case of a reading shared with Codex Bezae, reference will be made to the section where the reading is discussed earlier in relation to Codex Bezae.

### I. 1. Matthew/Matthew Parallels

#### 1. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ἔκραζαν λέγοντες· ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ

ⲉⲓⲃⲟⲩ Ⲙⲓⲣⲓⲉ, ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς Ⲙ B D L Z Θ 085 0281 *f*<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo |  
 ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | *txt* C K N W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 Ⲙ f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c,h</sup>  
 sa<sup>ms</sup> mae

This variant reading shared by all three codices in question, appears to be a specific class of harmonistic variants where the wording corresponds to either a repetition from the immediate context or a stereotyped wording, a case which was discussed in Chapter 6 I. 1. 2.

#### 2. Mt 24.10 – par. Mt 24.9

Mt 24.10 καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους

ⲉⲓⲃⲟⲩ εἰς θλίψιν Ⲙ

As in the previous case, Codex Sinaiticus alone apparently substitutes καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους with εἰς θλίψιν ‘into tribulation,’ a phrase mentioned in the preceding verse in a similar context using similar wording, hence a possible consequence of an homoioteleuton.

#### 3. Mt 27.5 – par. Mt 27.3

Mt 27.5 καὶ ῥίψας τὰ τριακόντα ἀργύρια εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀνεχώρησεν, καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγαγον.

ⲉⲓⲃⲟⲩ (3) τριάκοντα Ⲙ (D *lac.*)

The proposed harmonistic reading is singular where Codex Sinaiticus reads that Judas threw ‘thirty’ pieces of silver in the temple as no mention of a particular peculiar sum in the rest of the tradition, probably because the number is already mentioned in v.3. This potential harmonistic addition is more likely to have been removed than added, since it could have been the earlier mention of the amount that caused it to be omitted a second time.



## I. 2. Matthew/Mark Parallels

## 4. Mt 17.9 – par. Mk 9.9-10

Mt 17.9 Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· μηδενὶ εἶπητε τὸ ὄραμα ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἔγερθῆι.

<sup>Γ</sup>ρ) ἀναστῆι & C K L (W) Z Γ Δ Θ <sup>f</sup>1.13 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 l2211  
 ℣

In Mt 17.9, Codex Sinaiticus, along with a large number of witnesses, apparently substitutes ἐγερθῆι with ἀναστῆι in the expression ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῆι that can be found in the parallel passage Mt 9.9f. This instance of differences in stereotyped wording is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 3. 3.

## 5. Mt 19.16 – par. Mk 10.17 // Lk 18.18

Mt 19.16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;

<sup>Γ</sup>ρ) ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω & L 33 (579) 892 l2211 (sy<sup>s.c.hmg</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo) | ποιήσω ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν (<sup>ς</sup>ζωὴν ἔχω W) αἰώνιον K W Γ Δ <sup>f</sup>1.13 565 700 1241 1424 ℣ | txt B C D Θ sy<sup>h</sup>

In Mt 19.16, Codex Sinaiticus reads literally ‘by doing which good, I will inherit eternal life?’, wording which resembles Lk 18.18 and Mk 10.17 (Mk 10.17: διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; Lk 18.18: διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;).<sup>4</sup>

## 6. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.40

Mt 20.23 ὁ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε <sup>Τ</sup>1, τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἔξ ἐνωπύμων <sup>Τ</sup>2 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν [τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

<sup>ο</sup>ρ) & B K L N Z Γ Θ <sup>f</sup>1.13 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>p</sup> co | txt C D W Δ 085 33 (565) l844 q sy<sup>s.c.h</sup>

Mt 20.23 is the only ‘omission’ identified as a harmonising reading because of its verbal closeness with Mk 10.40. It is noteworthy that the presence of the pronoun τοῦτο is even disputed: square brackets indicate that the Committee is not ‘convinced of the authenticity of the enclosed words.’<sup>5</sup> This renders the identification of the absence of τοῦτο as a harmonistic omission even more subject to questioning.

## 7. Mt 24.29 – par. Mk 13.24-25

Mt 24.29 Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἄπο τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται.

<sup>4</sup> There are difficulties in these verses which would deserve more investigation (position and function of ἀγαθόν, presence of ἵνα and replacement of σχῶ by κληρονομήσω or vice versa before attributing the wording of Codex Sinaiticus to a harmonisation.

<sup>5</sup> NA<sup>28</sup>, 54\*.

ⲑⲣ) ἐκ 8 D 0281

In Mt 24.298.01, along with Codex Bezae and 0281 only, the preposition ἀπό is apparently ‘substituted’ by ἐκ in the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (‘from heaven’). The reading is discussed in Chapter 5 II. 3.

8. Mt 27.42 – par. Mk 15.32

Mt 27.42 ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· ⲧ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἔστιν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ ⲑⲣ πιστεύσομεν ἑπ’ αὐτόν

ⲑⲣ) πιστεύσομεν 8 L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 1424 1844 *pm* | πιστεύομεν A 1241 *it* *vg*<sup>cl.wv</sup> | *txt* B D K *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 892 *pm* *vg*<sup>st</sup>

In Mt 27.42, the future indicative πιστεύσομεν appears in Codex Sinaiticus as a subjunctive (with a volitive sense), as in Mk 15.32 where the clause is introduced by the conjunction ἵνα. A true harmonisation would have attracted the prepositional phrase ἐπ’ αὐτόν (σὺν αὐτῷ in Mk 15.328.01) which is not the case here. Furthermore, the usual confusion between -ο- and -ω- in Koine Greek may be the source of scribal error (see Chapter 3 II. 1), although it is more likely that the absence of ἵνα in Matthew should have led scribes to ‘rectify’ the subjunctive aorist into a future indicative.

### I. 3. Matthew/Luke Parallels

9. Mt 6.23 – par. Mt 6.22 // Lk 11.34

Mt 6.23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ᾦ<sup>ς</sup>, ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον

<sup>ς</sup>(22) ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς 8\* W 33 (D *lac.*)

In Mt 6.238.01\*, the conditional phrase ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ᾦ is read in the default word order (i.e. verb in initial position) ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς but further corrected (8.01<sup>c</sup>) in the preverbal order as into the preceding verse (v.22). The Lukan parallel has a similar wording (ἐπὰν δὲ πονηρὸς ᾦ) where the scribe writing Mt 6.23 could also have thought of a verb-ending clause.

10. Mt 8.9 – par. Lk 7.8

Mt 8.9 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ⲧ ἔχων ὑπ’ ἑμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τοῦτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποιήσον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.

ⲧ ⲣ) τασσόμενος 8 B *it* *vg*<sup>cl</sup> (sa bo) (D *lac.*)

Mt 8.98.01, supported by Codex Vaticanus and early versions, reads the participle τασσόμενος against the rest of the textual tradition, describing the centurion as ‘set under authority’ as in Lk 7.8 (secure). The external evidence as well as the most discordant reading was determining here the harmonistic and secondary character of the presence of the participle. The wording of Mt 8.9 is exactly the same as Lk 7.8 and the presence of τασσόμενος could be seen as scribal activity aimed at making the two verses identical.

## 11. Mt 8.10 – par. Lk 7.9

Mt 8.10 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ᾿παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ' εὗρον.

᾿*p*) οὐδε ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσαύτην πίστιν  $\aleph$  C K L N Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700  
1241 1424 1844 12211  $\aleph$  lat sy<sup>(s).p.h</sup> | παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν *f*<sup>1</sup> | *txt* B W  
(0281 892) a (g<sup>1</sup>) k q sy<sup>(c.hmg)</sup> co (D *lac.*)

Mt 8.10 $\aleph$ .01 has a reading that is, according to the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, potentially harmonistic (with presumably Lk 7.9: λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον). To be fully accurate, this variant reading should be described as both a word order difference (τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ  $\aleph$ .01/ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσαύτην πίστιν B.03) and alternative wording (παρ' οὐδενὶ  $\aleph$ .01/ οὐδε B.03), where NA<sup>28</sup> indicates only a substitution.<sup>6</sup>

## 12. Mt 8.13 – par. Lk 7.10

Mt 8.13 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ᾿εκατοντάρχη· ὕπαγε, <sup>τ</sup> ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς ο[αὐτοῦ] ᾿ ἐν τῇ ᾿ώρα ἐκείνῃ<sup>τ</sup>.

<sup>τ</sup>*p*) καὶ ὑποστρέψας ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ᾿ώρα εὗρεν τὸν παῖδα (+ αὐτοῦ sy<sup>h</sup>) ὑγιαίνοντα  $\aleph^{*.2b}$  C Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> (αὐτόν *Ioco* τὸν παῖδα N 33 1241) g<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> (D *lac.*)

Mt 8.13 $\aleph$ .01(<sup>\*.2b</sup>) is a fluctuating reading in Codex Sinaiticus where the withdrawal and re-addition by scribes shows that the question must have been questioned in early times ( $\aleph^*$  and  $\aleph^{2b}$  have the full reading while  $\aleph^1$  erased it). The resulting reading makes it verbally close to Lk 7.10, although the two parallel passages remain: indeed the centurion goes back to the house in Mt 8.31 $\aleph$ .01, as opposed to the sent disciples (Lk 7.10) and finds his son (Mt)/his slave (Lk). The ‘addition’ of such important material cannot be the result of a scribal distraction but the distant similarity is rather too weak to give the impression that the scribe would have ‘remembered’ the Lukan passage and re-adapted it to the Matthean sentences.

## 13. Mt 11.21 – par. Lk 10.13

Mt 11.21 οὐαὶ σοι, Χοραζῖν, ᾿οὐαὶ σοι<sup>τ</sup>, Βηθσαϊδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρω καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῶ <sup>τ</sup> μετενόησαν.

<sup>τ</sup>*p*) καθήμενοι  $\aleph$  C 33 | –μεναι Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 892 1424 sy<sup>h</sup>

Mt 11.21 $\aleph$ .01 reads καθήμενοι (‘they would have repented long ago [*sitting*] in sackcloth and ashes’) with C 33 (*om.* B). The longer reading attests a high degree of similarity to Lk 10.13. It could be understood that the repentance in sackcloth and ashes naturally implies the position of sitting (cf. Jon. 3.6).

<sup>6</sup> Interestingly, the wording in Lk 7.9D.05, οὐδέποτε τοσ. πισ.ευρ. ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, is singular.

## I. 4. Matthew/Mark/Luke Parallels

14. Mt 8.29 – par. Mk 1.24 // Lk 4.34; 8.28

Mt 8.29 και ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

ⲓ (Lk 4.34) ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσαι πρὸ καιροῦ Ⲭ\* vg<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι W (D *lac.*)

Mt 8.29 $\aleph$ .01\* is supported by a few versions only, where βασανίσαι ('torment', found in Lk 8.28) became apparently substituted by ἀπολέσαι ('destroy', found in Mk 1.24 and Lk 4.34) in the description of the unclean spirit rebuking Jesus, making the verse close to Lk 4.34 although the prepositional phrase πρὸ καιροῦ is only found in Mt 8.29. NA<sup>28</sup> mentions only one parallel, but other parallel passages need to be taken into account for a thorough discussion of the variant in question.

15. Mt 9.17 – par. Mk 2.22 // Lk 5.38

Mt 9.17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὄγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· <sup>ⲓ</sup>ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

ⲓ<sup>1</sup>*p*) ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς βλητέον Ⲭ | ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς βάλλουσιν καινούς C 1424 1844<sup>c</sup> (–νέον 1844\*) 12211 | ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον βάλλουσιν εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς 892

Mt 9.17 $\aleph$ .01 has a singular reading where the adjective βλητέον ('must be put') seems to have 'replaced' βάλλουσιν, as in Lk 5.38 and Mk 2.22. Despite its being a singular reading, it should not remain unnoticed that the entire verse is highly variant within the textual tradition. Nevertheless, the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus in Lk 5.38 has interestingly βάλλουσιν instead of βλητέον, where the Markan parallel passage in Mk 2.22 reads neither the verb nor the adjective (the first hand of Sinaiticus however has βλητέον). This closer observation shows that the designation of a harmonistic reading seems to refer to the text of the NA<sup>28</sup> and not different passages in the same manuscript.

16. Mt 9.27 – par. Mk 10.47-48 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 9.27 Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν ὁ[αὐτῷ] δύο τυφλοὶ κρᾶζοντες καὶ λέγοντες· ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ

ⲓ<sup>1</sup>*p*) υἱέ Ⲭ C D K L Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 579 892\* 1424 *pm* | κύριε υἱέ N *f*<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> | *txt* B W 565 (700) 1844 12211 *pm*

Mt 9.27 $\aleph$ .01 is in agreement with Codex Bezae on the vocative υἱέ Δαυίδ instead of the nominative υἱὸς Δαυίδ. This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 1. 2. 1.

17. Mt 12.4 – par. Mk 2.26 // Lk 6.4

Mt 12.4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον, ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;

## EXCURSUS

<sup>ϕ</sup>*p*) οὐς & C K L N Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> (οἷς 33) 565 579 700 892 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa bo |  
*txt* ℞<sup>70</sup> B D W *f*<sup>13</sup> aur ff<sup>2\*</sup> k q

Mt 12.4℞.01 apparently substitutes the relative pronoun in the accusative in the sentence Mt 12.4 ‘[David] ate the bread of the Presence, which it was not lawful for him to eat’ ([...] καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον, ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν κτλ.) with the nominative as found in Mk 2.26 and Lk 6.4, although these two references read οὐς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν while Mt 12.4 reads a periphrastic form (ὃ/οὐς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν) where both cases are grammatically correct.

18. Mt 15.37 – par. Mt 14.20 // Mk 8.8 // Lk 9.17

Mt 15.37 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν. καὶ <sup>ς</sup>τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ἦραν<sup>2</sup> ἑπτὰ σφυρίδας πλήρεις

<sup>ς</sup>*p*) ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων & C K L N P W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 1241  
 1424 ℳ f (ff<sup>1</sup>) q | *txt* B D Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 700 892 /2211 lat

In Mt 15.37℞.01, a different word order is read, while a second strand of tradition (followed by Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae) prefer a preverbal, marked order, like in Mt 14.20 (Feeding of the 5,000) but also with a slightly different wording as Mk 6.43; 8.8 and Lk 9.17.

19. Mt 21.1 – par. Mk 11.1 // Lk 19.29

Mt 21.1 Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Βηθφαγὴ <sup>Γ</sup>εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, τότε <sup>Γ</sup>Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

<sup>Γ</sup>*p*) πρὸς & D K L N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 /2211  
 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* B C 33 it

A part of the textual tradition follows Codex Vaticanus with the use of the preposition εἰς [τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν] while the other strand of traditions follows Codex Bezae, as is the case in Mt 21.1℞.01, with the use of πρὸς. This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 II. 2Chapter 6 II. 1.

20. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30 // Mk 10.47 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μείζον ἔκραζαν λέγοντες· ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, Ἰσὺς Δαυὶδ

<sup>ϕ</sup>*p*) υἱέ & (\*).<sup>1</sup> C D L N 085 0281 33 579 892 1241 1424 | *txt* B K W Z Γ Δ Θ *f*  
<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 ℳ

See variant 17 above.

21. Mt 24.24 – par. Mk 13.22 // Lk 21.10-11

Mt 24.24 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα ἄμεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε ἰκανῶς πλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

<sup>ϕ</sup>*p*) καὶ τέρατα & W\* ff<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup> | μεγάλα sy<sup>p</sup> | καὶ τέρατα μεγάλα 1241 1424  
 bo<sup>ms</sup>

In Mt 24.24 $\aleph$ .01, the expression *σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα* ('great signs and wonders') is found in different forms classified in the NA<sup>28</sup> as substitutions, although the reading supported by Codex Sinaiticus corresponds in actual fact to an 'omission' of the adjective (*μεγάλα*), as in Mk 13.22 (Lk 21.10-11 has a similar context *σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι...καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα...* with variant readings).

## I. 5. Conclusions

From the above short survey, it appears that nearly half of the harmonistic readings are instances where Codex Sinaiticus has a reading that departs from both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae. The remaining cases are divided into agreements with Codex Vaticanus or Codex Bezae, but the numerous lacunose portions of texts in Mt D.05 (28% of the 21 instances) precludes a full description of the characteristics of Mt  $\aleph$ .01 compared with the other codices. From the other half of the cases, the variant readings are apparent improvement of the language, or are likely to be insignificant variations that have no influence on the transmitted text. Finally, the significantly important number of instances where Mt  $\aleph$ .01 departs from Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae calls for a re-consideration of the usual hypothesis whereby Codex Sinaiticus is seen as a state of development of the text of the New Testament between Codex Vaticanus (as the purest form) and Codex Bezae (as the most corrupted form), the latter corresponding to a climatic point in the transmission of the NT.<sup>7</sup> The variant readings discussed above have shown that they are mostly independent of both codices, a conclusion that would require the previous statement to be reviewed.

## II. Synopsis of All Alleged Harmonisations within Matthew in Codex Vaticanus

I will now present the reference the same way as for Codex Sinaiticus where Codex Vaticanus has variant readings identified in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonising within the Synoptics. There are 24 such *vll*, out of which one reflects similarities with the Gospel of John, leaving therefore 23 instances with the Synoptics.

Similarly to Table 28, the results for Matthew in Codex Vaticanus are as follows:

Type of Agreement	No.	References
B against $\aleph$ D	11	Mt 2.13 (x2); 14.22; 15.27; 16.5; 17.23; 19.9; 20.23; 23.19; 25.40; 27.46
BD against $\aleph$	6	Mt 9.6; 16.20; 19.9; 20.19;26; 24.39
$\aleph$ B against D	1	Mt 20.23
$\aleph$ with B (D <i>lac.</i> )	1	Mt 8.9
$\aleph$ against B (D <i>lac.</i> )	1	Mt 8.23
$\aleph$ against B against D	2	Mt 15.38; 19.9
$\aleph$ BD agreement	1	Mt 20.31
Total	23	

Table 29: Agreements of Harmonistic Readings in Mt  $\aleph$ .01/B.03/D.05

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. EPP, 'Textual Criticism in Exegesis,' in PORTER, *Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, 70–71.

## II. 1. Matthew/Matthew Parallels

## 1. Mt 2.13 – par. Mt 2.12

Mt 2.13 Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν <sup>τ</sup> ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοι· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό.

<sup>τ</sup> (12) εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν B

Mt 2.13B.03 is a singular reading where the end of the preceding verse εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν seems accidentally repeated from v.12.

## 2. Mt 2.13 – par. Mt 1.20

Mt 2.13 Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν <sup>τ</sup> ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοι· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό.

<sup>τ</sup>(1.20) κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη B | (19 v.l.) κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται C K 33 700 892

Mt 2.13B.03 reads κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη, which echoes the wording in Mt 1.20 a singular reading against φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ in the rest of the tradition.

## 3. Mt 23.19 – par. Mt 23.17

Mt 23.19 <sup>τ</sup> τυφλοί, τί γὰρ μεῖζον, τὸ δῶρον ἢ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἀγιάζον τὸ δῶρον;

<sup>τ</sup>p) μωροὶ καὶ B C K W Γ Δ 0102 f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 l844 M c f sy<sup>p,h</sup> co | txt & D L Z Θ f<sup>1</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>s,c</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>

Mt 23.19B.03 reads μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοί against τυφλοί as a potential harmonisation with the immediate context (v.17 μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοί) in Jesus' verbal opposition to the Pharisees and Sadducees, which is brought to a climax in Mt 23.

## 4. Mt 25.40 – par. Mt 25.45

Mt 25.40 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐν τούτων <sup>μ</sup>τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιή

<sup>μ</sup>(45) B\* 0128\* 1424 ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup>; Cl<sup>p</sup>t Eus GrNy

Mt 25.40B.03\* does not read 'of my brothers' and this reading can be understood as having been withdrawn in order to match Mt 25.45, while later hands have corrected the original hand by supplying with τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου. In actual facts, it is rather this latter correction that could reflect a harmonisation in the true sense.

## II. 2. Matthew/Mark Parallels

## 5. Mt 14.22 – par. Mk 6.45

Mt 14.22 Καὶ <sup>ο</sup>εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς <sup>τ</sup> ἐμβῆναι εἰς <sup>ο</sup>1 τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν <sup>ο</sup>2 αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους

<sup>τ</sup>p) αὐτοῦ B K P Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 892 1424 l844 l2211 pm it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy co? | txt & C D L W Γ Δ 067 0106 0277 f<sup>1</sup> 33 700 1241 pm lat

The problem of the inclusion or not of the pronoun is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 1.  
3. The division into two distinct and large strands of tradition is noteworthy for a variant reading that does not look significant *prima facie*.

6. Mt 15.27 – par. Mk 7.28

Mt 15.27 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· ναὶ κύριε, καὶ ὁ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.

<sup>ο</sup>p) B e sy<sup>s.p</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

Mt 15.27B.03, supported by a few versions only, omits the conjunction γὰρ in the response of the Syrophoenician to Jesus and this omission is understood from NA<sup>28</sup> as a harmonisation, probably because the parallel passage (Mk 7.28) does not use this conjunction.

7. Mt 15.38 – par. Mk 8.9

Mt 15.38 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν <sup>τ</sup> τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς ῥ γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων ῥ

<sup>τ</sup> p) ὡς B Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 l2211 | ὡσεὶ 8 579 1241 | txt C D K L N P W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup>  
565 700 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>s.c.p</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo

Mt 15.38B.03 reads ὡς as in Mk 8.9 (secure) against Codex Bezae (*om.* ὡς) and Codex Sinaiticus (ὡσεὶ) to describe the crowd as being ‘about forty men.’<sup>8</sup>

8. Mt 16.5 – par. Mk 8.14

Mt 16.5 Καὶ ἐλθόντες ῥ οἱ μαθηταὶ ῥ εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο <sup>ς</sup> Mt 16.5 <sup>ς</sup>.

<sup>ς</sup>p) B K 579 892 1424 (e)

Mt 16.5B.03 reads a different word order when compared to most of the tradition (incl. Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae). This order is the same as in Mk 8.14, although the verse in Mark is fairly different, to the extent that a scribal activity ignoring the main difference between Mark and Matthew but trying to match the word order is a relatively impossible hypothesis.

9. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11-12

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ῥ ὅτι ὃς ἂν ῥ ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ῥ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ῥ <sup>τ</sup>

<sup>τ</sup>p) καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (ἀπολυμένην Θ 565, + ἀπό ἄνδρος 579) γαμῶν (γαμήσας B K Z Γ 700 892 ℣) μοιχᾶται B C\* K N W Z Γ Δ Θ 078 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>p.h</sup> bo | ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμ. ἀπολελ. μοιχ. ℞<sup>25</sup> mae | txt 8 C<sup>3</sup> D L 1241 it sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

<sup>8</sup> A possible explanation for the existence of variation between ὡς and ὡσεὶ in other books of the New Testament is suggested by J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, ‘Luke’s Use of ὡς and ὡσεὶ: Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message,’ in PIERRI, *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae*, 251–74 [264–70]. See Chapter 3 II. 2. 4 note 62.



Mt 19.9B.03 reads *καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται*, a reading that is similar to Mt 5.32 *καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται* hence its designation as a harmonisation in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. It is noteworthy that Mt 5.32B.03 is variant (*καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται*), a near-singular reading. The verse in question is looked into in depth in Chapter 6 I. 2. 1. Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae agree against Codex Vaticanus here.

10. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.39-40

Mt 20.23 <sup>τ</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς<sup>τ</sup> · τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε <sup>τ</sup><sup>1</sup>, τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου <sup>τ</sup>καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων <sup>τ</sup><sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν <sup>ο</sup>[τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ οἷς ἡτοιμάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

<sup>τ</sup>ρ) ἦ B L Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 1424 it vg<sup>cl</sup> sa mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Epiph

Mt 20.23B.03 reads ἦ instead of *καὶ* as in the parallel passage Mk 10.40.

11. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.39-40

Mt 20.23 <sup>τ</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς<sup>τ</sup> · τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε <sup>τ</sup><sup>1</sup>, τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου <sup>τ</sup>καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων <sup>τ</sup><sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν <sup>ο</sup>[τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ οἷς ἡτοιμάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

<sup>ο</sup>ρ) ⋈ B K L N Z Γ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p</sup> co | txt C D W Δ 085 33 (565) l844 q sy<sup>s.c.h</sup>

This *v/* is shared with Codex Sinaiticus and was discussed in I. 2.

12. Mt 20.26-27 – par. Mk 10.43-44

Mt 20.26 οὐχ οὕτως <sup>τ</sup>ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ’ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ <sup>τ</sup>ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι <sup>τ</sup>ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, [27] καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ <sup>τ</sup>ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος <sup>τ</sup>ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·

[26] <sup>τ</sup>ρ) ἐστίν B D Z 0281 sa<sup>mss</sup> | txt ⋈ C K L N W Γ Δ Θ 085 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 l844 ℳ lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 5 II. 3.

13. Mt 27.46 – par. Mk 15.34

Mt 27.46 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν <sup>τ</sup>ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων· ἠλι ἠλι ἠλεμα σαβαχθανι<sup>τ</sup> ; τοῦτ’ ἔστιν· Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες

<sup>τ</sup>ρ) ἐβόησεν B L W 33 700 l844

Mt 27.46B.03 reads the simplex verb *ἐβόησεν* against the compound verb *ἀνεβόησεν* in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae as well as in most of the textual tradition, making it verbally close to the parallel Mk 15.34 as far as the verb is concerned (the context is slightly different in the two passages: Matthew has ‘around the ninth hour’ while Mark reads ‘at the ninth hour’).

## II. 3. Matthew/Luke Parallels

14. Mt 8.9 – par. Lk 7.8

Mt 8.9 και γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ὅτι ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποιήσον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.

ὅτι *p*) τασσόμενος & B it vg<sup>cl</sup> (sa bo) (D lac.)

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 3.

## II. 4. Matthew/Mark/Luke Parallels

15. Mt 8.23 – par. Mk 4.36 // Lk 8.22

Mt 8.23 Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς ὅτῳ πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

ὅτι *p*) &<sup>1</sup> B C f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1844 12211 | txt &<sup>\*2</sup> K L N W Γ Δ Θ 579 700 1424 ℳ (D lac.)

The absence of the article in the prepositional phrase ‘into the boat’ is understood as a harmonistic reading with Lk 8.22, where the noun is anarthrous (εἰς πλοῖον). While the possibility that a scribe would have omitted the article because of the lexical proximity with Luke can be subject to discussion, it can be noted that the article is present in the Markan parallel in a slightly revised phrasing (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ).

16. Mt 24.39 – par. Mt 24.37 // Lk 17.26

Mt 24.39 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἕως ἡλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ[καὶ] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

ὅτι(37) B D 892 12211 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup> co | txt & K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup>

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 5 I. 1.

17. Mt 9.6 – par. Mk 2.10-11 // Lk 5.24

Mt 9.6 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας - τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἔγερθεὶς ἄρον σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.

ὅτι *p*) ἔγειρε (+ καὶ D) B D 0281 sy | txt & C K L N W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 1844 12211 ℳ q

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 1. 1

18. Mt 16.20 – par. Mk 8.30 // Lk 9.21

Mt 16.20 τότε ἔδιστεῖλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι ἵνα μηδενὶ εἰπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός

ὅτι *p*) ἐπέτιμησεν B\* D e sy<sup>c</sup>; Or<sup>mss</sup> | txt & B<sup>2</sup> C K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 (579) 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p.h</sup> co; Or<sup>mss</sup>

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 II. 1.

19. Mt 17.23 – par. Mt 16.21 ; 20.18–19 // Mk 8.31 ; 9.31 ; 10.33-34 // Lk 9.22 ; 18.32-33

Mt 17.23 καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔγερθήσεται. καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα. ὁ

ῥ) ἀναστήσεται B f<sup>13</sup> 892 1424

This variant reading seems to be a consequence of the often repeated wording ‘he will rise on the third day’. This type of alternative wording is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 3. 3

20. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11–12 // Lk 16.18

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ὁ

ῥ(5.32) παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι B f<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>1</sup> bo | μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην (om. καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην N) ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι C\* N | παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται D f<sup>13</sup> 33 it (sy<sup>c</sup>) sa mae | txt & C<sup>3</sup> K L (-καὶ W) Z Γ Δ Θ 078 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 M l vg sy<sup>s.p.h</sup>

Mt 19.9 is a doublet to Mt 5.32 and is also found in the other Synoptics with variant wordings including many variants in each case. The wording used in Mt 19.9B.03 reflects Mt 5.32 *verbatim* with respect to the clause παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι and it could well be a harmonisation to the doublet verse. The complexity of this verse and its variants is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 2. 1.

21. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11-12 // Lk 16.18

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ὁ

ῥ) ὃς ἂν B D Z it | ὅστις 1424

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 2. 1.

22. Mt 20.19 – par. Mk 10.34 // Lk 18.33

Mt 20.19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔγερθήσεται.

ῥ) ἀναστήσεται B C<sup>2</sup> D K W Γ Δ Θ 085 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 1241 1424 l844 M | txt & C\* L N Z 579 892; Or

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 3. 3.

23. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30 // Mk 10.47-48 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μείζον ἐκραξάν λέγοντες· ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ.

ῥ(30) κύριε ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς & B D L Z Θ 085 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | ἑλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | txt C K N W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 M f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c.h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae

This variant reading is discussed in Chapter 6 I. 1. 2. 2

## II. 5. Conclusions

After examining all the variants of Mt B.03 claimed by NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic, it can be said that none of them affect the sense of the text of Matthew; their identification as harmonisations and simply reflects the principle that the discordant reading is more likely to be original. Moreover, the linguistic importance of the variants does not reveal any definite pattern. They involve one word only most of the time except three cases where more substantial material is involved. No alleged harmonisation in Mt B.03 gathered from the apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> allows any extrapolation with regard to a harmonising tendency in Codex Vaticanus and most instances are somewhat far-fetched as the comparative study of with Codex Bezae in Chapter 4–6 has already suggested.

Further, most of the variant flagged as harmonising are insignificant in nature (e.g. is ἢ [‘or’] in Mt 20.23B.03 really a harmonisation with Mk 10.39-40 to avoid καί?), or fluctuating (e.g. is the alleged harmonistic reading κατ’ ὄναρ ἐφάνη in Mt 2.13B.03 really harmonising with Mt 1.20 or is the other reading κατ’ ὄναρ φαίνεται rather a harmonisation with Mt 2.19?),<sup>9</sup> or dubious (is the absence of the already challenged presence of τοῦτο in Mt 20.23 really a harmonisation with Mk 10.39-40?).

A final point is that the consideration of harmonistic readings in Mt B.03 seems to have been carried out done atomistically without consideration of the parallel passage’s actual reading in all manuscripts but ra simply the reading in NA<sup>28</sup>.

## III. Conclusions on the Alleged Harmonistic Readings in ⲬB

Despite the fact that all the variant readings in this section are clearly identified in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonisations, the analysis seems to be based on external evidence only or, if internal criticism is involved, the argument of the ‘more discordant reading’ is chosen somewhat mechanically. Indeed, where Synoptic Gospels in essence share common material, overlaps are inevitable and the most discordant reading needs to be carefully examined in every instance. In this respect, it can be said that the variants discussed above are just as likely to result from the construction of the Gospel text itself as to originate from scribal errors or deliberate harmonisation to match what are, most of the time, insignificant verbal echoes of Synoptic parallels.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Parker’s comment ‘Harmonisation may not necessarily be made in the direction of what the modern synopsis would present as a parallel but might be to a passage which today is considered to be one that is unrelated’ in D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 340. A text-critical decision is though taken at some point to mention that the harmonisation is done in the way indicated by the critical apparatus!

## Chapter 7

### CONCLUSIONS

#### I. Summary of the Preceding Chapters

The present work has revisited afresh all the variant readings in the Gospel of Matthew in Codex Bezae (D.05), compared with the roughly contemporaneous Alexandrian text of Codex Vaticanus (B.03), as well as the wider textual tradition, with a particular focus on the variants identified as harmonising in the Greek New Testament of Nestle-Aland.

The reason for choosing the Gospel of Matthew in Codex Bezae was the comparably slight scholarly treatment of the first Gospel in contrast to the studies of the book of Acts or of the other Synoptics in this manuscript. At the same time, the wealth of methodological approaches available for the analysis of a Gospel in a particular manuscript allowed a smooth access to the study of the variant readings in Bezan Matthew. Though earlier scholarly work provided a good starting point, it is the presence of contradictory analyses and judgements on the secondary character of the variant readings in Mt D.05 that generated the interest for re-visiting them by applying the tools of both linguistics and textual criticism.<sup>1</sup>

Chapter 1 introduces the text critical study of manuscripts of the New Testament and delineates the study of the Bezan text of the Gospel of Matthew. The history of the related scholarship was presented and the point was made that general use of the Greek text of the New Testament as presented in the current edition of Nestle-Aland (NA<sup>28</sup>) tends to cause the user to consider most of the time any alternative reading in Codex Bezae as secondary.

Textual criticism generally groups variant readings found in manuscripts as an *omission*, an *addition*, a *substitution*, a *word order change* or a *harmonisation*. This usual classification was identified as expressing a *parti pris* – indeed, it favours the reading with which a variant is being compared as most probably the earliest – reason for reason this work substituted the former categories with *presence*, *absence*, *alternative wording* and *word order differences*. The chapter further introduced the concept of harmonisation as a combination of these four categories. Earlier influential scholarly works on the harmonistic tendency of Codex Bezae were briefly commented on in order to understand the background of textual critics' eagerness to conclude that the Bezan text reflects secondary, albeit early, scribal activity aimed at 'adding' or 'omitting' as well as trying to remove verbal differences that exist in relation to parallel passages.

In chapter 2, the limited scholarship that exists on Bezan Matthew was presented through Holmes' and Amphoux's respective works. Their opposing views show the diffi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Despite the more recent classification of manuscripts as A-, B-, C- and D-texts, I retained the distinction of 'text-types' (Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean and 'Western') throughout the thesis since this continues to be a customary practice.

culties in finding an objective methodology suitable for discussing the origin of variant readings. Indeed, the review of Holmes' work suggests that because internal evidence is rarely conclusive, the argument of external evidence is used, making the reasoning circular because of the assumed pre-eminence of Codex Vaticanus (and to large extent Codex Sinaiticus) whereby 'Western' readings are frequently deemed more likely to be secondary. For his part, Amphoux explains each variant reading by referring to the cultural situation of the pre-200 CE Church, suggesting that the Bezan variants in Matthew reveal *lectiones difficiliores* that were not understood by later scribes due to their complex and abstruse nature. This reasoning explains that such original readings were *de facto* simplified into a form that eventually gave birth to the Alexandrian text. Amphoux's views, based on literary analysis, are only shared by a minority of scholars, mainly because of the overwhelming weight of the Westcott-Hort heritage and the complex approach suggested by the author, which remains inaccessible to non-French speakers. Finally, the presentation of the literature on Bezan Matthew concluded with a look at the status of papyri witnesses and the importance of early versions.

Chapter 3 discussed the philological aspects inherent to the fluid state of Koine Greek in the first centuries, comparing all variant readings between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 from the basis of a linguistic analysis. This was an important step because the Bezan scribe has often been described as careless, generating orthographical mistakes or grammatical errors because of his poor knowledge of Greek. An exhaustive comparison of all the D.05 readings that differ from those of B.03, whether orthographical, grammatical, lexical or syntactical, was undertaken in order to objectively weigh the variability of readings with relatively a contemporary manuscript.

A specific section in this chapter was dedicated to word order differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 by using the principles of discourse analysis, which have been outlined by Levinsohn with reference to the New Testament generally, and applied by Read-Heimerdinger in a study of the Bezan form of the book of Acts. Variant readings based on word order differences are frequently discarded as insignificant, or simply as a scribal emendation, but recent linguistic research in the field of discourse analysis indicates that, on the contrary, word order flexibility is a tool used by a speaker to convey or enhance his or her message. The fact that NA<sup>28</sup> does not systematically count word order differences confirmed this idea.

The exhaustive philological study carried out in chapter 3 established a foundation on which to build a closer inspection of the issue of harmonisation. Indeed, the classification into orthographical, grammatical and lexical differences between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03 helped to consider harmonisation as a combination of these very classes when the variant text in Codex Bezae is found to 'resemble' a parallel passage from the Synoptics (whether Matthew itself and/or Luke and/or Mark) in contrast to the text witnessed in Codex Vaticanus. Since earlier scholarship was dedicated to verses of 'repre-

sentative length<sup>2</sup> and *de facto* imposed a significant restriction on the work, the present study has sought to adopt a more holistic approach by taking into account all the *vll* potentially pointing to harmonisations in the critical apparatus of Mt D.05 in NA<sup>28</sup>. For the purposes of this thesis, comparison with the Gospel of John was not included because of the complex differences between John and the Synoptic Gospels. Such a study would, however, no doubt be fruitful and would serve to refine conclusions reached on the basis of Synoptic Gospels comparison.

In order to achieve the goals of this research, I proposed at the beginning of chapter 4 criteria for the identification of harmonisation as suggested by the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. Though it is not made explicit as such, it would appear that both references tagged as ‘*p*’ (for ‘parallel passages’) as well as cross-references with the parallel passage(s) in question, indicated in brackets, constitute the way the readings are indicated in the Nestle-Aland as harmonistic. Therefore, I have used the criteria that any variant reading indicated in the critical apparatus with such a *p*) symbol or a biblical cross-reference is understood as potentially being a harmonistic reading and *vice-versa*. With this methodology, I found 70 readings that are identified as harmonistic in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. The rest of the work focused on 65 of them, after setting to one side the variant reading that apparently harmonises with John and four readings that allegedly harmonise with the Septuagint. Indeed, in this latter case, the claim that readings in Mt D.05 are ‘aligning’ with the LXX ignores the possibility of multiple Greek and Hebrew textual traditions, and even appears to assume a single text for the Septuagintal and Masoretic texts, both reasons being ground to exclude such readings and to devote the study to the harmonisation with the Synoptic Gospels alone.

Chapter 5 analyses the references which are suggested as harmonistic readings in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> with either inter- or intra-Gospel passages in the Bezan text of Matthew. Section I of chapter 5 dealt with the apparent harmonisations within the book of Matthew itself (ten instances). Such harmonisations are potentially influenced by the immediate or intermediate contexts but equally with other Gospels as well. This section examined only the interactions within Matthew and evaluated the corresponding variant readings.

Section II analysed the particular case of potential harmonisation with Mark. Harmonisations with the second Gospel have a particular status. Indeed, it is often forgotten in text-critical studies that such harmonisations are inevitably linked to the question of the accessibility of the text of Mark in the first two centuries, a possibility that is far from being a foregone conclusion. As a matter of fact, the ground-breaking work of the Belgian scholar Massaux on the use of the Gospel of Matthew in the Christian literature before Irenaeus has carefully documented that Mark was not circulating widely in the second century. If this conclusion is applied to the process of harmonisation, the

---

<sup>2</sup> HOLMES, ‘Early Scribal Activity,’ 138. Amphoux’s discussion of the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae also discusses variant readings that have substantial word variation (AMPHOUX, *L’Évangile de Saint Matthieu*).

probability that scribes in the second century would have made the text of Matthew closer to Mark because of their supposed more intimate knowledge of the second Gospel calls for some prudent reflection before reaching any conclusion. That being said, I have analysed all ten readings in Mt D.05 noted by NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic where the parallel would seem to be in Mark, carefully distinguishing between the cases where the parallel passage exhibits a similar textual variation and those that do not.

Section III discusses the 11 places where NA<sup>28</sup> indicates variant readings in Bezan Matthew where the parallel would be in Luke. This section was of particular importance, since the textual similarity between Matthew and Luke is closely linked to the so-called Synoptic Problem and any misjudged harmonisation may either contradict or question if not the existence, at least the form, of any document lying behind the common parts of Matthew and Luke.

Chapter 6 completed the examination of harmonisations in Mt D.05 as given in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, by considering those places where there were parallels in both of the other two Synoptic Gospels, and sometimes inner parallels in Matthew as well. The three Gospels were considered simultaneously, a complex endeavour that involves up to four (three inter-Gospel and one intra-Gospel) parallels, with each one often bearing their own variant readings. The chapter was divided into two types of potential harmonistic variant readings. The first deals with material that involves either standard expressions (six instances), or expressions found from both the immediate context and in parallel passages (ten instances), which could have facilitated a harmonisation. The second type concerns all the remaining inter-Gospel parallels that could be equally deemed harmonisations (18 instances).

As an excursus, I subsequently applied the criteria I identified earlier on how NA<sup>28</sup> designates harmonistic readings to Codex Sinaiticus then to Codex Vaticanus in Matthew and briefly described the nature of their variant readings.

## II. Main Conclusions

In broader terms, it appears from the present study that judgements on variant readings in the Bezan text of Matthew are somewhat influenced by some pre-conceived ideas from earlier scholarship on the ‘Western’ text which fairly systematically sees traces of scribal activity in any divergence from the Nestle-Aland text. The present study of the Greek text of Bezan Matthew has revealed a number of findings that will now be listed.

### II. 1. Prior Studies

The contrasting studies of Holmes and Amphoux proposed two different analyses of the text of Bezan Matthew: the first scholar gives greater weight to external evidence and thus sees early scribal amendments in most Bezan variants, favouring the  $\aleph$ B reading in inconclusive or disputable cases. The second scholar generally justifies the Bezan variant as being the one most likely to be original, appealing to internal textual symmetries and contextually-based reasoning. Both discuss only the main (i.e. longer) variant readings



and leave the others aside as insignificant. A holistic approach as described in this work has helped ‘close the loop’ by taking account of all the *vll* in Bezan Matthew.

## II. 2. External Evidence

The availability of Matthew in papyri was discussed and readings shared with Codex Bezae were pointed out. Their fragmentary status does not allow the reconstruction of any kind of ‘proto-Bezan’ text on a par with papyrus  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  with respect to Codex Vaticanus, but it does confirm the existence of readings as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. that are found in Mt D.05, especially in  $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{101}$ . Although the nature of the readings shared by the papyri and Codex Bezae does not allow any particular patterns to be established, their very existence nevertheless indicates that judgements that argue for idiosyncratic and late scribal activity in Codex Bezae in Matthew should be approached with caution.

A review of the scholarship of the other Greek witnesses to Matthew (majuscules and minuscules) indicated that it was thin on the ground. Little would appear to be gained from a numerical comparison of the majuscules and minuscules with Codex Bezae precisely because of their fragmentary nature of their texts. Strikingly, majuscules, apart from the earlier extant or near extant codices, can be as fragmentary as papyri but the latter seem to attract more scholarly attention than the former.

On the other hand, it was useful to present numerically the frequent agreements between Bezan Matthew and early versions. Despite documented evidence on agreements between Codex Bezae and early versions, especially Latin, Syriac, Coptic, no satisfactory explanation has been offered to account for their wide geographical distribution, and those manuscripts from the Old Latin, the Old Syriac and the Coptic dialects are frequently dismissed as ‘Western’ without further discussion. However, such agreements have been instrumental in the dating of a number of variant readings in Bezan Matthew to 2<sup>nd</sup> c., preventing such readings thereby from being discarded during the analysis of the external evidence as later corruptions. It was also shown that in many instances the support of the Old Latin and Old Syriac combined with Mt D.05 is discarded in NA<sup>28</sup>, despite the wide geographical attestation it provides in contrast to the support of one single, Alexandrian text-type.

### *Language*

The review of all the differences between the Bezan text of Matthew and Codex Vaticanus unsurprisingly reported a number of scribal slips and variation that are typical of the copying of Koine Greek. The work listed the differences in Matthew between the two manuscripts throughout the entire Gospel, and it tended to reveal that the variation goes back to the earliest steps of the transmission of the text rather than its representing a poorly executed copying exercise. Furthermore, Mt D.05 is equally as subject to orthographical variation as Codex Vaticanus is, and these comparisons allowed the somewhat unrealistic concept of ‘correct spelling’ in the first centuries to be challenged. This study indicates that different spelling should be considered simply as alternative forms of or-

thography, except where an authorial message could lie behind alternative spellings, an avenue that has been already documented in for other books of Codex Bezae and that is something that could be taken up further in future research with reference to Matthew. Besides, the presence in Codex Bezae of alternative forms that are typical of the first centuries suggests that it is more likely that the copy carried out in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. by the Bezan scribe testifies to careful copying activity rather than any introduction of archaic or Latinising forms.

The study went on to classify other variant readings between Mt D.05 and B.03 according to the nature of parts of speech. From this study, it could be seen that the majority of the D.05 variants either involve pronouns and connectives that give a different force to the message, or they consist in alternative readings that are particularly close to those found Codex Vaticanus (nominal or verbal synonyms or differences in verbal tenses); it is also apparent that most of the time the variant readings are isolated within a secure sentence. As a result, it appears that the variant readings in the Bezan text of Matthew cannot be judged to be purely erratic scribal errors, or arising from extra-Greek influences or a poor knowledge of Greek. They should rather alert the reader to ask the question as to why a scribe would have ‘substituted’ apparently synonymous words for a matching one in the exemplar.

In the majority of cases, alternative wording in Mt D.05 compared to Mt B.03 has not been identified as obvious alterations aiming at clarifying the sentence but can be only judged as being of equal status in both manuscripts. One important cause for lexical variation was identified: being alert to the potential use of allusions appealing to Jewish tradition on the basis of findings in the Bezan text of other books, this work brought to light several examples where the Bezan reading was the trace of most probably authorial composition when the author had made an implicit reference to the Jewish context that is absent in the other manuscripts. Notable examples are Mt 26.55 and Mt 28.8. Given their discreet nature, it could be argued that it is more likely that such references were removed in other manuscripts because they were not understood or because the link they established with Judaism was felt to be contrary to the new direction of Christianity, rather than that they were added in at a later stage. Nevertheless, there has been found nothing like the extent of Jewish allusion in Bezan Matthew that has been found in Bezan Luke and Acts.

Similarly, the examination of the frequent occurrences of ‘additions’ and ‘omission’ of material, disambiguated in this work as ‘presence’ and ‘absence’, have shown that there cannot be at the same time a tendency to ‘add to clarify,’ or ‘omit to simplify,’ or a mixture thereof, based on the reading proposed as most likely to be original according to the Nestle-Aland text. While no firm pattern of removing text in either manuscript could be observed, the careful comparison made by the present study of all the readings in Mt D.05/B.03 has facilitated further research which can aim to reach a clearer understanding of the process that may have generated such readings.

Beyond the presence or absence of words and that of alternative wording, there are variant readings that use the same words but arranged in a different order, a feature

that has no immediate impact on the meaning. Since the idea of a free order in Koine Greek does not answer the question why virtually identical sentences in manuscripts differ only in word order if there is no consequence for understanding the sentence, I applied the conclusions of the discourse analysis to look for evidence for changes in the significance or force of sentences between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew. Specifically, the effect that the linguistic concepts of *default order*, *prominence* and *markedness* has on the importance given to a particular element of the clause or phrase was considered with reference to word order variation in the first Gospel, and it was found that these concepts do indeed provide a rationale for identifying the reasons for the variation. This study established that differences in word order are not free variations where a scribe would have deliberately or unknowingly re-arranged the constituents for no other reason than personal habit or whim, but rather that they express a difference of viewpoint or emphasis. The position of pronouns or prepositional phrases has been identified as the major source of variation, an indication of an active discourse based on the articulation using linguistic features of the language. A few telling examples have illustrated the difference in force in similar sentences where only word order differs. In particular, the present study suggests that, with regard to the *vll* studied, Mt D.05 usually has the default order signalling no specific emphasis, or rather the emphasis lies somewhere else in the sentence than in the variant words, in contrast to Codex Vaticanus. This section of the thesis provided all instances of word order differences between the texts of Matthew in Codex Bezae compared to Codex Vaticanus, in an orderly manner, doubling thereby the cases listed in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>. In the process, it became apparent that the typically neglected consideration of word order ‘change’ raises important questions. In many instances, it brings to light why a scribe would have ‘twisted’ a sentence around rather than simply copying the text. On some occasions, the reason is not so obvious and more investigation, linguistic, textual and exegetical is required.

### *Harmonisations*

The careful examination of the presence, absence, alternative wording and word order differences, helped in the analysis of harmonisations since they can be technically seen as a combination of these four classes. Attention was paid to the concept of harmonisation itself, which was noted to bear implicitly the assumption that a scribe had deliberately altered the text taken as reference (most of the time Codex Vaticanus) in order to reduce the discordance between Gospels because of his/her alleged familiarity with parallel passages of the Scriptures. The systematic analysis of all the readings suggested by NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonisations in Bezan Matthew has demonstrated that such a conclusion often results from a superficial reasoning. Indeed, the wording is frequently not the same in the parallel Gospel passages but in many cases, only partially ‘resembles’ a parallel reading. Furthermore, most of the time, alternative explanations for the Bezan readings are equally plausible.

With regard to readings that verbally echo a different Matthean passage in the Bezan text and that are referred to as potential harmonisations in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> (ten such instances), it was found repeatedly that these can equally be understood as such in Codex Vaticanus on the basis of other passages from the immediate or more distant context. More generally and because of the verbally repetitive nature of the Gospels, it appeared that both the reading in Mt B.03 and that in Mt D.05 can be found in different places within the immediate or intermediate context. In consequence, to identify one reading as a harmonisation and not the other does rather seem to reflect a purposeful bias founded on prior assumptions, generally in favour of the Alexandrian text.

After the point was made that a harmonisation with Mark is *stricto sensu* either potentially anachronistic or irrelevant, careful scrutiny of the readings and the Markan parallels showed that none of the eight alleged harmonistic parallels with Mark can be classified straightforwardly as such. More specifically, most of these variant readings involve a complex textual difficulty, either because of further variant readings in Mark or simply because the similarity with the Markan parallel is only verbally approximate. Here again, in instances where the tradition is equally split there appeared to have been the mechanical application of the rule for preferring a discordant reading over a similar one, despite the important weight of the manuscripts supporting the Bezan readings.

When a reading in Bezan Matthew (*contra* NB) ‘resembles’ a passage in Luke that is firm, it is tempting to identify it with a harmonisation. Nevertheless, even in this case the careful review of such instances rather suggests that the Bezan resemblance of Matthew’s text to Luke’s could be due to other reasons than scribal emendation, one of which being a common source between Matthew and Luke. Indeed, while it was noted that virtually any common textual material between the two Gospels in NA<sup>28</sup> is attributed by many synoptic scholars to the same source (e.g. ‘Q’), any material which is common between Bezan Matthew and Luke against NB is indicated as potentially harmonising in the critical apparatus. This conclusion is a facile one, which prevents proper investigation of how the Gospel texts were created and transmitted.

This point was demonstrated by applying to Bezan Matthew one of the alternative theories to Q as the origin of the text of Luke that is verbally common with Matthew, namely the Goulder-Farrer hypothesis which claims that such verbal agreements arise from Luke’s use of the text of Matthew. When the Bezan text of Matthew is used, the hypothesis can often be successfully substantiated, and these initial findings suggest that it should be revisited afresh taking into account textual variation.

More problems frequently arise when the Lukan text is also variant, a factor that appears to be ignored by NA<sup>28</sup>. Just as with Mark, in such instances the alleged harmonistic variant readings of Bezan Matthew with Luke show either textual/theological difficulties or approximate connections. Additionally, when they were scrutinized in detail, it was revealed that the alleged harmonisation of the Bezan reading in Matthew did not always reflect Bezan Luke but rather a parallel verse in N.01 and/or B.03. The analysis does not show any specific pattern of textual relationship, and opens up the possibility

that the readings in question are more likely to be authorial than the consequence of scribal emendation.

In the last chapter (6), where alleged harmonistic readings in Bezan Matthew involving all Synoptics (both vertical and horizontal) were considered, it was suggested that any conclusion concerning harmonisation is somewhat unrealistic. It is evident that the presence of interwoven readings among a multiplicity of texts echoing similar situations renders any conclusion at least partial, if not impossible. It emerged that all harmonistic readings implied as such in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> and affecting the three Synoptic Gospels are mostly based on external evidence, when not on a deliberate preference for Codex Vaticanus. Most of the readings even appear to have been randomly selected on the basis of their (sometimes very partial) match with a verbally similar parallel against other discordant ones.

An excursus to Chapter 6 was presented to examine the indications in the Nestle-Aland edition of harmonisation in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus in Matthew. The number of harmonisations appeared to be identical in both codices (Mt 8.01: 24, Mt B.03: 24) with four instances where both manuscripts have different readings. However, there is no harmonisation of substantial length apart from the presence of 16 words in Mt 8.13&.01 (par. Lk 7.10), once the 'Western' non-interpolation of Mt 27.49 (par. Jn 19.34) is omitted due its presence in the Fourth Gospel. The rest amounts to unrelated variant readings, being a mix of mainly individual words (article, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs etc.). In sum, they can be analysed as mostly theologically insignificant and would not help in the understanding of textual transmission. That said, additional potential harmonisations in 8.01 and/or B.03 were noted in looking at places where harmonisation in D.05 is indicated by NA<sup>28</sup>. These would need to be taken into account in taking the research further.

As a summary of the review of 65 apparently harmonistic readings of Bezan Matthew, the core part of this research, the present work suggests that:

- (1) Mt D.05 attests readings that, most of the time, are suggested as harmonistic simply because they differ from somewhat reflect the presupposed pro-Alexandrian preference towards Codex Vaticanus as suggested by Westcott-Hort. the Alexandrian text, specifically B.03 and to a lesser extent 8.01. The reasoning is based on the fact that readings found in B.03 and its support are more discordant than in Codex Bezae when compared with the parallel passages in the Synoptics. The rationale, which is understandable from a mechanical point of view, is in actual fact rarely applicable in most of the cases presented or, at the very least, subject to caution;
- (2) for each harmonistic reading there are, in an overwhelming majority of cases, only two strands of tradition: one attested by Codex Vaticanus and one by Codex Bezae. The rest of the textual tradition follows more or less equally each of the streams; interestingly, the original and later hands of

Codex Sinaiticus oscillate between the readings supported by Codex Vaticanus or Codex Bezae without any obvious pattern;

- (3) where Mt D.05 allegedly harmonises with a different Gospel and the parallel passage is itself variant, no conclusion can be drawn except to note the fact that the variant reading usually testifies to a textual difficulty.
- (4) when the Alexandrian reading is the most discordant one compared to the Bezan allegedly harmonised word, it is usually a rare word which may have been generated by correction, but the most likely original form cannot be ascertained for certain;
- (5) the presence of doublets (Matthean or Lukan) in the immediate context complicates the data and it is not possible to be conclusive as to which reading is harmonising since the existence of doublets precludes an objective reference point.
- (6) Some Jewish characteristics hidden in the Bezan of Matthew were identified. Though only a few instances were detected, they corroborate the findings by some scholars of extensive reference to Jewish tradition in the Bezan text of Luke-Acts, which they suggest could have been attenuated by in later tradition. These findings are an encouragement to find other causes than harmonising amendment in alternative wording.
- (7) if the Matthean passage is also found in Mark and Luke, it may be concluded that Mt D.05 tends to 'harmonise' with Mark, however, such a conclusion that ignores the relative absence of Mark in the early part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c.
- (8) out of the 65 *vll* considered in this work, there are five instances where Codex Bezae and either the original or even a later hand of Codex Sinaiticus agree. These instances would deserve further research. As Codex Sinaiticus is traditionally seen as an Alexandrian text contaminated with 'Western' variants,<sup>3</sup> it would be interesting to further analyse the cases when scribes responsible for emendations in 8.01 have corrected either a reading matching the one in B.03 according to D.05 or vice *versa*.
- (9) the atomistic approach consisting in judging that an isolated word is a scribal emendation aimed at making parallel passages agree appears sometimes disingenuous. Indeed, it has been shown in a few examples that there are other verbal elements in the parallel passage which are not in Matthew that would have been far more likely to have been 'imported' to

---

<sup>3</sup> C.-B. AMPHOUX *et al.*, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014) 19.

Bezan Matthew at the expense of a difference in one pronoun or preposition, where the contrary is witnessed.

- (10) Evidence for frequently alleged harmonising trend of Codex Bezae and its ‘love for paraphrase,’ commonly mentioned in text-critical works, has not been substantiated in this detailed and close analysis of the text. Hitherto, the widely used Griesbachian canons, along with Vogels’ key but slightly subjective work, have been both influential enough to leave the *status quo* unchallenged. The deliberations that generated the text in the Nestle-Aland edition seem to be based on the status of Codex Vaticanus as a “Neutral” text, which was suggested at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. but is a view still alive in textual criticism today, whereby the value of Bezan readings is accepted chiefly when they agree with either the dual support of Mt 8.01/B.03, or at least with Codex Vaticanus.

The findings of the present work suggest that the references to harmonistic readings in the Nestle-Aland edition should be revised. Specifically, the symbol ‘*p*,’ should not be used in the critical apparatus as it carries too high a level of presupposition reflecting a high confidence in Codex Vaticanus; ideally, it should be replaced by the corresponding biblical cross-reference only. Where the starting point of the potential harmonisation that may have generated variant readings is uncertain, the alternative wording should be indicated by the usual text-critical signs and abbreviations. As Christian Amphoux mentioned during the Lunel colloquium, the alleged harmonisation features of the Bezan text ‘demeure solidement ancrée dans les esprits,’<sup>4</sup> a statement that explains why hardly any work has been done after Holmes’ dissertation.

### III. Further Considerations

#### III. 1. Consequences for the Synoptic Problem

A direct consequence of the careful scrutiny of potential harmonisations in Bezan Matthew is that the matter of the literary dependence of the Synoptics is called into question. Where current theories attempt to explain the verbal inter-relationships, the text of NA<sup>28</sup> is inevitably used. The consideration of the Bezan text in the Synoptics would lead to somewhat different results. For example, if one takes the Two Document theory under consideration, as generally accepted by most scholars since Streeter’s influential work in the 1920s, the texts describing special Matthew (‘M’) or special Luke (‘L’) as well as passages common to Matthew and Luke (‘Q’) are different when the Bezan text is used as a basis. To illustrate this statement, two striking examples from this work can be taken: because the longest ‘addition’ of Bezan Matthew (61 words), Mt 20.28D.05, is verbally close to Lk 14.8-11 and could be explained as a harmonisation, it can equally, if original, be considered as material common to Matthew and Luke, and consequently

---

<sup>4</sup> C.-B. AMPHOUX, ‘Le Texte,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 339.

qualify as ‘Q’ material, even though it is usually regarded as ‘L’ material (present in Luke only) according to the NA<sup>28</sup> text. Similarly, Lk 19.10, which says ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός (‘For the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost’) is also found verbatim in Mt 18.11D.05 and would also qualify as ‘Q’ material as opposed to ‘L.’ Certainly, reasoning based on the external evidence, considering the superiority of Alexandrian manuscripts and weak Greek support, will disregard both Mt 20.28D.05 and 18.11D.05 as original, but the idea merits consideration for all similar passages in order to evaluate the form ‘Q’ would take if ⲚB were not assumed *a priori* to have preserved the more authentic text.

While the secondary character of all alleged harmonistic variants in Bezan Matthew remains a possibility, it should be noted that, because the text of the reconstructed ‘Q’ document/material is decisive here in determining from the ⲚB text by and large, if not exclusively, the delineation of ‘Q’ may be different if the Bezan text were used instead. The reasoning is inevitably circular if the Bezan text is by essence taken as harmonising and ⲚB as relatively ‘pure’ in terms of harmonisation. It needs to be highlighted that the two components of this reasoning are intimately linked together. This conclusion contradicts to some extent Parker’s statement that harmonisations are ‘not influenced by modern Synoptic Problem theory.’<sup>5</sup> I believe it is precisely because it is thought that ‘[the critical study of the text] has restored the unharmonised texts of the Gospels’<sup>6</sup> that the text as presented in NA<sup>28</sup> allows to generate a text allegedly ‘free of harmonisation,’ this being the text from which theories on the Synoptic Problem are generated. On the contrary, it is hoped that the present work has specifically cast some light on the frequently doubtful instances of harmonisations, and therefore that the theories on the Synoptic Problem should consider the variant readings indicated in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic at equal state to the assumed ‘original’/‘initial’ text. As a direct result, the assumption that the status of the reconstructed sources of Matthew is fixed would, if not be invalidated, at least require to be reconsidered.

### III. 2. The Problem of Sources

Beyond these traditional views on the document sources, it can be observed that the variants in Bezan Matthew discussed in this work could have been original, or at least not harmonistic, when other theories like the Goulder-Farrer are taken into account. This alternative theory to the more widely accepted Two-Document theory suggests that Luke would have taken Matthew as a source. The main drawback in this latter explanation of Matthew-Luke verbal agreements is the absence of a definite explanation for the so-called *minor agreements*, i.e. Mt–Lk agreements against Mark. Indeed, such agreements would, as it has been mentioned several times in this work, differ if the basis of the text were Codex Bezae since the usual reference in this theory is the ⲚB text. On this view, the presence of common material in Matthew and Luke in Codex Bezae as opposed to

---

<sup>5</sup> D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 314.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 314.



Codex Vaticanus may well testify to Luke's use of Matthew. However, considerable care would need to be taken in order to avoid a circular reasoning similar to that discussed earlier, which more or less treats the Nestle-Aland text as the 'initial' or even the 'original' form of Matthew.

Furthermore, although the focus of Gospel scholarship has tended to move away from the theory of sources in recent years, the unresolved nature of the textual issues means that it cannot yet be set aside: the text of Matthew has followed a complex history and our understanding of how Matthew or the compiler of Matthew transmitted his Gospel is an area that deserves further attention in order to obtain the most objective picture possible.

Finally, while Parker's monograph *Codex Bezae* probably obviates the need for a further description of the manuscript, it has also led to the impression that there is no longer anything to be said about one of the first majuscules available as a non-fragmentary text and about its influence on our understanding of the construction of the New Testament. It is my belief that the publication of Amphoux's *Evangile de Matthieu, Codex de Bèze*, where scattered variant readings are discussed and in which the construction of Matthew as well as the Synoptic Gospels is presented, has received too little attention in the Anglo-Saxon world. His work on Bezan Matthew has left certain questions unanswered, or overlooked, mainly because of the persistence of the widely assumed  $\aleph$ B superiority.

This latter point, emphasised by the confirmatory early support of Codex Vaticanus by  $\aleph$ <sup>75</sup>, continues to ignore the question of agreement between Codex Bezae and other early papyri. However, I hope this research has shown that the present identification of harmonistic variants based on Nestle-Aland is significantly linked to the external evidence and apparently obeys mechanical text-critical principles. In this respect, any conclusion based on the assumption that the Bezan verse (or any verse in any manuscript) is an 'obvious' import from a parallel passage should not be taken for granted; further scholarly work to refine the observation is needed. On the contrary, I conclude that there is no objective or mechanical way of identifying a true harmonisation. As a result, the question of sources is highly dependent on the text used as a reference.

### III. 3. Further Research Areas

This work makes a contribution to the study of the text of Matthew in Codex Bezae. It highlights a number of areas that could be investigated further, and there remain various desiderata.

Firstly, linguists, and specifically specialists of discourse analysis, should now be able to use the lists presented in Chapter 2 and conduct a more in-depth analysis pertaining to the probable reason for one word being used or changed into an apparently synonymous one. Such a work would help in providing more insight into the word order differences or choice of words and their impact on the discourse and articulation of the passages studied.

Secondly, the same exercise needs to be ideally conducted in Luke and Mark in Codex Bezae in order to validate, challenge, or fine tune the present conclusions, especially with respect to Bezan variants that appear *prima facie* as harmonising. Furthermore, the construction of the New Testament as a text should take into consideration the ‘not so insignificant’ variants.

Thirdly, it could prove illuminating to reconstruct the ‘Q’ document based on Codex Bezae and see how it compares with the current scholarly form of ‘Q.’ Such a work could be undertaken on the basis of this work as well as the recently published Synoptic Gospels in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus by J. Read-Heimerdinger and J. Rius-Camps.<sup>7</sup> The result will in essence lead to a different form of ‘Q,’ it will immediately demonstrate that the present reconstructed Q text is actually subject to the one presented in Nestle-Aland as a reference.<sup>8</sup> It would be interesting to analyse its new borders and differences in an attempt to revisit the current conclusions on the proposed theological aspects of ‘Q’ and the *Sitz im Leben* of the early communities.<sup>9</sup>

Fourthly, the relatively scarce examples of alleged harmonisations with the Gospel of John would deserve special attention by including the particular status of the Fourth Gospel and its relationship with the Synoptics.

Finally, it could be real value to compare the findings on the Gospel of Matthew in Codex Bezae that emerged from this study with those related to other books in the manuscript, notably the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles, which are the only books to have been studied in comparable detail. Bringing the present research on Matthew alongside the earlier research would enable textual critics to work towards acquiring a more accurate and more comprehensive notion of the manuscript than presently exists.

---

<sup>7</sup> J. READ-HEIMERDINGER and J. RIUS-CAMPS, *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus* (NTTSD 45; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

<sup>8</sup> This conclusion would be come as complementary to Parkers’s opinion that ‘The study of harmonisation, however, is not influenced by modern Synoptic Problem theory.’ (D.C. PARKER, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 314.

<sup>9</sup> J.S. KLOPPENBORG, ‘The Function of Apocalyptic Language in Q,’ in *SBLSPS* 25 (1986) 224–35; *ibid.*, ‘Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q,’ in R.A. PIPER (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels. Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 275–319; *ibid.*, ‘The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,’ in R. URO (ed.), *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (PFES 65; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1996) 1–66; *ibid.*, ‘L’Évangile ‘Q’ et le Jésus historique,’ in D. MARGUERAT, E. NORELLI and J.M. POFFET (eds), *Jésus de Nazareth. Nouvelles approches d’une énigme* (MdB 38; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1998) 225–68.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### REFERENCE BOOKS

- NESTLE E. and K. ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (25<sup>th</sup> ed.; London: United Bible Societies, 1963)
- ALAND, K., M. BLACK, C.M. MARTINI and B.M. METZGER, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (26<sup>th</sup> ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979)
- ALAND, B., K. ALAND, J. KARAVIDOPOULOS, C.M. MARTINI and B.M. METZGER, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993<sup>27</sup>; 2012<sup>28</sup>).
- ALAND, K., M. WELTE, B. KÖSTER and K. JUNACK, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1994).
- BAUER, W., F. DANKER, W. ARNDT and F.W. GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000) [BDAG].
- CHRYSOSTOM, J., *Homiliae in Mattheum*, in J.-P. MIGNE, *PG*, 57.
- COMFORT, P.W. and D.P. BARRETT, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 2001).
- FRIBERG, T., B. FRIBERG and N.F. MILLER, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000).
- JAROŠ, K., *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten griechischen Handschriften: die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments vor Codex Sinaiticus und Codex Vaticanus* (Ruhpolding/Mainz: F.P. Rutzen; Vienna/Würzburg: Echter, 2006).
- JÜLICHER, A., *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938).
- METZGER, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1975<sup>1</sup>; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994<sup>2</sup>).
- MIGNE, J.-P., *Patrologia Graeca* (162 vols; Imprimerie Catholique: Paris, 1857-1886).
- MILL, J., *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum lectionibus variantibus manuscriptorum. Exemplarium, Versionem, Editionum, SS. Patrum et Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, et in easdem notis* (Studio et Labore Joannis Millii, S.T.P. Oxonii, e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1707)
- MOULTON, J.H., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906).
- MOULTON J.H. and W.F. HOWARD, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 2, *Accidence and Word-Formation, with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929).
- ORIGEN, *Commentaria in Evangelium secundum Matthaemum*, in J.-P. MIGNE, *PG*, 13.
- RAHLFS A., *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX interpretes* (2 vols ; Stuttgart, 1935, 1950)
- ROBERTSON, A.T., *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; New York: George H. Doran, 1919).
- SCRIVENER, F.H., *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Apostles, Written Early in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza A. D. 1581* (Cambridge, 1864, reprinted by Pickwick Press, Pittsburgh, 1978).
- SWANSON, R.J., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Vol. 1, Matthew* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press; Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995).
- THAYER, J.H., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; repr. Hendrickson, 1996; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896).
- WALLACE, D.B., *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).
- , *The Basics to New Testament Syntax* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000).
- WESTCOTT, B.F. and F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1907).
- WINER G.B., *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek: Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis* (trans. and rev. W.F. Moulton, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959).
- YODER, J.D., *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae* (NTTS 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961).

### OTHER WORKS REFERRED TO

- ADAMS, S.A., 'Atticism, Classicism, and Luke-Acts: Discussions with Albert Wifstrand and Loveday Alexander,' in PORTER-PITTS, *The Language of the New Testament*, 91–111.
- ALAND, B., 'Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte,' *ETL* 62 (1986) 5–65.
- , 'Kriterien zu Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments,' in A. DENAUX (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, 1–13.
- ALAND, K., 'Der heutige Text des griechischen Neuen Testaments. Ein kritischer Bericht über seine modernen Ausgaben,' *Die Bibel in der Welt* 9 (1966) 44–71.
- , 'Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament. Betrachtungen zu  $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$  und 0171,' in S. JANERAS (ed.), *Miscellània Papirologica Ramon Roca-Puig en el seu vuitantè aniversari a cura de Sebastià Janeras* (Barcelona, Fundacio Sal. Vives Casajuana, 1987) 37–61. Reprinted in B. KÖSTER, H.U. ROSENBAUM and M. WELTE [eds.], *Supplementa zu den neutestamentlichen und den kirchen-geschichtlichen Entwürfen. Kurt Aland: zum 75. Geburtstag* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990] 72–96.
- ALAND, K. and B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (transl. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995).
- ALFRED, M., 'A propos des doublets du livre de Jérémie. Réflexions sur la formation d'un livre prophétique,' in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Prophecy. Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday 6 September 1980* (BZAW 150; Berlin/New York, 1980) 106–20.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEN, J.P., *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- ALLISON, D.C., *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004).
- AMMASSARI, A., *Il Vangelo di Matteo nella colonna latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: note di commento sulla struttura letteraria, le punteggiatura, le lezioni e le citazioni bibliche* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996).
- AMPHOUX, C.-B., 'La révision marcionite du "Notre Père" de Luc (11,2–4) et sa place dans l'histoire du texte,' in R. GRYSOON and P.-M. BOGAERT (eds.), *Recherche sur l'histoire de la Bible latine* (CRThL 19; Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de la Faculté de Théologie, 1987), 105–21.
- , 'Les contextes de la parabole des deux fils (Mt 21,28–32),' *LOAPL* 3 (1991) 215–48.
- , 'Les premières éditions de Luc, I, L'histoire du texte au II<sup>e</sup> siècle,' *ETL* 67 (1991) 312–27.
- , 'Les premières éditions de Luc, II, L'histoire du texte au II<sup>e</sup> siècle,' *ETL* 68 (1991) 38–48.
- , *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; transl. J. Read-Heimerdinger; English ed. amplified and updated by Amphoux and Heimerdinger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- , 'La finale longue de Marc: un épilogue des quatre Évangiles,' in C. FOCANT, *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993) 548–55.
- , 'Review of Parker's *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*,' *NovT* 35 (1993) 411–13.
- , 'La composition de Matthieu inscrite dans dix prophéties de la Bible grecque,' in G. DORIVAL and O. MUNNICH (eds.), *Κατὰ τοὺς Ὁ' – Selon les Septante. Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante. En hommage à Marguerite Harl* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995) 333–69.
- , *L'Évangile selon Matthieu, Codex de Bèze* (L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue: Bois d'Orion, 1996).
- , 'La grande lacune du Codex de Bèze,' *FilNeo* 17 (2004) 3–25.
- , 'Qu'est-ce que le type de texte "césaréen"?,' in AMPHOX–OUTTIER–ELLIOTT, *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels*, 73–87.
- , 'Pour une approche documentaire des paroles de Jésus,' *BABELAO* 1 (2012) 99–116.
- AMPHOUX, C.-B., G. DORIVAL and J.K. ELLIOTT, *Manuel de Critique Textuelle du Nouveau Testament. Introduction générale* (Bruxelles: Safran, 2014).
- AMPHOUX, C.-B. and J.K. ELLIOTT, *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity. Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000 / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme. Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000* (HistTB 6; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003).
- AMPHOUX, C.-B. and A. SIRANDOUR, 'La composition de Jérémie LXX d'après les divisions du Codex Vaticanus (B),' in M.K.H. PETERS (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubljana, 2007* (SBL.SCSt 55; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 3–19.
- AMPHOUX, C.-B., B. OUTTIER and J.K. ELLIOTT, *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels – Recherches textuelles sur les psaumes et les évangiles. Papers from the Tbilisi Collo-*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- quium on the Editing and History of Biblical Manuscripts – Actes du Colloque de Tbilisi, 19–20 septembre 2007* (NovTSup 142; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2012).
- ANDERSEN, H., ‘Markedness Theory – The First 150 Years’ in O. MIŠESKA–TOMIC (ed.), *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony* (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989) 11–46.
- ANDERSON, A.S., *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family 1 in Matthew* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004).
- ARGYLE, A.W., ‘Evidence for the View that Luke Used St. Matthew’s Gospel,’ *JBL* 83 (1964) 390–6.
- ASKELAND, C., ‘The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,’ in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 201–29.
- AUWERS, J.M., ‘Le texte latin des Évangiles dans le Codex de Bèze,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 183–216.
- BAARDA, T., ‘Mt 17:1–9 in Codex Schøjen,’ *NovT* 46 (2004) 265–87.
- , ‘The Reading “Who Wished to Enter” in Coptic Tradition, Mt 23:13, Lk 11:52 and Thomas 39,’ *NTS* 52 (2006) 583–91.
- , ‘“...Thereafter He Shut the Door”: Matthew 25.10c in the “Schøjen Codex” – A Short Note,’ *NTS* 54 (2008) 275–81.
- , ‘Διαφωνια–Συμφωνια. Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian,’ in W.L. PETERSEN (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century. Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (CJAS 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989) 133–54 (repr. T. BAARDA, *Essays on the Diatessaron* [CBET 11; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994] 29–47).
- BACON, W., *Studies in Matthew* (London: H. Holt & Co., 1930).
- BARTSCH, H.-W., ‘Über den Umgang der frühen Christenheit mit dem Text der Evangelien. Das Beispiel des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis,’ *NTS* 29 (1983) 167–82.
- BATIFFOL, P., ‘Evangeliorum codex Graecus purpureus Beratinus Φ,’ *MAH* 5 (1885) 358–76.
- , *Les manuscrits grecs de Berat d’Albanie et le Codex Purpureus Φ* (Paris: Editions Imprimerie nationale, 1886).
- BEATTIE, D., G. ROBERT and M.J. MCNAMARA, *The Aramaic Bible Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- BECKER, A.H. and A.Y. REED, *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).
- BERTRAND, D., *Les Écrits des Pères apostoliques* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2001).
- BILLINGS, B.S., *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b): A Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (LNTS 314; T. & T. Clark, 2006).
- BIRDSALL, J.N., ‘The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the *Status Quaestionis*, Mainly from the Palaeographical Standpoint,’ in W. SCHRAGE (ed.), *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven* (BZNW 47; Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1986) 102–14.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , ‘A Fresh Examination of the Fragments of the Gospel of St. Luke in Ms. 0171 and an Attempted Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Recto,’ in R. GRAYSON, *Philologia Sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien*, 212–7.
- , ‘The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the *Status Quaestionis*, Mainly from the Palaeographical Standpoint,’ in *ibid.* (ed.), *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (TaS.ThS 3; Piscataway, Gorgias Press, 2006) 109–23.
- , ‘After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, xix–xxx.
- BLACK, D.A., *Learn to Read New Testament Greek* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994).
- BLACK, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998).
- BLOMBERG, C.L., ‘Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage, and Celibacy: An Exegesis of Matthew 19:3–12,’ *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990) 161–96.
- , *Matthew* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992).
- BOCKMUEHL, M.N.A., ‘Matthew 5,32; 19,9 in the Light of Pre-Rabbinic Halakhah,’ *NTS* 35 (1989) 291–5.
- BOISMARD, M.-É., ‘Étude sur le papyrus copte de l'évangile de Matthieu provenant de la collection Schøyen,’ *RB* 110 (2003) 387–98.
- , *L'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après le papyrus copte de la collection Shøyen : analyse littéraire* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2003).
- BONNARD, P., *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2002).
- BORNKAMM, G., G. BARTH and J. HEINZ, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960).
- BORNKAMM, G., G. BARTH and H.J. HELD, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (transl. Percy Scott; Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963).
- BOSSON, N., ‘Le Codex Schøyen (Évangile de Matthieu). Études pour servir à l'identification d'un nouveau dialecte de Moyenne-Égypte,’ in L.P. PAINCHAUD and P.-H. POIRIER (eds.), *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica. Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk* (BCNH.E 7; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval; Louvain/Paris: Editions Peeters, 2006) 19–79.
- BROCK, S.P., ‘Doublet and its Ramifications,’ *Biblica* 56 (1975) 550–3.
- BROWN, J.P., ‘The Form of “Q” Known to Matthew,’ *NTS* 8 (1961) 27–42.
- , ‘Mark as witness to an edited form of Q,’ *JBL* 80 (1969) 22–44.
- BROWN, R.E and P.J. ACHTEMEIER, *Mary in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978).
- BRUNER, F.D., *Matthew: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).
- BUCHANAN, E.S., *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: the Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis: (ff (or ff<sup>l</sup>)), Being the First Complete Edition of the MS. Now Numbered Lat. 17225 in National Library at Library at Paris* (vol. 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).
- BURGON, J.W., *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels; Being the Sequel to the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (London: G. Bell, 1896).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BURNSIDE, J.P., *The Signs of Sin. Seriousness of Offence in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 364; London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003).
- CALLAHAN, A.D., 'Again: The Origin of the Codex Bezae,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 56–64.
- CALLOW, J.C. 'Constituent Order in Copula Clauses: A Partial Study,' in D.A. BLACK (ed), *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992) 68-89.
- CARAGOUNIS, C.C., *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).
- CERVIN, R.S., 'Word Order in Ancient Greek: VSO, SVO, SOV, or All of the Above?' (Ph.D. thesis; University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign, 1990).  
Accessible from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/21810>
- CHAE, Y.S., *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd. Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT.2 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- CHAMPLIN, R., *Family II in Matthew* (SD 24; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1964).
- , *Family E and Its Allies in Matthew* (SD 28; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1966).
- CHASE F.H., *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1893).
- , *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1895).
- CHRISTIDIS, A.F., *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- CLIVAZ, C., *L'ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43-44). Ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l'histoire* (BiTS 7; Leuven /Paris/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2010).
- CLIVAZ, C. and J. ZUMSTEIN, *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context – Lire les papyrus du Nouveau Testament dans leur contexte* (BETL 242; Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011).
- COLWELL, E.C., 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,' in J.P. HYATT (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964* (Nashville: Abington Press, 1965) 370-89.
- , *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1969).
- COMFORT, P.W., *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990).
- COUSLAND, J.R.C., 'The Feeding of the Four Thousand Gentiles in Matthew? Matthew 1:29-39 as a Test Case,' *NovT* 41 (1999) 1-23.
- , *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NTS 102; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- DAIN, A., *Les Manuscrits* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DALMAN, G. and D.M. KAY, *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language: Introduction and Fundamental Ideas*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).
- DAVID, M., 'Nonrecurring Doublets in the Book of Joel,' *CBQ* 56 (1994) 56–67.
- DAVIES, W.D., *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1964).
- DAVIES, W.D. and D.C. ALLISON, *Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–1997).
- DEISSMANN, A., *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1922).
- DELOBEL, J., 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Textual Tradition. Variant Readings in the Greek Manuscripts of the Gospels, in *ibid.* (ed.), *Logia, les paroles de Jésus, the Sayings of Jesus* (BETL 59; Leuven: 1982) 431–57.
- , 'The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition. A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion's Role,' in J.-M. SEVRIN (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif* (BETL 86; Leuven: Peeters/Louvain: University Press, 1989) 293–303.
- , 'The Text of Luke-Acts, A Confrontation of Recent Theories,' in J. VERHEYDEN (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven: University Press & Peeters, 1999).
- DENAUX, A., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven/Paris/Sterling/Virginia: Peeters Publishers and Leuven University Press, 2002).
- DERRETT, J.D.M., 'Ecce homo Ruber (John 19.5 with Isaiah 1.18; 63.1–2),' *BibOr* 32 (1990) 215–29.
- DEUTSCHE, C., 'Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol,' *NovT* 32 (1990) 13–47.
- DIAMOND, A.R.P., 'Portraying Prophecy: of Doublets, Variants and Analogies in the Narrative Representation of Jeremiah's Oracles – Reconstructing the Hermeneutics of Prophecy,' *JSOT* 57 (1993) 99–119.
- DIK, S., *The Theory of Functional Grammar: Part I: The Structure of the Clause* (FGS 9; Dordrecht; Providence, R.I.: Foris 1989).
- DORIVAL, G., M. HARL and O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Editions du Cerf/Editions du CNRS, 1988).
- DOVER, K.J., *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960; reprint 2010).
- DRYER, M.S., 'Aspects of Word Order in the Languages of Europe,' in A. SIEWIERSKA (ed.), *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe* (ESFLTS; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998) 283–319.
- DUFF, N.J., 'Wise and Foolish Maidens, Matthew 25:1–13,' *USQR* 40 (1985) 55–8.
- DUNN, J.D.G., 'Syntactic Word Order in Herodotean Greek,' *Glotta*, 66 (1988) 63–79.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DUPLACY, J., 'Note sur les variantes et le texte original de Matthieu 19,9,' in J. DUPLACY (ed.), *Études de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (BETL 78; Leuven: Leuven University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1987) 387–412.
- EHRMAN, B.D., *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993<sup>1</sup>; 2011<sup>2</sup>).
- , *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 33; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2006).
- , 'The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 96–122.
- EHRMAN, B.D. and M.W. HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger* (SD 46; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995<sup>1</sup>; NTTSD 42; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2013<sup>2</sup>).
- EJENOBO, D.T., 'Textual Criticism: Its Value to New Testament Studies,' *Asia Journal of Theology* 22 (2008) 126–41.
- ELLINGWORTH, P., '(His) Disciples,' *NovT* 42 (2000) 114–26.
- ELLIOTT, J.K., 'United Bible Societies' Textual Commentary Evaluated,' *NovT* 17 (1975) 130–50.
- , *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976).
- , 'Moeris and the Textual Tradition of the Greek New Testament,' in *ibid.*, *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, 144–52.
- , 'Μαθητής with a Possessive in the New Testament,' *TZ* 35 (1979) 300–4.
- , 'L'importance de la critique textuelle pour le problème synoptique,' *RB* 96 (1989) 56–70.
- , *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Cordoba: Ediciones El Al-mendro, 1992).
- , 'Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 161–82.
- , 'Six New Papyri of Matthew's Gospel,' *NovT* 41 (1999) 105–7.
- , 'The Parable of the Two Sons. Text and Exegesis,' in A. DENAUX (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, 67–78.
- , 'Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ,' in C. HORTON (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$*  (JSNTSup 258; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 122–31.
- , *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2010).
- , 'Resolving the Synoptic Problem Using the Text of Printed Greek Synopses,' in *ibid.* (ed.) *New Testament Textual Criticism*, 459–67.
- , 'Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism,' in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 321–3.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , ‘Recently Discovered New Testament Papyri and Their Significance for Textual Criticism,’ in CLIVAZ-ZUMSTEIN, *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context*, 89–108.
- , ‘A New Edition of Nestle–Aland, Greek New Testament,’ *JTS* 64 (2013) 47–65.
- ELLIOTT, J.K. and I. MOIR, *Manuscripts and the Text of the New Testament. An Introduction for English Readers* (London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006).
- EMERTON, J.A., *Prophecy. Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday 6 September 1980* (BZAW 150; Berlin/New York, 1980) 106–20.
- EPP, E.J., ‘The “Ignorance Motif” in Acts and Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Codex Bezae,’ *HTR* 55 (1962) 51–62.
- , *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (SNTSMS 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).
- , ‘The Multivalence of the Term “Original Text” in New Testament Textual Criticism,’ *HTR* 92 (1999) 245–81.
- , ‘Textual Criticism in Exegesis,’ in S.E. PORTER, *Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, 45–97.
- , ‘Anti-Judaic Tendencies in the D-Text of Acts: Forty Years of Conversation,’ in NICKLAS-TILLY, *The Book of Acts as Church History*, 111–46.
- , *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays, 1962–2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2005).
- , ‘Coptic Manuscript G67 and the Rôle of Codex Bezae as a Western Witness in Acts,’ in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 15–39.
- , ‘Toward the Clarification of the Term “Textual Variant”,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 47–61. Reprinted in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 101–24.
- , ‘The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament,’ in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 1–39.
- , ‘A Continuing Interlude in the New Testament Textual Criticism?,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 109–23. Reprinted in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 185–209.
- , ‘Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 17–44. Reprinted in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 227–83.
- , ‘The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 141–73. Reprinted in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 125–73.
- , ‘The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 274–97. Reprinted in *ibid.*, *Perspectives*, 345–81.
- EPP, E.J. and G.D. FEE, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993).
- FEE, G.D., ‘A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem,’ *NovT* 22 (1980) 12–24.
- , ‘Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 136.
- , ‘Textual Criticism of the New Testament,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 3–16.
- , ‘On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation,’ in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 62–79.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , 'Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: on the Problem of Harmonisation in the Gospels,' in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 174–82.
- , 'Ⲣ<sup>75</sup>, Ⲣ<sup>66</sup>, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,' in EPP–FEE, *Studies*, 247–73.
- FINEGAN, J., *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974).
- FITZMYER, J.A., 'The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *To Advance the Gospel. New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) 79–111.
- FLEDDERMANN, H.T., 'The Doublets in Luke,' *ETL* 84 (2008) 409–44.
- FOCANT, C., 'La fonction narrative des doublets dans la section des pains. Mc 6,6b–8,26,' in F. VAN SEGBROECK, C.M. TUCKETT, G. VAN BELLE and J. VERHEYDEN (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992, Festschrift Frans Neiryck* (BETL 100; Leuven, Peeters–University Press 1992) 1039–63.
- FRANCE R.T., *Matthew: Evangelist & Teacher* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998).
- , *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).
- FRANCIS, L.J. and P. ATKIN, *Exploring Matthew's Gospel: A Guide to the Gospel Readings in the Revised Common Lectionary* (London: Mowbray, 2001).
- FRENZ, A., 'Mt 21:5–7,' *NovT* 13 (1971) 259–60.
- FRIEBERG, T., 'New Testament Greek Word Order in Light of Discourse Considerations' (Ph.D. Thesis; University of Minnesota, 1982).
- GEERLINGS, J., *Family 13–The Ferrar Group: The Text According to Matthew* (SD 19; Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press).
- , *Family E and Its Allies in Mark* (SD 31; Salt Lake City, UT, 1968).
- , *Family E and Its Allies in Luke* (SD 35; Salt Lake City, UT, 1968).
- GERSTINGER, H., 'Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrusammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien,' *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 67–72.
- GLINKA, J., *Das Matthäusevangelium* (2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1992–93).
- GOODACRE, M., 'Fatigue in the Synoptics,' *NTS* 44 (1998) 45–58.
- , *The Synoptic Problem. A Way through the Maze* (London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2001).
- GREENLEE, J., *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995).
- GRYSON, R. and P. BOGAERT, *Recherche sur l'histoire de la Bible latine* (CRTL 19; Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de la Faculté de Théologie, 1987).
- GRYSON R., *Philologia Sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem 70. Geburtstag* (VL.AGLB 24; Freiburg: Herder, 1993)
- GÜTING, E., 'Weakly Attested Original Readings of the Manuscript D.05 in Mark,' in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 217–31.
- HAENCHEN, E., 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte,' *ZTK* 51 (1954) 153–67.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , *Die Apostelgeschichte, kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956).
- HAGNER, D.A., *Matthew 1–13* (Word Biblical Commentary; Dallas: World Publishing, 1993).
- HARRINGTON, D.J., *The Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- HARRIS, J.R., *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1891).
- , ‘Does Codex Bezae Syriacize?’, in *ibid.*, *Codex Bezae*, 178–90.
- HAWKINS, J.C., *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (2<sup>nd</sup> rev. edn; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).
- HEDLEY, P.C., ‘The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts,’ *CQR* 118 (1934).
- HEDRICK, C.W., ‘An Unpublished Coptic Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew,’ *JCS* 3 (2001) 149–51.
- HEIKKINEN, J.W., ‘Notes on “epistrophe” and “metanoeo”,’ *ER* 19 (1967) 313–6.
- HENDRIKS, W.M.A., ‘Leçons pré-alexandrines du Codex Bezae dans Marc,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 232–9.
- HERNÁNDEZ, J., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi* (WUNT2 218; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- HILL C.E. and M.J. KRUGER, *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- HILLS, E.F., ‘Harmonizations in the Caesarean Text of Mark,’ *JBL* 66 (1947) 135–52.
- HOLMES, M.W., ‘Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984). Accessible through UMI Microfilms.
- , ‘Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 123–60.
- , ‘The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,’ *JBL* 109 (1990) 651–64.
- , ‘From “Original Text” to “Initial text”: The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion,’ in EHRMAN–HOLMES, *The Text of the New Testament*, 637–88.
- HORTON, C., ‘The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance,’ in C. HORTON (ed.) *The Earliest Gospels. The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex* Ƴ<sup>45</sup> (JSNTSup 258; London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 149–60.
- HOWARD, G., ‘Stylistic Inversion and the Synoptic Tradition,’ *JBL* 97 (1978) 375–89.
- HUIZENGA, L.A., *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2009).
- HURTADO, L.W., ‘The New Testament in the Second Century: Text, Collections and Canon,’ in J.W. CHILDERS and D.C. PARKER (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (TaS.ThS 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006) 3–27.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts. Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove* (SBLTCS 6; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).
- JANZEN, D., 'The Meaning of *Porneia* in Matthew 5.32 and 19.9: An Approach from the Study of Ancient Near Eastern Culture,' *JSNT* 80 (2000) 66–80.
- JEREMIAS, J., *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Eng. transl. N. PERRIN; London: SCM Press, 1966).
- JOHNSTON, J.W., *The use of Πῶς in the New Testament* (New York/Washington/Baltimore: Peter Lang, 2004).
- JONGKIND, D., 'Review of *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity/Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*,' *TC* 12 (2007) 1–5.
- , *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (TaS.ThS 5; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007).
- JORDAAN, G.J.C., 'The Word Order between the Greek and Latin Texts in Codex Bezae,' in J.H. PETZER and P.J. HARTIN (eds.), *South African Perspective on the New Testament, Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce M. Metzger During His Visit in South Africa in 1985* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986) 99–111.
- KEENER, C.S., *Matthew* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997).
- KENYON, F.G., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri 2, Gospels and Acts, Text* (London: E. Walker, 1933).
- , *The Text of the Greek Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1949).
- KILPATRICK, G.D., *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).
- , 'Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament,' in J. BLINZER, O. KUSS and F. MUSSNER (eds.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1963) 125–37.
- , 'Luke xxii,' in *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy* (The Moorhouse Lectures; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 28–42.
- , 'Eclecticism and Atticism,' *ETL* 53 (1977) 107–12.
- , 'Eclecticism and Atticism,' in G.D. KILPATRICK and J.K. ELLIOTT (eds.), *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays* (BETL 96; Louvain: Presses Universitaires, 1990) 73–9.
- KINGSBURY, J.D., 'The Title "Son of David" in Matthew's Gospel,' *JBL* 95 (1976) 591–602.
- KLIJN, A.F.J., *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts, II: 1949–1969* (NovTSup 21; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969).
- KLOPPENBORG, J.S., *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).
- , *Q Parallels. Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (FoundF.RS; Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988).
- , 'The Function of Apocalyptic Language in Q,' *SBLSPS* 25 (1986) 224–35.
- , 'Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q,' in R.A. PIPER (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels. Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 275–319.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , ‘The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,’ in R. URO (ed.), *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (PFES 65; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1996) 1–66.
- , ‘L’Évangile “Q” et le Jésus historique,’ in D. MARGUERAT, E. NORELLI and J.M. POFFET (eds.), *Jésus de Nazareth. Nouvelles approches d’une énigme* (MdB 38; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1998) 225–68.
- KÖSTER, H., *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TUGAL 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).
- , *Introduction to the New Testament* (2 vols; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000).
- KWONG, I.S.C., *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages* (LNTS 298; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005).
- LAFLEUR, D., ‘Le Codex de Koridethi (Θ.038) et la famille 13: une nouvelle collation de l’Évangile de Marc,’ in AMPHOUX–OUTTIER–ELLIOTT, *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels*, 89–112.
- , ‘Les relations, au sein du groupe “césaréen”, entre le Papyrus Chester Beatty (P<sup>45</sup>) et la Famille Ferrar (f<sup>13</sup>), dans l’Évangile de Marc,’ in AMPHOUX–OUTTIER–ELLIOTT, *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels*, 289–306.
- , ‘The “Caesarean” Text of the Gospel of Mark: Lake Revisited,’ in *BABELAO* 3 (2014) 145–69.
- LAGRANGE, M.-J., *L’Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1923).
- , *L’Évangile selon Saint Marc* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1947).
- LAKE, K. and R.P. BLAKE, ‘The Text of the Gospels and the Koridethi Codex,’ *HTR* 16 (1923) 267–86.
- LEE, D.A., *Transfiguration* (London: Continuum, 2004).
- LEE, S.S., *Jesus’ Transfiguration and the Believers’ Transformation. A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (WUNT 2, 265; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- LEONARD, J.M., ‘Codex Schøyen as an Alternative Gospel of Matthew: A Consideration of Schenke’s Retroversion of Mt 12:2–14’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; University of Cambridge, 2007).
- LEVINSOHN, S.H., *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Dallas: SIL International, 2000).
- , ‘The Relevance of Greek Discourse Studies to Exegesis,’ *Journal of Translation* 2 (2006) 11–21.
- LONG, T.G., *Matthew* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).
- LUZ, U., *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005).
- LUZ, U. and H. KOESTER, *Matthew* (4 vols; trans. J.E. Crouch; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2001–2007)
- MACCHI, J.D., ‘Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,’ in A.H.W. CURTIS and T. ROEMER (eds.), *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception* (BETL 128; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997) 119–150.
- MACCOBY, H., *Judaism in the First Century* (IRSt; London: Sheldon Press, 1989).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MARCUS, D., 'Non-Recurring Doublets in the Book of Lamentations,' *Hebrew Annual Review* 10 (1986) 177–95.
- MARTIN, M.W., 'Defending the "Western Non-Interpolations": The Case for an Anti-Separationist *Tendenz* in the Longer Alexandrian Readings,' *JBL* 124 (2005) 269–94.
- MARTINI, C.M., *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966).
- , 'La problématique générale du texte de Matthieu,' in *ibid.* (ed.), *La Parola di Dio alle Origini della Chiesa* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 129–44.
- MARUCCI, C., 'Clausole matteane e critica testuale. In merito alla teoria di H. Crouzel sul testo originale di Mt 19,9,' *RivBib* 38 (1990) 301–25.
- MASSAUX, É., *L'influence de l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irénée* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950).
- MCARTHUR, H.K., "'On the Third Day,'" *NTS* 18 (1971) 81–6.
- MCKENZIE, R.S., 'The Latin Column in Codex Bezae,' *JSNT* 6 (1980) 58–76.
- MCNAMARA, M., 'Non-Vulgate Readings of Codex Ambrosianus I 61 sup. The Gospel of Matthew,' in R. GRYSON (ed.), *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien*, 177–92.
- METZGER, B.M., 'An Early Coptic Manuscript of the Gospel according to Matthew,' in J.K. ELLIOTT, *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, 301–12.
- , *The Early Versions of The New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- , *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).
- METZGER, B.M. and B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4<sup>th</sup> edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- MICHAELS, J.R., 'The Parable of the Regretful Son,' *HTR* 62 (1968) 15–26.
- MIN, K.S., *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.). Edition und Untersuchung* (ANTT 34; Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2005).
- MINK, G., 'Problems of a highly contaminated tradition: the New Testament,' in P.T. VAN REENEN, A.A. DEN HOLLANDER and M. VAN MULKE (eds.), *Studies in Stemmatology II* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996) 13–86.
- MOORE, B.R., *Doublets in the New Testament* (Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1993).
- MORRIS, L., *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992).
- MOUNCE, R.H., *Matthew* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991).
- NASELLI, A.D. 'A Brief Introduction to Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek,' *DBSJ* 12 (2007) 17–28
- NEIRYNCK, F., 'The Form of "Q" Known to Matthew,' *NTS* 8 (1961) 27–42.
- , 'Duplicate Expressions in the Gospel of Mark,' *ETL* 48 (1972) 150–209.
- , 'ΑΠΟ ΤΟΤΕ ΕΡΕΑΤΟ and the Structure of Matthew,' *ETL* 6 (1988) 21–59.
- , *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction* (rev. edn; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Peeters, 1988).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , ‘Q<sup>Mt</sup> and Q<sup>Lk</sup> and the Reconstruction of Q,’ *ETL* 66 (1990) 385–90.
- , ‘John and the Synoptics: 1975-1990,’ in A. DENAUX (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 3-62.
- , ‘The Question of John and the Synoptics. D. Moody Smith 1992-1999,’ in F. NEIRYNCK (ed.), *Evangelica III. 1992-2000. Collected Essays* (BETL 150; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001) 616–28.
- , ‘John and the Synoptics in Recent Commentaries,’ in *ibid.*, 601–15.
- NEUDECKER, R., ‘Das “Ehescheidungsgesetz” von Dtn 24,1–4 nach altjüdischer Auslegung. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der neutestamentlichen Aussagen zur Ehescheidung,’ *Biblica* 75 (1994) 350–87.
- NICKLAS, T. and M. TILLY, *The Book of Acts as Church History, Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte* (BZNTW 120; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003).
- NOLLAND, J., *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005).
- OMANSON, R.L., ‘A Question of Harmonization – Matthew 9:18–25,’ *Bible Translator* 42 (1991) 241.
- PANTEN, K.E., ‘A History of Research on Codex Bezae, with Special Reference to the Acts of the Apostles: Evaluation and Future Directions’ (Ph.D. dissertation; Murdoch University, 1995).  
Accessible from <http://Researchrepository.Murdoch.edu.au/244>
- , ‘A History of Research on Codex Bezae,’ *TynB* 47 (1996) 185–7.
- PARKER, D.C., *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- , *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- , *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- , *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977–2007* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2010).
- , *The Gospel before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1953).
- PARKER, D.C. and C.-B. AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- PARKE-TAYLOR, G.H., *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).
- PAULSON, G., ‘Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus in the Gospel of Matthew’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; University of Edinburgh, 2013).  
Accessible from <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/8957/2/Paulson2013.pdf>
- PETERSEN, W.L., *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (SVigChr 25; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994).
- PETZER, J.H., ‘The History of the NT Text – Its Reconstruction,’ in B. ALAND and J. DELOBEL (eds), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History. A Discussion of Methods* (CBET 7; Kampen: KOK Pharos, 1994).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- PHILLIPS, T.E., “‘Will the Wise Person Get Drunk?’: the Background of the Human Wisdom in Luke 7:35 and Matthew 11:19,” *JBL* 127 (2008) 385–96.
- PIERRI, R., *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di padre Lino Cignelli, OFM* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta 68; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006).
- PINCHARD, L., ‘Review of J. Rius-Camps and J. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae* (4 vols),’ *FilNeo* 25 (2012) 164–84.
- , ‘Des traces vétérotestamentaires dans quelques variantes de Matthieu traditionnellement jugées harmonisantes,’ *NovT* 56 (2014) 1–13.
- , ‘Four Variant Readings in Bezan Matthew Claimed as Harmonising with the Septuagint,’ *BABELAO* [pending].
- PITTS, A.W., ‘Greek Word Order and Clause Structure: A Comparative Study of Some New Testament Corpora,’ in PORTER–PITTS, *The Language of the New Testament*, 311–46.
- PLISCH, U.-K., ‘Die Perikopen über Johannes den Täufer in der neuentdeckten mittelägyptischen Version des Matthäus-Evangeliums (Codex Schøyen),’ *NovT* 43 (2001) 368–92.
- PORTER, S.E., ‘Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case,’ *FilNeo* 6 (1993) 177–205.
- , *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (BLGS 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- , *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).
- PORTER S.E. and A.W. PITTS, *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History, and Development* (LingBS 6; ECIHC 3; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013).
- PORTER S.E. and J.T. REED, *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament. Approaches and Results* (JSNT.S 170; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- PORTER, S.E. and E.J. SCHNABEL, *On the Writing of New Testament Commentaries: Festschrift for Grant R. Osborne on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- PREGEANT, R., *Matthew* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004).
- PRIOR, J.B., ‘The Use and Non-Use of *Nomina Sacra* in the Freer Gospels of Matthew,’ in HURTADO, *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts*, 147–646.
- RACINE, J.-F., ‘The Text of Matthew in the Freer Gospels, A Quantitative and Qualitative Appraisal,’ in HURTADO, *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts*, 123–46.
- READ-HEIMERDINGER, J. ‘Word Order in Koine Greek. Using a Text–Critical Approach to Study Word Order Patterns in the Greek Text of Acts,’ *FilNeo* 9 (1996) 139–80.
- , ‘The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae: A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 303–10.
- , *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNTSup 236; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- , ‘The Apostles in the Bezan Text of Acts,’ in NICKLAS–TILLY, *The Book of Acts as Church History*, 263–80.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , ‘Variation in the Use of Prepositions between Codex Bezae and the Alexandrian Uncials,’ in AMPHOUX–ELLIOTT, *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity*, 275–87
- , ‘Luke’s Use of  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ : Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message,’ in PIERRI, *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae*, 251–74.
- , ‘The Tracking of Participants with the Third Person Pronoun: A Study of the Text of Acts’, *RCT* 31 (2006) 439–55.
- READ-HEIMERDINGER, J. and S.H. LEVINSOHN, ‘The Use of the Definite Article before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular Reference to Codex Bezae,’ *FilNeo* 5 (1992) 15–44.
- READ-HEIMERDINGER, J. and J. RIUS-CAMPS, ‘Tracing the Readings of Codex Bezae in the Papyri of Acts,’ in CLIVAZ–ZUMSTEIN, *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context*, 307–38.
- , *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus* (NTTSD 45; Leiden: Brill, 2014).
- REID, B.E., *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).
- RICE, G., ‘The Alteration of Luke’s Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Case Western Reserve University, 1974).  
Accessible at <http://documents.adventistarchives.org/Theses/Luke19740601.pdf>
- , ‘The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke,’ *AUSS* 18 (1980) 50–7.
- , ‘Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias in the Western Text of the Gospel of Luke,’ *AUSS* 18 (1980) 149–56.
- RIUS-CAMPS, J., ‘La fracció del pa (sense copa eucarística), ¿gest distintiu de les comunitats lucanes?’, *RTC* 25 (2000) 81–93.
- , ‘Le substrat de la version latine,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 271–95.
- , ‘“Nazareno” y “Nazoreo”, con especial atención al Códice Bezae,’ in PIERRI (ed.), *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae*, 183–204.
- , ‘Simó Pere, ¿fou des dels inicis deixeble de Jesús?’, in A. PUIG I TARRECH (ed.), *La veritat i la mentida* (SB 10; Barcelona: ABCat–PAM, 2010) 139–53.
- , ‘Le Codex de Bèze : une base indispensable pour une édition de l’Évangile de Marc,’ *CCO* 5 (2008) 255–95. Reprinted in in AMPHOUX–OUTTIER–ELLIOTT, *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels*, 125–45.
- RIUS-CAMPS J. and J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (4 vols; London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004–9).
- ROBINSON, J.M., P. HOFFMANN and J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis, including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).
- ROSS, J., ‘The Spelling of Jerusalem in Acts,’ *NTS* 38 (1992) 474–6.
- ROUGER, D., ‘Celse et la tradition évangélique du Codex de Bèze,’ in PARKER–AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, 240–7.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ROYSE, J.R., *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Boston: E.J. Brill, 2008).
- RÜGER, H.P., 'Nazareth/Nazara Nazarēnos/Nazōraios,' *ZNW* 72 (1981) 257–63.
- RUNGE, S.E., *A Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems Inc., 2010).
- SCHEDINGER, R.F., 'The Textual Relationship between  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew,' *NTS* 43 (1997) 58–71.
- SCHENKE, H.-M., *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)* (TUGAL 127; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981; reprinted MSC.CP 2; Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2001).
- , *Apostelgeschichte 1,1–15,3 im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen Codex Glazier* (TUGAL 137; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991).
- , 'Codex Glazier – ein koptischer Zeuge des "westlichen" Actatextes,' in SCHENKE–SCHENKE–GESA–PLISCH, *Der Same Seths*, 846–53.
- , 'Ein anderes Matthäusevangelium im Dialekt M. Bemerkungen zum Codex Schøyen,' in SCHENKE–SCHENKE–GESA–PLISCH, *Der Same Seths*, 942–52.
- SCHENKE, R., G. SCHENKE and U.K. GESA-PLISCH (eds.), *Der Same Seths. Kleine Schriften zu Gnosis, Koptologie und Neuem Testament* (NHMS 78; Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2012).
- SCHOEMAKER, W.R., *The Gospel According to the Hebrews* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902).
- SENIOR, D., *What Are They Saying about Matthew?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1996).
- SHAFFER, J.R., 'A Harmonisation of Mt 8:5–13 and Luke 7:1–10,' *TMSJ* 17 (2006) 35–50.
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 'Middle Egyptian Gleanings: Grammatical Notes on the "Middle Egyptian" Text of Matthew,' *Chronique d'Egypte* 58 (1983) 311–29.
- SKEAT, T.C., 'A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of Gospels and Acts ( $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ),' *Hermathena* 155 (1993) 27–43.
- SNODGRASS, K.R., 'Western Non-Interpolations,' *JBL* 91 (1972) 369–79.
- STANTON, G.N., 'The Communities of Matthew,' *Interpretation* 46 (1992) 379–91.
- STEIN, R., 'Duality in Mark,' in P. FOSTER, A. GREGORY, J.S. KLOPPENBORG and J. VERHEYDEN (eds.), *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008. Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* (BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 253–80.
- STERN, D., *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- STEWART R.B., *The Reliability of the New Testament. Bart D. Ehrman & Daniel B. Wallace in Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011).
- STONE, R.C., *The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1946).
- STRECKER, G., *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (FRLANT 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).
- STREETER, B.H., *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1924).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SWAELES, R., 'L'Arrière-fond scripturaire de Matt 21:43 et son lien avec Matt 21:44,' *NTS* 6 (1960) 310–3.
- SANCHEZ NAVARRO, L., 'Mt 19,3–9: una nueva perspectiva,' *EstB* 58 (2000) 211–38.
- TALBERT, C.H., *Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010).
- TAVARDON, P., *Le texte occidental et le texte alexandrin des Actes des Apôtres. Doublets et variantes de structures* (CRB 37; Paris: Gabalda, 1997).
- THOMAS, R.L., *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002).
- TORREY, C.C., 'The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels,' in D.G. LYONS and G.F. MOORE (eds.), *Studies in the History of Religions Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (New York: Macmillan, 1912) 269–317.
- TOV, E., 'The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,' *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3–29.
- , *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, MI: Fortress Press, 2001)
- TRILLING, W., *Das wahre Israel; Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (StANT 10; 3<sup>rd</sup> edn; Munich: Kösel, 1964).
- URBAN, Á., 'Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis [D]: intercambios vocálicos en el texto griego de Lucas y Hechos,' *CCO* 3 (2006) 269–316.
- , 'Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis [D]: intercambios vocálicos en el texto griego de Mateo,' *CCO* 5 (2008) 325–60.
- VAGANAY, L. and C. B. AMPHOUX, *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1986).
- VAN OYEN, G., 'The Doublets in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Gospel Study,' *ETL* 73 (1997) 277–306.
- VERHEYDEN, J., *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven: University Press, 1999).
- VERSEPUT, D. 'The Role and Meaning of the "Son of God" Title in Matthew's Gospel,' *NTS* 33 (1987) 532–56.
- VOELZ, J., 'The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek,' *NovT* 47 (2005) 209–49.
- VOGELS, H.J., *Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910).
- WARD-POWERS, B., *The Progressive Publication of Matthew An Explanation of the Writing of the Synoptic Gospels* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010)
- WARREN, W.F., 'The Textual Relationships of  $\mathfrak{P}^4$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ , and  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  in the Gospel of Luke' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans).
- WASSERMAN, T., 'The Early Text of Matthew,' in HILL–KRUGER, *The Early Text of the New Testament*, 83–107.
- WEIBLING, J.M., 'Reconciling Matthew and Mark on Divorce,' *Trinity Journal* 22 (2001) 219–35.
- WENHAM, G.J., 'Why Do You Ask Me about the Good: A Study of the Relation between Text and Source Criticism,' in *NTS* 28 (1982) 116–25.
- , 'Matthew and Divorce: An Old Crux Revisited,' *JSNT* 22 (1984) 95–107.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- WENHAM, J.W., 'How Many Cock-Crowings: The Problem of Harmonistic Text-Variants,' *NovT* 25 (1979) 523–5
- WENSINCK, A.J., 'The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and Their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of Saint Luke,' *BBC* 12 (1937) 11–48.
- WIELAND, D.J., 'Subject Verb Object Relationship in Independent Clauses in the Gospels and Acts' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946).
- WILCOX, M., 'Semitisms in the New Testament,' in W. HAASE (ed.), *Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament, Fortsetzung [Kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen]* (ANRW; Principat 25.2.; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984) 978–1029.
- WILLIAMS, P.J., *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004).
- WISSE, J., 'Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism,' in G. NAGY (ed.), *Greek Literature in the Roman Period and in Late Antiquity Greek Literature* (London: Routledge, 2001) 65–82.
- , 'Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts,' in W.L. PETERSEN (ed.) *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century. Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (CJAS 3; Notre-Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989) 39–53.
- WREDE, W., *The Messianic Secret* (transl. J.C.G. GRIEG; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971).
- YODER, J.D., 'The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis' (unpublished Th.D. thesis; Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1958).  
Accessible via UMI microfilms.
- , 'The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae,' *NovT* 3 (1959) 241–48.
- , 'Semitisms in Codex Bezae,' *JBL* 74 (1959) 317–21.

## APPENDIX 1 SUPPORT OF EARLY PAPYRI FOR BEZAN MATTHEW

The below lists detail the 83 instances of variant readings noted in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, between Papyri, Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew, where Codex Bezae is extant.

- Agreements between B.03, D.05 and papyri: 21 references (22%)

Mt 4.1 ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν ἔρημον πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου & K 892 1424 sy<sup>s.(c.p)</sup>  
| txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{101\text{vid}}$  B C D L P W Γ Δ  $f^{1.13}$  33<sup>vid</sup> 565 579 700 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  latt sy<sup>h</sup> sa

Mt 10.33 αὐτὸν κάγω C K L Γ  $f^{13}$  565 579 700 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{19\text{vid}}$  & B D W Δ<sup>c</sup> Θ  $f^1$  33 892  
l2211 lat

Mt 11.25 ἀπέκρυψας C K L N W Γ Δ Θ  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; Mar<sup>Ir</sup> | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{62}$  & B D  
33 l2211

Mt 12.4 *p*) οὓς & C K L N Γ Δ Θ  $f^1$  (οἷς 33) 565 579 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa bo | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$   
B D W  $f^{13}$  aur ff<sup>2\*</sup> k q

Mt 17.3 ὠφθησαν C K L W Γ Δ  $f^1$  565 700 892 1241 1424 l2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  f ff<sup>1</sup> q vg<sup>cl</sup> sy<sup>p,h</sup>; Cyr |  
txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{44\text{vid}}$  & B D Θ  $f^{13}$  33 579 lat sy<sup>c</sup>

Mt 19.17 τήρει  $\mathfrak{P}^{71\text{vid}}$  B D 565 | txt & C K L W Γ Δ Θ  $f^{1.13}$  33 579 700 892 1241 1424 l2211  
 $\mathfrak{M}$

Mt 23.37 ἐπισυνάρει ὄρνις C W Γ Δ 0102 565 579 1241 1424 l844  $\mathfrak{M}$  | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$  & B D (K) L  
Θ  $f^{1.13}$  33 700 892 latt; (Cl)

Mt 25.21 <sup>T</sup> δέ A W Δ  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 1424 l844 l2211 *pm* sy<sup>h</sup> bo | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$  & B C D K L Γ Θ  
33 700 892 1241 *pm* lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa mae

Mt 26.3 <sup>T</sup> καὶ οἱ (-Δ) γραμματεῖς K Γ Δ 579 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  it sy<sup>p,h</sup> | καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι W | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  & A  
B D L Θ 0293  $f^{1.13}$  33<sup>vid</sup> 565 700 892 1424 lat sy<sup>s</sup> co

Mt 26.8 <sup>T</sup> αὐτοῦ A K W Γ Δ  $f^1$  565 579 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  c f q sy sa<sup>ms</sup> | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}.64\text{vid}}$  & B D L  
Θ 0293  $f^{13}$  33 700 892 l844 lat co

Mt 26.20 <sup>T</sup> μαθητῶν & A L W Δ Θ 33 892 1241 1424 l844 *pm* lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo |  
μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ 0281 it vg<sup>cl</sup> sy<sup>p</sup> | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}.45\text{vid}}$  B D K Γ  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 l2211 *pm* (sy<sup>s</sup>)  
sa<sup>mss</sup>; Eus

Mt 26.26 <sup>T</sup> τόν A K W Γ Δ 0160<sup>vid</sup>  $f^{13}$  565 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  & B C D L Z Θ  $f^1$  33 579 700  
892 1424 l844 l2211 co

Mt 26.26 *p*) καὶ εὐχαριστήσας A K W Γ Δ  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 1241 l844 *pm* sy<sup>h</sup> | -1424 | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  &  
B C D L Z Θ 0160 0281 0298<sup>vid</sup> 33 700 892 l2211 *pm* sy<sup>s.p.hmg</sup> co; (Or)

Mt 26.26 ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ (-&\*) &\* A C K W Γ Δ 565 579 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  | διδούς τοῖς  
μαθηταῖς l844 | δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ 0298 1424 | txt  $\mathfrak{P}^{37.45\text{vid}}$  &<sup>1</sup> B D L Z Θ 0160 0281  $f^{1.13}$   
33 700 892 l2211

APPENDIX 1 SUPPORT OF EARLY PAPYRI FOR BEZAN MATTHEW

Mt 26.28 <sup>τ</sup> τό A C K W Γ Δ  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844  $\mathfrak{M}$  sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  & B D L Z ⊕ 33 /2211

Mt 26.29 <sup>τ</sup> ρ) ὅτι A C K L W Γ Δ 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 /844  $\mathfrak{M}$  f ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> vg<sup>mss</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  & B D Z ⊕ 0281  $f^{1.13}$  33 892\* /2211 ; Ir<sup>lat</sup>

Mt 26.42 <sup>τ</sup> ἀπ' ἐμοῦ A C K W Γ Δ 067  $f^{13}$  565 579 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  f ff<sup>2</sup> q vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$  & B D L ⊕  $f^1$  33<sup>vid</sup> 700 892 1424 /844 lat sy<sup>s.p</sup>

Mt 26.43 εὔρεν αὐτούς πάλιν A K W Δ 565 1241 1424 sy<sup>h</sup> | εὕρισκει αὐτούς πάλιν 579  $\mathfrak{M}$  | πάλιν εὕρισκει αὐτούς Γ | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$  & B C D L ⊕ 067  $f^{1.13}$  33 700 892 /844 (lat) sy<sup>s.p.hmg</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo<sup>pt</sup>

Mt 26.52 ἀποθаноῦνται K W Γ Δ  $f^{13}$  565 579 1241 *pm* sy<sup>p.h</sup> mae? | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  & A B C D L ⊕ 0281  $f^1$  33 700 892 1424 /844 *pm* sy<sup>s</sup> sa bo; Cyr

Mt 28.3 ὡσεὶ A C L W Γ Δ ⊕  $f^{13}$  33 565 579 700 1241 1424 /844 /2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{105\text{vid}}$  & B D K  $f^1$  892

Mt 28.4 ἐγένοντο A C<sup>3</sup> K W Γ Δ ⊕  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 892 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{105}$  & B C\* D L 33 /844 /2211

- Agreements between papyri and D.05 *contra* B.03 (17 references, 18%)

Mt 4.2 καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας  $\mathfrak{P}^{101\text{vid}}$  & D 892 | *p*) - $f^1$  sy<sup>c</sup> | *txt* B C K L P W Γ Δ  $f^{13}$  33 565 579 700 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  sy<sup>h</sup>

Mt 10.25 Βεεζ- & B | Beelzebub c (ff<sup>1</sup>) vg sy | *txt* ( $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$ ) C D K L N W Γ Δ ⊕  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892 1424 /2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  it co; Cyp

Mt 10.32 *om.* τοῖς  $\mathfrak{P}^{19\text{vid}}$  & D L W Γ Δ ⊕  $f^1$  579 700 1424 /2211  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; Cl Or | *txt* B C K  $f^{13}$  565 892 ; Eus

Mt 10.33 *om.* τοῖς  $\mathfrak{P}^{19}$  & C D K L W Γ Δ<sup>c</sup> ⊕  $f^1$  565 579 700 /844 /2211  $\mathfrak{M}$  | *txt* B  $f^{13}$  892 1424

Mt 12.4 ἐφαγεν  $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$  C D K L N W Γ Δ ⊕  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  latt sy co; Eus | ἔλαβεν 892\* | *txt* & B

Mt 12.24 Βεεζεβούλ & B | Beelzebub c (ff<sup>1</sup>) vg sy | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$  C D K L N W Γ Δ ⊕ 0281  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  it (co)

Mt 12.25 εἰδὼς δὲ Ἰησοῦς C K L N W Γ Δ ⊕ 0106  $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  (lat) sy<sup>p.h</sup> mae | ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς 0281<sup>vid</sup> 33 892<sup>c</sup> ff<sup>1</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | ἰδὼν δὲ  $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$  &<sup>1</sup> D 892\* (k) sy<sup>s.c</sup> bo | *txt* δέ &<sup>\*.2</sup> B sa

Mt 20.29 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ (- $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ) ὄχλοι πολλοί (ὄχλος πολὺς Γ 1241)  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  D Γ 1241 1424 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* B *rell*



Mt 20.30 *p)* υιέ  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  C D 085 0281  $f^1$  33 565 579 1241 1424 *pm* | Ἰησοῦ υιέ  $\aleph$  L N  $\Theta$   $f^{13}$   
700 892 c e h n sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo | *txt* B K W Z  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  *pm*

Mt 24.1 ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ C K W  $\Gamma$  0102 565 579 1241  $\aleph$  | ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο B |  
ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρου ἐπορεύετο  $\Theta$  | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{83\text{vid}}$   $\aleph$  D L  $\Delta$   $f^{1.13}$  33 700 892 1424 *lat*

Mt 26.22 *om.* αὐτῶ  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid.45}}$  D  $\Theta$   $f^{13}$  700 1424 *l2211* *latt* sy<sup>s</sup> mae bo; Eus | *txt* B *rell*

Mt 26.22 εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$  D  $\Theta$   $f^{13}$  | ἕκαστος αὐτῶν A K W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $f^1$  565 579 700 1241  
*l844 l2211*  $\aleph$  sy<sup>h</sup>; Eus |  $\mathfrak{P}^{64\text{vid}}$  1424 | *txt*  $\aleph$  B C L Z 0281 33 892 sa

Mt 26.27 Ἦτό  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  A C D K  $\Gamma$   $f^{13}$  565 1241 *pm* | *txt*  $\aleph$  B L W Z  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  0281 0298  $f^1$  33 579  
700 892 1424 *l844 l2211 pm* co; Or

Mt 26.29 πίω  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  D  $\Theta$  565 *l2211* ; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Epiph | *txt* B *rell*

Mt 26.34 *om.* ἐν  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  D | *txt* B *rell*

Mt 26.44 *om.* ἐκ τρίτου  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  A D K  $f^1$  565 1424 *it* | *txt* B *rell*

Mt 26.45 *om.* τό B C L W 892 1241 | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$   $\aleph$  A D K  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^{1.13}$  565 579 700 1424 *l844*  $\aleph$

- Agreements between Papyri and B.03 *contra* D.05 (18 references, 19%)

Mt 4.3 προσελθὼν αὐτῶ ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν C K L P  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  565 579 1241 1424  $\aleph$  f (k) sy<sup>h</sup> |  
προσηλθεν αὐτῶ ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῶ D *it* sy<sup>s.c.(p)</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{101\text{vid}}$   $\aleph$  B W  $f^{1.13}$  33 700 892<sup>vid</sup>  
aur ff<sup>1</sup> l vg mae bo

Mt 5.13 βληθῆναι ἔξω καί D K W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^{13}$  565 579 700 1241 1424 *l844 l2211*  $\aleph$  | *txt*  
 $\mathfrak{P}^{86*(c)}$   $\aleph$  B C  $f^1$  33 892

Mt 5.22 Ἦεικῆ  $\aleph^2$  D K L W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424  $\aleph$  *it* sy co; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Or<sup>mss</sup>  
Cyp Cyr | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$   $\aleph^*$  B aur vg; Or Hier<sup>mss</sup>

Mt 5.25 Ἦ*p)* σε παραδῶ K L W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$  33 565 579 700 1241 1424 *l844*  $\aleph$  *lat* sy<sup>c.p.h</sup> co | σε  
παραδώσει D | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{64\text{vid}}$   $\aleph$  B 0275  $f^{1.13}$  892 k; Cl

Mt 18.16 ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο μετὰ σοῦ  $\mathfrak{P}^{44\text{vid}}$  B 0281 | μετὰ σεαυτοῦ ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο  $\aleph$  K L N  $\Theta$   $f^{1.13}$   
33 892 *pm* | *txt* D W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  078 565 (-ἔτι 579) 700 1241 1424 *pm lat*

Mt 19.3 Ἦ οἱ  $\aleph$  D K  $\Gamma$  1241 1424  $\aleph$  sa<sup>mss</sup>; Or | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  B C L W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892  
sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo

Mt 19.18 ἔφη  $\mathfrak{P}^{71}$  B  $f^{13}$  | *txt*  $\aleph$  C D K L W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^1$  33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 *l2211*  
 $\aleph$

Mt 23.34 καί C D K L  $\Gamma$  579 700 892 1241 1424  $\aleph$  *it* vg<sup>cl.ww</sup> sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> bo; Ir<sup>lat pt</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{77\text{vid}}$   $\aleph$  B  
W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  0102  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 *l844* e q vg<sup>st</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup>; Ir<sup>lat pt</sup>

Mt 23.38 *om.* ἔρημος  $\mathfrak{P}^{77\text{vid}}$  B L ff<sup>2</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> | *txt*  $\aleph$  C D K W  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$  0102  $f^{1.13}$   
33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 *l844*  $\aleph$  *lat* sy<sup>p.h</sup> mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Cl Eus

APPENDIX 1 SUPPORT OF EARLY PAPYRI FOR BEZAN MATTHEW

Mt 25.22 <sup>†</sup> λαβών & D K Γ 565 579 700 1424 /844 /2211 ℳ latt sa<sup>mss</sup> | txt ℳ<sup>35</sup> A B C L W Δ  
Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 892 1241 sy<sup>p,h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>

Mt 25.22 ἐπεκέρδησα D Θ f vg<sup>mss</sup> | ἐπεκέρδησα ἐπ' (ἐν 1424) αὐτοῖς A C K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup>  
565 579 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 /844 /2211 ℳ sy<sup>p,h</sup> | txt ℳ<sup>35</sup> & B L 33 700 892\* lat co

Mt 25.41 ὁ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ μου D f<sup>1</sup> it sy<sup>hmg</sup> mae; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Cyp | txt ℳ<sup>45</sup> & A B K L W Γ Δ Θ  
067 0128 f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 /2211 ℳ lat sy sa bo; Eus Did

Mt 25.42 <sup>†</sup> καί ℳ<sup>45vid</sup> B\* L | txt & D rell

Mt 26.28 <sup>†</sup> ρ) καινῆς A C D K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 /2211 ℳ latt sy  
sa bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | txt ℳ<sup>37.45vid</sup> & B L Z Θ 0298<sup>vid</sup> 33 mae bo<sup>ms</sup>; Ir<sup>arm</sup>

Mt 26.34 ἀπαρνῆση με τρίς A | τρίς με ἀπαρνῆση &<sup>\*</sup> 33 | τρίς ἀπαρνῆσει με ℳ<sup>53</sup> B C Θ 565  
579 892 1424 | txt &<sup>2</sup> D K L W Γ Δ 067 0160<sup>vid</sup> f<sup>1.13</sup> 700 1241 ℳ

Mt 26.36 προσεύξομαι ἐκεῖ A C K W Δ 067 f<sup>1</sup> 579 /844 pm | προσεύξομαι ἐκεῖ Γ 1241 1424  
pm | ἐκεῖ προσεύξομαι (εὐξομαι 700) D Θ f<sup>13</sup> 700 | προσεύξομαι 565 sy<sup>s,p</sup> | txt ℳ<sup>53vid</sup> & B L  
0281 33 892

Mt 26.42 τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον K Γ (Δ\*) Θ 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 ℳ lat sy<sup>s,p</sup> mae bo | τὸ  
ποτήριον τοῦτο D f<sup>13</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l | txt ℳ<sup>37</sup> & A B C L W Δ<sup>c</sup> 067 f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 b ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>

Mt 26.44 om. πάλιν A C D K W Γ Δ 067 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 ℳ lat  
sy<sup>p,h</sup> sa mae | txt ℳ<sup>37</sup> & B L Θ (sy<sup>s</sup>) bo

- Agreement between B.03 and D.05 *contra* Papyri (28 references, 30%)

Mt 2.23 Ναζαρέθ C K N W Γ f<sup>13</sup> 565 pm lat co | Ναζαράθ Δ f<sup>1</sup> | Ναζαρά ℳ<sup>70vid</sup>; Eus | txt & B  
D L 33 700 892 1241 1424 /2211 pm

Mt 5.28 αὐτῆς &<sup>1</sup> f<sup>1</sup> | -ℳ<sup>64</sup> &<sup>\*</sup>; Tert Cl | txt B D K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241  
1424 /844 ℳ; Ir<sup>lat vid</sup>

Mt 10.14 ἦ (+τῆς 0281) κώμης ℳ<sup>110</sup> & 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 892 vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup> co | txt B D rell

Mt 10.14 <sup>†</sup> ἐκ & C 0281 33 892 lat | ἀπό ℳ<sup>110</sup> | txt B D rell

Mt 10.37 om. B\* D | om. usque ad ἄξιος (v 38) ℳ<sup>19</sup> | txt & rell

Mt 18.32 πονηρέ δοῦλε ℳ<sup>25</sup> c | txt B D rell

Mt 18.33 ἠλέησα ὑμᾶς ℳ<sup>25vid</sup> | txt B D rell

Mt 19.2 om. ἐκεῖ ℳ<sup>25vid</sup> h sy<sup>s</sup> | txt B D rell

Mt 19.10 om. αὐτῶ ℳ<sup>25</sup> &<sup>\*</sup> | txt αὐτῶ &<sup>c</sup> B D rell

Mt 20.31 ἔκραζον &<sup>2a</sup> C K N W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424 ℳ | ἐκραύγαζον Θ f<sup>13</sup> |  
ἐκραύγασαν ℳ<sup>45</sup> | txt &<sup>\*.2b</sup> B D L Z 085 0281 700 892

APPENDIX 1 SUPPORT OF EARLY PAPYRI FOR BEZAN MATTHEW

Mt 23.30 κοινωνοὶ αὐτῶν  $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$  & C K L W Γ Δ 0102 33 565 579 892 1241 1424 /844  $\mathfrak{M}$  |  
κοινωνοὶ Θ g<sup>1</sup> | *txt* B D f<sup>1.13</sup> 700

Mt 25.43 ἤμην  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  h vg<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 25.43 ἰκαί  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  Θ | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.7 ἀλάβαστρον μύρου ἔχουσα A K W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  | ἀλάβαστρον  
ἔχουσα μύρου  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  | *txt* & B D L Θ 0293 f<sup>13</sup> 33 700 892 /844 *latt*

Mt 26.7 τὴν κεφαλὴν  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  A K L W Γ Δ 33 565 579 892 1241 1424 /844  $\mathfrak{M}$  | *txt* & B D Θ  
0293 f<sup>1.13</sup> 700

Mt 26.21 *om.* ὅτι  $\mathfrak{P}^{37.45}$  | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.25 ὁ Ἰησοῦς  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  & 13 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>p</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.29 τούτου  $\mathfrak{P}^{37*}$  &\* C L | τοῦ Δ 892 1424 sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.33 *om.* αὐτῶ  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  700 1424 b c ff<sup>2</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.33 ἐν σοί ἐγὼ δέ C<sup>3</sup> K Γ 33 565 700 1241 *pm* h sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo | ἐγὼ ἐν σοί  $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$  | *txt* B D  
*rell*

Mt 26.34 ἰκαί  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.34 ἀλεκτοροφωνίας (+ἦ L)  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid.45}}$  L f<sup>1</sup> (a) | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.38 ἰδέ  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$  | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.39 *om.* μου  $\mathfrak{P}^{53*}$  L Δ f<sup>1</sup> 892 a vg<sup>ww</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.42 *om.* μου  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  a c h<sup>c</sup> | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.44 ἀπελθὼν πάλιν προσηύξατο Γ 579 1424 *pm* f r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>p</sup> | ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο πάλιν A  
K W Δ 565 1241 *pm* q sy<sup>h</sup> | ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο  $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$  Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 700 /844 a sy<sup>s</sup> | *txt* & B C D  
L 067 33 892 *lat* sa bo

Mt 26.49 ἰαὐτῶ  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  C sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo; Eus | *txt* B D *rell*

Mt 26.49 *om.* χαίρει  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  | *txt* B D *rell*

- Agreement between Papyri and B.03 *contra* Other Papyri and D.05 (4 references, 4%)

Mt 19.10 *om.* αὐτοῦ  $\mathfrak{P}^{71\text{vid}}$  & B Θ e ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  C D K L N W Z Γ Δ 078 f<sup>1.13</sup>  
33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424  $\mathfrak{M}$  *lat* sy sa<sup>mss</sup> bo

Mt 26.23 τὴν χεῖρα μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ  $\mathfrak{P}^{37.45}$  (D) Θ 700 /2211 sy<sup>h</sup> | μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ  
τρυβλίῳ τὴν χεῖρα C K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 1241  $\mathfrak{M}$  | τῷ τρυβλίῳ μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα 579 | *txt*  
 $\mathfrak{P}^{64\text{vid}}$  & A B L Z 0281 33 892 1424 /844 *lat*; Cyr

APPENDIX 1 SUPPORT OF EARLY PAPYRI FOR BEZAN MATTHEW

Mt 26.31 διασκορπισθήσεται  $\mathfrak{P}^{37.45}$  D K W Γ Δ Θ  $f^1$  565 579 1424 *pm* | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$   $\aleph$  A B C L  
067 0281  $f^{13}$  33 700 892 1241 *pm*

Mt 26.39 προσελθών  $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$   $\aleph$  A C D K L W Γ Δ Θ 067  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 1241 1424\* /844  
 $\aleph$  sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$  B 892 1424<sup>c</sup> lat co

- Absence of Support between Papyri, B.03 and D.05 (5 references, 5%)

Mt 13.55 Ἰωσή  $\mathfrak{P}^{103\text{vid}}$  K L W Δ 0106  $f^{13}$  565 1241 *pm* k q<sup>c</sup> sa bo<sup>mss</sup> | Ἰωσή 700\* sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> |  
Ἰωάννης  $\aleph^{*\text{vid}}$  D Γ 579 1424 *pm* vg<sup>mss</sup>; Or<sup>pt</sup> | *txt*  $\aleph^1$  B C N Θ  $f^1$  33 700<sup>c</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>s.c.hmg</sup> mae  
bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or<sup>pt</sup>

Mt 18.33 οὖν  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  | οὖν καὶ σέ D Θ (lat) sa<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* B *rell*

Mt 19.9 <sup>τ</sup>*p*) καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (ἀπολυμένην Θ 565, +ἀπὸ ἀνδρός 579) γαμῶν (γαμήσας B K  
Z Γ 700 892  $\aleph$ ) μοιχᾶται B C\* K N W Z Γ Δ Θ 078  $f^{1.13}$  33 565 579 700 892 1424  $\aleph$  lat  
sy<sup>p.h</sup> bo | ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμ. ἀπολελ. μοιχ.  $\mathfrak{P}^{25}$  mae | *txt*  $\aleph$  C<sup>3</sup> D L 1241 it sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

Mt 20.30 κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς B L Z 085 0281 892 lat sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς  $\aleph$  D Θ  $f^{13}$  565  
700 it sy<sup>c</sup> mae | *txt*  $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}}$  C K N W Γ Δ  $f^1$  33 579 1241 1424  $\aleph$  f q sy<sup>p.h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup>

Mt 26.36 ἄν D K L W Δ Θ  $f^{1.13}$  565 | -  $\aleph$  C 0281 33 700 892 1424 /844 | οὗ ἄν  $\mathfrak{P}^{53\text{vid}}$  A | *txt*  
B Γ 067 579 1241  $\aleph$

## APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

### I. Itacistic forms in Matthew According to Codex Bezae Compared to Codex Vaticanus

#### I. 1. Common Itacistic Forms in 'ει' in Mt B.03/D.05 *contra* Dictionary Form: 68 forms

Spelling in D.05/B.03	References
ἀκρειβῶς	2.8
ἀπεκρύνετο] -νατο	27.12
ἄτειμος	13.57
Γαλιλαίας	4.25; 19.1
Γαλιλαία	17.22
Γαλιλαίου	26.69
Γεθσαμανεῖ] Γεθσημανεῖ	26.36
γείνεσθαι	6.16; 24.44
γείνεσθε	10.16
γίνεται	9.16; 12.45; 13.22; 26.2; 27.24
γαινόμενα	27.54
γινωσκέτω	9.30
γινώσκεται	12.33; 24.32,43
γινώσκετε	24.33
γινώσκει	24.50
Δανείδ	9.27; 12.3,23; 15.22; 20.30,31; 21.9,15; 22.42,43,45
ἐπειτεῖμᾶν] ἐπιτείμων	16.22
ἐπετείμησεν	16.20; 17.18
ἐπετείμησαν	19.13
ἐπιγινώσκει	11.27b
ἔπνειγεν] -γε	18.28
ἐφειμῶθη	22.12
ἐφείμωσεν	22.34
ἠκρέιβασεν	2.7,16
θλείψαιως	13.21; 24.21,29
θλεῖψις	24.21
θλεῖψειν	24.29
κάμεινον	13.50
καταπαίνοντες	23.24
κειβωτόν	24.38
κεινήσαι	23.4
κρέινοντες	19.28
κύμεινον	23.23
λείαν	2.16; 4.8
λειμοί	24.7
μαργαρείτας	13.45
μαργαρείτην	13.46
μεικρότερον	13.32; 18.10,14; 26.39,73
μεικρῶν	18.6
μεισήσεις	5.43

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Spelling in D.05/B.03	References
μεισήσουσιν	24.10
μεισούμενοι	10.22; 24.9
Νεινευεΐται] Νινευεΐται	12.41
Νεφθαλείν] –λείμ	4.15
παραγείνεται	3.1
Πειλᾶτος	27.17,22,65
Πειλάτῳ	27.58
Πειλᾶτον	27.62
πείνων	11.18,19
πείνοντες	24.38
πείνη	24.49
πεινῶντα	25.37,44
πειπτόντων	15.27
πεντακισχίλιοι	14.21
πολύτειμον	13.46
Ραββεί	23.7,8; 26.25,49
Σειδῶνι	11.22
Σειδῶνος	15.21
σειτιστά	22.4
συνπνεΐγει	13.22
τείμα	15.4; 19.19
τετρακεισχειλείς] -κισχειλίων	16.10
τραπεζείταις	25.27
Φαρισαῖοι	12.14; 22.34
ψείχων] - χίων	15.27
ψευδόχριστοι	24.24

I. 2. Shorter Forms in ‘ι’ in Mt D.05 contra Itacistic Forms in Mt B.03: 60 Forms

a. Shorter Form ‘ι’ in Mt D.05 and Dictionary Form *contra* Mt B.03: 19 forms (53 occ.)

D.05	B.03	References
Γαλιλαίας	Γαλειλαίας	2.22; 4.15,18,25; 15.29; 21.11; 28.7,10,16
Γαλιλαίαν	Γαλειλαίαν	4.12,23; 26.32; 28.7,10
ἐνεβριμήσατο	ἐνεβρειμήθη	9.30
ἐρίσει	ἐρείσει	12.19
ἐσθίων	ἐσθείων	11.19
ζιζάνια	ζειζάνια	13.25,26,27,29,30,36,38,40
ζιζανίων	ζειζανίων	13.36
Ἰεριχώ	Ἰερείχώ	20.29
κάμινον	κάμεινον	13.42
μικρότερος	μεικρότερος	11.11
νῆκος	νεΐκος	12.20
Πιλᾶτος	Πειλᾶτος	27.13,24
πίπτει	πεΐπτει	17.15

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
Σαμαριτανῶν	Σαμαρειτῶν	10.5
Σιδῶναι	Σειδῶναι	11.21
Σιών	Σειῶν	21.5
τετρακισχίλιοι	τετρακισχίλιοι	15.38
Φαρισαίων	Φαρεισαίων	3.7; 16.6,11,12; 22.41
Φαρισαῖοι	Φαρεισαῖοι	9.11,14; 12.2,24; 15.12; 16.1; 19.3; 21.45; 22.15; 23.2,13,15,23,25;27,29; 27.62

b. Shorter Form ‘ι’ in Mt D.05 *contra* Mt B.03 and Dictionary Form: 41 forms (45 occ.)

D.05	B.03	References
ἄλιψόν	ἄλειψαί	6.17
ἀναπεσῖν	ἀναπεσεῖν	15.35
ἀποκριθῆς	ἀποκριθεῖς	20.13
βαλῖν	βαλεῖν	15.26
βασιλία	βασιλεία	3.2; 13.47
βασιλίας	βασιλείας	4.23
βλασφημί	βλασφημεῖ	9.3
δάνιον	δάνειον	18.27
ἐκλίσθη	ἠκλείσθη	25.10
ἐπειορκήσῃς	ἐπιορκήσεις	5.33
ἐπί	ἐπεῖ	21.46
ἐπίνασαν	ἐπέινασαν	12.1
ἐπίνασεν	ἐπέινασεν	12.3
ἐρεῖ	ἐρεῖ	25.41
ἦδι	ἦδει	27.18
ἰδῆτε	εἰδῆτε	9.6
Καισαρίας	Καισαρείας	16.13
κατακρινεῖ	κατακρινεῖ	12.4
κηρύσσειν	κηρύσσειν	4.17
λαβῖν	λαβεῖν	21.34
λάμπι	λάμπει	5.15
μερισθῆσα	μερισθεῖσα	12.25
μνημῖα	μνημεῖα	27.52
μνημίων	μνημείων	27.53
μνημίου	μνημείου	27.60
μοιχῆαι	μοιχεῖαι	15.19
ὄνιδίσουσιν	ὄνειδίσωσιν	5.11
ὀφιλέματα	ὀφειλέματα	6.12
πάσχιν	πάσχειν	17.12,13
πειράζων	πειράζων	4.3
πλείονας	πλείονας	21.36
πόλι	πόλει	10.23
πόλις	πόλεις	9.35
προάγειν	προάγειν	14.22

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
προσεκύνι	προσεκύνει	9.18; 15.25
προφηγία	προφητεία	13.14
σημίον	σημεϊον	12.39b; 16.4
σπείριν	σπείρειν	13.4
ταμίον	ταμεϊόν	6.6
τέλιός	τέλειός	5.48
χρονίζι	χρονίζει	24.48

I. 3. Shorter Form 'ι' in Mt B.03 *contra* Itacistic Form 'ει' in Mt D.05: 160 forms (304 occ.)

a. Shorter Form 'ι' in Mt B.03 *contra* Mt D.05 and Dictionary Form: 5 forms (6 occ.)

D.05	B.03	References
ἀγαπήσεις	ἀγαπήσις	22.39
εἰστήκεισαν	ἰστήκεισαν	12.46
ὄφεις	ὄφισ <sup>1</sup>	10.16
βρῶσις	βρῶσις	6.19
καταλειπών	καταλιπών	4.13; 21.17

b. Itacistic Form in 'ει' in Mt B.03 *contra* Mt D.05 and Dictionary Form: 155 forms (298 occ.)

D.05	B.03	References
αἰτείαν	αἰτίαν	19.3; 27.37
αἰτεία	αἰτία	19.10
ἀκαθαρσείας	ἀκαθαρσίας	23.27
ἀκρασείας	ἀκρασίας	23.25
ἀμαρτείας	ἀμαρτίας	9.6
ἀνακλειθῆναι	ἀνακλιθῆναι	14.19
ἀνείπτοις	ἀνίπτοις	15.20
ἀνομείας	ἀνομίας	23.28
ἀντίδεικος	ἀντίδικος	5.25
ἀπεδοκείμασαν	ἀπεδοκίμασαν	21.42
ἀπιστείας	ἀπιστίαν	13.58
ἀποκριθείς	ἀποκριθείς	11.25; 13.37; 14.28; 21.24,29,30; 22.29; 24.2; 25.40
ἀποκριθέντες	ἀποκριθέντες	21.27
ἀποκριθίς	ἀποκριθείς	20.13
ἀποκριθῆναι	ἀποκριθῆναι	22.46
ἀποστασίου	ἀποστασίου	19.7
Ἄρειμαθείας	Ἄριμαθαίας	27.57
ἄρτει	ἄρτι	26.29
ἀρχιεραίων	ἀρχιερέων	16.21
ἀρχιερεῖς	ἀρχιερεῖς	26.3
ἀφείεται	ἀφίεται	24.41a

<sup>1</sup> ὄφεις can be understood as a plural form, in which case, this variant reading would not be an itacism of ὄφισ or *vice versa*.



APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
ἀφορείζει	ἀφορίζει	25.32
βαραχείου	βαραχίου	23.35
βασειλεία	βασιλεία	18.4; 26.29
Βηθανείαν	Βηθανία	21.17
βλασφημεία	βλασφημία	15.19
βλασφημείαν	βλασφημίαν	26.65
γαμείζονται	γαμίζονται	22.30
γαμείζοντες	γαμίζοντες	24.38
γίνεται	γίνεται	13.32
γενεσείοις	γενεσίοις	14.6
γυναικεί	γυναικί	19.5
γωνείας	γωνίας	21.42
δειψῶντα	διψῶντα	25.37,44
δεξιὰ	δεξιὰ	6.3
διδασκαλείας	διδασκαλίας	15.9
διεφήμεισαν	διεφήμισαν	9.31
ἐδείψησα	ἐδίψησα	25.42
εἰδίαν	ἰδίαν	14.13
εἶδιον	ἴδιον	22.5; 24.15; 25.20; 28.6
εἰδόντες	ἰδόντες	9.8
εἰδού	ἰδού	2.1,13; 11.8; 12.42
εἰδῶν	ἰδῶν	9.22; 21.19
εἰδεῖν	ἰδεῖν	11.9; 13.17; 26.58
εἶδητε	ἴδητε	24.15
εἶδε	ἴδε	25.20
εἰδόντες	ἰδόντες	27.54
εἶδεται	ἴδετε	28.6
εἶδωσιν	ἴδωσιν	5.16
εἰερεῖς	ἰερεῖς	12.5
εἴματίου	ἱματίου	9.16
εἴματίῳ	ἱματίῳ	9.16
εἴματα	ἱμάτια	17.2; 21.7,8; 27.35
εἴματιον	ἱμάτιον	24.18
εἴματα	ἱμάτια	26.65; 27.31
εἴματιον	ἱμάτιον	5.40
εἴμει	εἴμι	11.29; 14.27; 18.20; 20.15
εἴσθι	ἴσθι	2.13
Εἰσραήλ	Ἰσραήλ	10.6; 15.24
ἐκκλησεῖα	ἐκκλησία	18.17
ἐκτεινάξατε	ἐκτινάξατε	10.14
ἐλειθοβόλησαν	ἐλιθοβόλησαν	21.35
ἐμεισθῶσατο	ἐμισθῶσατο	20.7
ἐμπορείαν	ἐμπορίαν	22.5
ἐξουσειά	ἐξουσία	21.27
ἐξουσειαν	ἐξουσίαν	21.23

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

<b>D.05</b>	<b>B.03</b>	<b>References</b>
ἐπεί	ἐπί	4.6; 5.23
ἐπειορκήσις	ἐπιορκήσεις	5.33
ἐπειτειμᾶν	ἐπιτείμων	16.22
ἐπετειμήσεν	ἐπετίμησεν	20.31
ἐπιγεινώσκει	ἐπιγινώσκει	11.27a
ἐπότειζεν	ἐπότιζεν	27.48
ἐποτείσεται	ἐποτίσατε	25.35
ἐποτείσατε	ἐποτίσατε	25.42
ἐρίφεια	ἐρίφια	25.33
εὐδοκεία	εὐδοκία	11.26
εὐρείσκει	εὐρίσκει	12.43
ἡμεῖν	ἡμῖν	6.11,12; 15.15,33; 19.27; 20.12; 21.25; 24.3; 26.63,68
θερισταί	θερισταί	13.39
θλεῖψιν	θλεῖψιν	24.9,29
Ἰηρεμίαν	Ἰρεμίαν	16.14
ἴσθι	ἴσθι	5.25
καθεῖσαι	καθίσαι	20.23
καρδεῖα	καρδία	22.37
κατακρηνῖ	κατακρινῖ	12.42; 4.13; 21.17
καθαρείσατε	καθαρίζετε	10.8
κατακρηνῖ	κατακρινεῖ	12.42
καταρτίσω	κατηρτίσω	21.16
κοιλίαν	κοιλίαν	15.17
κοιλίας	κοιλίας	19.12
κρίσεως	κρίσεως	11.22
λαλειά	λαλιά	26.73
λεγειῶνης	λεγιῶνας	26.53
μαλακείαν	μαλακίαν	4.23; 9.35; 10.1
μαστιγῶσαι	μαστιγῶσαι	20.19
μαστιγώσουσιν	μαστιγώσουσιν	10.17
μείαν	μίαν	5.36; 17.4; 19.5; 21.19
μεία	μία	19.6; 24.41
μισθόν	μισθόν	5.46
μηδενί	μηδενί	17.9
Νεινευεῖται	Νινευεῖται	12.41
νηπίων	νηπίων	21.16
νομείσητε	νομίσητε	5.17
νοσσεῖα	νοσσία	23.37
οἰκιακοῦς	οἰκιακοῖς	10.25
οἰκίαν	οἰκίαν	2.11; 9.23,28; 10.12; 12.29; 17.25; 24.43
οἰκία	οἰκία	9.10; 13.57; 26.6
οἰκία	οἰκία	10.13
οἰκίας	οἰκίας	19.29; 24.17
ὀπίσω	ὀπίσω	4.19
ὄσταις	ὄστις	10.32

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
ὄψείας	ὄψίας	14.15,23- 20.8- 26.20- 27.57
πάλειν	πάλιν	13.47
παρουσία	παρουσία	24.27,37,39
πᾶσει	πᾶσι	23.20
πέεται	πίετε	26.27
πεντακισχιλείοις	πεντακισχιλίων	16.9
πείνειν	πίειν	20.22
πλησείον	πλησίον	19.19
ποικίλαις	ποικίλαις	4.24
ποσάκεις	ποσάκις	18.21 ; 23.37
ποτείση	ποτίση	10.42
πρεῖν	πρίν	26.34
πρωτοκλεισίαν	προτοκλισίαν	23.6
ῥαπίσει	ῥαπίξει	5.39
σείτου	σίτου	13.25
σεῖτον	σῖτον	13.29,30
σειωπήσωσιν	σιωπήσωσιν	20.31
Σιδῶναι	Σειδῶναι	11.21
σκανδαλείσωμεν	σκανδαλίσωμεν	17.27
σκανδαλείση	σκανδαλίση	18.6
σκειᾶ	σκιᾶ	4.16
σκοτεῖα	σκοτία	4.16
σοφεία	σοφία	13.54
στρουθείων	στρουθίων	10. 31
σχίσμα	σχίσμα	9.16
τεί	τί	11.9
τεις	τις	16.24
τειμήσει	τιμήσει	15.6
τειμᾶ	τιμᾶ	15.8
τετρακεισχειλείοις	τετρακισχειλίων	16.10
τρεία	τρία	13.33
τρείβους	τρίβους	3.3
τρείτης	τρίτης	27.64
τρειῶν	τριῶν	18.16; 26.61
ὑβρῆσαν	ὑβρῆσαν	22.6
ὑγειῆς	ὑγιῆς	12.13
ὑμεῖν	ὑμῖν	3.7; 5.18,22,28,32,34,39,44; 6.2,5,14,16,20; 9.29; 10.15,20,23,27; 11.9,17,21,22,24; 12.6,31,36; 13.11,17; 16.28; 17.12,20; 18.3,10,12,13,18,19,35; 19.8,9,24,28; 20.4,26; 21.21,24,27,31,43; 22.31,42; 23.9,13,15,16,23,25,27,29,36,38; 24.2,23, 25,26,34,47; 25,8,9, 11,12,34,40,45; 26.13,15,21,29,64,66; 27.17,21; 28.20
ὑποκριταί	ὑποκριταί	6.16; 22.18
χειτῶνά	χιτῶνα	5.40

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
χειθῶνας	χιτῶνας	10.10
ῶτειον	ῶτίον	26.51

II. Lexical differences

II. 1. Nouns

(1) Similar Meaning

D.05	B.03	References
ἄγγια	ἄγγη	13.48
ἄνδρος	ἀνθρώπου	19.10
ἀπάντησιν	ὑπάντησιν	25.1
ἀπιστεῖαν	ὀλιγοπιστίαν	17.20
βόθρον	βόθυνον	15.14
γάμος	νυμφών	22.10
ἐρίφων	ἐρίφιων	25.32
ἔξω (τό)	ἔξωθεν (τό)	23.25
ἔξωθεν (τό)	ἐκτός (τό)	23.26
θεοῦ	κυρίου	23.39
θεραπείας	οἰκετείας	24.45
Ἰησοῦ	Χριστοῦ	11.2
Ἰουδαίας	γῆ Ἰούδα	2.6
Ἰσραήλ	γῆν Ἰσραήλ	2.21
καθηγητῆς	διδάσκαλος	23.8
κοινωνοῦντα	κοινοῦντα	15.20
κόσμου	αἰῶνος	13.49
κρυφία	κρυφαίω	6.18
κτήματα	χρήματα	19.22
κυναρίων	κυρίων	15.27
μύλωνι	μύλω	24.41
νυμφίου	νυμφῶνος	9.15
ὀμμάτων	ὀφθαλμῶν	9.29
παῖδα	παιδίον	2.11,13,14,20,21
ποιήσας (ὁ)	κτίσας (ὁ)	19.4
στατήρας	ἀργύρια	26.15
υἰόν	ἄνθρωπον	10.35
φαρισαίων	πρεσβυτέρων	27.41
φυλακάς	κουστωδῖαν	27.65
φυλακῶν	κουστωδίας	27.66

- Alternative Parts of Speech

D.05	B.03	References
ἐν οὐρανοῖς	οὐράνιος	5.48
Ἰησοῦ	αὐτοῦ	26.51
πολλοί (οἱ)	ὄχλοι (οἱ)	21.11

## APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

τις	ἄνθρωπος	13.44
τυφλοῦς	αὐτοῦς	15.14

### (2) Different Entities

D.05	B.03	References
ἐθνικοί	ὑποκριταί	6.7
Ἡρωδιάς	Ἡρωδιάδος	14.6
Ἰωάννης	Ἰωσήφ	13.55
Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσή	27.56
Λεββέος	Θαδδαῖος	10.3
τέκνων	ἔργων	11.19
χειῶν	φῶς	17.2
ῥας	ἡμέρας	22.46

### - Alternative Parts of Speech

D.05	B.03	References
δικαιοσύνης	ἐμοῦ	5.11
αὐτόν	Ἰησοῦ	15.1

## II. 2. Adjectives

### (1) Similar Meaning

D.05	B.03	References
ἄλλην	ἐτέραν	10.23
αἴσχατος	ὑστερος	21.31
δεκαδύο	δώδεκα	19.28
διετείς	διετοῦς	2.16
ἐλαχίστων	μεικρῶν	10.42
ἐκατονταπλασίον	πολλαπλασίονα	19.29
ἐτέρω	δευτέρω	21.30
εἰσερχόμενον	ἐρχόμενον	15.11
εἰσπορευόμενον	εἰσερχόμενον	15.17
κάλλιστα	καλά	13.48
πάντας	ἅπαντας	24.39
πολυτείμου	βαρυτείμου	26.7
σταυρωθέντες	συνσταυρωθέντες	27.44

### (2) Different Meaning

D.05	B.03	References
ἀπλούστατοι	ἀκέρατοι	10.16
δύνατόν	ἀδύνατόν	19.26
ἐργαζόμενος	ἐρχόμενος	11.3

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

πέντε	δέκα	25.28
σώζοντος	ζώντος	16.16

(3) Change of Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	References
αὐτοῦ	ἰδίαν	25.15
έπτακίς	έπτά	18.22
ιδίω	έαυτοῦ	13.24

II. 3. Verbs

(1) Similar Meaning

a. Synonyms or equivalent in meaning

D.05	B.03	References
ανάγει	ἀναφέρει	17.1
ἀναστῆναι	ἐγερθῆναι	16.21
ἀνήγγειλαν	ἀπήγγειλαν	28.11
ἀπήντησεν	ὑπήντησεν	28.9
ἄρατε	δήσαντες	22.13
ἐγερθήσεται	ἀναστήσεται	17.23
εἶπεν	ἔφη	19.18
εἶπεν	φησίν	14.8
ἐκαθήμην	ἐκαθεζόμην	26.55
ἐξελθοῦσαι	ἀπελθοῦσαι	28.8
ἔξέστιν	ἔστιν καλόν	15.26
ἐπέθηκαν	περιέθηκαν	27.29
ἐπέπληξεν	ἐπετείμησεν	12.16
ἐποίησαν	ἔλαβον	27.1
ἐπώλησεν	πέπρακεν	13.46
ἔφη	λέγει	19.21
ζήτηι	αἰτεῖ	16.4
ιδών	εἰδώς	9.4, 12.25
κοινωνει	κοινοῖ	15.18,20
λέγει	ἔφη	27.23
λέγει	φησίν	13.29
παραγών	ἐπαναγαγών	21.18
παράγων	περιπατῶν	4.18
πάσχει	ἔχει	17.15
προσελθών	προελθών	26.39
σταθήσεσθαι	ἀχθήσεσθε	10.18
συνέκειντο	συνανέκειντο	9.10
συνλέγεται	συνάγετε	13.30
σφάξαι	ἀποκτεῖναι	10.28

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

D.05	B.03	References
ὑπάγετε	πορεύεσθαι	10.6
ὑπάγουσιν	ἀπερχομένων	25.10
φράσον	διασάφησον	13.36

b. Compound Verb in Mt D.05/Simple Verb in Mt B.03

D.05	B.03	References
ἀναστρεφομένων	συστρεφομένων	17.22
ἀνεβόησεν	ἐβόησεν	27.46
ἀπέλθῃ	βληθῆ	5.29
ἀπῆλθεν	ἦλθεν	14.25
ἀποχωριζέτω	χωριζέτω	19.6
διεξελθών	ἐξελθών	20.3
διεγερθείς	ἐγερθείς	1.24; 2.14,21
ἐπερωτήσω	ἐρωτήσω	21.24
ἐξεγερθήσονται	ἐγερθήσονται	24.11
ἐνπεσοῦνται	πεσοῦνται	15.14
ἐπεκέρδησα	ἐκέρδησα	25.20; 25.22
εἰσελθόντι	ἐλθόντα	17.25
παραλαβών	λαβών	27.59

c. Simple Verb in Mt D.05/Compound Verb in Mt B.03

D.05	B.03	References
ἀρθῆ	ἀπαρθῆ	9.15
βάλεται	ἐκβάλετε	22.13, 25.30
εκάθητο	ἐπεκάθισεν	21.7
ἐφάνησαν	ἐνεφανίσθησαν	27.53
ἐφάνησαν	ἐνεφανίσθησαν	27.53
ἐλθεῖν	εἰσελθεῖν	19.17
ἐλθών	προσελθών	9.18
ἐπνιξαν	ἀπέπνιξαν	13.7
ἐσπειρεν	ἐπέσπειρεν	13.25
ἦλθες	εἰσῆλθες	22.12
ἦλθον	εἰσῆλθον	27.53
ἦλθον	προσελθόντες	26.60
ἦλθατε	ἐξήλθατε	26.55
ἦλθεν	εἰσῆλθεν	2.21
λάμπουσιν	ἐκλάμπουσιν	13.43
ὀρκίζω	ἐξορκίζω	26.63
πειράσεις	ἐκπειράσεις	4.7
πληρωθήσεται	ἀναπληροῦται	13.14
τηροῦνται	συντηροῦνται	9.17

## d. Different Prefixes

D.05	B.03	References
ἐξελθοῦσαι	ἀπελθοῦσαι	28.8
ἐπέθηκαν	περιέθηκαν	27.29
καταλλάγηθι	διαλλάγηθι	5.24
παραγών	ἐπαναγαγών	21.18
προσελθών	προελθών	26.39
συνέκειντο	συνανέκειντο	9.10

## (2) Different Meaning

D.05	B.03	References
γαμίζοντες	γαμίσκοντες	24.38
ἐλάλησεν	ἐτέλεσεν	19.1
ἐλάλησεν	παρέθηκεν	13.31
ἐποίησαν	ἔλαβον	27.1
ἔστε	ἐλθέτω	10.13
ἐστιν	ἀπέχει	15.8
ἐστίν	ἔξεστιν	20.15
εὔρεν	εἶδεν	20.3
ζήτει	αἰτεῖ	16.4
λαλοῦντας	ἀκούοντας	15.31
νηστεύειν	πενθεῖν	9.15
πάσχει	ἔχει	17.15
συνιόντος	συνιέντος	13.19

## II. 4. Pronouns

D.05	B.03	References
ἄλλοι	οἱ	16.14; 26.67
ἃ	ὅσα	13.46
αὐτήν	ἣν	13.48
αὐτοί	ὕμεῖς	19.28
αὐτοῦ	ἐαυτοῦ	12.45
αὐτῶν	ἐαυτῶν	6.16; 18.31; 21.8; 25.4; 25.7
ἐκεῖνο	τοῦτο	15.11
οὗτος	αὐτός	16.20
πάντας	αὐτούς	4.24
σε	αὐτήν	23.37
σοί	αὐτῇ	12.39
συ	οὗτος	3.17
τί	τίς	12.11
ὕμειν	σοί	11.24
ὕμειν	ὕμῶν	23.9



- Alternative Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	References
αὐτοῦ	ἐκεῖνοι	22.10
ὅς	πᾶς	5.32
σου	σῆς	24.3
τί	τά	24.17
τόν	αὐτόν	17.8

II. 5. Particles, Prepositions and Conjunctions

• Particles

(NoI = Number of Instances)

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
δέ	καί	9	9.11; 10.39; 11.4; 12.16; 12.26f; 17.6; 20.10; 26.47
καί	δέ	5	9.28; 12.14; 17.24; 20.17; 21.3
μητέ	μηδέ	5	10.9 x2; 10.10 x3
γάρ	δέ	2	12.6; 23.4
δέ	οὖν	2	18.26; 27.17
ἢ	καί	2	12.37; 12.48
μήγε	μή	2	9.17; 10.13
ἀλλά	δέ	1	10.30
γάρ	ἄρα	1	24.45
δέ	ἀλλά	1	9.17
ἢ	δέ	1	25.39
κάγώ	καί	1	18.29
καί	ἢ	1	20.23
καὶ μή	οὐδέ	1	13.13
μήτι	μή	1	9.15
μητέ	μή	1	10.10
νῦν	οὖν	1	28.19
οὖν	δέ	1	20.9
οὖν	γάρ	1	25.3
οὖν	καί	1	26.63
τότε	δέ	1	16.7

- Alternative Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
ἰδοῦ	ἴδε	1	25.22
δέ	ἔτι	1	12.46
καί	ἐκεῖ	1	27.55

- Prepositions

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
ἀπό	ἐκ	2	24.1; 28.2
εἰς	ἐν	4	10.17; 10.28; 21.28; 26.23
εἰς	ἐπί	2	3.16; 13.7
ἕως	μέχρι	1	28.15
ἐκ	ἀπό	1	24.29
ἐν	ἐκ	1	12.11
ἐν	ἐπί	1	4.4
ἐν	εἰς	1	10.16
ἕνεκεν	ἕνεκα	3	5.10; 5.11; 19.5
ἐπί	ἐν	1	22.16
ἐπί	εἰς	1	5.39
ἐπί	περί	1	18.6
ἐπί	κατά	2	12.25
παρά	ἐν	1	21.25
περί	ἐπί	1	14.14
πρός	ἐπί	1	10.13
πρός	εἰς	1	21.1
ὑπέρ	περί	1	26.28
ὑπό	παρά	1	15.30
ὑπό	ἀπό	1	16.21

- Alternative Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
παρ' οἷς	ἐκει	1	18.20

- Subordinating Conjunctions

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
ἄν	ἐάν	2	21.3; 28.14
εἰ δὲ μήγε	ἐάν δὲ μή	1	10.13
ἵνα	ὅπως	1	6.18
ἵνα	ὅτι	1	13.13
ἵνα	ὥστε	1	27.1
ὅταν	ἐπάν	1	2.8
ὅτι	ἐπεὶ	1	14.5
ὥς	ὥσει	2	3.16; 9.36
ὥσπερ	ὥς	2	5.48; 24.38

- Condition Particles

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
ἄν	ἐάν	10	11.27; 12.32; 15.5; 16.19,25; 18.5; 20.4; 22.9; 24.28; 26.13

- Alternative Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	NoI	References
ὡς	εἰς	1	21.46

## II. 6. Adverbs

D.05	B.03	References
ἐκεῖ	ὧδε	24.23
ἐνίοτε	πολλάκις	17.15
ἔξω	ἔξωθεν	23.25
ἔξωθεν	ἐκτός	23.26
εὐθέως	εὐθύς	26.74
κάτω	κατωτέρω	2.16
μή	οὐδαμῶς	2.6
μή	οὐκ	22.11
ὅπου	ὅθεν	25.24
τότε	δή	23.23
ὡς	ὡσεὶ	14.21
πῶς	ὅπως	22.15

### - Alternative Part of Speech

D.05	B.03	References
οὐκ	οὐδέν	13.34
οὕτως	τὸ αὐτό	5.46

## III. Verbal Grammatical Differences

### III. 1. Differences in Person

The list is ordered by variant reading, specifying reference in Matthew, form in Codex Bezae, form in Codex Vaticanus, and nature of the grammatical change:

Ref.	D.05	B.03	Type of Alternation
12.20	κατιάξεις	κατεάξει	2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>
13.13	λαλεῖ	λαλῶ	3 <sup>rd</sup> /1 <sup>st</sup>
20.27	ἔστω	ἔστω	2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup>
• Singular Singular			
27.27	συνήγαγεν	συνήγαγον	ind aorist 3 <sup>rd</sup>
12.4	ἔφαγεν	ἔφαγον	ind aorist 3 <sup>rd</sup>
1.23	καλέσεις	καλέσουσιν	ind future 2 <sup>nd</sup>
6.5	ἔση	ἔσεσθε	ind future 2 <sup>nd</sup>
6.5	προσεύχη	προσεύχεσθε	subj present 2 <sup>nd</sup>
• Singular Plural			

- Plural Singular

6.19	ἀφανίζουσιν	ἀφανίζει	ind present	3 <sup>rd</sup>
4.16	εἶδον	εἶδεν	ind aorist	3 <sup>rd</sup>
11.23	ἔμειναν	ἔμεινεν	ind aorist	3 <sup>rd</sup>
12.28	ἔφθασαν	ἔφθασεν	ind aorist	3 <sup>rd</sup>
17.4	ποιήσωμεν	ποιήσω	ind future	1 <sup>st</sup>

- Plural Neuter Subject with the Singular instead of the Plural

- verb plural / verb singular

10.21	ἐπαναστήσονται	ἐπαναστήσεται
10.29	πωλοῦνται	πωλεῖται
13.6	ἐκαυματίσθησαν	ἐκαυματώθη
13.40	συνλέγονται	συλλέγεται
15.20	εἶσιν	ἐστιν
15.27	ἐσθίουσιν	ἐσθείει

- verb singular/ verb plural

13.5	ἐξανέτειλεν	ἐξανέτειλαν
26.31	διασκορπισθήσεται	διασκορπισθήσονται

### III. 2. Difference in Tense

#### III. 2. 1. Indicative

- Present Future

Ref.	D.05	B.03
4.6	ἀροῦσίν	ἀροῦσί
5.41	ἀγαρεύει	ἀγαρεύσει
12.11	ἐστιν, ἔχει, κράτει, ἐγείρει	ἔσται, ἔξει, κρατήσει, ἐγερεῖ
12.18	ἀπαγγελλεῖ	ἀπαγγελεῖ
12.19	ἀκούει	ἀκούσει
12.21	ἐλπίζουσιν	ἐλπιουσιν
12.36	λαλοῦσιν	λαλήσουσιν
13.42	βαλλοῦσιν	βαλοῦσιν
13.50	βαλλοῦσιν	βαλοῦσιν
16.26	ὠφελεῖται	ὠφελθήσεται
18.12	ἀφήσιν	ἀφήσει
20.25	κατακυριεύουσιν	κατακυριεύσουσιν
24.6	μέλλεται	μελλήσεται
25.29	περισσεύεται	περισσευθήσεται

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

	• Present	Aorist
<b>Ref.</b>	<b>D.05</b>	<b>B.03</b>
2.13	φαίνεται	ἐφάνη
6.12	ἀφίομεν	ἀφήκαμεν
10.25	κάλουσιν	ἐπεκάλεσαν
13.52	λέγει	εἶπεν
19.16	λέγει	εἶπεν
20.21	λέγει	εἶπεν
15.39	ἐνβαίνει	ἐνέβη
	• Aorist	Present
<b>Ref.</b>	<b>D.05</b>	<b>B.03</b>
4.8	ἔδειξεν	δείκνυσιν
21.13	ἐποιήσατε	ποιεῖτε
25.11	ἦλθον	ἔρχονται
	• Aorist	Imperfect
<b>Ref.</b>	<b>D.05</b>	<b>B.03</b>
1.25	ἔγνω	ἐγείνωσκεν
2.18	ἠθέλησεν	ἠθέλεν
5.2	ἐδίδαξεν	ἐδίδασκεν
18.30	ἠθέλησεν	ἠθέλεν
20.11	ἐγόγγυσαν	ἐγόγγυζον
21.8	ἔστρωσαν	ἔστρώννουον
21.11	εἶπον	ἔλεγον
27.23	ἔκραξαν	ἔκραζον
	• Aorist	Future
23.32	ἐπληρώσατε	πληρώσετε
	• Aorist	Perfect
19.8	ἐγένετο	γέγονεν
	• Future	Present
5.10	ἔστε	ἐστίν
5.39	ῥαπίσει	ῥαπίζει
5.46	ἔξεται	ἔχετε
23.34	ἀποστέλω	ἀποστέλλω
	• Future	Aorist
21.16	καταρτίσω	κατηρτίσω

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

• Imperfect Aorist

9.9,19	ἠκολούθει(-ι)	ἠκολούθησεν
17.5	ἐπεσκίαζεν	ἐπεσκίασεν
26.4	συνεβουλεύοντο	συνεβουλεύσαντο

• Imperfect Present

18.25	εἶχεν	ἔχει
-------	-------	------

• Perfect Aorist

11.20	γεγόνεισαν	ἐγένοντο
19.27	ἠκολουθήκαμεν	ἠκολουθήσαμεν
25.6	γέγονεν	ἐγένετο

• Pluperfect Aorist

11.21	ἐγεγόνεισαν	ἐγένοντο
-------	-------------	----------

III. 2. 2. Imperative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
10.8	θεραπεύσατε	θεραπεύετε	aor/pres
10.8	ἐγείρατε	ἐγείρετε	aor/pres
10.8	καθαρίσατε	καθαρίζετε	aor/pres
10.8	ἐκβάλετε	ἐκβάλλετε	aor/pres
10.27	κηρύσσεται	κηρύξατε	pres/ aor
23.3	ποιεῖτε	ποιήσατε	pres /aor

III. 2. 3. Subjunctive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
26.29	πίω	πείνω	aor/present

III. 2. 4. Participle

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
9.4	ιδών	εἰδώς	aor/perfect
13.18	σπείροντος	σπείραντος	pres/aor
13.19	σπειρόμενον	ἐσπαρμένον	pres/perfect
13.22	σπειρόμενος	σπαρείς	pres pass/aor pass
18.12	πορευόμενος	πορευθείς	pres mid/aor pass
18.31	γινόμενα	γενόμενα	aor mid/ pres mid
23.21	κατοικήσαντι	κατοικοῦντι	aor/pres
26.23	ἐμβαπτόμενος	ἐμβάψας	pres mid/aor
27.35	βάλλοντες	βάλλοντες	aor/pres

III. 3. Difference in Mood

III. 3. 1. Indicative in Mt D.05

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

(1) Indicative Participle

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
4.3	προσήλθεν	προσελθών	aor
9.28	καὶ ἔρχεται	ἐλθόντι δέ	pres mid/aor
9.29	εἶπεν	λέγων	aor/pres
13.1	ἐξήλθεν	ἐξελθών	aor
13.4	ἦλθον	ἐλθόντα	aor
13.48	ἀνεβίβασαν	ἀναβιβάσαντες	aor
17.26	λέγει	ειπόντος	pres /aor
19.3	λέγουσιν	λέγοντες	pres
20.6	ἐξήλθεν	ἐξελθών	aor
20.30	ἤκουσαν	ἀκούσαντες	aor
21.6	ἐποίησαν	ποιήσαντες	aor
25.25	ἀπῆλθον	ἀπελθών	aor
26.51	ἐπάταξεν	πατάξας	aor
26.66	σώσει	σώσων	fut
27.58	προσήλθεν	προσελθών	aor
28.19	πορεύεσθαι	πορευθέντες	aor mid/pass

(2) Indicative Imperative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
5.24	προσφέρεις	πρόσφερε	Pres
5.40	ἀφήσεις	ἄφες	fut /aor
6.19	θησαυρίζεται	θησαυρίζετε	fut mid/pres

(3) Indicative Subjunctive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
5.11	διώξουσιν, ὀνειδίσουσιν	διώξωσιν, ὀνειδίσωσιν	fut/aor, fut/aor
5.19	λύσει	λύσῃ	fut/aor
5.25	παραδώσει	παραδῶ	fut/aor
10.19	παραδώσουσιν	παραδῶσιν	fut/aor
10.23	διώκουσιν	διώκωσιν	pres/pres
12.10	κατηγορήσουσιν	κατηγορήσωσι	fut/aor
12.32	ἀφελήσεται	ἀφελῆ	fut/aor pass
12.50	ποιεῖ	ποιήσῃ	pres/aor
16.25	ἀπολέσει	ἀπολέσῃ	fut/aor
18.19	συμφωνήσουσιν	συμφωνήσωσιν	fut/aor
26.17	ἐτοιμάσωμεν	ἐτοιμάσωμεν	fut/aor
26.36	προσεύξομαι	προσεύξωμαι	fut/aor mid
26.54	πληρωθήσονται	πληρωθῶσιν	fut/aor pass
26.59	θανατώσουσιν	θανατώσωσιν	fut/aor
27.64	ἐροῦσιν	εἴπωσιν	fut/aor

## (4) Indicative      Infinitive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
27.1	θανατώσουσιν	θανατώσαι	fut/aor

## III. 3. 2. Imperative in Mt D.05

## (1) Imperative      Indicative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
5.37	ἔστω	ἔσται	pres/fut

## III. 3. 3. Participle in Mt D.05

## (1) Participle      Indicative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
17.2	μεταμορφωθείς	μετεμορφώθη	aor pass
27.41	λέγοντες	ἔλεγον	pres/impf

## (2) Participle      Imperative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
14.19	κελεύσας	κελεύσατε	Aor

## (3) Participle      Infinitive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
6.5	προσευχόμενοι	προσεύχεσθαι	pres mid

## III. 3. 4. Subjunctive in Mt D.05

## (1) Subjunctive      Indicative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
9.6	ἰδῆτε	εἰδῆτε	aor
13.13	βλέπωσιν	βλέπουσιν	pres
13.13	ἀκούσωσιν, συνῶσιν	ἀκούουσιν, συνίουσιν	aor/pres
24.23	πιστεύσῃται	πιστεύετε	aor/pres
27.22	ποιήσωμεν	ποιήσω	aor/fut



## (2) Subjunctive Participle

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
5.32	ἀπολύση	ἀπολύων	aor/pres
19.9	γαμήση	γαμήσας	aor

## (3) Subjunctive Infinitive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
23.15	ποιῆσθαι	ποιῆσαι	aor mid/aor

## (4) Subjunctive Imperative

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
19.14	κωλύσητε	κωλύετε	aor/pres

## III. 3. 5. Optative

## (1) Optative Subjunctive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
24.21	γένοιτο	γένηται	aor mid

## (2) Optative Infinitive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
24.12	πληθύναι	πληθυνθῆναι	aor passive

## III. 4. Difference in Voice

## • Active Middle

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
6.17	ἄλιψον	ἄλειψαι	impv aor
24.27	φαίνει	φαίνεται	ind pres
27.66	ἡσφάλισαν	ἡσφάλισαντο	ind aor

## • Active Passive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
9.17	ρήσσει	ρήγνυνται	ind pres
13.32	αὐξησῆ	αὐξηθῆ	subj aor
27.26	σταυρώσωσιν	σταυρωθῆ	subj aor

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

• Middle Active

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
24.19	θηλαζομέναις	θηλαζούσαις	ptc pres
27.35	διεμέρισαντο	διεμέρισαν	ind aor

• Middle Passive

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
9.2	ἀφίοντε	ἀφίενται	ind pres
9.30	ἐνεβριμήσατο	ἐνεβριμήθη	ind aor

• Passive Active

Ref.	D.05	B.03	
12.22	προσηνέχθη	προσηνέγκαν	ind aor
24.24	πλανηθήναι	πλανῆσαι	inf aor
27.57	ἐμαθητεύθη	ἐμαθητεύσεν	ind aor

IV. Nominal Grammatical Differences

IV. 1. Difference in Number

• Singular Plural

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.12	τῷ οὐρανῷ	τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
11.16	τῇ ἀγορᾷ	ταῖς ἀγοραῖς
15.19	βλασφημεία	βλασφημίαι
15.31	τὸν ὄχλον	τοὺς ὄχλους
15.36	τῷ ὄχλῳ	τοῖς ὄχλοις
16.11	ἄρτου	ἄρτων
16.23	τοῦ ἀνθρώπου	τῶν ἀνθρώπων
19.28	αὐτῷ	αὐτοῖς
21.7	αὐτοῦ	αὐτῶν
21.16	αὐτῷ	αὐτοῖς
22.7	τὸ στρατεύμα	τὰ στρατεύματα
23.27	ὁ τάφος φαίνετε ὡραῖος	φαίνονται ὡραῖοι
25.27	τὸ ἀργυριόν	τὰ ἀργύρια
27.39	τὴν κεφαλὴν	τὰς κεφαλὰς
28.12	ἀργύριον ἱκανόν	ἀργύρια ἱκανά

• Plural Singular

Ref.	D.05	B.03
13.19	αὐτῶν	αὐτοῦ
13.58	τὰς ἀπιστείας	τὴν ἀπιστίαν
17.25	τίνων	τίνος
20.29	ἤκολούθησαν ὄχλοι πολλοί	ἤκολούθησεν ὄχλος πολὺς

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

22.5	οί μὲν, οἱ δὲ ...αὐτῶν	ὄς μὲν, ὄς δὲ ...αὐτοῦ
18.10	οὐρανοῖς	τῷ οὐρανῷ
24.30	οὐρανοῖς	οὐρανῷ
28.18	οὐρανοῖς	οὐρανῷ

• Difference in Case

Ref.	D.05	B.03
9.22	θυγάτηρ	θύγατερ
9.27	υἱέ	υἱός
17.20	κόκκος	κόκκον
20.30	υἱέ	υἱός
20.31	υἱέ	υἱός

• Difference in Declension

Ref.	D.05	B.03
12.1,12	σάββασιν	σαββάτοις

IV. 2. Prepositions

- Governing Different Cases

• ἐπί + accusative in Mt D.05 vs. ἐπί + genitive/dative in Mt B.03

Ref.	D.05	B.03
14.19	ἐπὶ τὸν χόρτον	ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου
16.18	ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πέτραν	ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ
18.26	ἐπ' ἐμέ	ἐπ' ἐμοί
18.29	ἐπ' ἐμέ	ἐπ' ἐμοί
21.7	ἐπ' αὐτὸν	ἐπ' αὐτῶν
27.29	ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν	ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς
27.43	ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν	ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ

• ἐπί + dative in Mt D.05 vs. ἐπί + accusative in Mt B.03

Ref.	D.05	B.03
10.18	ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων	ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας
14.25	ἐπὶ τῆς θάλασσης	ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

- Use of a Preposition in D.05 vs. B.03

Ref.	D.05	B.03
12.18	ἐν ᾧ ἠὲ δόκησεν	ὄν εὐδόκησεν
15.1	πρὸς αὐτόν	τῷ Ἰησοῦ
16.21	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
17.14	ἐνπροσθεν αὐτοῦ	αὐτόν
17.23	μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας	τῇ τρί<τη> ἡμέρᾳ
22.16	πρὸς αὐτόν	αὐτῷ
25.18	ἐν τῇ γῇ	γῆν

- Use of a Preposition in B.03 vs. D.05

Ref.	D.05	B.03
4.23	ὄλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν	ἐν ὄλη τῇ Γαλιλαιά
10.32	αὐτόν	ἐν αὐτῷ
13.30	δέσμας	εἰς δέσμας
21.37	αὐτοῖς	πρὸς αὐτοὺς
27.42	αὐτῷ	ἐπ' αὐτόν

- Differently Inflected Nouns

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.40	ὁ θέλών	τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι...
5.42	τῷ θέλοντι δανίσασθαι	τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι
9.24	καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτόν	καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ
9.25	ἐκράτησεν τὴν χειρά	ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρός
9.38	δεήθητε οὖν τὸν κύριον	δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου
10.25	εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βελζεβούλ κάλουσιν	εἰ τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη Βελζεβούλ ἐπεκάλεσαν

- Agreement with a Different Word

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.13	τὸν παῖδα τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτόν	τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό
6.5	τὸν μισθὸν αὐτόν	τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν
9.26	ἡ φήμη αὐτοῦ	ἡ φήμη αὐτῆ
13.32	ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων σπερμάτων ὅταν δὲ αὐξησῇ μείζων τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν	ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων σπερμάτων ὅταν δὲ αὐξησῇ ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ μείζων τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν
14.12	ἔθαψαν αὐτό	ἔθαψαν αὐτόν
21.5	ἐπὶ ... πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου	ἐπὶ ... ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου
22.34	συνήχθησαν ἐπ' αὐτόν	συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό
23.24	ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, τὸν δὲ κάμηλον καταπαίνοντες	ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπαίνοντες

V. Differences in Wording

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.6	Βηθλέεμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας	Βηθλέεμ γῆ Ἰούδα
2.9	ἐπάνω τοῦ παιδίου	ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον
4.16	οἱ καθήμενοι... ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς	τοῖς καθήμενοις... ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς
6.8	πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς ἀνοῖξε τὸ στόμα	πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν
9.2	ἀφίοντέ σοι αἰ ἁμαρτίαι	ἀφίενταί σου αἰ ἁμαρτίαι
9.17	ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς	ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοί
9.17	ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί	ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται
10.11	ἡ πόλις εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσέλθητε εἰς αὐτήν	εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε
10.15	(γῆ Σοδόμων καὶ) Γομόρας	(γῆ Σοδόμων καὶ) Γομόρων
10.42	μὴ ἀπόληται ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ	μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ
12.22	προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλός	προσηνέγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενον τυφλόν
13.17	οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰδεῖν	οὐκ εἶδαν
13.23	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν	ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
14.24	ἦν εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης	ἤδη σταδίου πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπέειχεν
14.25	τετάρτης δὲ φυλακῆς τῆς νυκτός	τετάρτη δὲ φυλακῆ τῆς νυκτός
16.9	πέντε ἄρτους τοῖς πεντακισχιλείοις	πέντε ἄρτους τῶν πεντακισχιλίων
16.10	τοῖς τετρακισχειλείοις	τῶν τετρακισχειλίων
16.22	ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμιᾶν καὶ λέγειν	ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμιῶν
20.17	καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς	μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν Ἰησοῦς
22.13	ἄρατε αὐτὸν πόδων καὶ χεῖρων	δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας
22.39	δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία ταύτῃ	δευτέρα ὁμοίως
23.9	πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν	πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν
23.9	ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς	ὁ οὐράνιος
24.20	χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαββάτου	χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαββάτω
24.38	ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας	ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας
25.10	ἕως ὑπάγουσιν ἀγοράσαι	ἀπερχομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀγοράσαι
25.41	τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον ὃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ μου	τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἠτοιμασμένον
26.15	οἷς δέ	οἱ δέ
26.22	ἤρξαντο λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν	ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος
26.60	καὶ πολλοὶ προσήλθον ψευδομάρτυρες	πολλῶν προσελθόντων ψευδομαρτύρων
26.61	τοῦτον ἠκούσαμεν λέγοντα	οὗτος ἔφη
26.71	ἐξεληθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ... εἶδεν...	ἐξεληθόντα δὲ... εἶδεν...
26.73	ἢ λαλιὰ σου ὁμοιάζει	ἢ λαλιά σου δήλόν σε ποιεῖ

VI. Presence/Absence of Words in Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew

VI. 1. Presence in Mt D.05 *contra* Absence in Mt B.03 (1–2 Words)

One Word

Ref.	D.05	B.03
1.22	Ἡσαΐου	<i>om.</i>
1.25	(ἕως) οὗ	<i>om.</i>
1.25	τὸν (υἰόν)	<i>om.</i>
2.22	ἐπὶ (τῆς Ἰουδαίας)	<i>om.</i>
2.8	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
3.2	καί	<i>om.</i>
3.7	(τὸ βάπτισμα) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
4.1	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>
4.16	(ἐν) τῇ (σκοτείᾳ)	<i>om.</i>
4.17	γάρ	<i>om.</i>
4.19	γένεσθαι	<i>om.</i>
4.24	καί	<i>om.</i>
4.4	Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
4.3	καί	<i>om.</i>
4.3	(προσηλθεν) αὐτῷ	(προσηλόν) <i>om.</i>
5.1	(προσηλθον) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i>
5.12	ὑπαρχόντων	<i>om.</i>
5.13	καί	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.16	(τὰ καλὰ) ἔργα	<i>om.</i>
5.18	ἄν	<i>om.</i>
5.22	εἰκῆ	<i>om.</i>
5.32	ἄν	<i>om.</i>
6.10	(ἐπὶ) τῆς (γῆς)	<i>om.</i>
6.15	(ἀφήσει) ὑμῖν	<i>om.</i>
6.4	αὐτός	<i>om.</i>
6.5	στῆναι	<i>om.</i>
6.5	καί	<i>om.</i>
9.14	(νηστεύομεν) πολλά	<i>om.</i>
9.15	αἱ (ἡμέραι)	<i>om.</i>
9.22	ἔστη	<i>om.</i>
9.28	καί	<i>om.</i>
9.28	δύο (τυφλοί)	<i>om.</i>
9.29	καὶ (εἶπεν)	<i>om.</i> (λέγων)
9.32	ἄνθρωπον (κωφόν)	<i>om.</i>
9.4	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
9.6	καί	<i>om.</i>
10.23	(ἕως) ἄν	<i>om.</i>
10.29	τοῦ (ἄσσαρίου)	<i>om.</i>
10.33	ἄν	<i>om.</i>
10.4	καί	<i>om.</i>
10.42	(ποτήριον) ὕδατος (ψυχροῦ)	<i>om.</i>
10.5	καὶ (λέγων)	<i>om.</i>
10.7	(λέγοντες) ὅτι	<i>om.</i>
10.8	καί	<i>om.</i>
11.11	τοῖς (γεννητοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
11.11	τῶν (γυναικῶν)	<i>om.</i>
11.12	οἱ (βιασταί)	<i>om.</i>
11.23	ἦ	<i>om.</i>
11.28	ἔσται	<i>om.</i>
11.8	εἰσὶν	<i>om.</i>
12.1	τούς (στάχυας)	<i>om.</i>
12.12	τοῦ (προβάτου)	<i>om.</i>
12.15	(αὐτούς) πάντας	<i>om.</i>
12.18	εἰς (ὄν)	<i>om.</i>
12.18	ἐν (ᾧ)	<i>om.</i> (ὄν)
12.2	(ιδόντες) αὐτούς	<i>om.</i>
12.21	ἐν (τῷ ὀνόματι)	<i>om.</i>
12.23	ὅτι	<i>om.</i>
12.26	δὲ (καί)	<i>om.</i>
12.35	(λαλεῖ) ἀγαθὰ	<i>om.</i>
12.40	καί	<i>om.</i>
12.42	τοῦ (Σολομῶνος)	<i>om.</i>
12.45	(πονηρότερα) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
12.5	ἐν (τοῖς σάββασιν)	<i>om.</i>
13.1	δέ	<i>om.</i>
13.1	καί	<i>om.</i>
13.6	τοῦ (δὲ ἡλίου ἀνατελιαντος)	<i>om.</i>
13.13	καί	<i>om.</i>
13.14	τότε	<i>om.</i>
13.14	ἐπ' (αὐτοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
13.14	τοῦ (Ἡσαΐου)	<i>om.</i>
13.16	(ᾧτα) ὑμῶν	<i>om.</i>
13.17	ἠδυνήθησαν	<i>om.</i>
13.2	(εἰς) τὸ (πλοῖον)	<i>om.</i>
13.23	τὴν (γῆν) (τὴν καλήν)	<i>om.</i>
13.27	(οἰκοδεσπότου) ἐκείνου	<i>om.</i>
13.28	(οἱ) δοῦλοι	<i>om.</i>
13.29	καί	<i>om.</i>
13.29	σὺν (αὐτοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
13.35	κόσμου	<i>om.</i>
13.4	καί	<i>om.</i>
13.43	ἀκούειν	<i>om.</i>
13.44	(πωλεῖ) πάντα	<i>om.</i>
13.45	ἀνθρώπῳ	<i>om.</i>
13.48	τά (ἄγγια)	<i>om.</i>
13.52	ἐν (τῇ βασιλείᾳ)	<i>om.</i>
13.6	τοῦ (ἡλίου)	<i>om.</i>
13.9	ἀκούειν	<i>om.</i>
14.1	δέ	<i>om.</i>
14.10	τὸν (Ἰωάννην)	<i>om.</i>
14.11	(ἐπὶ) τῷ (πίνακι)	<i>om.</i>
14.12	(τὸ πτῶμα) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
14.15	(οἱ μαθηταὶ) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
14.2	μήτι	<i>om.</i>
14.22	τό (πλοῖον)	<i>om.</i>
14.3	(ἔδῃσεν) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
14.30	(ἄνεμον) ἰσχυρόν	<i>om.</i>
14.33	ἐλθόντες	<i>om.</i>
14.36	(παρεκάλουν) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
14.6	(ἡ θυγάτηρ) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
14.9	(διὰ... καὶ) διὰ	<i>om.</i>
15.11	πᾶν (τὸ εἰσερχόμενον)	<i>om.</i>
15.15	(παραβολὴν) ταύτην	<i>om.</i>
15.2	(τὰς χεῖρας) αὐτῶν	<i>om.</i>
15.24	(πρόβατα) ταῦτα	<i>om.</i>
15.27	γάρ	<i>om.</i>
15.30	(ἔριψαν) πάντας	<i>om.</i>
15.31	καί	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
15.31	τούς (τυφλούς)	<i>om.</i>
15.32	(ὄχλον) τοῦτον	<i>om.</i>
15.32	ἤδη	<i>om.</i>
15.33	(οἱ μαθηταί) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
15.34	(εἶπεν) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i>
15.39	(ὄρια) τῆς (Μαγαδάν)	<i>om.</i>
15.5	δ' (ἄν)	<i>om.</i>
15.5	δ' (ἄν)	<i>om.</i>
16.13	με	<i>om.</i>
16.16	(εἶπεν) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i>
16.17	τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
16.20	(ὁ Χριστός) Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
16.21	μετὰ (τρεῖς ἡμέρας)	<i>om.</i> (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)
16.22	ἤρξατο	<i>om.</i>
16.22	καί	<i>om.</i>
16.24	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>
16.27	ἀγίων (ἀγγέλων)	<i>om.</i>
16.9	ὅτε	<i>om.</i>
17.1	ἐγένετο	<i>om.</i>
17.1	τὸν (Ἰάκωβον)	<i>om.</i>
17.1	τὸν (Ἰωάννην)	<i>om.</i>
17.14	ἐνπροσθεν (αὐτοῦ)	<i>om.</i> (αὐτόν)
17.26	(λέγει) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i> (εἰπόντος)
17.27	(εἰς) τὴν (θάλασσαν)	<i>om.</i>
17.27	εκεῖ	<i>om.</i>
17.7	καί	<i>om.</i>
18.10	τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
18.12	δέ	<i>om.</i>
18.14	τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
18.17	ὡς	<i>om.</i>
18.18	τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
18.19	τοῦ (πράγματος)	<i>om.</i>
18.20	οὐκ	<i>om.</i>
18.25	(τὴν γυναῖκα) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
18.26	(δοῦλος) ἐκεῖνος	<i>om.</i>
18.27	(δοῦλου) ἐκεῖνου	<i>om.</i>
18.28	(δοῦλος) ἐκεῖνος	<i>om.</i>
18.30	(ἕως) οὗ	<i>om.</i>
18.33	οὖν	<i>om.</i>
18.7	ἐστιν	<i>om.</i>
18.7	δέ	<i>om.</i>
19.10	(οἱ μαθηταί) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
19.11	(λόγον) τοῦτον	<i>om.</i>
19.14	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
19.17	εἶς	<i>om.</i>



APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
19.26	τῷ (θεῷ)	<i>om.</i>
19.26	ἐστιν	<i>om.</i>
19.3	οἱ (Φαρισαῖοι)	<i>om.</i>
19.3	(λέγουσιν) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i> (λέγοντες)
19.3	ἀνθρώπῳ	<i>om.</i>
19.7	ὁ (Μωϋσῆς)	<i>om.</i>
19.8	καί	<i>om.</i>
19.9	(γαμήσῃ) ἄλλην	<i>om.</i> (γαμήσας)
20.14	δέ	<i>om.</i>
20.17	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>
20.18	θανάτῳ	<i>om.</i>
20.21	(ἐκ δεξιῶν) σου	<i>om.</i>
20.21	(λέγει) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i> (εἶπεν)
20.23	τοῦτο (δοῦναι)	<i>om.</i>
20.25	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
20.30	καί	<i>om.</i>
20.32	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>
20.5	δέ	<i>om.</i>
20.6	καί	<i>om.</i>
20.7	(ἀμπελῶνα) μου	<i>om.</i>
21.29	δέ	<i>om.</i>
21.3	ποιεῖται	<i>om.</i>
21.30	ὑπάγω	<i>om.</i>
21.36	οὖν	<i>om.</i>
21.43	ὅτι	<i>om.</i>
21.7	καί	<i>om.</i>
22.10	τῶν (ἀνακειμένων)	<i>om.</i>
22.13	καί	<i>om.</i>
22.16	πρὸς (αὐτόν)	<i>om.</i> (αὐτῷ)
22.21	(λέγουσιν) αὐτῷ	<i>om.</i>
22.21	τῷ (Καίσαρι)	<i>om.</i>
22.24	ἵνα	<i>om.</i>
22.27	καὶ (ἢ γυνή)	<i>om.</i>
22.37	Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
22.37	τῇ (καρδίᾳ σου)	<i>om.</i>
22.37	τῇ (ψυχῇ)	<i>om.</i>
22.39	δέ	<i>om.</i>
22.39	(ὁμοία) ταύτῃ	(ὁμοίως) <i>om.</i>
22.7	ἐκεῖνος (ὁ βασιλεύς)	<i>om.</i>
22.7	ἀκούσας	<i>om.</i>
23.1	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>
23.15	ἵνα	<i>om.</i>
23.37	(νοσσεῖα) αὐτῆς	<i>om.</i>
23.38	ἔρημος	<i>om.</i>
23.39	ὅτι	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
23.7	(Ῥαββεί) Ῥαββεί	<i>om.</i>
24.17	δέ	<i>om.</i>
24.2	ὅτι	<i>om.</i>
24.30	τοῦ (ἐν οὐρανοῖς)	<i>om.</i> (ἐν οὐρανῶ)
24.3	τῆς (συντελείας)	<i>om.</i>
24.31a	καί	<i>om.</i>
24.32	ἐστιν	<i>om.</i>
24.37	καί	<i>om.</i>
24.38	καί	<i>om.</i>
24.48	ἐλθεῖν	<i>om.</i>
25.15	εὐθέως	<i>om.</i>
25.16	τάλαντα	<i>om.</i>
25.21	(ἐπὶ) ἐπ' (ὀλίγα)	<i>om.</i>
25.22	δέ	<i>om.</i>
25.22	λαβών	<i>om.</i>
25.23	(ἐπὶ) ἐπ' (ὀλίγα)	<i>om.</i>
25.25	καί	<i>om.</i>
25.30	ἔξω	<i>om.</i>
25.41	οἱ (κατηραμένοι)	<i>om.</i>
25.42	οὐκ	<i>om.</i>
25.6	(ἀπάντησιν) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.16	(παραδῶ) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
26.24	οὖν	<i>om.</i>
26.25	ὁ (Ἰούδας)	<i>om.</i>
26.27	τὸ (ποτήριον)	<i>om.</i>
26.28	(τῆς) καινῆς (διαθήκης)	<i>om.</i>
26.36	(τοῖς μαθηταῖς) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.36	ἄν	<i>om.</i>
26.40	(τοὺς μαθηταῖς) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.42	λέγων	<i>om.</i>
26.45	(τοὺς μαθητάς) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.45	τὸ (λοιπόν)	<i>om.</i>
26.51	καί	<i>om.</i>
26.61	ἠκούσαμεν	<i>om.</i>
26.61	(οἰκοδομῆσαι) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
26.64	ὅτι	<i>om.</i>
26.68	(ἐράπεισαν) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
26.7	(ἀνακειμένου) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.71	παιδίσκη	<i>om.</i>
26.72	λέγων	<i>om.</i>
26.9	τοῖς (πτωχοῖς)	<i>om.</i>
27.15	τήν (ἐορτήν)	<i>om.</i>
27.23	(λέγει) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i> (ἔφη)
27.23	(ὁ) ἡγεμῶν	<i>om.</i>
27.24	ἐγώ	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
27.26	(παρέδωκεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om.</i>
27.34	καί	<i>om.</i>
27.40	τοῦ (θεοῦ)	<i>om.</i>
27.40	οὐά	<i>om.</i>
27.41	δέ	<i>om.</i>
27.43	εἰ	<i>om.</i>
27.43	(ρύσασθω) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
27.49	καί	<i>om.</i>
27.51	(δύο) μέρη	<i>om.</i>
27.58	καί	<i>om.</i>
27.64	(οἱ μαθηταί) αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
27.65	δέ	<i>om.</i>
28.14	(πέισομεν) αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
28.15	τὰ (ἀργύρια)	<i>om.</i>
28.15	τοῖς (Ἰουδαίοις)	<i>om.</i>
28.9	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)	<i>om.</i>

Two Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.17	ὑπὸ κυρίου	<i>om.</i>
2.18	θρήνος καὶ (κλαυθμός)	<i>om.</i>
3.17	πρὸς αὐτόν	<i>om.</i>
4.10	ὀπίσω μου	<i>om.</i>
4.23	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
5.25	σε παραδώσει	<i>om.</i>
5.41	ἔτι ἀλλά	<i>om.</i>
10.11	εἰς αὐτήν	<i>om.</i>
10.14	μὴ δέξεται	<i>om.</i>
12.31	τοῖς ἀνθρώποις	<i>om.</i>
12.38	καὶ Φαρισαίων	<i>om.</i>
12.44	τὸν οἶκον	<i>om.</i>
13.13	μήποτε επιστρέψωσιν	<i>om.</i>
14.2	διὰ τοῦτο	<i>om.</i>
15.22	ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
15.32	εἰσὶν καὶ	<i>om.</i>
18.2	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
18.9	τὸ αὐτό	<i>om.</i>
19.20	ἐκ νεότητος	<i>om.</i>
19.6	εἰς ἓν	<i>om.</i>
19.25	καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν	<i>om.</i>
20.23	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
21.12	τοῦ θεοῦ	<i>om.</i>
22.20	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	<i>om.</i>
22.35	καὶ λέγων	<i>om.</i>

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
22.45	ἐν πνεύματι	<i>om.</i>
23.27	ὁ τάφος	<i>om.</i>
25.18	ἐν τῇ (γῆ)	<i>om.</i> (γῆν)
26.15	καὶ (εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς	<i>om. om.</i>
26.24	διὰ τοῦτο	<i>om.</i>
26.3	τοῦ λαοῦ	<i>om.</i>
26.4	καὶ ἀποκτείνωσιν	<i>om.</i>
26.42	τὸ ποτήριον	<i>om.</i>
26.55	πρὸς ὑμᾶς	<i>om.</i>
26.60	τὸ ἐξῆς	<i>om.</i>
26.66	πάντες καί	<i>om.</i>
26.70	οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι	<i>om.</i>
27.58	τὸ σῶμα	<i>om.</i>
28.6	ὁ κύριος	<i>om.</i>

Three Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
1.25	αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον	<i>om.</i>
12.10	ἦν ἐκεῖ τήν (χεῖρα)	<i>om.</i>
12.16	πάντας οὓς ἐθεράπευσεν	<i>om.</i>
14.2	ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα	<i>om.</i>
21.29	εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα	<i>om.</i>
25.1	καὶ τῆς νύμφης	<i>om.</i>
25.40	τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου	<i>om.</i>
25.41	ὁ πατήρ μου	<i>om.</i>
27.28	εἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν καί	<i>om.</i>
27.32	εἷς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ	<i>om.</i>
3.16	ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	<i>om.</i>

Four Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
9.15	ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμεραῖς	<i>om.</i>
18.10	τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ	<i>om.</i>
25.3	ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν	<i>om.</i>
25.17	τάλαντα λαβῶν καὶ αὐτός	<i>om.</i>

5-15 Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
26.60	καὶ οὐκ εὔρον τὸ ἐξῆς	<i>om.</i> (5 words)
10.12	λέγοντες εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦτῳ	<i>om.</i> (5 words)
13.14	Πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπε τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	<i>om.</i> (6 words)
20.16	πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί	<i>om.</i> (7 words)

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

16.2b	Ὁψείας γενομένης λέγεται, Εὐδεία, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός	<i>om.</i> (8 words)
5.44	εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μεισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς	<i>om.</i> (9 words)
18.11	ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός	<i>om.</i> (9 words)
24.41b	δύο ἐπὶ κλείνης μειᾶς εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται	<i>om.</i> (9 words)
10.23	ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ διώκουσιν ὑμᾶς φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην	<i>om.</i> (11 words)
17.21	τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστεία	<i>om.</i> (12 words)

More than 15 words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
	ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γείνεσθαι ἀναβλέψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς	<i>om.</i> (15 words)
24.31b	κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν διότι ἐγγερίζει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσεις ὑμῶν	
12.47	Εἶπεν δὲ τις αὐτῷ, Ἴδου ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντές λαλήσαι σοι	<i>om.</i> (17 words)
16.3	καὶ πρῶεῖ, Σήμερον χειμῶν, πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ ἀήρ. Τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γεινώσκειται διακρίνειν τὰ δὲ σημῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθαι;	<i>om.</i> (23 words)
20.28	ὕμεις δὲ ζητεῖτε· ἐκ μεικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνήσαι μὴ ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι; ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυθηθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσης εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· συνάγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον	<i>om.</i> (61 words)

VI. 2. Absence in Mt D.05 *contra* Presence in Mt B.03 (1–2 Words)

One Word

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.3	<i>om.</i>	πᾶσα (Ἱεροσόλυμα)
3.4	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰωάνης)
3.6	<i>om.</i>	(ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ) ποταμῷ
4.15	<i>om.</i> (Νεφθαλείμ)	γῆ (Νεφθαλείν)
4.16	<i>om.</i>	καί
4.16	<i>om.</i>	καί
4.17	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
4.23	<i>om.</i>	ἐν (ὄλῃ)
5.11	<i>om.</i>	ψευδόμενοι
5.13	<i>om.</i>	ἔτι
5.19	<i>om.</i>	ἐάν
5.19	<i>om.</i>	τῶν (ἐλαχίστων)
5.19	<i>om.</i>	οὕτως
5.3	<i>om.</i>	τῷ (πνεύματι)
5.32	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
5.38	<i>om.</i>	καί

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.9	<i>om.</i>	αὐτοὶ (υἱοί)
6.1	<i>om.</i>	(ἐν) τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)
6.10	<i>om.</i>	ὡς
6.14	<i>om.</i>	γάρ
6.18	<i>om.</i> (κρυφία)	(ἐν) τῷ (κρυφαίῳ)
6.6	<i>om.</i>	τῷ (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ)
9.10	<i>om.</i>	καί
9.17	<i>om.</i>	ἐκχεῖται
9.18	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
9.22	<i>om.</i>	(ὁ δέ) Ἰησοῦς
9.30	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
9.33	<i>om.</i>	(ἐν) τῷ (Ἰσραήλ)
10.13	<i>om.</i>	καί
10.17	<i>om.</i>	δέ
10.2	<i>om.</i>	καί
10.20	<i>om.</i>	(πατρός) ὑμῶν
10.23	<i>om.</i>	γάρ
10.32	<i>om.</i> (αὐτόν)	ἐν (αὐτῷ)
10.33	<i>om.</i>	(ἐν) τοῖς (οὐρανοῖς)
10.42	<i>om.</i>	μόνον
10.6	<i>om.</i>	δέ
11.12	<i>om.</i>	δέ
11.20	<i>om.</i>	(δυνάμεις) αὐτοῦ
11.7	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
11.8	<i>om.</i>	ἐν (μαλακοῖς)
12.1	<i>om.</i> (σάββασιν)	τοῖς (σάββάτοις)
12.11	<i>om.</i>	ἐάν
12.11	<i>om.</i>	(ἐμπέση) τοῦτο
12.15	<i>om.</i>	(αὐτοὺς) πάντας
12.31	<i>om.</i>	(ἀφεθήσεται) ὑμῖν
12.32	<i>om.</i>	οὐκ
12.32	(οὐκ) <i>om.</i>	(οὐ) μή
12.35	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος)
12.40	<i>om.</i>	ἦν
12.49	<i>om.</i>	(χεῖρα) αὐτοῦ
12.50	<i>om.</i>	ἄν
13.14	<i>om.</i>	ἡ (λέγουσα)
13.16	<i>om.</i>	οἱ (ὀφθαλμοί)
13.16	<i>om.</i>	τὰ (ὄτα)
13.21	<i>om.</i>	ἐν (ἐαυτῷ)
13.23	<i>om.</i>	ὅς
13.26	<i>om.</i>	καί
13.28	<i>om.</i>	οὖν
13.28	<i>om.</i>	δέ
13.3	<i>om.</i> (σπείρειν)	τοῦ (σπείρειν)

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
13.30	<i>om.</i>	(κατακαῦσαι) αὐτᾶς
13.32	<i>om.</i>	τῶν (σπερμάτων)
13.44	<i>om.</i>	(ἐν) τῷ (ἀγρῷ)
13.46	<i>om.</i>	ἕνα
13.46	(ἐπώλησεν) <i>om.</i>	(πέπρακεν) πάντα
13.5	<i>om.</i>	τῆς (γῆς)
14.16	<i>om.</i>	(ὁ δὲ) Ἰησοῦς
14.18	<i>om.</i>	ᾧδε
14.22	<i>om.</i>	(προάγειν) αὐτόν
14.22	<i>om.</i>	(τοὺς μαθητὰς) αὐτοῦ
14.28	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Πέτρος)
14.29	<i>om.</i>	καί
14.3	<i>om.</i>	καί
14.3	<i>om.</i>	ἀπέθετο
14.3	<i>om.</i>	Φιλίππου
14.3	<i>om.</i>	τότε
14.31	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
14.4	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰωάννης)
14.6	<i>om.</i> (Ἡρωδιάς)	τῆς (Ἡρωδιάδος)
15.26	<i>om.</i>	καλόν
15.28	<i>om.</i>	ᾧ (γύναι)
15.3	<i>om.</i>	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς
15.30	<i>om.</i>	κωφούς
15.38	<i>om.</i>	ὡς
16.11	<i>om.</i>	(εἶπον) ὑμῖν
16.11	<i>om.</i>	δέ
16.13	<i>om.</i>	(τοὺς μαθητὰς) αὐτοῦ
16.13	<i>om.</i>	τόν (υἰόν)
16.17	<i>om.</i>	(εἶπεν) αὐτῷ
16.2a	<i>om.</i>	(εἶπεν) αὐτοῖς
16.21	<i>om.</i>	(Ἰησοῦς) Χριστός
16.23	<i>om.</i> (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου)	τά (τῶν ἀνθρώπων)
16.28	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
16.7	<i>om.</i>	οἱ (δὲ διελογίζοντο)
17.11	<i>om.</i>	καί
17.12	<i>om.</i>	ἐν (αὐτῷ)
17.15	<i>om.</i>	(τὸν υἰόν) μου
17.2	<i>om.</i>	καί
17.24	<i>om.</i> (δεῖδραγμα)	τά (δίδραγμα)
17.26	<i>om.</i>	δέ
17.9	(καταβαίνοντες) <i>om.</i>	(καταβαίνόντων) αὐτῶν
18.1	<i>om.</i>	δέ
18.12	<i>om.</i>	(ἐννέα) πρόβατα
18.16	<i>om.</i>	(δύο) μαρτύρων
18.19	<i>om.</i>	ἀμήν

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
18.21	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Πέτρος)
18.26	<i>om.</i>	(ἀποδώσω) σοι
18.32	<i>om.</i>	(λέγει) αὐτῷ
18.34	<i>om.</i>	πᾶν (τὸ ὀφειλόμενον)
18.7	<i>om.</i>	(ἄνθρώπῳ) ἐκείνῳ
19.17	<i>om.</i>	(περὶ) τοῦ (ἀγαθοῦ)
19.17	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (ἀγαθός)
19.18	<i>om.</i>	τό (οὐ φονεύσεις)
19.22	<i>om.</i>	δέ
19.22	<i>om.</i>	(λόγον) τοῦτον
19.28	<i>om.</i>	τάς (δώδεκα φυλάς)
19.7	<i>om.</i>	(ἀπολύσαι) αὐτήν
20.14	<i>om.</i>	ἐγώ
20.17	<i>om.</i>	μέλλων
20.22	<i>om.</i>	(λέγουσιν) αὐτῷ
20.30	<i>om.</i>	κύριε
21.11	<i>om.</i>	(Ἰησοῦς) ὁ (ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ)
21.16	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
21.19	<i>om.</i>	οὐ
21.22	<i>om.</i>	ἄν
21.24	<i>om.</i>	ὄν
21.25	<i>om.</i>	(τὸ βάπτισμα) τὸ (Ἰωάννου)
21.28	(ἀμπελῶνα) <i>om.</i>	(ἀμπελῶνι) μου
21.32	<i>om.</i>	οὐδέ
21.37	<i>om.</i> (αὐτοῖς)	πρὸς (αὐτούς)
21.4	<i>om.</i>	ἄλλο
21.5	<i>om.</i>	καί
21.5	<i>om.</i>	ἐπὶ (πᾶλλον)
21.6	<i>om.</i>	καί
22.20	<i>om.</i>	καί
22.21	<i>om.</i>	οὖν
22.25	<i>om.</i>	δέ
22.30	<i>om.</i>	τῷ (οὐρανῷ)
22.32	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (θεός)
22.38	<i>om.</i>	ἢ ... (ἐντολή)
23.11	<i>om.</i>	δέ
23.16	<i>om.</i>	οἱ (λέγοντες)
23.23	<i>om.</i>	δέ
23.27	<i>om.</i>	οἵτινες
23.27	<i>om.</i>	μέν
23.3	<i>om.</i>	(εἶπωσιν) ὑμῖν
23.34	<i>om.</i>	ἐγώ
23.35	<i>om.</i>	τοῦ (αἵματος)
23.35	<i>om.</i>	τοῦ (αἵματος)
24.17	<i>om.</i>	(οἰκίας) αὐτοῦ



APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
24.2	<i>om.</i>	οὐ
24.21	(ἕως) <i>om.</i>	(ἕως) τοῦ (νῦν)
24.21	<i>om.</i> (γέννοιτο)	οὐ (μὴ) (γέννηται)
24.31a	<i>om.</i>	τῶν (ἄκρων)
24.38	<i>om.</i>	ταῖς (πρὸ τοῦ κατακλισμοῦ)
24.43	<i>om.</i>	ἄν
24.45	<i>om.</i>	τοῦ (δοῦναι)
24.9	<i>om.</i>	τῶν (ἔθνῶν)
25.14	<i>om.</i>	γάρ
25.18	<i>om.</i>	ἀπελθῶν
25.24	<i>om.</i>	(δέ) καί
25.24	<i>om.</i>	(ἔγνω) σε
25.29	<i>om.</i>	(τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι) παντί
25.33	<i>om.</i>	μέν
25.42	<i>om.</i>	καί
25.7	<i>om.</i>	(παρθένοι) ἐκεῖναι
26.1	<i>om.</i>	(τοῖς μαθηταῖς) αὐτοῦ
26.10	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
26.2	<i>om.</i>	οἴδατε
26.27	<i>om.</i>	(πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ) πάντες
26.34	<i>om.</i>	ἐν (ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί)
26.35	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Πέτρος)
26.36	<i>om.</i>	(ἕως) οὗ
26.44	<i>om.</i>	πάλιν
26.45	<i>om.</i>	γάρ
26.56	<i>om.</i>	(οἱ μαθηταί) αὐτοῦ
26.63	<i>om.</i>	καί
26.72	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
26.75	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
27.17,21	<i>om.</i>	τόν (Βαραββᾶν)
27.23	<i>om.</i>	δέ
27.31	<i>om.</i>	καί
27.42	<i>om.</i> (αὐτῷ)	ἐπ' (αὐτόν)
27.46	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
27.47	<i>om.</i>	ὅτι
27.59	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰωσήφ)
27.61	(Μαρία) <i>om.</i>	(Μαριάμ) ἢ (Μαγδαληνή)
27.64	<i>om.</i>	τῆς (τρίτης ἡμέρας)
28.1	<i>om.</i>	(Μαριά) ἢ (Μαγδαληνή)
28.10	<i>om.</i>	(εἰς) τὴν (Γαλιλαίαν)
28.12	<i>om.</i>	τε
28.16	<i>om.</i>	ὁ (Ἰησοῦς)
28.19	<i>om.</i>	τοῦ (υἱοῦ)
28.7	<i>om.</i>	(καί) ἰδοὺ

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Two Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.4	<i>om.</i>	παρ' αὐτῶν
2.9	<i>om.</i>	οὗ ἦν
5.42	<i>om.</i>	ἀπό σοῦ
6.8	<i>om.</i>	ὁ θεός
10.11	<i>om.</i>	ἡ κάμην
12.20	<i>om.</i>	κάλαμον συντετριμμένον
13.1	<i>om.</i>	τῆς οἰκίας
13.29	<i>om.</i>	ὁ δέ
13.30	(δῆσατε) <i>om.</i>	αὐτὰ εἰς (δέσμας)
13.33	<i>om.</i>	ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς
13.52	<i>om.</i>	ὁ δέ
14.27	<i>om.</i>	ὁ Ἰησοῦς
15.28	<i>om.</i>	ὁ Ἰησοῦς
16.12	<i>om.</i>	τῶν ἄρτων
16.14	<i>om.</i>	οἱ μὲν
16.4	<i>om.</i>	καὶ μοιχαλεῖς
18.9	<i>om.</i>	τοῦ πυρός
19.29	<i>om.</i>	(ἡ ἀδελφάς) ἡ πατέρα
19.9	<i>om.</i> (γαμήση)	ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (γαμήσας)
20.21	<i>om.</i>	ἡ δέ
22.37	<i>om.</i>	ὁ δέ
23.19	<i>om.</i>	μωροὶ καὶ
23.34	<i>om.</i>	πρὸς ὑμᾶς
26.44	<i>om.</i>	ἐκ τρίτου
26.73	<i>om.</i>	καὶ σύ
27.14	<i>om.</i>	πρὸς οὐδέ

Three Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
4.4	<i>om.</i>	ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος (θεοῦ)
6.15	<i>om.</i>	τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν
10.13	εἰρήνη	ἡ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη
10.14	ἔξω	ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ
10.18	<i>om.</i>	δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς
11.5	<i>om.</i>	καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν
14.8	κεφαλὴν	ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν
19.9	<i>om.</i>	ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι
22.17	<i>om.</i>	εἰπὲ οὖν ἡμῖν
22.24	<i>om.</i>	τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ
23.26	<i>om.</i>	καὶ τῆς παροψίδος
28.7	<i>om.</i>	ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Four Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
2.13	<i>om.</i>	εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν

More than Five Words

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.32	<i>om.</i> (5)	καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται
23.34	<i>om.</i> (8)	καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστειγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν
10.19b	<i>om.</i> (9)	δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσητε
10.41b	<i>om.</i> (10)	καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται
18.18	<i>om.</i> (11)	ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

Larger Portions (more than 15)

Ref.	D.05	B.03
27.49b	<i>om.</i> (13)	ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλεῦραν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα
21.44	<i>om.</i> (15)	Καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέση λικμήσει αὐτόν
5.19b-20	<i>om.</i> (37)	ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν

VI. 3. Word Order Differences between Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus in Matthew<sup>2</sup>

Ref.	D.05	B.03
1.20*	ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐστίν	ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστίν ἁγίου
2.13a*	Αὐτῶν δὲ ἀναχωρησάντων	ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν
2.13b	φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ	κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη τῷ Ἰωσήφ
2.13c*	ἕως ἂν σοι εἴπω	ἕως ἂν εἴπω σοι
2.22	Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ	τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρώδου
4.2	καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας	καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα
4.4*	ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
4.9*	πάντα σοι δώσω	σοι πάντα δώσω
4.16*	εἶδον φῶς μέγαν	φῶς εἶδεν μέγα
4.24a*	αὐτοῦ ἢ ἀκοή	ἢ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ
4.24b*	καὶ πάντας ἐθεράπευσεν	καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς
5.11a	διώξουσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσουσιν	ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν
5.11b	εἴπωσιν καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν	εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρόν καθ' ὑμῶν
5.18*	ἕως ἂν γένηται πάντα	ἕως πάντα γένηται.

<sup>2</sup> The asterisk indicates a reference which is not listed as a word order difference in the critical apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> (68 instances out of 158 constituent order differences).

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.29*	ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ὁ δεξιὸς σου σκανδαλίζει σε	ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε
5.36	τρίχα μείαν	μίαν τρίχα
5.36	οὐ δύνασαι ποιεῖν τρίχα μείαν λευκὴν	οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι
6.4	ὅπως ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη σου ἦ	ὅπως ἦ σου ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη
6.4	ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη σου	σου ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη
6.14*	ἀφήσει ὑμεῖν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν
6.18	ἵνα μὴ φανῆς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύων	ὅπως μὴ φανῆς νηστεύων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
9.6*	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει	ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
9.9	καὶ παράγων ἐκείθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν	καὶ παράγων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκείθεν εἶδεν
9.11	ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἐσθίει	μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν
9.17	καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι	καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπόλλυνται
9.21	ἐὰν ἄψωμαι μόνον	Ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι
9.28	δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι	τοῦτο δύναμαι ποιῆσαι
9.30*	οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ
9.33*	οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐφάνη	οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως
10.11	ἢ πόλις εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς αὐτήν	εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθῃτε
10.30	καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς
11.9	εἶδεῖν; προφήτην;	προφήτην ἰδεῖν;
11.26*	ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔνπροσθέν σου	εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου
12.1*	ἤρξαντο τοὺς στάχους τίλλειν καὶ αἰσθίειν	ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχους καὶ ἐσθίειν
12.4*	ὁ οὐκ ἦν ἐξὸν αὐτῷ	ὁ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ
12.13*	τὴν χεῖρα σου	σου τὴν χεῖρα
12.46a	λαλοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ	ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
12.46b	ζητοῦντες λαλήσαι αὐτῷ	ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι
13.13	λαλεῖ αὐτοῖς	αὐτοῖς λαλῶ
13.23a*	ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν	ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν
13.23b*	οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀκούων τὸν λόγον	οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων
13.24*	τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀγρῷ	τῷ ἀγρῷ ἑαυτοῦ
13.28	λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ δοῦλοι	οἱ δὲ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν
13.29*	ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα καὶ τὸν σείτον σὺν αὐτοῖς	ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον
13.30*	ἄφετε ἀμφότερα συναυξάνεσθαι	ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα
13.39*	ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτά ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος	ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρας αὐτά ὁ διάβολος
13.48	ὅτε δὲ ἐπληρώθη ἀναβίβασαν αὐτήν	ἦν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη ἀναβίβασαντες
13.56*	πάντα ταῦτα	ταῦτα πάντα
14.4	ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης	ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης αὐτῷ
14.8*	εἶπεν, Δός μοι	Δός μοι, φησὶν
14.14*	ὄχλον πολὺν	πολὺν ὄχλον
14.16	δότε ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν αὐτοῖς	δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν
14.21	παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν	γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων
14.25*	ἀπῆλθεν περιπατῶν πρὸς αὐτούς	ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτούς περιπατῶν
14.28	αὐτῷ Πέτρος εἶπεν,	ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ
14.33*	Ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ εἶ σύ	Ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ
15.14	ἀμφότεροι ἐνπεσοῦνται εἰς βόθρον	ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
15.15*	εἶπεν αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ εἶπεν
15.30	τυφλοὺς, κυλλοὺς	κυλλοὺς, τυφλοὺς
15.31*	ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι βλέποντας	ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους βλέποντας θαυμάσαι
15.38	παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν	γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων
16.1*	αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτησαν	ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν
16.4	Γενεὰ πονηρὰ ζῆτει σημίον	Γενεὰ πονηρὰ σημεῖον αἰτεῖ
16.5a*	εἰς τὸ πέραν· ἐπελάθοντο οἱ μαθηταὶ	οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο
16.5b	ἄρτους λαβεῖν	λαβεῖν ἄρτους
16.12	Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων	Σαδδουκαίων καὶ Φαρισαίων
16.13	τίνα με οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι	Τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι
16.18*	τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μου	μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
16.19	σοι δώσω τὰς κλεῖς	δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας
16.22	ἤρξατο αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμιμᾶν καὶ λέγειν	λέγει αὐτῷ ἐπιτεμιμων
17.3	μετ' αὐτοῦ συναλοῦντες	συναλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ
17.4	τρεις σκηνάς	σκηνάς τρεῖς
17.4	καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μείαν καὶ Ἡλεία μείαν	καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ μίαν Ἡλεία
17.8*	εἶδον εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸν Ἰησοῦν	εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον
17.16*	οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν θεραπεῦσαι αὐτόν	οὐκ ἠδυνήσθησαν αὐτόν θεραπεῦσαι
17.22*	Αὐτῶν δὲ ἀναστρεφομένων	ἀναστρεφομένων δὲ αὐτῶν
17.24*	καὶ εἶπαν τῷ Πέτρῳ	τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ εἶπαν
18.8	χωλὸν ἢ χωλόν	κυλλὸν ἢ χωλόν
18.9	εἰ καὶ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδαλίζει σε	καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου σκανδαλίζει σε
18.10*	τούτων τῶν μεικρῶν	τῶν μεικρῶν τούτων
18.16	παράλαβε μετὰ σοῦ ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο	παράλαβε ἔτι ἓνα ἢ δύο μετὰ σοῦ
18.19	δύο ἢ δύο συνφωνήσουσιν	ἓν ἢ δύο συνφωνήσουσιν
18.20	οὐκ εἰσιν γὰρ δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι	οὐ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι
18.21	ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου	ἀμαρτήσῃ ὁ ἀδελφός μου εἰς ἐμέ
18.24	(προσήχθη) αὐτῷ εἰς ὀφειλέτης	(προσήχθη) εἰς αὐτῷ ὀφειλέτης
18.28*	δηνάρια ῥ (ἑκατόν)	ἑκατόν δηνάρια
18.31*	οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ οἱ σύνδουλοι
18.35*	ὕμειν ποιήσει ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος	ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ποιήσει ὑμῖν
19.6	μεία σάρξ	σάρξ μία
19.8*	πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν	Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν
	ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν Μωϋσῆς	ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν
19.13*	ἐπιθῆ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς	τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῆ αὐτοῖς
19.16	λέγει αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ εἶπεν
19.29	τοῦ ὀνόματός μου	τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματός
20.3*	ὥραν τρίτην	τρίτην ὥραν
20.5	ὥραν ἕκτην καὶ ἐνάτην	ἕκτην καὶ ἐνάτην ὥραν
20.10	ἔλαβον δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνά δηνάριον	καὶ ἔλαβον ἀνά δηνάριον καὶ αὐτοὶ
20.12	ἴσους αὐτοὺς ἡμεῖν ἐποίησας	ἴσους ἡμῖν αὐτοὺς ἐποίησας
20.13	Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐνὶ αὐτῶν εἶπεν	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῶν ἐνὶ εἶπεν
20.14*	τῷ αἰσχάτῳ τούτῳ	τούτῳ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ
20.17	ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπεν
20.22*	δύνασθε τὸ ποτήριον πιεῖν	δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
20.26	ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμεῖν μέγας γενέσθαι	ὅς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας ἐν ὑμεῖν γενέσθαι
20.27	ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμεῖν εἶναι	ὅς ἂν θέλῃ εἶναι ἐν ὑμεῖν
20.34	τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν τῶν ὀμμάτων
21.21*	καὶ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ ἐὰν εἶπητε	κἂν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἶπητε
21.24	ἓνα λόγον	λόγον ἓνα
21.26	ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην	ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην
21.28	τέκνα δύο	δύο τέκνα
21.31*	τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐποίησεν	τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησεν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς
21.32	ἦλθεν γὰρ πρὸς ὑμᾶς Ἰωάννης	ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς
21.39	ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλαν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος	ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν
22.7	ἐκεῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας ὠργίσθη	ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὠργίσθη
22.13	εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς διακόνους	ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τοῖς διακόνους
22.28	τίνος ἔστε τῶν ἑπτὰ γυνή;	τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή;
22.36*	ποία ἐντολὴ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ μεγάλη	ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ
23.1	ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς	Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν
23.2	τῆς καθέδρας Μωϋσέως	τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας
23.9	ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν ὁ πατήρ
23.10	καθηγητῆς ὑμῶν εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός	καθηγητῆς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν εἷς ὁ Χριστός
23.36	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα
24.2*	πάντα ταῦτα	ταῦτα πάντα
24.3*	τῆς παρουσίας σου	τῆς σῆς παρουσίας
24.14*	κηρυχθήσεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο	κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
24.30a	καὶ κόψονται τότε πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί	καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί
24.30b*	πολλῆς καὶ δόξης	καὶ δόξης πολλῆς
24.33	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα
24.34	ταῦτα πάντα	πάντα ταῦτα
24.40	δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ	ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ
24.51*	μέρος αὐτοῦ θήσει μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν	μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει
25.15*	τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ	τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν
25.23	ἦς πιστός	πιστός ἦς
25.27	ἔδει οὖν σε βαλεῖν	ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν
25.38*	εἶδομεν σε ξένον	σε εἶδομεν ξένον
25.40*	ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς	ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς
26.22	ἤρξαντο λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν	ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος
26.23	ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος τὴν χεῖρα μετ' ἐμοῦ	ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα
26.26a	Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐσθιόντων	ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν
26.26b*	ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λαβὼν ἄρτον	ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον
26.36	ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετ' αὐτῶν	ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
26.50a*	εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
26.50b	ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, Ἐτεροι	Ἐταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει
26.53	ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείω	ὅτι οὐ δύνομαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι ἄρτι πλείω
26.55a*	ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς ὄχλοις	εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις
26.55b	καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκαθήμην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ	καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν
27.13*	τόσα καταμαρτυροῦσιν σου	ὅσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσι

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Ref.	D.05	B.03
27.15*	ἀπολύειν ἕνα δέσμιον τῷ ὄχλῳ	ἀπολύειν ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον
27.17*	ὕμειν ἀπολύσω	ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν
27.23	λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ ἡγεμῶν	ὁ δὲ ἔφη
27.40	εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ	εἰ υἱὸς θεοῦ εἶ
27.45*	ἐνάτης ὥρας	ὥρας ἐνάτης
27.51	εἰς δύο μέρη ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω	ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω εἰς δύο
27.59*	παραλαβὼν Ἰωσήφ τὸ σῶμα	λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ
27.64*	ἡμέρας τρίτης	τρίτης ἡμέρας
28.9*	τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας
28.20	εἶμι μεθ' ὑμῶν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας	μεθ' ὑμῶν εἶμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας

- Verse order changes

Ref.	D.05	B.03
5.5/5.4	Μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν	μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται.
5.4/5.5	Μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται.	μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν.
Ref.	D.05	B.03
17.12	λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἡλείας ἤδη ἦλθεν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν· ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν	λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἡλείας ἤδη ἦλθεν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν·
17.13	τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς	οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν
	οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν	τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

- Modification of the order of the internal structure of a passage

Ref.	D.05	B.03
21.29-31	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν οὐ θέλω ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα προσελθὼν δὲ τῷ ἐτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἐγὼ κύριε ὑπάγω καὶ οὐκ ἀπήλθεν·	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Ἐγώ, κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπήλθεν.  προσελθὼν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Οὐ θέλω, ὕστερον μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήλθεν. τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησεν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός;
	τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐποίησεν λέγουσιν ὁ αἴσχατος	λέγουσιν, Ὁ ὕστερος.

APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

<p><b>Ref. D.05</b>  <i>Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς  ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ  πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς  εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ</i></p>	<p><b>B.03</b>  <i>λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι  καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς  εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.</i></p>
---	--

VII. Summary Table of All Variant Readings between Mt D.05 and Mt B.03

Class	Subclass	Number of Forms	Number of Instances
Specific Orthographic Differences	Weak aorist endings	7	11
	Strong aorist endings	8	8
	Other Alternatives	7	7
Itacisms	‘ι’ in D/itacistic form ‘ει’ in B	60	98
	‘ι’ in B/itacistic form ‘ει’ in D	160	304
	Apparent Difference in Persons	2	3
	Itacism with Grammatical Difference	5	5
Other Orthographic Differences	Assimilation of Consonants	51	73
	Elision and Non-Elision	7	7
	Crisis and Non-Crisis	8	13
	Confusion κ/ξ	2	2
Proper Nouns	All	38	57
Nonsense Readings	General	69	69
	Erroneous Form in Mt B.03 /Correct Form in Mt D.05	4	4
	Nonsense Reading Due to Attraction	4	4
	Grammatical Nonsense Reading	4	4
<b>TOTAL Orthography Mt D.05/B.03</b>		<b>436</b>	<b>669</b>
Lexical Differences			
Nouns	Similar Meaning	30	35
	Alternative Parts of Speech	5	5
	Different Entities	8	8
	Alternative Parts of Speech	2	2
Adjectives	Similar Meaning	13	13
	Different Meaning	5	5



APPENDIX 2 PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BEZAN MATTHEW

Class	Subclass	Number of Forms	Number of Instances
Verbs	Change in Part of Speech	3	3
	Similar Meaning	32	34
	Compound Verb /Simple Verb	32	36
	Different Prefixes	6	6
	Different Meaning	13	13
Pronouns	All	20	25
Particles	All	24	44
Prepositions	Alternative Prepositions Only	21	28
Conjunctions	All	11	23
Adverbs	All	14	14
Verbal Grammatical Differences	Singular/Plural	21	21
	Tense	63	64
	Mood	51	51
	Voice	13	13
Nominal Grammatical Differences	Singular/Plural	23	23
	Declensions	7	7
	Different Usage of Prepositions	35	35
Differences in Wording	All	33	33
<b>TOTAL Alternative Wording Mt D.05/B.03</b>		<b>485</b>	<b>541</b>
Presence in Mt D.05	All	327	327
Absence in Mt D.05	All	243	243
Word Order Differences Mt D.05/B.03	All	155	155
<b>Total Variant Readings Mt D.05/B.03</b>		<b>1,646</b>	<b>1,935</b>
<i>(excl. Orthography)</i>		<i>1,210</i>	<i>1,266</i>

## APPENDIX 3 SYNOPSIS OF ALL ALLEGED HARMONISATIONS WITHIN MATTHEW IN CODEX SINAITICUS

The below list identifies all the 24 *vll* indicated in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic. The variant readings between Codex Sinaiticus and the other manuscripts will be ordered according to the nature of the harmonisation, whether it corresponds to the absence or presence of word(s), alternative wording or word order difference. The list will then indicate the reference of the verse in Matthew along with the one of the parallel passage involved in the alleged harmonisation, the Greek text of the Matthean verse and the list of manuscripts supporting Codex Sinaiticus. The diacritical marks will indicate the location of all variant readings as mentioned in the NA<sup>28</sup>, which can be consulted for further details.

All *vll* identified as harmonising in NA<sup>28</sup> will be indicated below, even if the parallel is to be found in the Septuagint or John in order to present all the instances of harmonisations, despite the fact that the thesis concentrates on Synoptic parallel passages only.

### I. Absence in Mt 8.01 *contra txt* (1)

#### 1. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.39-40

Mt 20.23 <sup>τ</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς <sup>τ</sup>· τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε <sup>τ</sup><sup>1</sup>, τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου <sup>τ</sup> καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων <sup>τ</sup><sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν <sup>ο</sup>[τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

<sup>ο</sup>*p*) 8 B K L N Z Γ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 579 700 892 1241 1424 38 lat sy<sup>p</sup> co | *txt* C D W Δ 085 33 (565) 1844 q sy<sup>s.c.h</sup>

### II. Presence in Mt 8.01 *contra txt* (5)

#### 2. Mt 8.9 – par. Lk 7.8

Mt 8.9 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, <sup>τ</sup> ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποιήσον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.

<sup>τ</sup> *p*) τασσόμενος 8 B it vg<sup>cl</sup> (sa bo)

#### 3. Mt 8.13 – par. Lk 7.10

Mt 8.13 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ <sup>τ</sup> ἑκατοντάρχη· ὕπαγε, <sup>τ</sup> ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς <sup>ο</sup>[αὐτοῦ] <sup>τ</sup> ἐν τῇ ᾠρᾷ ἐκεῖνη<sup>τ</sup>.

<sup>τ</sup> *p*) καὶ ὑποστρέψας ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ᾠρᾷ εὗρεν τὸν παῖδα (+ αὐτοῦ sy<sup>h</sup>) ὑγιαίνοντα 8<sup>\*.2b</sup> C Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> (αὐτόν *loco* τὸν παῖδα N 33 1241) g<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>h</sup>

4. Mt 11.21 – par. Lk 10.13

Mt 11.21 οὐαί σοι, Χοραζίν, ῥοὐαί σοι, Βηθσαϊδὰ· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρω καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῶ ὧ μετενόησαν.

ῥ (p) καθήμενοι & C 33 | –μεναι Δ f<sup>1</sup> 892 1424 sy<sup>h</sup>

ῥ καὶ D it | ῥ Βηθσαϊδάν & 45 & W Γ f<sup>1.13</sup> 700 | ῥ ἐγένοντο A C K N W Γ Δ Ψ 0115 f<sup>1</sup> 565 & | txt & 45.75 & B D L Θ Ξ f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542; Did

5. Mt 27.5 – par. Mt 27.3

Mt 27.5 καὶ ῥίψας τὰ ῥ ἀργύρια ῥ εἰς τὸν ναὸν ῥ ἀνεχώρησεν, καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγατο.

ῥ (3) τριάκοντα &

6. Mt 27.49 – par. Jn 19.34

Mt 27.49 οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ῥ ἔλεγον· ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται ῥ Ηλίας σώσων αὐτόν. ῥ

ῥ (Jn 19.34) ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην (λόγχην Γ) ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα (ῥ αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ Γ) & B C L Γ vg<sup>mss</sup> mae | txt A D K W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 & lat sy sa bo

III. Alternative Wording in Mt &.01 *contra txt* (15)

7. Mt 8.29 – par. Mk 1.24 // Lk 4.34; 8.28

Mt 8.29 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ῥ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε ῥ πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

ῥ (Lk 4.34) ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσαι πρὸ καιροῦ &\* vg<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι W

8. Mt 9.17 – par. Mk 2.22 // Lk 5.38

Mt 9.17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὄγε, ῥ ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ ῥ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ῥ ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ῥ ἄλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

ῥ ἄλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς βάλλουσιν καινοὺς C 1424 /844<sup>c</sup> (–νέον /844\*) /2211 | ἄλλὰ οἶνον νέον βάλλουσιν εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς 892 | p) ἄλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον &

9. Mt 9.27 – par. Mk 10.47-48 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 9.27 Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῶ ῥ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν ὁ[αὐτῶ] δύο τυφλοὶ κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες· ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ῥ υἱὸς Δαυὶδ

ῥ (p) υἱέ & C D K L Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892\* 1424 pm | κύριε υἱέ N f<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> | txt B W 565 (700) /844 /2211 pm

10. Mt 12.4 – par. Mk 2.26 // Lk 6.4

Mt 12.4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον, Ἐδ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;

Ὶp) οὐς & C K L N Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> (οἶς 33) 565 579 700 892 1424 & lat sy<sup>h</sup> sa bo |  
txt &<sup>70</sup> B D W f<sup>13</sup> aur ff<sup>2\*</sup> k q

11. Mt 13.57 – par. Mk 6.4 // Lk 4.23-24 // Jn 4.44

Mt 13.57 καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ Ὶπατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Ὶ(Jn 4.44) ἰδία πατρίδι & Z f<sup>13</sup> 892; Or<sup>pt</sup> | p) πατρίδι αὐτοῦ K L N W Γ Δ  
0106 f<sup>1</sup> 565 579 1241 & (co); Or<sup>pt</sup> | ἰδία πατρίδι αὐτοῦ C | txt B D Θ 0281 33  
700 1424 a k

12. Mt 17.9 – par. Mk 9.9-10

Mt 17.9 Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· μηδενὶ εἶπητε τὸ ὄραμα ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν Ὶἐγερθῆ.

Ὶp) ἀναστῆ & C K L (W) Z Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 l2211  
& | txt B D

13. Mt 19.16 – par. Mk 10.17 // Lk 18.18

Mt 19.16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἷς προσελθὼν Ὶαὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε, Ὶ τί ἀγαθὸν Ὶποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;

Ὶποιήσω ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν (Ὶζωὴν ἔχω W) αἰώνιον K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 1241  
1424 & | p) ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω & L 33 (579) 892 l2211  
(sy<sup>s.c.hmg</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo) | txt B C D Θ sy<sup>h</sup>

14. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον Ὶἔκραξαν λέγοντες· Ὶἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, Ὶυἱὸς Δαυὶδ

Ὶ(30) Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς & B D L Z Θ 085 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo |  
ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | txt C K N W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 & f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c.h</sup>  
sa<sup>ms</sup> mae

15. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30 // Mk 10.47 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον Ὶἔκραξαν λέγοντες· Ὶἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, Ὶυἱὸς Δαυὶδ

Ὶp) υἱέ &<sup>(\*)</sup>.1 C D L N 085 0281 33 579 892 1241 1424 | txt B K W Z Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup>  
565 700 &

16. Mt 21.1 – par. Mk 11.1 // Lk 19.29

Mt 21.1 NA<sup>27</sup> Καὶ ὅτε Ὶἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ Ὶἦλθον εἰς Βηθφαγὴ Ὶεἰς τὸ Ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, τότε ῚἸησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

<sup>1</sup>p) πρὸς ⋈ D K L N W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 l844 l2211  
 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | txt B C 33 it

17. Mt 24.10 – par. Mt 24.9

Mt 24.10 καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν ἑκαὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(9) εἰς θλίψιν ⋈

18. Mt 24.24 – par. Mk 13.22 // Lk 21.10-11

Mt 24.24 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα ἄμεγάλα καὶ τέρατα ὥστε ἑπλανῆσαι, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

<sup>1</sup>καὶ τέρατα μεγάλα 1241 1424 bo<sup>ms</sup> | p) καὶ τέρατα ⋈ W\* ff<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup> | μεγάλα sy<sup>p</sup>

19. Mt 24.29 – par. Mk 13.24-25

Mt 24.29 Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἄπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται.

<sup>1</sup>p) ἐκ ⋈ D 0281

20. Mt 26.7 – par. Mk 14.3 // Jn 12.3

Mt 26.7 προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ γυνὴ ἑξήχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου<sup>2</sup> βαρυτίμου καὶ κατέχευεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς<sup>3</sup> αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου.

<sup>1</sup>p) πολυτίμου ⋈ A D L Θ 33 565 892 1424 sy<sup>p,hmg</sup> | txt B K W Γ Δ 0293 f<sup>1.13</sup>  
 579 700 1241 l844 ℣ sy<sup>s,h</sup>

21. Mt 27.42 – par. Mk 15.32

Mt 27.42 ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἔστιν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ ἑπιστεύσομεν ἑπ' αὐτόν<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>p) πιστεύσωμεν ⋈ L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 1424 l844 pm | πιστεύομεν A  
 1241 it vg<sup>cl,ww</sup> | txt B D K f<sup>1</sup> 700 892 pm vg<sup>st</sup>

#### IV. Word Order Differences in Mt ⋈.01 *contra txt* (3)

22. Mt 6.23 – par. Mt 6.22 // Lk 11.34

Mt 6.23 ἔὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ᾦ<sup>2</sup>, ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον

<sup>5</sup>(22) ᾦ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ⋈\* W 33

23. Mt 8.10 – par. Lk 7.9

Mt 8.10 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἑπαρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ<sup>1</sup> εὔρον.

APPENDIX 3 SYNOPSIS OF ALL ALLEGED HARMONISATIONS WITHIN MATTHEW IN CODEX SINAITICUS

<sup>ρ</sup>) οὐδε ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν ⋈ C K L N Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700  
 1241 1424 1844 12211 ℣ lat sy<sup>(s).p.h</sup> | παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν *f*<sup>1</sup> | *txt* B W  
 (0281 892) a (g<sup>1</sup>) k q sy<sup>(c.hmg)</sup> co

24. Mt 15.37 – par. Mt 14.20 // Mk 6.43; 8.8 // Lk 9.17

Mt 15.37 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν. καὶ <sup>ρ</sup>τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ἦραν<sup>2</sup>  
 ἑπτὰ σφυρίδας πλήρεις

<sup>ρ</sup>) ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ⋈ C K L N P W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 1241  
 1424 ℣ f (ff<sup>1</sup>) q | *txt* B D Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 579 700 892 12211 lat

## APPENDIX 4 SYNOPSIS OF ALL ALLEGED HARMONISATIONS WITHIN MATTHEW IN CODEX VATICANUS

The below list identifies all the 24 *vll* indicated in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic. The presentation will be the same way as in Appendix 3.

### I. Absence in Mt B.03 *contra txt* (5)

1. Mt 8.23 – par. Mk 4.36 // Lk 8.22

Mt 8.23 Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῶ εἰς ὄτῳ πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

°*p*) ⑆<sup>1</sup> B C *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1844 12211 | *txt* ⑆<sup>\*.2</sup> K L N W Γ Δ Θ 579 700 1424 ℳ

2. Mt 15.27 – par. Mk 7.28

Mt 15.27 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· ναὶ κύριε, καὶ ὁ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.

°*p*) B e sy<sup>s.p</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

3. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.39-40

Mt 20.23 ὁ ἄρχεις λέγει αὐτοῖς· τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε <sup>1</sup>, τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἡ καὶ ἐξ ἐνωπύμων <sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν ὁ [τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοιμάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

°*p*) ⑆ B K L N Z Γ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p</sup> co | *txt* C D W Δ 085 33 (565) 1844 q sy<sup>s.c.h</sup>

4. Mt 24.39 – par. Mt 24.37 // Lk 17.26

Mt 24.39 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἕως ἡλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ [καὶ] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

°(37) B D 892 12211 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup> co | *txt* ⑆ K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>h</sup>

5. Mt 25.40 – par. Mt 25.45

Mt 25.40 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τούτων ἰσθίων ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιή

°(45) B\* 0128\* 1424 ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup>; Cl<sup>pt</sup> Eus GrNy

### II. Presence in Mt B.03 *contra txt* (7)

6. Mt 2.13 – par. Mt 2.12

Mt 2.13 Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοι· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό.

° (12) εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν B

7. Mt 8.9 – par. Lk 7.8

Mt 8.9 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ὁ ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλω· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποιήσον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.

Ἅ ρ)τασσόμενος & B it vg<sup>cl</sup> (sa bo)

8. Mt 14.22 – par. Mk 6.45

Mt 14.22 Καὶ ὁ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὁ ἐμβῆναι εἰς ὁ<sup>1</sup> τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν ὁ<sup>2</sup> αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους

Ἅ ρ) αὐτοῦ B K P Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 579 892 1424 1844 12211 pm it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy co? | txt  
& C D L W Γ Δ 067 0106 0277 f<sup>1</sup> 33 700 1241 pm lat

9. Mt 15.38 – par. Mk 8.9

Mt 15.38 οἱ δὲ ἐσθιόντες ἦσαν ἁ τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς ἁ γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων

Ἅ ρ) ὡς B Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 12211 | ὡσεὶ & 579 1241 | txt C D K L N P W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup>  
565 700 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>s.c.p</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo

10. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11-12

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ἁ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἁ

Ἅ ρ) καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (ἀπολυμένην Θ 565, + ἀπὸ ἄνδρος 579) γαμῶν (γαμήσας B K Z Γ 700 892 ℳ) μοιχᾶται B C\* K N W Z Γ Δ Θ 078 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p.h</sup> bo | ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμ. ἀπολελ. μοιχ. ϑ<sup>25</sup> mae | txt & C<sup>3</sup> D L 1241 it sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>ms</sup>

11. Mt 23.19 – par. Mt 23.17

Mt 23.19 ἁ τυφλοί, τί γὰρ μεῖζον, τὸ δῶρον ἢ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἀγιάζον τὸ δῶρον;

Ἅ ρ) μωροὶ καὶ B C K W Γ Δ 0102 f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 1844 ℳ c f sy<sup>p.h</sup> co | txt & D L Z Θ f<sup>1</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>s.c</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>

12. Mt 27.49 – par. Jn 19.34

Mt 27.49 οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἁ ἔλεγον· ἁ φες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται ἁ Ἐλίας σῶσων αὐτόν. ἁ

Ἅ (Jn 19.34) ἁ ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην (λόγην Γ) ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἁ ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα (ἁ αἷμα καὶ ἁ ὕδωρ Γ) & B C L Γ vg<sup>mss</sup> mae | txt A D K W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℳ lat sy sa bo

III. Alternative Wording in Mt B.03 *contra txt* (12)

13. Mt 9.6 – par. Mk 2.10-11 // Lk 5.24

Mt 9.6 ἁ ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁ ἁμαρτίας - τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἁ ἐγερθεὶς ἁ ἄρὸν σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ἁ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.



ⲓⲱ) ἔγειρε (+ καί D) B D 0281 sy | txt & C K L N W Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700  
892 1424 1844 12211 ℞ q

14. Mt 16.20 – par. Mk 8.30 // Lk 9.21

Mt 16.20 τότε ⲓⲃιστεῖλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ⲧ ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι ⲓⲁὐτός ἐστιν ⲧ ὁ χριστός

ⲓⲱ) ἐπετίμησεν B\* D e sy<sup>c</sup>; Or<sup>mss</sup> | txt & B<sup>2</sup> C K L W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 (579)  
700 892 1241 1424 ℞ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> co; Or<sup>mss</sup>

15. Mt 17.23 – par. Mt 16.21 ; 20.18–19 // Mk 8.31 ; 9.31 ; 10.33-34 // Lk 9.22 ;  
18.32-33

Mt 17.23 καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ⲧτῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ⲓⲁγερθήσεται. ⲡκαὶ ἐλυπήθησαν  
σφόδρα.Ⲙ

ⲓⲱ) ἀναστήσεται B *f*<sup>13</sup> 892 1424

16. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11–12 // Lk 16.18

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ⲓⲃτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ⲓⲁμὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ  
ἄλλην μοιχᾶταιⲘ ⲧ

ⲓⲁ(5.32) παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι B *f*<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>1</sup> bo | μὴ ἐπὶ  
πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην (om. καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην N) ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι  
C\* N | παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται D *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 it (sy<sup>c</sup>)  
sa mae | txt & C<sup>3</sup> K L (–καί W) Z Γ Δ Θ 078 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℞ I  
vg sy<sup>s,p,h</sup>

17. Mt 19.9 – par. Mt 5.32 // Mk 10.11-12 // Lk 16.18 *inter alia*

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ⲓⲃτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ⲓⲁμὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ  
ἄλλην μοιχᾶταιⲘ ⲧ

ⲓⲱ) ὃς ἂν B D Z it | ὅστις 1424

18. Mt 20.19 – par. Mk 10.34 // Lk 18.33

Mt 20.19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτόν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι,  
καὶ τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ⲓⲁγερθήσεται.

ⲓⲱ) ἀναστήσεται B C<sup>2</sup> D K W Γ Δ Θ 085 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 1241 1424 1844 ℞ |  
txt & C\* L N Z 579 892; Or

19. Mt 20.23 – par. Mk 10.39-40

Mt 20.23 ⲧ λέγει αὐτοῖςⲧ · τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε ⲧ<sup>1</sup>, τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ⲓⲁκαὶ ἐξ  
εὐωνύμων ⲧ<sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν ὁ[τοῦτο] δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου.

ⲓⲱ) ἡ B L Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 1424 it vg<sup>cl</sup> sa mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Epiph | txt & D *rell*

∘ⲱ) & B K L N Z Γ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℞ lat sy<sup>p</sup> co | txt C D W  
Δ 085 33 (565) 1844 q sy<sup>s,c,h</sup>

20. Mt 20.26-27 – par. Mk 10.43-44

Mt 20.26 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἐάν θέλῃ ἔν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, [27] καὶ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἔν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος·

[26] ὁ ρ) ἐστὶν B D Z 0281 sa<sup>mss</sup> | txt X C K L N W Γ Δ Θ 085 f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579  
700 892 1241 1424 l844 M̄ lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo

21. Mt 27.46 – par. Mk 15.34

Mt 27.46 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἠνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων· ἤλι ἤλι ἑλεμα σαβαχθάνι ἰ; τοῦτ' ἔστιν· Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες

ὁ ρ) ἐβόησεν B L W 33 700 l844

22. Mt 2.13 – par. Mt 1.20

Mt 2.13 Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἴδου ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοι· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό.

ὁ (1.20) κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη B | (19 v.l.) κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται C K 33 700 892 | txt D  
rell

23. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30 // Mk 10.47-48 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μείζον ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε ἱ, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

ὁ (30) κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς X B D L Z Θ 085 0281 f<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo |  
ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | txt C K N W Γ Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 M̄ f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c,h</sup>  
sa<sup>ms</sup> mae

#### IV. Word Order Differences in Mt B.03 *contra txt* (1)

24. Mt 16.5 – par. Mk 8.14

Mt 16.5 Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν.

ὁ ρ) B K 579 892 1424 (e)

## APPENDIX 5 SYNOPSIS OF ALL ALLEGED HARMONISATIONS WITHIN MATTHEW IN CODEX BEZAE

The below list orders all the 70 *vll* indicated in NA<sup>28</sup> as harmonistic according to the criteria identified in Chapter 4 according to the Gospel(s) identified as a parallel. The presentation will be done the same way as introduced in Appendix 3.

### I. Absence in Mt D.05 *contra txt* (4)

1. Mt 16.4 (Mt 12.39) – par. Mk 8.12-13 // Lk 11.29

Mt 16.4 Γενεὰ πονηρὰ <sup>□</sup>καὶ μοιχαλὶς ἡ σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ ἡ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ <sup>⊲</sup>. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

<sup>□</sup>*p*) D it

2. Mt 19.9 (Mt 5.32) – par. Mk 10.11–12 // Lk 16.18

Mt 19.9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται. <sup>⊲</sup> <sup>⊲</sup>

<sup>⊲</sup>*p*) ὃς ἂν B D Z it | ὅστις 1424

3. Mt 24.39 – par. Mt 24.37

Mt 24.39 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἕως ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας, οὕτως ἔσται <sup>○</sup>[καὶ] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>○</sup>(37) B D 892 l2211 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s,p</sup> co | *txt* & K L W Γ Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 *ℳ* lat sy<sup>h</sup>

4. Mt 26.73 – par. Mk 14.70 // Lk 22.59

Mt 26.73 μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προσελθόντες οἱ ἐστῶτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ἀληθῶς <sup>□</sup>καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ <sup>⊲</sup> ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμολογῶν σε ποιεῖ <sup>⊲</sup>.

<sup>□</sup>*p*) D Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup>

### II. Presence in Mt D.05 *contra txt* (28)

5. Mt 2.18 – par. Jr 38.15LXX

Mt 2.18 φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμὰ ἠκούσθη, <sup>⊲</sup> κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολὺς· Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν

<sup>⊲</sup> (Jr 38.15) θρῆνος καὶ (–1241) C D K L W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 *ℳ* sy<sup>s,c,h</sup> | *txt* & B Z *f*<sup>1</sup> l2211 lat sy<sup>p</sup> co; Ju

6. Mt 4.10 – par. Mt 16.23

Mt 4.10 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὑπαγε <sup>⊲</sup>, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ, Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

APPENDIX 5 SYNOPSIS OF ALL ALLEGED HARMONISATIONS WITHIN MATTHEW IN CODEx BEZAE

<sup>†</sup> (16.23) *p*) ὀπίσω μου C<sup>2</sup> D L Z Γ 33 579<sup>c</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 ℳ b h l\* sy<sup>(s)c.h</sup>  
sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup> | retro it; Ir<sup>arm</sup> vid | *txt* & B C\*<sup>vid</sup> K P W Δ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579\* 700  
892\*<sup>vid</sup> f k vg sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> vid Or

7. Mt 4.19 – par. Mk 1.17

Mt 4.19 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς <sup>†</sup> ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων

<sup>†</sup> *p*) γένεσθαι &<sup>1</sup> D 33 1844 12211 lat sy<sup>p,hmg</sup>

8. Mt 5.25 – par. Lk 12.58b

Mt 5.25 ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ, ἕως ὅτου εἶ <sup>†</sup> μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ<sup>2</sup>, μήποτε σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς <sup>†</sup> τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ·

<sup>†</sup> *p*) σε παραδῶ K L W Γ Δ Θ 33 565 579 700 1241 1424 1844 ℳ lat sy<sup>c,p,h</sup> co  
| σε παραδώσει D | *txt* &<sup>64vid</sup> & B 0275 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 892 k; Cl

9. Mt 5.44 – par. Lk 6.27-28

Mt 5.44 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν <sup>†</sup> ἵνα προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν  
διωκόντων ὑμᾶς

<sup>†</sup> *p*) εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς (ὕμιν D\*) καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν  
ὑμᾶς D\*<sup>1</sup> K L W Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℳ lat sy<sup>(p),h</sup>  
mae; (Athen, Cl) Eus | *txt* & B *f*<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s,c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> mae; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Or Cyp | ἵνα (–  
W; Eus) προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς (ἡμᾶς Θ\*, –D; Eus) καὶ D  
K L W Δ Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 ℳ lat sy<sup>(p),h</sup>; (Athen Cl)  
Or<sup>pt</sup> Eus | *txt* & B *f*<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s,c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup> mae; (Ir<sup>lat</sup>) Or<sup>pt</sup> Cyp

10. Mt 9.15b – par. Mk 2.20 // Lk 5.35

Mt 9.15b ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν <sup>†</sup>.

<sup>†</sup> *p*) ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμεραῖς D it sy<sup>hmg</sup>

11. Mt 12.1 – par. Mk 2.23 // Lk 6.1

Mt 12.1 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς <sup>†</sup> τοῖς σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ  
μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπέινασαν καὶ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν <sup>†</sup> στάχυν καὶ ἐσθίειν

<sup>†</sup> *p*) τούς D W 700 sa bo

12. Mt 13.9 – par. Mk 4.9 // Lk 8.8 *inter alia*

Mt 13.9 ὁ ἔχων ὄτα <sup>†</sup> ἀκουέτω

<sup>†</sup> *p*) ἀκούειν &<sup>2</sup> C D K N W Z Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ  
lat sy<sup>c,p,h</sup> co | *txt* &\* B L a e ff<sup>1</sup> k sy<sup>s</sup>

13. Mt 13.14 – par. Is 6.9LXX

Mt 13.14 καὶ ἵνα πληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα· <sup>†</sup> ἀκοῆ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ  
μὴ συνήτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.

<sup>†</sup> (Is 6.9) πορεύητι καὶ εἶπὲ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ D it mae; Eus

14. Mt 14.15a – par. Mk 6.35 // Lk 9.12 *inter alia*

Mt 14.15a ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ ᾠ λέγοντες, Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν· ἀπόλυσον ᾠ τοὺς ὄχλους

ᾠ p) αὐτοῦ C D K L W Γ Δ Θ 0106<sup>vid</sup> f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy | txt ℵ B Z<sup>vid</sup> 33 892 l844 l2211 b e k

## 15. Mt 16.13 (Mt 16.15) – par. Mk 8.27,29a // Lk 9.18,20

Mt 16.13 Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων, Τίνα ᾠ λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι ᾠ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

ᾠ p) με D K L Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 892 1241 1424 l844 l2211 (C W) ℳ it vg<sup>mss</sup> (sy<sup>s.c</sup>); Ir<sup>lat</sup> | txt ℵ B 0281 579 700 c vg sy<sup>p.h</sup> co; Or

## 16. Mt 17.20-21 – par. Mk 9.29

Mt 17.20 ὁ δὲ ᾠ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Διὰ τὴν ᾠ ὀλιγοπιστίαν ὑμῶν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, ᾠ Μετάβα ἔνθεν ᾠ ἐκεῖ, καὶ μεταβήσεται· καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν. ᾠ [21] om.

ᾠ p) [21] τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται (ἐκβαλλ–ℵ<sup>2</sup>; ἐξερχ– 118 209 l2211) εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ ℵ<sup>2</sup> C D K L W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 l2211 ℳ lat sy<sup>(p).h</sup> (mae) bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or | txt ℵ\* B Θ 0281 33 579 892\* e ff<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s.c</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup>

## 17. Mt 18.10 – par. Mt 18.6

Mt 18.10 Ὅρατε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἑνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων· ᾠ λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ᾠ διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. ᾠ

ᾠ (18.6) τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ D it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>c</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup>

## 18. Mt 18.11 – par. Lk 9.10

Mt 18.11 (om.) ᾠ

ᾠ (Lk 19.10) [11] ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ (–Δ) υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (+ ζητῆσαι καὶ 579 892<sup>c</sup> c sy<sup>h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup>, + ζητῆσαι L<sup>mg</sup>) σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός D K L<sup>mg</sup> N W Γ Δ Θ<sup>c</sup> 078<sup>vid</sup> 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>c.p.h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> | txt ℵ B L<sup>txt</sup> Θ\* f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 892\*e ff<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> sa mae bo<sup>pt</sup>; Or Eus.

## 19. Mt 19.20 – par. Mk 10.20 // Lk 18.21

Mt 19.20 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος, ᾠ Πάντα ταῦτα ᾠ ἐφύλαξα ᾠ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;

ᾠ p) ἐκ νεότητός μου (–D) ℵ<sup>2</sup> C D K W Γ Δ f<sup>13</sup> 33 565 700<sup>c</sup> 892 1241 1424 l2211 ℳ it vg<sup>cl</sup> sy co; Cyr | txt ℵ\* B L Θ f<sup>1</sup> 579 700\* lat; Cyp

## 20. Mt 20.16 – par. Mt 22.14

Mt 20.16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι. ᾠ

<sup>⊥</sup> (22.14) πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ C D K N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup>  
33 565 579 700 892<sup>c</sup> 1241 ℣ latt sy mae bo<sup>pt</sup> | *txt* & B L Z 085 892\* 1424  
1844 sa bo<sup>pt</sup>

21. Mt 20.28 – par. Lk 14.8–10

Mt 20.28 ὡσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν  
ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. <sup>⊥</sup>

<sup>⊥</sup> (*cf.* Lk 14.8–10) ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε· ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ (+μή sy<sup>c</sup>) ἐκ  
μειζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνήσαι μὴ  
ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους (<sup>c</sup>εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους  
ἀνακλίνεσθε Φ), μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθῶν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ  
εἶπῃ σοι; ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνηθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσης εἰς τὸν ἥττονα  
τόπον καὶ (–Φ) ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· συνάγε (ἄγε Φ) ἔτι  
ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον. (χρησιμώτερον Φ) D Φ (it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>c.hmg</sup>)

22. Mt 22.27 – par. Mk 12.22b // Lk 20.32

Mt 22.27 ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν <sup>⊥</sup> ἡ γυνή

<sup>⊥</sup> *p*) καὶ D K Γ Θ 0102 *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℣ lat sy<sup>p.h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae  
bo | *txt* & B L W Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 565 (e) sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup>

23. Mt 22.45 – par. Mt 22.43

Mt 22.45 εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ <sup>⊥</sup> καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔστιν;

<sup>⊥</sup> (43) ἐν πνεύματι D K Δ Θ 0281 *f*<sup>13</sup> 565 1424 *pm* it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>h\*\*</sup> mae bo<sup>pt</sup>

24. Mt 24.31 – par. Lk 21.27-28

Mt 24.31 καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος <sup>⊥</sup> μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυναξουσιν  
τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρων <sup>⊥</sup> οὐρανῶν ἕως <sup>∘</sup> [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν  
<sup>⊥1</sup>

<sup>⊥1</sup> *p*) ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀναβλέψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν  
διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολυτρώσις ὑμῶν D it

25. Mt 24.37 – par. Mt 24.39

Mt 24.37 Ὡσπερ <sup>⊥</sup> γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται <sup>⊥</sup> ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>⊥</sup> (39) καὶ D K W Δ Θ 067 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 1241 1424 12211 ℣ lat sy<sup>h</sup> | *txt* & B  
L Γ 33 700 892 it vg<sup>mss</sup> sy<sup>s.p</sup> co

26. Mt 24.41 – par. Lk 17.34-36

Mt 24.41 δύο ἀλήθουσai ἐν τῷ <sup>⊥</sup> μύλῳ, μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται <sup>⊥</sup>

<sup>⊥</sup> *p*) δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται D *f*<sup>13</sup> it vg<sup>s</sup>

27. Mt 25.3 – par. Mt 25.4

Mt 25.3 αἰ γὰρ μωραὶ λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας <sup>⊥</sup> αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔλαβον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ἔλαιον<sup>⊥</sup>.

<sup>⊥</sup> (4) ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν D (ff<sup>1</sup>)

28. Mt 26.9 – par. Mk 14.5 // Jn 12.5

Mt 26.9 ἐδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο ὧ παραθῆναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι ὧ πτωχοῖς

ὧ p) τοῖς A D K W Γ Δ 700 1241 1424 pm | txt & B L Θ 0293 f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579  
892 1844 pm

29. Mt 26.28 – par. Mk 14.24 // Lk 22.19-20

Mt 26.28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου ὧ τῆς ὧ διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

ὧ p) καινῆς A C D K W Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 12211 ℣  
latt sy sa bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | txt ℞<sup>37.45</sup> vid & B L Z Θ 0298<sup>vid</sup> 33 mae bo<sup>ms</sup>; Ir<sup>arm</sup>

30. Mt 26.55 – par. Mk 14.48-49 // Lk 22.52-53

Mt 26.55 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις, Ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων συλλαβεῖν με; καθ' ἡμέραν ὧ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με.

ὧ p) πρὸς ὑμᾶς (A) C D K W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 1241 (1844) ℣ latt sy<sup>p,h</sup>  
mae; Eus | txt & B L 0281 33 700 892 1424 sy<sup>s</sup> sa bo

31. Mt 26.70 – par. Mk 14.68 // Lk 22.57,60

Mt 26.70 ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο ἔμπροσθεν ὧ πάντων λέγων· οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις ὧ.

ὧ p) οὐδὲ (οὐτὲ Δ) ἐπίσταμαι D Δ f<sup>1</sup> it sy<sup>s</sup>

32. Mt 27.28 – par. Mt 27.31 // Mk 15.17,20

Mt 27.28 καὶ ὧ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν ὧ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ

ὧ p) ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ D it (sy<sup>s</sup>) | τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ 33 sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae bo<sup>ms</sup>

### III. Alternative Wording in Mt D.05 *contra txt* (37)

33. Mt 1.23 – par. Is 7.14LXX

Mt 1.23 Ἴδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ ὧ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.

ὧ (cf. Is 7.14) καλέσεις D bo<sup>mss</sup>; Or Eus

34. Mt 1.25 – par. Lk 2.7

Mt 1.25 καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως ὅσ' ἔτεκεν ὧ υἱόν· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

ὧ (Lk 2.7) τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς (–D<sup>c</sup> L d q) τὸν πρωτότοκον C D K L N W Γ Δ 087  
565 579 700 892 1241 1844 12211 ℣ aur d f ff<sup>1</sup> q vg sy<sup>p,h</sup> | txt & B Z<sup>vid</sup> 071<sup>vid</sup>  
f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 it mae sy<sup>s,c</sup> (sa bo)

35. Mt 3.17 – par. Mk 1.11 // Lk 3.22 // Jn 1.34 (Mt 17.5 // Mk 9.7 // Lk 9.35)

Mt 3.17 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα ὧ· ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

ⲣ) συ εἶ D a sy<sup>s.c.</sup>; Ir

36. Mt 4.18 – par. Mk 1.16

Mt 4.18 Ἐπιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλιεῖς.

ⲣ) παράγων D it sy<sup>s.</sup>; Eus

37. Mt 5.29 – par. Mk 9.47 *inter alia*

Mt 5.29 εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γὰρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ σῶμά σου ἵνα βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν

ⲣ) ἀπέλθῃ D 700<sup>ms</sup> it sy<sup>s.c.</sup> (mae) bo

38. Mt 5.32 (Mt 19.9) – par. Mk 10.11-12 // Lk 16.18

Mt 5.32 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἅς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται

ⲣ) ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ D 579 pm it sy<sup>s.c.</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo

39. Mt 5.39 – par. Lk 6.29

Mt 5.39 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

ⲣ) ἐπί Ϻ<sup>2</sup> D K L Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 ℳ | txt Ϻ\* B W l844

40. Mt 9.6 – par. Mk 2.9,11,12a // Lk 5.24

Mt 9.6 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἔγερθεὶς ἄρον σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.

ⲣ) ἔγειρε (+ καί D) B D 0281 sy | txt Ϻ C K L N W Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 l844 l2211 ℳ q

41. Mt 9.15a – par. Mk 2.19 // Lk 5.34

Mt 9.15a καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος;

ⲣ) νηστεύειν D W (579) 1424 it sy<sup>p.hmg</sup> sa mae bo<sup>mss</sup>

42. Mt 9.17 – par. Mk 2.22 // Lk 5.37-39

Mt 9.17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὄγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται

ⲣ) ῥήσσει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς D (g<sup>1</sup> k μ sy<sup>s</sup>)

43. Mt 9.17 – par. Mk 2.22 // Lk 5.37-39



Mt 9.17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὄγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἔτι καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται· ἄλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι συντηροῦνται

ῥ*p*) ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί D (a) k

44. Mt 9.27 – par. Mk 10.47-48 // Lk 18.38-39 *inter alia*

Mt 9.27 Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠκολούθησαν ὁ[αὐτῶ] δύο τυφλοὶ κρᾶζοντες καὶ λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

ῥ*p*) υἱέ Ɑ C D K L Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 579 892\*1424 *pm* | κύριε υἱέ N *f*<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>c</sup> | *txt* B W 565 (700) 1844 12211 *pm*

45. Mt 9.29 – par. Mt 20.34

Mt 9.29 τότε ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν λέγων· κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν.

ῥ(20.34) ὀμμάτων D Θ

46. Mt 10.35 – par. Mi 7.6LXX

Mt 10.35 ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς

ῥ(Mi 7.6) υἱόν D *it sy*<sup>s.c</sup>

47. Mt 11.19 – par. Lk 7.35

Mt 11.19 ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν, Ἴδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν. καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς

ῥ*p*) τῶν τέκνων B<sup>2</sup> C D K L N Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1424 Ɑ *lat sy*<sup>s.c.hmg</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae | πάντων τῶν ἔργων *f*<sup>13</sup> (k) | *txt* Ɑ B\* W *sy*<sup>p.h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo; Hier<sup>mss</sup>

48. Mt 13.13 – par. Mk 4.12 // Lk 8.10

Mt 13.13 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν

ῥ*p*) ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούσωσιν μηδὲ συνῶσιν 1424 ff<sup>1</sup> sa mae | ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ ἀκούωσιν (–σωσιν D) καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν (συνῶσιν D) μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν D Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> it; (Eus)

49. Mt 13.34 – par. Mk 4.33-34

Mt 13.34 Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς ὁ οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.

ῥ*p*) οὐκ Ɑ<sup>2</sup> D K L Γ Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 Ɑ *lat bo* | *txt* Ɑ\* B C W Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> *f sy*<sup>h</sup> sa; Cl

50. Mt 15.36 – par. Mk 8.6

Mt 15.36 Ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας ὁ καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς τ, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ῥ τοῖς ὄχλοις

[36] ρ τῷ ὄχλῳ C D N P W Γ Δ Θ 565 1424 l2211 ℳ lat sa<sup>mss</sup> mae | txt ℵ  
B K L f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 579 700 892 1241 e f ff<sup>1</sup> sy sa<sup>ms</sup> bo

51. Mt 16.4 (Mt 12.39) – par. Mk 8.11 // Lk 11.29

Mt 16.4 Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς ἡ σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ ἡ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τ. Καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν.

ρ ζήτεῖ σημεῖον καὶ D\* b c e | σημεῖον ζητεῖ καὶ D<sup>c</sup> Θ | σημεῖον αἰτεῖ καὶ B\* | –  
700

52. Mt 16.20 – par. Mk 8.30 // Lk 9.21

Mt 16.20 τότε διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός

ρ ἐπετίμησεν B\* D e sy<sup>c</sup>; Or<sup>mss</sup> | txt ℵ B<sup>2</sup> C K L W Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565 (579)  
700 892 1241 1424 ℳ lat sy<sup>p,h</sup> co; Or<sup>mss</sup>

53. Mt 16.21; 17.23; 20.13 *inter alia*

Mt 16.21 Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι

ρ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι D (it) bo

54. Mt 16.23 – par. Mk 8.33

Mt 16.23 ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

ρ ἐπιστραφεὶς D K L Θ f<sup>13</sup> 565 1424

55. Mt 17.2 – par. Mt 28.3

Mt 17.2 καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς.

ρ (28.3) χιών D lat sy<sup>c</sup> bo<sup>mss</sup>

56. Mt 17.23 – par. Mk 9.31 // Lk 9.22 *inter alia*

Mt 17.23 καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται. καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα

ρ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας D it sy<sup>s</sup> bo

57. Mt 20.3 – par. Mt 20.6

Mt 20.3 καὶ ἐξελθὼν περὶ τρίτην ὥραν εἶδεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀργούς

ρ (6) εὔρεν D 1424 it

58. Mt 20.19 – par. Mk 10.34 // Lk 18.33 *inter alia*

Mt 20.19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται

ⲑⲫ) ἀναστήσεται B C<sup>2</sup> D K W Γ Δ Θ 085 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 33 565 700 1241 1424 /844 ℳ |  
*txt* ℵ C\* L N Z 579 892; Or

59. Mt 20.26 – par. Mk 10.43-44 // Lk 22.26-27

Mt 20.26 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἐάν θέλῃ ἔν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος

ⲑⲫ) ἐστίν B D Z 0281 *sa*<sup>mss</sup> | *txt* ℵ C K L N W Γ Δ Θ 085 *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700  
 892 1241 1424 /844 ℳ *lat sa*<sup>mss</sup> *mae bo*

60. Mt 20.30 – par. Mk 10.47 // Lk 18.38-39

Mt 20.30 καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, [κύριε] Ἰσὶδ Δαυίδ.

ⲑⲫ) υἱέ ℳ<sup>45</sup> C D 085 0281 *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 579 1241 1424 *pm* | Ἰησοῦ υἱέ ℵ L N Θ *f*  
<sup>13</sup> 700 892 *c e h n sa*<sup>mss</sup> *mae bo* | *txt* B K W Z Γ Δ *pm*

61. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30 [1]

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, Ἰσὶδ Δαυίδ.

ⲑⲫ) υἱέ ℵ<sup>(\*)</sup>.1 C D L N 085 0281 33 579 892 1241 1424 | *txt* B K W Z Γ Δ Θ *f*  
<sup>1.13</sup> 565 700 ℳ

62. Mt 21.1 – par. Mk 11.1 // Lk 19.29

Mt 21.1 Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Βηθφαγὴ ἑἷς εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς

ⲑ<sup>1</sup> ⲫ) πρὸς ℵ D K L N W Γ Δ Θ *f*<sup>1.13</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 /844 /2211  
 ℳ *lat sy*<sup>h</sup> | *txt* B C 33 *it*

63. Mt 21.13 – par. Mk 11.17 // Lk 19.46

Mt 21.13 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Γέγραπται, Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

ⲑⲫ) ἐποιήσατε C D K W Γ Δ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 565 579 1424 /844 (N 700 1241 /2211) ℳ  
 | πεποιήκατε *f*<sup>1</sup>; Or<sup>pt</sup> | *txt* ℵ B L Θ 0281 892 *bo*; Or<sup>pt</sup> Cyr

64. Mt 24.17 – par. Mk 13.15 // Lk 17.31

Mt 24.17 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι ἑτὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ

ⲑⲫ) τι D Θ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 1424 /2211 *latt*; Ir<sup>lat</sup> | τὸ ℵ\*

65. Mt 24.29 – par. Mk 13.24-25

Mt 24.29 Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται

ⲑⲫ) ἐκ ℵ D 0281

66. Mt 24.45 – par. Lk 12.42

Mt 24.45 Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ὅτι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ;

ⲑⲣⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥ D K Γ *f*<sup>1</sup> 700 1424 ℳ e sy<sup>s</sup> | οἰκίας Ⲭ 0281 565 579 892 q | *txt* B L W Δ Θ 067 0204 *f*<sup>13</sup> 33 1241 (1844 12211) lat sy<sup>p,h</sup>

67. Mt 25.27 – par. Lk 19.23

Mt 25.27 ἔδει ὅτι οὖν βαλεῖν τὰ ἀργύριά μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ

ⲑⲣⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥ Ⲭ<sup>2</sup> A C D K L Γ Δ *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 33 565 579 892 1241 1424 1844 12211 ℳ sy<sup>h</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> mae bo; Cl | *txt* Ⲭ\* B W Θ 700 sa<sup>mss</sup>

68. Mt 26.7 – par. Mk 14.3 // Jn 12.3

Mt 26.7 προσήλθεν αὐτῷ γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου βαρυτίμου καὶ κατέχευεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου.

ⲑⲣⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥ Ⲭ A D L Θ 33 565 892 1424 sy<sup>p,hmg</sup> | *txt* B K W Γ Δ 0293 *f*<sup>1,13</sup> 579 700 1241 1844 ℳ sy<sup>s,h</sup>

69. Mt 28.8 – par. Mk 16.8 // Lk 24.9

Mt 28.8 καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

ⲑⲣⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥ ἔξελθοῦσαι A D K W Γ Δ 0148 *f*<sup>1</sup> 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 1844 12211 ℳ | *txt* Ⲭ B C L Θ *f*<sup>13</sup> 33

## II. Word Order Difference *contra txt* (1)

70. Mt 20.31 – par. Mt 20.30

Mt 20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μείζον ἔκραζαν λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ.

ⲑⲣⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥ (30) Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς Ⲭ B D L Z Θ 085 0281 *f*<sup>13</sup> 892 lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>mss</sup> bo | ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς 579 700 e | *txt* C K N W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> 33 565 1241 1424 ℳ f ff<sup>2</sup> q sy<sup>c,h</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> mae